

## THE PUBLIC FORUM

"THE SKINNERS."—I am a poor working boy of 20 and am supporting a sick mother and two little sisters. My father died long ago. It makes my blood boil when I read in the papers the write-ups given Julius Rosenwald by the hired flatterers of the press.

They portray him almost with a halo. Let me pull the mask off and exhibit the wolf in the sheep skin. I have been behind the curtain of his play for quite a while. He is pulling the wool over your eyes when he issues a statement to the press that in order to show the other business people what a philanthropist can do he has forced his department managers to employ a hundred extra men. Yes, he did hire 100 and paraded them through the front door with trumpets, getting notoriety which netted him double their wages in advertising.

But at what expense to his old employes? In order to make way for the 100 men, 300 employes were laid off throughout the plant the very same week for a "two weeks' vacation." Many others were asked to take a day or two off to give the poor unemployed a chance.

This was only a good excuse for the foreman to give every employe a legal lay-off. Practically everybody had to take two or three weeks off. Why don't Rosenwald take care of his own employes and let the other philanthropists do the same, like Ford?

Of course, I was one of the employes laid off within the last two weeks. I could stand it if I was getting much, but my pay was hardly enough to make both ends meet.

And maybe you think Montgomery-Wards are better. Don't be fooled. I worked there just one week and nearly got palpitation of the heart. They gave me a job as picker and put me on roller skates to make time. You should see the squad of boys and girls picking orders and chasing each

other in the narrow aisles like racers on roller skates, hands filled with large parcels.

They are allowed two minutes for an order. I nearly broke my neck and was fired for it. I am sorry I could not boil down according to your request, but these skimmers got me all boiled up to a frenzy.—Ira McLeary.

AN "UNHOLY ALLIANCE."—Will you permit me to express my surprise at the amazing attitude of the Hearst newspapers in their unequivocal endorsement of the candidacy of the Democratic nominee for mayor? These newspapers poured violent abuse upon the head of Roger C. Sullivan when he was a candidate for United States senator a few months ago. Not only that, but for many years they have bitterly opposed Sullivan policies and Sullivan candidates for elective positions, including judges.

Now, when a candidate for mayor comes before the people with the unqualified endorsement of Roger Sullivan, these same newspapers, which in the past have asserted copyright claims to everything that spelled good in government, stand back of Bob Sweitzer. It is to be wondered at that the people ask, "Why this change of front?"

To my mind, two reasons stand out in bold relief. During the primary campaign the Hearst papers were neutral—they didn't seem to care who licked Harrison. The opposition to the mayor raised every conceivable issue but one, and that would have done Harrison, the greatest damage, namely, the voting machine scandal. Is somebody afraid of something? Maybe yes.

The other explanation of the Hearst "neutrality" is seen in the "unholy alliance" between Sullivan and Hearst, whereby these two men have decided to pool their issues in opposition to President Wilson. Sullivan, for obvious reasons, hates the