

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1914.

No. 831.

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE THACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.
STOUGHTON COOLEY, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, }
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana	HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
HENRY F. RING, Texas	FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio	ROBERT BAKER, New York
HERBERT QUICE, West Virginia	GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio	W. G. EGLESTON, California
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio	C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
JOHN Z. WATTS, Illinois	R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
LEWELLYN JONES, Illinois	LEWIS H. BREWERS, England
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Calif.	J. W. S. CALLIE, England
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island	JOSEPH FELS, England
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota	JOHN PAUL, England
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri	ERNEST BRAY, Australia
LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York	GEORGE FOWLES, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago,
Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Chicago's Tributes of Respect.....	217
The Best Memorial.....	217
Turning the Other Cheek.....	217
Intervention Indefensible.....	218
To Avoid War.....	219
Monarch's Protect No One.....	219
Saving the Country.....	219
Unfair Discrimination.....	219
A Fundamental Measure—W. G. Stewart.....	219
Censorship in Chicago.....	219
Boosting Boston.....	220
A Just Tax System for Washington.....	220
Democrats Who Reject Democracy.....	220
Senators in Need of Fight.....	221
Legal Disfranchisement.....	221
The Modern Gospel—Will Atkinson.....	222
Why Is Tammany?—Robert S. Doubleday.....	222

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Hearing on Herrick-Schaap Bill—Grace I. Colbron.....	223
The Proof of the Pudding—Edward P. E. Troy.....	223

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

Treatment of an Enlisted Man—Thorwald Siegfried.....	224
The Land Question in Early United States History —Henry Leffmann.....	225

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Mrs. Fels Acknowledgment.....	226
The Funeral of Joseph Fels.....	226
Joseph Fels Memorial Meetings.....	227
Suffrage Matters.....	228
U'Ren for Governor of Oregon.....	228
Denver Defeats a Franchise.....	228
The Cleveland Foundation.....	228
The Labor War.....	229
Mexico and the United States.....	230
English Politics.....	231
News Notes.....	231
Press Opinions.....	232

RELATED THINGS:

A Defense on Parnassus—S. Gertrude Ford.....	232
Two Women on a Hill Top. No. 2. The One Who Gave and Had—Charles Howard Shinn.....	233

BOOKS:

Finance and Social Organization.....	234
Books Received.....	235
Pamphlets.....	235
Pamphlets Received.....	236

EDITORIAL

Chicago's Tribute of Respect.

Chicago's memorial meeting for Joseph Fels is announced to be held at the Y. M. C. A. Hall, 19 S. La Salle street, on the evening of Wednesday, March 11. The world-wide respect for the memory of the departed is shown in the fact that among the speakers will be Josiah Wedgwood, a member of the British Parliament, who comes solely to represent the progressives of his country at meetings held on this side of the water. This Chicago meeting is but one of many which will be held throughout the nation and the world. These meetings should not be looked upon as mere mourning assemblages. The spirit that prevails is the one so well expressed in the message of the Los Angeles Home Rule Tax League on receiving the news of Joseph Fels' death: "Another gap in the ranks—God, what a big one! Close up—blows are to strengthen. We rejoice that he fell face forward and well out on the firing line. To Mrs. Fels our sympathy inexpressible in words. To the cause our renewed pledges of loyalty."

S. D.



The Best Memorial.

From many places come announcements of preparation for memorial meetings in honor of Joseph Fels. This is as it should be. But the tribute to his memory that must not be overlooked is pushing on the work to which he gave not only his money but himself.

S. D.



Turning the Other Cheek.

