

toward the miners of Colorado who appealed to him, he never exhibits toward "business" classes when they appeal. But bad manners aside, Roosevelt is right in refusing to send troops. True, Cleveland sent troops to Chicago when the railroad combine asked for them; but he was able to say the Chicago strike interfered with the United States mails. That was a subterfuge, to be sure, but it was a plausible subterfuge. Roosevelt could have made no such excuse even if he had wanted to comply with the demand of the miners. But suppose a plausible subterfuge had been available, what is to be thought of labor leaders who invite the worst forms of tyranny by committing themselves to the theory that the President may invade a State with Federal troops whenever he wants to? Have they no notion at all of the kind of conflict in which we are all involved? Do they not realize that American liberty is at stake in the lawless use of military power against workingmen, and that if the man-on-horseback has not yet come the corporation-on-horseback is already here?

This is no mere labor fight. It is a great conflict between interests—the centralizing interests of monopoly on the one hand, and unorganized or only loosely-organized non-monopoly interests on the other.

The line between them is not yet sharply drawn, but it will be soon. At present the centralizing monopoly-interests are getting control everywhere of the machinery of government. When they shall have accomplished that, and after it is too late for the people to divest them of their enormous centralized power, then will the line be drawn; and, amazing as it may sound, then also will "business" men who are now helping the monopolists, find themselves on the nether side of the line along with workingmen.

The significant thing about the present stage of this acquisition of power and division of interests is not the explosion at Indepen-

dence nor the arbitrary arrest and deportation of Colorado miners. The most significant thing in Colorado is the lawless closing down, by soldiers under command of the centralized mining corporations, of a competing mine.

Let no one suppose that this is a partisan question. The Standard Oil "crowd" is as non-partisan as a citizens' league. Republican officials are doing their work for the most part, but that is only because Republicans are in power for the most part. Monopolists can find the necessary tools among the politicians of both parties. In the Democratic party nationally they would be as well content with your Cleverlands and your Parkers as with such Republicans as will dominate the convention at Chicago next week. In Colorado it happens that their subservient governor is a Republican, but might they not have gained the good will of a Democratic governor had one been in the chair?

Like Jay Gould in the early days of the present trend toward government of the people by and for privileged corporations, the Standard Oil "crowd" are Republican in Republican localities and Democratic in Democratic localities, but for Standard Oil interests everywhere. Significantly enough they have not yet been detected in the disguise of Bryan Democrats or La Follette Republicans. From that fact a valuable lesson might be learned by intelligent voters in both parties.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK.

Lake Mohonk, N. Y., June 4.—Perhaps the newspapers are not to be blamed for slighting the Mohonk peace conference. When a number of men, most of them men of influence in their respective communities, who gather together to ask for international arbitration pride themselves on their "practicality" and take advantage of every opportunity to insist that they are not "fanatics," "dreamers," "visionaries," it is not surprising that they are taken not quite seriously by chroniclers of the doings of the world. They were so intensely practical that while assuming to be leaders in this cause, they were forever

fearful of getting ahead of public opinion. Their chief proof of being practical was their insistence on the inevitability of war "under present conditions," one of their spokesmen who has taken part in several previous gatherings even declaring his belief that wars would continue "until God shall change the hearts of men." If such men are determined to find a scapegoat upon whom to lay the blame for the greed and lust of kings, emperors and other rulers, surely it would be more fitting and less irreverent and illogical to blame the devil. While men who affect to lead in the cause of arbitration are open fatalists, those who profit from war and warlike preparations need not worry that their business of supplying \$7,500,000 battleships and 100-ton guns will come to an end. It was not necessary to scratch very deep to find even in this "peace" gathering many who are worshipers of war. So wedded to the old idea were they that they saw nothing inconsistent in a suggestion that an international army be created to compel obedience to the decrees of The Hague court. Force, force, force! One might think that moral considerations or influences have no place in the world.

Much importance was attached to the formation during the recent session of Congress of an American section of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for Arbitration. The Union is said to number some 1,500 members, or about half the entire membership of the parliamentary bodies of which they are members. How intense is their devotion to the cause of universal peace and good will among the nations of the earth is seen in the fact that each of the parliamentary bodies in Europe of which these men are members is annually increasing army and navy appropriations. If anything like half the membership of European parliamentary bodies were sincerely desirous of establishing a world's peace, would they in their several bodies vote increasing taxation upon the poor to provide funds for larger and ever larger armies and navies? They cannot now, if the total membership in the Inter-Parliamentary Union is correctly stated, plead that they would reduce the appropriations for their own country if other countries would do likewise. To do that is to impeach the good faith of their fellow members in the Union.

I fear that little importance can be attached to the numerical strength of the I. P. U. for A., for its European members treated it about as seriously as the Americans do. How seriously it is regarded here, and how little it affects their official acts, is shown in the fact that although 43 members of Congress were present at the meeting in January when the American group was formed, and about 100 others subsequently gave in their names, only one other member

joined with Congressman Burton in opposing, not immense naval appropriations, but two additional battleships; while but one voice, my own, was raised against the appropriation of \$75,000,000 for a big army. You see it wouldn't do for us to show the "white feather." The European members of the I. P. U. for A. might even think we were serious in joining that body whose ostensible, but apparently only transcendental object is to do away with war. Besides, how are we to live up to our new dignity of a "world power" if we don't compete with European nations in the size of our army and navy? Duty and destiny lead us on.

