

ently, to wide spread belief in the vine-growing south that prosperity can be manufactured by regulative law for the million as well as for the few. Austria has adopted a manhood suffrage law, and as a result of this great stride in the path of democracy sees her racial quarrels already waxing less bitter and a new political alignment not based on race distinctions taking form. Portugal is protesting against an autocratic administration and a pleasure-seeking King, and the latent republicanism of the Latin peoples of Europe is now being voiced in that sleepy corner of the continent. The Russian Czar has shown the value of an autocrat's oath by again dissolving the Douma and restricting still further the political suffrage of the distracted people; but no Mirabeau has arisen to dominate the tottering throne, nor a Danton to give it the last unsetting impulse. Tolstoy preaches in vain, and the terrorists above and below train their artillery on each other, heedless of the non-combatants in the way. Meanwhile, under the farcical auspices of the same Russian Czar, the peace conference pursues its deliberations at The Hague. The delegates to this great meeting and those they represent, like most of the delegates to the little meeting at Lake Mohawk in the United States, seem bent chiefly on showing that they are not fanatics or visionaries—not they—and that an abstract belief in the beauties of peace is quite compatible with a concrete appreciation of the advantages of war. Everything must have its beginning, however, and perhaps from the formal and meagre proceedings of The Hague congress something worth while will eventually "burst full-blossomed on the thorny stem of time."

EDITORIAL FROM THE JOHNSTOWN (PA.) DEMOCRAT.

Perhaps it will be prudent to wait for a confirmation of the amazing story of Harry Orchard before accepting it in all its revolting details. It is an unparalleled confession of crime. Nothing like it was ever told on the American continent before. It may be true. Orchard may have committed all the atrocities he declares he is guilty of. He may indeed have been the hired assassin of a great labor organization which sought with the gun and dynamite the extirpation of its enemies. But something more than the unsupported words of Harry Orchard will be needed to convince the sober judgement of the country that what he so calmly, so smoothly and so unconcernedly relates is true.

Orchard makes no concealment of the fact that while he was professedly serving as the hired murderer of the Western Federation of Miners he was at the same time playing into the hands of the other side. He admits that he betrayed those whose money he alleges he had in his pocket and in whose power he must have been if he were indeed guilty of the frightful crimes which he declares he shared in committing. His story appears to lack consistency. Not even a pervert as low as Orchard represents himself to be is likely to be as ready as he says he was to run his neck into a halter as he must have known he was doing if he were concerned in even half the diabolism for which he claims a sort of credit. He talks too much like one who is boasting. He seems rather to glory in the appalling record that he has partly detailed in court. Every word he says may be true. But there are a good many chances that he is lying.

However, conceding the substantial truth of his story, it but confirms the view which has often been put forward by people who have no sympathy with violence of any sort, that the condition which prevailed in the western mining states was one of war. It was a condition, not of public but of private war. It was a war between the Mine Owners' association and the Western Federation of Miners; and the latter, whether with good reason or without it, asserted and apparently believed that all the powers of the state were arrayed, not

in preserving order, but as allies of the Mine Owners' association in its ruthless policy of subjugation and destruction. This war extended over a period of years and embraced a wide territory. In its prosecution the Mine Owners' association had the state and national military forces at its command and it did not hesitate to over-ride and even to over-throw the civil authority whenever the latter failed or refused submissively and unquestioningly to do its bidding.

Under these circumstances it is not strange, although it is none the less horrible and revolting, that, denied the protection of the law, feeling that they were indeed its victims, the miners should have entered upon a policy of terrorism such as that which to-day prevails in Russia and that is almost certain to prevail everywhere under despotism. There can be little reasonable question of the condition which confronted the working men in Colorado, Idaho and other western mining states. There was a military reign of terror instituted and upheld by the Mine Owners' association whose control of the executive and judicial powers of the states was undisguised. There was deadly and relentless war on organized labor. Men were deported from their homes to distant states without legal warrant. Public officials were driven from their places under threat of death. Sheriffs and judges and other civil servants were lawlessly compelled to resign and their places were filled with the accredited tools of the Mine Owners' association. Martial law took the place of civil procedure and it was maintained until the courts of the United States intervened and compelled the governor of Colorado to restore the civil processes. The effect of all this must inevitably have been to inflame the passions of the men against whom it was directed. They must have felt that the hand of society was against them. Their souls must have become embittered. They must have been driven to that very desperation of purpose which the Orchard tale reveals; and so that is, after all, less surprising than it would be if the conditions precedent had been other than we know them to have been.

The lesson of it all is that arbitrary power, whether exercised by a labor organization or by an organization of plutocratic monopolists, is always dangerous, that it always invites to abuse, that it is always a threat against society and that it is always the enemy of order. We do not hold labor blameless. It may have gone quite to the unspeakable depths which this revolting story indicates. It may have imbrued its hands in innocent blood. It may have hired assassins and plotted the death of high officials. It may have done all these things and it may indeed have planned to go further in its destructive warfare. But if this is true, it is also true that there is another side to the case. There were the monopoly forces at work—the forces which held the opportunities, the forces which held the power of life or death, the forces that could and did take the bread out of the mouths of women and children, the forces that were able to control government and to bend it to their own will. These forces in the name and under the protection of the law and with all its machinery at command were not idle. They were making peace impossible. They were driving their employes to desperation. All the elements of war were present. And if acts of war developed it was only what was to be expected.

“It may seem strange that in England, the land where above all others the personal and political rights of the simplest freeman have been saved whole through all changes of princes and dynasties, the law should find so little room for public and unstinted rights of using the very elements. Even the air is not free, for the maxim is that the owner of the soil is owner up to the height above and down to the depth beneath. I conceive it is indisputable that to pass over land in a balloon, at whatsoever height, without the owner's or occupier's license, is technically a trespass.”—SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, *Professor of Jurisprudence*, at Oxford, in “The Land Laws.”