

operate these coal deposits, though it is lacking to buy permission to do so.

But what would the president of the Erie road and his sympathizers say to a proposition to secure to the American citizen the right to work, by giving him access to the monopolized natural coal deposits? Would they say it is a crime to prevent it?

If they would, then the virtue of sincerity may be attributed to the sentiment he expressed when denouncing the miners' union for interfering with the right to work. If they would not, then the liberty loving sentiment which he expressed and his sympathizers profess to admire is a good doctrine in a bad cause, quoted merely because it happens momentarily to serve a selfish purpose. The devil often quotes Scripture in that spirit.

There would be no interference by labor unions with the right to work, if men like this railroad president and his sympathizers did not systematically restrict the right to work by forestalling and monopolizing natural opportunities for work. There would be no excuse for "strike breakers" if land monopolists were not such effective strike makers.

ARTHUR H. STEPHENSON AND JOHN H. MOORE.

The recent death of these two men, both unknown to that larger world which buzzes away with its sensations and follies, but in their respective parts of the country prominent figures among thoughtful people, adds to the roll of those who have responded to Henry George's "clarion call" and like himself have passed away almost before the opening of the battle he planned.

Widely separated by distance and unknown to each other, Mr. Stephenson in Philadelphia and Mr. Moore in Texas had for nearly two decades, each in his own way and among his own people, devoted themselves to the popularizing of George's theory of social regeneration. Either might have been a plutocrat in his social ideals and political affiliations without exciting special wonder. For both were, by comparison at any rate, favorites of

fortune. Yet each turned away from the temptations of personal "success" to work for the general good.

Mr. Moore was the son of a wealthy slaveowner, once chief justice of Texas. His own opportunities in the conventional Democracy of a generation ago were good enough to advance him, while still a young man, from a seat in the Texas legislature to the post of secretary of state. But personal advantages lost their importance to him when George's voice awoke the sterling democracy of his nature; and in the fullness of health and at the height of a promising public career he embraced the then unpopular cause.

The circumstances of Mr. Stephenson's choice of a life were not much different. It was a brilliant commercial career that opened before him, and which, without being undiligent in business, he subordinated to the higher calling to which "Progress and Poverty" invited him. He was among the very first to respond to George's call. Throughout the rest of his life he never wavered with reference either to the moral principles involved or the economic adjustments proposed, nor hesitated in the work for their realization.

Both were men of reasonable financial means, of about the same age, of great natural abilities, and of excellent educational acquirements. In business the one was successful in spite of his practical and effective devotion to a moral ideal. The other, had his health not suddenly failed him, would doubtless have risen to political leadership while impressing that ideal upon the common sentiment of his State. They were types of men whom it is a satisfaction to contemplate in times when the spirit of money-making has become an obsession and spectacular examples of mere success are held up to the young for emulation.

ANGER.

The tendency of a good deal of modern writing and preaching is to discredit anger of all degrees and kinds. We might mention certain much-read periodicals and books that savor of a constant peaches-and-cream sweetness. They would criticize the devil himself with gentle-

ness and forbearance. Their cue seems to be to assume an air of judicial superiority which forbids them ever to be angry or even indignant.

The philosophy of these superior people seems to rest in the idea that "all's well with the world," warping Browning's saying out of its true interpretation. We must believe that "all's well with the world," so far as God's laws are concerned; but to use the expression with the extended idea that man's acceptance of, and dealing with, God's laws are all well, is simply playing with words.

Another cause of this all-serene attitude probably lies in the surrender of the idea of an absolute standard of right and wrong. All right and wrong being merely relative, who can say that this or that course of action is right or wrong? And so, why condemn anything, without a large and exceptional "but"? If we cannot be sure that anything is evil, then of course we cannot "hate the thing that is evil."

Doubtless also some of this notion of the advisable suppression of all anger is due to a partial view of the words of Jesus. Some think of him as meek and lowly, and forget that he was more. No one ever showed more of genuine anger, or gave stronger expression to his passion. Can we imagine a more stinging epithet than to call a class of men "sons of snakes"? And yet this is the literal translation of words which Jesus in his anger—why should we shirk the word?—applied to certain men whom he saw in Jerusalem.

We have said this much merely for the purpose of introducing a quotation from the Rev. C. Ernest Smith, an Episcopal clergyman of Baltimore, who is reported by the Sun to have spoken as follows in a recent sermon:

"What is the need of anger? First, the whole man needs anger as part of his make-up, along with the sterner qualities of an inflexible will, aggressive courage and righteous indignation. Lacking these he is developed but on one side. Second, the world itself is poorer without it. Anger has its part to play. When a man sees some dastardly deed, it is his business to express his opinion in a clear, unmistakable manner. In doing so the very air is clearer and

the atmosphere is purer. I imagine if the coal operators, whose hearts, judging from the recent conference, are as hard as the coal they mine, were confronted with an angry public we would have coal in a short time. The world is ever better for righteous indignation expressed at vile wrong.

