The Public

Sixth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1903. Number 284.

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.

Since the Ohio Democratic convention, the editorial page of the New York Times—a Wall street product—has been in a state of delirium bordering on insanity. "Loose writing" is what one might call it were it not so much like "tight writing."

Horrible as are the reported atrocities of the Turks in Macedonia, the United States is in no position to protest. Nowhere are the Turks reported to have been more atrocious in their conduct than American Christians are proved to have been in the Philippines. No Turkish general has yet been charged with issuing an order to his troops, as Gen. Smith did in Samar, instructing them to "kill all over ten."

When the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph insists with some show of violence that—

> the law says that every man shall have the right in this country to earn an honest living, and that he shall exercise that right; there is no need for loafers or room for loungers; the law condemns them, and says they shall go to work, if not freely then forcibly—

it must be understood as referring only to impecunious loafers who have no privileges, and not to rich loafers who are allowed to own the earth.

One of the New York papers of the current month, the Press we believe, reported a suggestive incident at one of the New York police courts. Eight men had been arrested for walking between the tracks on the Vanderbilt highway to Buffalo. Seven of the prisoners expressed contrition. They repented and were discharged. But one of the eight insisted that he had a right to walk on the tracks. The magistrate asserted the contrary. "Oh, yes, I have," said the prisoner; "but as things are going now I suppose a man won't be let walk along the roads." The response of the magistrate was a sentence of three months' imprisonment. Now, why is that man imprisoned? Is it because he walked along a railroad track? Or because he didn't repent of walking along the railroad track? Or because he said he had a right to walk along the railroad track? Or because he expressed the fairly sagacious opinion that "a man won't be let walk along the roads" after awhile? Or because the magistrate is an unfit person to sit upon the bench of a court of justice?

Charles Francis Adams is reported to have testified thus regarding municipal ownership of transportation:

> I can only say that, as the result of careful official examination on my part, I have never yet found in Europe anywhere a case of municipal or public transportation worthy of an instant's consideration as compared with our own. We here in America do things in the transportation line which in Europe they do not even dream of, and wherever the government lays its hands on a line it becomes, compared with our system, paralyzed at once.

But that is not the point. How does public transportation there compare with private transportation there? Is Glasgow better off or worse off than under the private system? Or, if Glasgow has had public ownership too long to admit of such a comparison, fairly, how does the public system in Liverpool compare with the recent private system there, and how do both compare with European systems where private operation still prevails? Those are the true tests. An expert witness should leave less wool on the edges of his testimony.

A Southerner writing to the New Orleans Harlequin, of John Temple Graves's recent anarchistic utterances on the Negro question, suggests this important comparison:

> There is not very far from our shores an English colony called Jamaica. The Negroes outnumber the whites in that colony far more than they outnumber the whites in any section of this country. And yet assault on white women in that colony by Negroes is absolutely unknown. It is unknown because the Negro in Jamaica knows that in an English colony the law is supreme, and that he will be inevitably pursued and punished for his crime. We of the South have tried lynching and the Island of Jamaica has tried the reign of law, and the record is there for any one to read who desires to be informed.

Expressions like that help to prove, what the fact is, that Southern sentiment is not altogether dominated by law defying mobs and their law-ignoring defenders in the press and upon the rostrum. It is to be regretted that the Harlequin found it necessary to disclaim "all sympathy" with its correspondent's views, without even an attempt to dispute the convincing facts he advanced in support of his views.

A case of white peonage has now come to light in Alabama to supplement the practice of black peonage (p. 264) which has prevailed in that and neighboring States. From black to white is an easy transition. Poor whites, North as well as South, who join in the hue and cry against the Negro race, little suspect the tendency of what they do. Let the Negro be deprived of natural rights on account of his black skin, and poor whites will soon be driven into the same procession on account of their empty pockets. In illustration of this ten-

Digitized by Google

dency we are confronted not only with the white peonage case in Alabama, but with several similar cases in Michigan. These have been discovered at Kalamazoo, where the proprietor of a shoe-blacking stand has been detected in buying a Greek boy. It appears that this is only one instance. Boys are said to be picked up every year in Greek cities and sold into slavery in the United States.

