

done nothing but peaceably to request and try to persuade others to join them in a strike, or else see the injunction treated with quiet contempt, another and less simple phase of government by injunction will be presented.

The degradation of American ideals is often felt, but nowhere is it so bluntly expressed as in the financial papers. They circulate chiefly where there is little call for euphemistic paraphrase, and the editors make no effort to disguise their sordid sentiments. An example is afforded in a recent issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, one of the great American authorities in financial matters. Commenting on the steel strike, in sympathy, of course, with the financial ring that has cornered the steel business, this paper makes no concealment of the satisfaction it derives from the statement of Mr. Shaffer, the strike leader, that the strikers "are not contending for wages, but for a principle." It is sure that the strike cannot last long, being for principle and not for money. So thoroughly saturated is it with the idea that men neither fight nor endure for principle, and that principle wouldn't be worth the sacrifice anyhow, that it doesn't hesitate for an instant to assume that upon the basis of principle instead of wages the strike is necessarily lost from the start. Nor is there any implication that the strikers are peculiarly sordid. No slur is cast upon them. The whole matter is regarded as a business affair, in which the strikers are subject to the same considerations that influence the paper's own constituency, to whom money always talks and principle never. This aristocracy of wealth, which is taking possession of our country, and in the talismanic name of Liberty destroying Liberty herself, has confessedly, even boastfully, come to merit the condemnation of Lowell's Hosea Bigelow. It—

don't vally princerples more'n an old cud.

But that condemnation does not apply in financial circles alone. Of the leader of the steel strike himself,

notwithstanding his verbal appeals to principle, Hosea Bigelow might also say that—

He don't vally princerples more'n an old cud.

In an interview published in the paper of the 22d, this leader, Mr. Shaffer, was quoted in these repulsive, even if excusable, terms:

If the republican party is going to obtain power to foster institutions that will destroy labor organizations it cannot longer rely on the support of labor. I have always been a republican, but if it comes to the worst and the administration stands by and allows the combine to crush us out of existence, in the future I shall be "all things to all men." Suppose the administration should be offended at J. Pierpont Morgan and his colleagues, and to punish them, should present restrictive measures to congress—laws tending to restrict the Morgan power—could not the administration have these laws passed? You will admit that it could. Then the administration is all-powerful and will be held responsible for the consequences of this conflict to labor and to the republican party.

Mr. Shaffer found no difficulty, it seems, in supporting Mr. McKinley when engaged in the ruthless slaughter of his brethren of the Philippines. That was not Mr. Shaffer's fight. He was deaf to principle when the crushing out process only affected others, and is ready to support Mr. McKinley again if Mr. McKinley will join the strike. But why, if Mr. McKinley may crush a distant republic with Mr. Shaffer's assent and hearty cooperation, may he not allow Morgan to crush the steel workers' union without Mr. Shaffer's assent and against his protest and threats? What is the difference—in principle? When Mr. Shaffer talks so glibly about principle, does he mean principle so far only as he and his are concerned? Is the crushing process right enough in principle when applied to men fighting for their homes against a foreign invader, and bad in principle only when applied to Mr. Shaffer's labor organization? In a word, is Mr. Shaffer one of those—

slaves most base,
Whose love of right is for themselves
and not for a.l the race?

Wisely, but not unexpectedly, Mr. Bryan has distinctly refused to countenance the folly of a bolt from the democratic party in, Ohio. The stronger such a movement could be made, the weaker would the democratic democrats of Ohio be in their fight for democracy within the party.

That the fight within the party is being made with vigor and intelligence is evident from this resolution, proposed by Mr. Salen, of Cleveland, and adopted by the state committee on the 20th:

Resolved, That the next call for a state convention shall contain the following provision: That in all counties containing a city in which there is registration of electors, and in which the number of voting precincts in such city form a majority of the precincts of the county, delegates to the state convention must be selected by a direct vote of the people, or by a convention composed of delegates selected by a direct vote of the people, at a primary election held under the laws of Ohio relating to primary elections; and no county central or executive committee shall have power to name delegates to the state convention.

The meaning of that resolution is not hidden in verbiage. To understand it nothing is necessary but to know that McLean's power in Ohio conventions has been due not to his influence with the democratic voters of Cincinnati, but to his control of a self-perpetuating committee. When Cincinnati elects delegates at primaries, instead of having them appointed by Mr. McLean's committee, Mr. McLean will not be able to enter state conventions with packed delegations. This is the beginning of a new regime in the democratic party of Ohio.

It was hardly necessary for the mayor of Cleveland to deny that he is about to announce his candidacy for the United States senate. He has said that he is not a candidate for the senate, and he is believed in spite of gossip newspapers. The once prevalent idea that his public actions are directed by some new and unfathomable kind of insincerity has been dissipated. Prof. Bemis was right when, in writing to the Springfield Repub-