"Finally, remember the prohibition 'sin not.' Ordinarily a man should keep cool at any personal injustice, but he will do well ordinarily to be angry at an injustice to another. Doubtless there are other excellent ways of meeting the wrongs of the world, such as kindness, but there are times when kindness fails and then the only weapon in the Christian quiver is a strong, righteous indignation. Failing in that, the Christian has failed in his duty."

This seems to us an excellent view of the just province of anger, as a passion not selfish but wholesome. Have we not recently had an instance, how by a brief display of it "the very air is clearer and the atmosphere is purer." Fortunately Baer made Odell angry, and Odell's words in reply have given the American people as genuine satisfaction as any of the many that have been uttered during the coal strike. By speaking out in righteous anger Odell came at once to the point of immediate difficulty in the settlement of the strike, and came to it with an emphasis that cleared the atmosphere of murkiness. "You've got to recognize the union," says Odell. "We won't do it," says Baer. This is straight talk; and how much better appearance even Baer makes than in his pious letter of blessed memory!

Another point in the preacher's discourse is worthy of note, where he says, "Ordinarily a man should keep cool at any personal injustice, but he will do well ordinarily to be angry at an injustice to another." This is the doctrine which has been ably supported by Bishop Gore in his very interesting commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. In this work the Bishop argues that one should be angry at an injury to one's self only when the injury is of such a nature as to be social rather than personal. It would appear that this distinction is the key to the true interpretation of the New Testament doctrine, where certainly no argument can be found for a weakish or compromising condemnation of social injustice.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

The anthracite coal strike (p.421) was compromised on the 16th.

At the time of our report last week the President had proposed to Mr. Mitchell that if Mr. Mitchell would secure the immediate termination of the strike the President would appoint a commission to investigate the merits of the strike and do all in his power to settle the questions at issue in accordance with its report. Mr. Mitchell had replied to this proposal, but his letter had not yet been made public. It is dated the 8th and was published on the 10th. After a courteous introduction, in which he tells the President that he has consulted with the district presidents of the miners' union, who fully concur in his own views, Mr. Mitchell writes:

We desire to assure you again that we feel keenly the responsibility of our position and the gravity of the situation, and it would give us great pleasure to take any action which would bring this coal strike to an end in a manner that would safeguard the interests of our constituents. In proposing that there be an immediate resumption of coal mining upon the conditions we suggested in the conference at the white house we believed that we had gone more than half way and had met your wishes. It is unnecessary in this letter to refer to the malicious assault made upon us in the response of the coal operators. We feel confident that you must have been impressed with the fairness of our proposition and the insincerity of those who maligned us. Having in mind our experience with the coal operators in the past, we have no reason to feel any degree of confidence in their willingness to do us justice in the future; and inasmuch as they have refused to accept the decision of a tribunal selected by you, and inasmuch as there is no law through which you could enforce the findings of the commission you suggest, we respectfully decline to advise our people to return to work simply upon the hope that the coal operators might be induced or forced to comply with the recommendations of your commission. As stated above, we believe that we went more than half way in our proposal at Washington, and we do not feel that we should be asked to make further sacrifice. We appreciate your solicitude for the people of our country who are now, and will be, subjected to great suffering and inconvenience by a prolongation of the coal strike, and we feel that the onus of this terrible state of affairs should be placed upon the side which has refused

to defer to fair and impartial investigation.

Closely following Mr. Mitchell's letter, Secretary Root came on from Washington to New York and conferred with J. Pierpont Morgan on the latter's yacht. Two days after the Root-Morgan interview, a conference of representatives of the coal carrying roads was held at New York. On the same day Mr. Morgan went to Washington with his partner, Robert R. Bacon, arriving at 9 in the morning. They were met and immediately conducted by Secretary Root to the White House, where a conference lasting into the early hours of the 14th took place between Mr. Morgan, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Root and President Roosevelt. At its close Secretary Cortelyou gave to the press an address to the public which Morgan and Bacon had laid before the President. This address, signed by Geo. T. Baer, E. B. Thomas, W. H. Truesdale, T. P. Fowler, R. M. Oliphant and Alfred Waters (the latter for the Lehigh Valley, which had not before appeared), thus coming from all the anthracite coal and coal carrying interests, is too lengthy for reproduction here in full. It opens with the statement that "there are in the anthracite regions about 75 operating companies and firms and 147,000 miners and workmen (of which 30,000 are under age), comprising some 20 nationalities and dialects," and asserts that "of these workmen possibly one half belong to the United Mine Workers' Union, of which John Mitchell is president." The address then declares that from 7,000 to 10,000 miners are now at work, and many more have wished to work but have been prevented by violence, continued and steadily increasing, which Mr. Mitchell "either cannot or will not prevent." As to wages it expresses the belief of the coal companies that "the wages paid in the coal regions are fair and full, and all that the business in its normal condition has been able to stand if the capital invested is to have any reasonable return." In explanation of the refusal to arbitrate, the address insists that its signers "are not and never have been unwilling to submit all questions between them and their workmen to any fair tribunal for decision," but that they of not willing to enter into arbitration with the miners' right union," which they describe as "an organization chiefly composed of men in a rival and competing and