

"THE TOUCH THAT MAKES US KIN"

Recently a child was born to Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The newspapers printed an interview with Mr. Hadley, the attorney general of Missouri, to the effect that the attorney general was ready to declare a truce, permitting the elder Rockefeller, who for several months has been dodging subpoenas, to visit his new grandchild without fear of being molested by the authorities. Sad to say, a number of newspaper editors enthusiastically, if not hysterically, endorse the attorney general's "generous offer." One newspaper prints an eloquent editorial entitled "The Touch That Makes Us Kin." That paper says: "The law is not cruel. Its intent is justice, justice for the rich and the poor alike. The law is for justice, and not for the persecution of a poor old man."

This may be said to be sentiment "gone mad."

What is to prevent John D. Rockefeller visiting his grandchild? Simply the fear that he may encounter an officer of the law holding a simple writ commanding him to appear and give testimony in a court of justice. Honest men do not avoid such writs. If John D. Rockefeller does not love his grandchild sufficiently to run the risk of being served with a subpoena, than he does not come within a thousand miles of "the touch that makes us kin."

If Attorney General Hadley made this offer to the oil trust magnate he acted unwisely. The happiness and, indeed, the lives of thousands and thousands of little children who are just as precious as the Rockefeller infant depend upon such proceedings as those instituted by the attorney general of Missouri, the purpose of which is to require justice for the people at the hands of the oil magnate. There is "the touch that makes us kin."

One newspaper editor says that when the attorney general of Missouri said to "the poor old man skulking through his broad acres in the Jersey hills: 'Go and see the boy. You shall not be molested,' he spoke the words of fellow feeling that makes the whole world kind."

There have been several instances where fugitives from justice charged with crime sought to attend the funeral of loved ones under a truce with the authorities. We do not remember that any such truce was ever granted. But suppose that, in this day, some such proposition came from some fugitive other than a captain of industry? Would any newspaper editor uphold the authorities did they grant such a truce? We make bold to say that the proposition would be laughed to scorn in every newspaper office in the country. Then why, when such a truce is granted to the oil magnate, who is dodging nothing more serious than a subpoena, do newspaper editors fall over themselves, as it were, to write in plaintive terms of "the touch that makes us kin?"

"The touch that makes us kin," indeed! If John D. Rockefeller had his just deserts he would have long ago been confronted with something more serious than the writ of subpoena. In the name of a plundered people, spare us from any sentimental gush with respect to Hadley's absurd offer to the oil magnate.

WHAT A "FLEW"

Recently the New York World, and other newspapers severely criticized Mr. Jerome because of his refusal to proceed against the insurance magnates. Somebody reminded the World, "You invented Jerome." The World replies "Even if we did, it is not the first time somebody invented an airship that would not fly." A few months ago the World referred to Mr. Jerome in the most complimentary terms and declared that his re-election would give impetus to every good government movement throughout the United States; but now the World likens Mr. Jerome to "an airship that would not fly?" What a "flew" my countrymen!

WHO IS TO BLAME?

In a recent wreck on a western railroad thirty people were killed and many more wounded. The wreck was caused by the failure of an operator to deliver a train order. The operator frankly confesses that he went to sleep and neglected the order. But he asserts that on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday he had worked practically day and night, without sleep. For seventy-two hours he was on duty without relief. Then he went to sleep, the train he was supposed to hold went by, and a collision resulted.

Who is to blame? Is it the operator whose physical frame was unable to stand the strain? Or is it the fault of the management which de-

manded so much of this operator? The company expended millions of dollars in building a fine roadbed, equipping it with heavy rails and running thereon palatial trains to carry thousands of men and women. It pays its trainmen a better average wage than most railroads. And then it demands that a \$60 a month operator, into whose hands is given the safety of these trains and human lives, shall work seventy-two hours without relief in order to save the paltry salary of an assistant. Upon whose shoulders should rest the blame for this awful accident, and for similar accidents that have happened under like circumstances?

CITY VS. COUNTRY

The Washington Post has fallen into the bad habit set by other metropolitan newspapers and is just now engaged in reprinting extracts from country papers. This is done for the purpose of having fun with the country editors by copying what the metropolitan journalist too often looks upon as a sample of "country journalism." The Washington Post should be above that sort of thing. We venture the assertion that the daily newspapers print more of what they are pleased to call "rot" than the country papers do. If a country paper devotes six or eight items to one family, the city journalist copies it with great glee and chuckles over the humor of it all. And yet the metropolitan papers recently printed more insufferable "rot" about one or two particular families than a hundred country newspapers could possibly print in a year.

The metropolitan papers take themselves too seriously. They seem inclined to the belief that they are "it," when the fact of the matter is they wield comparatively little influence as compared with the country weeklies. And they are by no means free from the faults they so joyfully point out in their country contemporaries. Only a few days ago the Washington Post said: "The program opened with a greeting song by the whole vocal class, followed by a selection by a part of the class called 'The Little Bird Tells.'" We refuse to believe that any part of the vocal class was called "the little bird tells."