It was not inappropriately a woman, Mrs. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, who pointed out that the cost of one battleship such as the Iowa exceeds the total outlay, from its foundation to the present time, for Harvard college, and yet that naval officials admit that the life of one of these modern wholesale destroyers is but 13 years.

The conference was regaled with much laudation of the so-called great "civilized" powers, Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy and Austro-Hungary. But there was no word of commendation for Chili and Argentina for their actually doing something to minimize the possibility of war by disposing of recently constructed warships and agreeing to submit all their disputes to arbitration. As one of the smallest countries, Switzerland, is the leader among the nations of the earth in achieving the democratic ideal of self-government and has made the greatest advances in the science of government, so two of the smaller, Chili and Argentina, have taken the greatest step towards the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

It was pleasing to note that there were a few at the national conference who would not "bow the knee to Baal." One of these was Rabbi Charles Fleischer, of Boston. He insisted that the usual conception of patriotism was simply an enlarged egoism, an enlargement of individual pride. To such their country was merely "a big I." Real patriotism, he contended, is the applauding of one's own country when it stands for high ideals, but equally to applaud any other country when it stands for justice and right.

Another speech along the same lines was that of the Rev. Lyman Abbott, who pointed out that the war feeling was largely an individual matter: that so long as it was encouraged in the home, in the school, in the factory, so long would it express itself in the action of the nation; that to eliminate the possibility of war it is necessary to teach the idea of mutual respect among the individuals who compose the nation. One of the officers of the organization sub-

sequently expressed this opinion privately: "We have heard the real Lyman Abbott to-night."

The speech, however, which it is to be hoped will make the most lasting impression was that of Baron Kontari, a former member of the Japanese government, now visiting America. It must have been somewhat mortifying to those ardent patriots who imagine that America leads the world in all things, many of whom are equally ardent admirers of kings and emperors, to learn that as long ago as 1875, when Japan was making its debut among the nations of the world, upon a Chilean vessel's bringing, 500 Chinese slaves to Japan they were immediately freed, despite the protest of Chili. It should have been even less flattering to their vanity and reverence for the doings of monarchs to be told that not one European nation approved of Japan's action, but that on the matter being referred to the czar as arbitrator he declared in Japan's favor. There was a well merited rebuke in Kontari's remark that whereas he had been told that the God of the United States and of Europe had said: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," he was obliged to infer that they had misunderstood the Saviour, for they seemed to assume he meant: "Blessed are the strong, for they shall take all they can get."

If so much stress had not been laid upon the fact at the opening of the conference that a large proportion of those present were clergymen and educators, it would have been difficult to believe that any such were present. For the little that was said against war was not against its immoralities, its tragedies, its engendering of hatred and malice, its destruction of human life, its robbery of the poor to pay for its glory and tinsel, or even of its infraction of the moral law. Such opposition as was made to war was based upon its injurious interference with trade, especially with our trade with the far East, whose possibilities were pictured in alluring colors. Perhaps nothing more could have been expected if the gathering had been made up exclusively of devotees of cent per cent.; but surely something more could be looked for in a gathering of "leaders" in the cause of peace.

Not a word of sympathy for those who had lost father, son or brother; not a word of regret for the 600 or 700 lives lost in the destruction of the Petro-pavlovsk. But much laudation of heroism. Yet heroism unaccompanied with the beating of drums, the call of bugles, the tinsel and display of armies was not applauded. The truly heroic act of the D. L. & W. engineer who a week ago backed his engine through a roaring fire on one of the company's piers, and, hitching to a car at the end of the pier which contained dynamite, hauled it through flames that he well knew might

at any moment ignite the car and cause an explosion, was not even referred to. So far as I have observed this act of genuine heroism has not been recognized by the company even to the extent of a \$50 bill, although if that engineer had refused to endanger his life in going through the flames with his engine to haul that car out it must soon have exploded and would probably have wrought wholesale destruction of life and property.

So fearful were the members of the conference of taking "advanced" ground, so determined to be conservative in their handling of the subject, that I was impelled to ask them whether they really were for peace or not, insisting that it was useless to expect that the American people could come to take any earnest interest in international peace until domestic peace was had, and that this could not be so long as children were taught to worship and prepare for war in school and the States were appropriating immense sums to build armories in our cities. If they really desired international peace it seemed to me that they must set their faces against all warlike measures, domestic as well as foreign, and that we, owing to our unique unassailable geographical position, could take a position on the subject in advance of any other nation. As was to have been expected, this view was dubbed crazy "sentimentalism." The warriors present immediately jumped into the arena and insisted that so long as other nations were increasing their warlike preparations we must do the same. Thereupon this gathering of "peace" advocates applauded. When the platform was presented it was seen to contain not one word in favor of disarmament, present or prospective. I therefore urged the incorporation therein of a declaration in favor of partial disarmament as a practical step towards ultimate peace. The proposal received about as much consideration as a plea for vegetarianism would get in a den of lions.

ROBERT BAKER.

BOSTON.

Boston, Mass., 6 Beacon street, room 621, June 13.—While the recent Centenary of Richard Cobden's birth was widely celebrated in England, it elicited slight recognition in this tariff-ridden country. It was, however, observed in Boston by the American Free Trade League, in the form of a dinner at the Hotel Verdome, on the evening of June 3rd.

Charles Francis Adams, Edward Atkinson and Louis R. Ehrlich of New York, paid worthy tributes to the great leader of the Anti-Corn law agitation, vindicating the principles for which he stood. It was an earnest and uplifting occasion, the heartiest response greeting the most radical utterances.