

OCTOBER 12, 1905

there are to be found those who will publicly applaud such Pharisaical hypocrisy.

The latest Pharisee is the insurance official who has been detected in misappropriating the funds of widows and orphans. And these same men and their ilk were the men who, in 1896 and 1900, were shouting themselves hoarse as champions of the widows and orphans. And while they were shouting they were contributing the money of widows and orphans to buy immunity from the law for themselves and for the companies they controlled.

"Every dog has his day." The Pharisees have had their day for almost ten years, but at last they are confounded by the great white light of the truth. A just Providence could not spare them these revelations until after they were dead. They had defied the world with an almost sub-human viciousness and justice seemed to require that they should be exposed and shamed before the world. In the day of their exposure and shame they snap and bite and growl like driven hounds, but relentless fate has brought them low. And that Providence which has struck them down into the dust will not fail, in due time, to shatter the system of finance which has produced the greatest criminals of all the ages.

#### BATTLE IS AGAINST THE "SYSTEM"

Those in charge of the Rockefeller whitewash bureau are not esteeming that fine discrimination and graceful diplomacy which ought to characterize such an aristocratic institution. The art of applying whitewash requires no little genius and should not be undertaken by a tyro. To hurl whitewash upon the one to be whitewashed by bucketfuls shows poor taste and does not accomplish the object desired. A good brush should be used—not too large and not too small, and the whitewash must be of the proper consistency. Few know how to mix whitewash aright, particularly whitewash of the literary kind. As a result there is much injudicious whitewashing that can scarcely be distinguished from mud-slinging.

The birthday party at the Rockefeller home was not a bad idea, but the work done by the chief whitewasher, Mr. Bacon, was decidedly crude. The book written by Marcus M. Brown in defense of Rockefeller was too palpable in its purpose. An attack may be bold, slashing and swashbuckling, a la Miss Tarbell and Mr. Lawson, but a defense must be a clever parry. A literary defense must be achieved with an art that conceals all art. The little stories going the rounds of the press, telling how lovable, charitable and generous Mr. Rockefeller is, are much more effective than this bulky and bushwacking book. The birthday party often serves an excellent purpose, but some bad mistakes have been made at birthday parties. Herod, tetrarch of Galilee, in a mad moment at his birthday party swore a terrible oath that made him a murderer and burdened his conscience until his dying day.

The mistakes of the Rockefeller bureau have been chiefly due to a desire to "pile it on." Not satisfied with the delicate pastels in the magazines and newspapers, the book and the birthday party, the bureau set about the work of getting certificates of character from the rich friends of Mr. Rockefeller. How much more convincing would have been the testimony of the stable boy, the butler, the office boy or the humble book-keeper.

The cardinal error, however, seems to have been in misunderstanding the nature of the attack on Mr. Rockefeller. The defenders assume that the assailants have been calling Mr. Rockefeller a miser, a thief, a cold-blooded tyrant and a hater of his fellow men. They have undertaken, therefore, to prove him a kindly, generous and lovable old man. Perhaps Mr. Rockefeller may have inferred that his assailants meant to call him these hard and cruel names, but as a matter of fact nearly all the attacks have been directed against his business methods. The principal attacks were made by Miss Tarbell and by Thomas W. Lawson. In her book Miss Tarbell produces evidence to discredit Standard Oil business methods and in his articles on "frenzied finance" Mr. Lawson proclaims it his purpose to expose and destroy the "system."

Truly the man is behind the system, but there may be excuses for the man when there are no excuses for the system. Man may be led astray by his passions and be not wholly bad, but what he does is bad and cannot be condoned. Pontius Pilate, who saw no wrong in the Just Man he turned over to the ruthless Judean mob, committed a great sin, but he had beguiled himself into the belief that he was acting for the best interests of those unruly provinces which imperial Rome had given him to rule. He fondly imagined that reasons of state dictated his action, and he blinded his eyes to the fact that his real reason for the wrong he did was his fear that he would be dethroned by a dissatisfied emperor.

It is impossible, of course, to condemn a bad system without

at the same time condemning, although not in equal measure, the man behind the system. Rockefeller happens to be the chief figure in a system of finance which thrives by special privileges and unjust discriminations such as are hateful to the spirit and antagonistic to the principles of our institutions. Because of the position he has occupied the battle against an unholy system has raged about him with incessant fury. But the people are not seeking to destroy Rockefeller, nor even to place him behind prison bars. If he died tomorrow the system would still exist, and until the system is destroyed the battle will go on to the bitter end.

#### JUDGE LETTON'S MISTAKE

Judge Letton has at length surrendered his passes, according to a number of republican papers. While the state officials were surrendering their passes without hypocritical pretense Mr. Letton allowed the impression to prevail that he was not a pass-user, but the Populist convention removed the mask from his face. Defenders of Mr. Letton now say that judicial dignity prevented him from making a public announcement of the fact that he had surrendered his passes. Mr. Letton would do well not to assume too much judicial dignity until he is elected. The people demand candor and straightforwardness in their candidates and are learning from revelations in "frenzied finance" that there has been too much pious pretense and dignity of one kind or another used to conceal fraud and corruption.

Defenders of the life insurance contributions to the republican campaign fund are saying that the officials who made the contributions were prompted by sincere motives and wished to save the nation from ruin. If that be the case why hold any national elections? Why not put up the presidency for sale to the highest bidder? Those who are eager to save the nation and the business interests of the country, more particularly the business interests, can then buy the presidency and avoid the cheap hypocrisy that now attends the barter and sale for that high office.

The elder McCurdy and his precocious boys found rich picking in the control of the Mutual Life. McCall and his boys looted the New York Life, while Hyde the elder and junior held up the Equitable for tainted millions. Evidently these gentlemen thought that the word mutual applied only to insurance officials and their families.

General Jose Miguel Gomez has come all the way from Cuba to tell us that the party in power is corrupting the ballot and he asks the United States to interfere. Gomez must be a traitor. Think of an American asking a foreign country to interfere because our elections are bought by the trusts, railways and insurance officials.

The rich and powerful life insurance lobby was defeated in Nebraska by the railway lobby, a local institution of which the state is justly proud. It is to be hoped, however, that in the present contest between the railway lobby and the people the result will be reversed.

The corporation whip has been cracked and David B. Hill and Richard Olney have come out against railway regulation by the government. All the old-time myrmidons of the money power are remaining true to their colors.

Those who say that trusts are a natural evolution and cannot be destroyed forget that the trusts have been created by special privileges and discriminations and can be destroyed by the withdrawal of these favors.

Pat Crowe failed to contribute a portion of the kidnapping prize to the republican campaign fund, and he must, therefore, stand trial.

Those who seek to regulate the trusts are wasting ammunition. The trusts must be destroyed or they will continue to regulate the government.

The republican national committee was probably trying to clean up the policy-holders "as clean as a hound's tooth."

The money power prefers Rockefeller control of education to government control of railways.