By degrees the more intelligent anti-Bryan newspapers are coming to understand Bryan's position on the money question. One of these newly enlightened papers is the Chicago Record-Herald, which, in commenting upon the Democratic platform of Ohio (wherein nothing is said in terms about bimetallism, but "financial monopoly" is opposed) observes:

> From this we are to infer that free and unlimited coinage at the prescribed ratio is not an indispensable specific, but merely one method of striking at financial monopoly.

Although this is not exactly as Mr. Bryan would state his position, it goes far to show that at least one hostile paper has come to some sort of an understanding of his insistence that the question of money monopoly is a live question whether the silver question be dead or not. The strange part of the matter is that any American newspaper, with its columns loaded with reports and discussions and conferences and schemes and Congressional bills with reference to the currency, should imagine that the money monopoly question is dead. Whether bimetallism be the remedy for money monopoly or not, and whether it is a dead issue in politics or not, the persistence of money monopoly is nevertheless a present fact too obtrusive to be innocently ignored.

The country has heard, with many expressions of much joy, of the recent conviction at New York of a labor leader of the name of Samuel J. Parks, for extortion. But few have heard that the prosecuting officers profess to know that Parks was in criminal partnership with a business house of enormous wealth, and that while Parks is sent to prison this house is unmolested. Yet that seems to be the fact. In the course of his cross-examination of Parks on the 20th of August, the assistant district attorney asked a question the object of which the court called upon him to explain. This was his explanation, as reported by the New York papers of the 21st:

> I am going to prove that before Sam Parks came to this city he was a maker of strikes in Chicago, and that he was brought here by Sam McConnell, the head of the Fuller Construction Company, for the purpose of calling strikes on all work in which the Fuller company was not engaged.

The court ruled out the question and struck the lawyer's statement from the record. That was proper. But why is Parks the only one of the conspirators to be indicted? If the district attorney knows that the Fuller Construction company conspired with him, why does the Fuller Construction company go scot free? This company is a $20,000,000 corporation, but that is no reason for ignoring the crimes of its officials, if they have committed any. So far, however, as has yet appeared, there has been no prosecution of the Fuller people.

The special election at Cleveland on the question of establishing a municipal lighting plant (p. 346) did not come off on the 8th. Senator Hanna's attorney general, upon the application of a Cleveland lawyer who belongs politically to Senator Hanna's Democratic contingent, secured a restraining order from some of the Supreme Court judges. The order was obtained without notice to the city, and the hearing was set at a date two weeks after that set for the election. The purpose of this "snap" order is therefore manifest upon the face of the proceedings. It was to prevent an expression of public opinion. A month had elapsed during which such proceedings might have been instituted and a full hearing had. But the back-door restraining order was granted only a week before the election. The election would not have determined the matter. Even after an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the people, a two-thirds vote of the city council would have been necessary to confirm. Consequently the restraining order might have been granted against the council after the popular election, and thus have saved all property rights. But it was an expression of popular opinion that the combination of corporations and Republican officials wished to prevent. Hence the restraining order at the particular moment at which it was granted.

The straits to which the Cleveland "grafters" are driven by Mayor Johnson is well illustrated by that injunction against a popular election. The law under which the election was to have been held was a Republican act, and the corporation-Republican combine now seek its nullification by Republican judges through a Republican attorney general. In doing so they advertise the very facts about themselves that Johnson lays stress upon in his appeals to the people. Surely Johnson is one of the luckiest of public men in the political enmities he incurs and the assinine maneuvers he frightens his adversaries into making.

They could hardly make any move more foolish than the moves they have already made, which have lost them the county of Cuyahoga and bid fair to lose them the State, unless it might be the one that Senator Hanna's attorney general threatens through the newspapers—the arrest of Johnson for contempt of court in criticising the injunction judges. Johnson's friends over the country might wisely pray for something of that kind. It would advertise the iniquity of the plutocratic programme in Ohio as nothing else could. Johnson has in fact not criticised the judges, un-

Digitized by Google