There is a vein of thought in the militarist's mind to this effect: Certainly, one should be a gentleman under all circumstances, and one may even turn the other cheek; but manifestly there must come a time, if the bully persists in his insults, when personal chastisement is unavoidable. This is now the jingo's state of mind regarding Mexico. It was well enough, he says, to adopt

pacific measures at the beginning, but these, it is patent, have been fruitless; and it is now time to apply force. Huerta defies us; Villa flouts us; Caranza evades us. Are we, the most powerful nation in all history, to tolerate it? Well, are we? That is something that every American citizen must answer for himself. It was easy to assume the role of gentleman at the beginning of the trouble; but when the property losses began to mount it required an effort to hold the hand that could so easily smite the offender, and some who had essayed to be gentlemen slipped over to the jingo camp; and now that an American has been reported, and a Briton has been, executed by Mexicans, many more have laid aside the badge of gentility.



It is not strange that there should have been this falling away of some who at first took their stand with President Wilson. This is a first attempt of a nation's assuming the role of gentleman, and the world is uncertain what to make of it. History will be searched in vain for a similar case; and without precedent what can statesmen do? With the nations of the world struggling for more territory, we, with defenseless territory at our hand, refrain from adding it to our own dominion. Nay, we suffer insult from the people of that territory, and become the laughing stock of Europe; still we hold the hand that might so easily smite. But how long shall we continue this policy? Must there not come a time when patience and forbearance shall cease to be a virtue? The answer to this question will be more easily found by those who are able to separate the individual from the nation. Nationally considered, it may be set down as a certainty that this country would win in a war with Mexico. Individually considered, it can be set down with equal certainty that a vast number of Americans would be killed and wounded. Before the citizen decides, therefore, whether or not this country is to go to war with Mexico—and intervention means war—he should in all fairness say what sacrifice he is ready to make. Is he willing to be one of those whose lives will be given in the contest? Is he willing to give an arm, a leg, an eye, or his general health, and finish his days as a cripple or an invalid? And even should he be willing himself to make this sacrifice, is he sufficiently convinced of the righteousness of his cause to plunge his country into a war that means the killing and maiming of so many of his fellows?



It is enough that citizens be compelled to

shoulder the war debt and the pension list of those who really do the fighting, but it is altogether out of reason to have them thrust upon us by those who will under no circumstances risk their own persons. There may come a time when this nation must fight; but it cannot come till the individual citizens are ready, not to send their brothers to the front, but to go themselves. Sacrifice by proxy cannot be accepted. A distinguished war correspondent, Mr. James Creelman, is now flooding the country with his views of the Mexican situation. Mr. Creelman is of that noisy school of patriots that is willing to sacrifice an indefinite number of other people's lives for the sake of maintaining the nation's honor. For President Wilson he has ill-concealed contempt, and for John Lind, laughter. The attempt of these idealists to treat a nation of which the mass of the people are "blanketed Indians," the war correspondent considers a crime against civilization, and a course that the nations of Europe will not long endure. Mr. Lind's letter to an American whose property was threatened with destruction, in which he spoke of a Constitutionalist officer as though he were a gentleman, and amenable to the ways of civilization, affords Mr. Creelman great amusement. But is the distinguished war correspondent so very sure that a Mexican, even a "blanketed Indian," is indifferent to the treatment of a gentleman? How did the smiting-handed Puritans and Cavaliers fare with the Indians, as compared with the open-handed Quakers? Why, if "blanketed Indians" recognize no power but force, were the Massachusetts and Virginia settlers so often at war with the Indians, while the Quakers lived in unbroken peace? The Mexicans know us as a nation of bullies, who in 1846 robbed them of half their territory. They still speak of us in the terms we taught them. Possibly we can teach them a better language. Such a triumph would be worth while. But we cannot teach them with rifles. They already understand that language. s. c.



Intervention Indefensible.

The killing of the Englishman W. S. Benton by Mexican constitutionalists is a crime for which there is no excuse. But it is no greater crime than would be intervention. Yet we have congressmen and senators urging that lives be sacrificed—other than their own—and that wealth be taken—from earnings of other people—to avenge this crime. Because one man has been murdered we must sacrifice hundreds of lives and bring suffering and distress upon thousands of innocent people. Such is the philosophy of our jingo states-