The city journalist should remove the beam in his own eye before pointing out the beam in the country journalist's eye.

MORTON AND THE PACKERS

In justifying his position in the Paul Morton case, Attorney General Moody, replying to Messrs. Harmon and Judson, said: "I have not as yet been able to overcome my repugnance to proceeding individually against the officers of the railroad for contempt of the injunction without some evidence with respect to every individual proceeded against that he had some culpable connection with the contempt of court."

Replying to the attorney general, Messrs. Harmon and Judson pointed out that the corporation can not be imprisoned and that punishment by fine is not only inadequate but reaches the real culprits only lightly, if at all, adding, "the evils with which we are now confronted are corporate in name but individual in fact. Guilt is always personal. So long as officers can hide behind their corporations no remedy can be effected. When the government searches out the guilty man and makes corporate wrong-doing mean personal punishment and dishonor, the laws will be obeyed." They said that while they respected the attorney general's opinion, "the end and circumstances of our appointment impose a certain independent responsibility upon us which we feel would not be by a proceeding against the corporation alone." Messrs. Harmon and Judson resigned and their resignations were accepted.

In his speech in the beef trust case, Attorney General Moody said: "I care but little about this corporation issue. The great government of the United States is too deeply interested in the vital trial here to be diverted by pursuit of that nerveless, senseless, soulless creation of law. We are not much concerned about the corporation. But if wrong has been done we want to get the living, breathing sinews behind it."

But he did care about the "corporation issue" when the president's friend, Paul Morton, was involved, and now the chickens have come home to roost.

REFORMING THE "CAPTAIN"

A Harvard professor asks: "Can the great capacities of the captains of industry be turned directly and unquestionably to the general good without the bribe of a fortune, and of power thinly veiled and lightly trammelled?"

What are the "great capacities" of "captains of industry?" May it not be true that the world is full of men of equal ability? The

great success of most of them has been due to their willingness to take advantage of special privileges within the law and without the law; to engage in conspiracies against the consumers of their products; to exert an undue influence with public officials to the end that the selfish interests of the few may be made paramount to the welfare of the many. To turn the "great capacities" of these men to the "general good" would be a mighty undertaking. We may, at least, withdraw all special privileges enjoyed by these men; we may call them to account for violations of the law; we may protect the public from their greed and wickedness even as we protect the public from the wickedness and greed of the ordinary plunderer. Then we may leave the rest to the "captain's" conscience. If he finds there is no money in waywardness he may conclude to be decent.

THE REAL "DEFENDERS"

The Chicago Chronicle asks: "What was it that plucked us from the dark despair in which the free silver craze had plunged us, and inaugurated this unheard of and indescribable prosperity?"

The Chronicle itself answers: "It was the contributions of these corporations to the McKinley campaign fund." And then the Chronicle gives this warning: "If the republican party now insanely punishes those for contributing to campaign funds who have the most at stake in elections and whose contributions have often been the salvation of the party in the past, it can confidently reckon on some kind of disaster in the future."

A BIT OF HUMOR

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat (republican) says: "There are intimations from Washington, New York and Chicago, that the heads of the great combines are to take a hand against the republican party in the congressional canvass of 1906."

Why should the heads of the great combines fight the republican party? In spite of the far-famed prosecution of the Northern Securities company, the people are suffering from the same old impositions in that neighborhood. The prosecution of the beef trust began with the farcical investigation by Garfield and has terminated with the discharge of the "captains of industry." We are told that in his investigation of the coal and oil trusts Garfield pursued the same tactics he adopted in the beef trust, and that the same plea of immunity through which the packers escaped will be used to give freedom to other violators of the anti-trust law. In congress trust interests are as carefully protected by republican members as they are in court by paid attorneys.

EVERYONE MAY HELP

Everyone who approves of the work The Commoner is doing is invited to co-operate along the lines of the special subscription offer. According to the terms of this offer cards each good for one year's subscription to The Commoner, will be furnished in lots of five, at the rate of \$3 per lot. This places the yearly subscription rate at 60 cents.

Any one ordering these cards may sell them for \$1 each, thus earning a commission of \$2 on each lot sold, or he may sell them at the cost price and find compensation in the fact that he has contributed to the educational campaign.

These cards may be paid for when ordered, or they may be ordered and remittance made after they have been sold. A coupon is printed below for the convenience of those who desire to participate in this effort to increase The Commoner's circulation:

THE COMMONER'S SPECIAL OFFER
Application for Subscription Cards

5	Publisher Commoner: I am interested in increasing The Commoner's circulation, and desire you to send me a supply of subscription cards. I agree to use my utmost endeavor to sell the cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each, when sold. NAME..... BOX, OR STREET NO..... P. O..... STATE..... Indicate the number of cards wanted by marking X opposite one of the numbers printed on end of this blank. If you believe the paper is doing a work that merits encouragement, fill out the above coupon and mail it to THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.
10	
15	
20	
25	
50	
75	
100	