

ment granted. The creditors who assented to this arrangement were generous creatures, truly, and the debtor who availed himself of it cannot be lacking in the saving sense of humor. To a bankrupt debtor without a very strong sense of humor, a European pleasure trip under those circumstances might be quite funereal.

Gen. Miles's address to the American army upon retiring from its command is worthy to be a classic in our military history. Its keynote is the sovereignty of citizenship within the army. The soldier who leaves his country the legacy of such a letter, backed by such a record of high ideals and both moral and physical courage as this man's record of two score years in its military service, can well afford to ignore the pettiness of his accidental superiors. What if President Roosevelt has put another officer through the bare formality of a six-day term in Miles's place, for the purpose of depriving Miles of the empty honor of being last in a discarded line of service where in Washington was the first? What if the Secretary of War did celebrate the end of this general's service with nothing but a cold record of the fact? These acts do not reflect upon Miles. They represent the actors, and no one else. As to the latter act, nothing else could have been done in decent good faith. The administration could not praise Gen. Miles upon his retirement when it had insulted, obstructed, and abused him during his service. The one commendable thing about the administration, in all its official intercourse with Gen. Miles, is its refusal to play the hypocrite when he retired. How could President Roosevelt and Secretary Root praise Miles without condemning themselves. He stands for high ideals of patriotism, they for the low ideals of a selfish national life; he for honor in the army, they for honoring the army's dishonor.

Our suspicions of last week

based on the non-action of the grand jury (p. 275) that the reports of labor violence in Chicago had been greatly exaggerated and the spectacular injunction proceedings a good deal of a sham, has received further confirmation. So long as the cases came only before Judge Holdom, whose action in the matter has been fairly open in several respects to severe criticism, it was made to appear that the strikers were behaving most lawlessly. Some of them were fined by this judge; one of them, an invalid, he threw mercilessly into jail; and others he condemned to imprisonment without appeal,—a right he had no legal authority to deny them. What with legislation by injunction order and trial upon affidavits, the proceedings in his court were of a "hop-skip-and-jump" kind which could hardly fail to bring the court into contempt even if the men had deserved the penalties it imposed. But there is now grave doubt even of the good faith of the proceedings. Not only has the grand jury refused to act, serious as were the charges against the strikers, but injunction cases of the same general kind have come before another judge, Kavanagh, who has exposed the flimsiness of the affidavits upon the strength of which he was invited to imitate Judge Holdom. Since then the exciting reports of lawlessness have died down. Such trifling with the courts is inexcusable. Riotous conditions have existed or they have not. If they have, the grand jury ought to act. If they have not, it is an outrage upon the administration of justice to apply the expedient of government by injunction in order to manufacture law for one party to strikes and against the other.

In commenting last week upon the action of the Denver conference of reformers (p. 257) we expressed regret that it had "recommended the organization of a new national party immediately," and gave our reasons, indicating among other objections that such

a party would be only a "paper organization," and suggesting that while little could be gained through it much might be lost. This comment, an entirely fair and considerate criticism of a policy to which we are firmly opposed, has elicited the following letter from Mr. J. A. Edgerton, the chairman of the conference in question and of the organizing committee it has appointed:

Your criticism of the Denver conference would not be noticed if it were in an opposition paper, but in a reform paper it is liable to breed misunderstandings.

In the first place the conference formed no new party, either paper or otherwise. It had no such power. That can only be done by a national convention composed of properly accredited delegates. This conference simply reunited the People's party, an organization that has been in existence since 1892. In addition to this it appointed a national organization committee whose duty it is to bring about a union of reform forces.

The object of those participating in the conference is exactly the opposite of that which you ascribe to us. We desire to amalgamate all those who favor a people's government, not divide them. It strikes me that the only possible effect of criticisms written in the spirit of that in *The Public*—if they have any effect at all—must be divisional rather than unifying.

It is all very well to talk about forming a party by a bolt at the time of the national convention. Those who have had any experience in managing campaigns know that it is necessary to have some sort of a preliminary organization. You cannot organize a national campaign in a few months. You must move in time or be caught unprepared.

No political party of any moment was ever formed by a bolt after the manner outlined by you. A little reading of history is all that is needed to make this point clear.

The sincere desire of those who made up the Denver conference is that there may be a real union of all those who favor the people's rule. We do not seek to dictate in what manner that union shall come. We simply are preparing for the inevitable. It becomes more and more apparent each day that the Democratic national convention will be controlled by the reactionary element of that party. We are determined that the reform cause shall not die because of that fact.

We beg the editor of *The Public* not to jump at conclusions and not to be too ready to condemn his co-workers. Most of those who made up the Denver conference have been sincere followers of Mr. Bryan. All of them, I think I am