gan in a mistake—the mistake of supposing that reforms are to be accomplished by a union of reformers of all shades and colors. Such unions, like the colored figures in a kaleidoscope, though picturesque, are frail. They are not true unions, but only aggregations. Some one said of the Detroit conference that there were 200 delegates there with 400 imperative reforms. That was an exaggeration. But it was only an exaggeration, as the resolutions finally adopted show. These resolutions seem to be an omnium gatherum into which all the reforms represented at the conference were chucked indiscriminately, upon the assumption that each delegate whose particular reform got this honorable mention would stay with the movement. Nothing justifies that assumption but the probability that each may recommend the movement as showing a tendency to go his way. But that does not really justify the assumption. It only indicates that the movement will be pulled and hauled in as many directions as it represents causes, until it loses all cohesiveness and disintegrates. Even if all reformers could unite organically they could not thereby carry through their reforms. For at no time are reformers more than a small fraction of the masses. Public opinion must be influenced in favor of a reform, to make it win; and public opinion cannot be influenced permanently in favor of a mere mess of reform pottage. In such a conglomeration good flavors are neutralized by bad, and the public rejects the whole dish.

If any man believes that he knows a way of improving social conditions, let him hesitate about uniting with other men who know other ways. In other words, let a reformer of one kind hesitate about making organic unions with those who differ radically. He will find it as impossible to convert them as they will to convert him. Even if he does convert them he will have made no great gain; for they, like himself, are apt to be men apart from the common thought and common impulse. But let him go direct to the masses of people. If his reform is vitalized by the truth, it will make its own way, slowly, perhaps, but surely, in public opinion. The reform that wins must be capable of converting the masses, rather than adaptable to a unification of reformers. This does not mean that the reformer with a true reform must isolate himself and his cause. Quite the contrary. There is no greater certainty of isolation than in a mosaic union of variegated reformers. It means that he must make himself a fellow among his fellow citizens, and his cause one of the vital subjects of common thought.

In the Australian Commonwealth the political situation is beginning to clear. Trustworthy correspondents assure us that the protection ministry has been forced to throw protection overboard. If they had not done so they could not have remained three months longer in power. The worst law they can possibly secure now is one with extensive tariffs along revenue lines and only a few protective features. It is doubtful whether even so much protection as that will be left to the commercial exclusionists. Though such a bill can be carried through the lower house, which came in with a protection majority, the free trade majority in the senate may not sanction it. Protection as a system is, in the language of our correspondent, "as dead as a door nail in Australia."

But that is only a beginning. The glamour that surrounded the Barton ministry is rapidly disappearing. Mr. Reid, the free trade leader in New South Wales, where he was premier and upon whose policy he has deeply impressed his personality, has jumped into the same commanding position in the parliament of the commonwealth that he occupied in the parliament of his state—a position of influence far and away above that of every one else. That was settled by his first speech in the federal parliament. When compared with the reply of Barton, the premier, no room was left to question Reid's superior powers of statesmanship. And now that he is a national instead of a local character, the protection newspapers outside his own state are no longer able to misrepresent him as successfully as before. He has consequently made tremendous advances in Victoria. Even the protectionist workingmen of that state are falling under his sway. So obvious is all this, that the protectionists are already saying that the next election will make Reid "dictator." Meanwhile it has become fairly certain that only a part of the revenues needed by the Commonwealth (possibly $40,000,000) can be raised by customs and excise, and that the states will have to raise a large amount by land value taxation.

A federal judge in Ohio, of the name of Wing, has outflown all competitors in the judicial race for government by injunction. When issuing a sweeping injunction against "picketing" by striking molders in Cleveland, Judge Wing made this bold reply to the objection that the "picketing" consisted only in arguing with non-strikers with a view to peaceably persuading them not to work: "Persuasion of itself, long continued, may become a nuisance and unlawful." He therefore issued an injunction broad enough to include peaceable persuasion in furtherance of the strike.

With reference to this class of injunctions, persons who are neither sympathetic with nor tolerant of strikes, jump hastily to the conclusion that the injunctions tend to preserve order and peace, and are therefore quite desirable. It is a dangerously thoughtless way of looking at the matter. Something more far-reaching and important is involved than the judicial regulation of strikes. Think of it a moment. When state

courts issue injunctions forbidding "picketing," "persuasion," or other action by working men in furtherance of strikes, they assail our system of government in one or both of two ways. They either enjoin what is already forbidden by criminal law—as riotous or other disorderly conduct; or they forbid what is not forbidden by the criminal law—as long continued persuasion of non-strikers to join strikers. If they enjoin what is already forbidden by criminal law, they deprive persons charged with the crime of their constitutional rights, including the right to trial by jury. By enjoining a crime, the court that does it may try upon affidavits, convict in its own discretion, and imprison at will, any person charged by way of contempt of the injunction with the crime enjoined. Grand juries, indictments, petit juries, confrontation of witnesses, limitation of penalties, all presumptions of innocence, and every other safeguard of personal liberty and precaution against tyranny, are brushed aside when injunctions issue in restraint of crime. It is not merely that this mode of restraining crime is something of which criminals may complain, but that it breaks down all the safeguards that long experience has proved necessary for the protection of the innocent when falsely accused. When injunctions make new offenses—when, for instance, as in the molders' case in Cleveland, they forbid "persuasion of itself, long continued,"—then all these objections apply as before, with another added. In such cases, not only do the courts usurp the functions of grand jury and petit jury, not only do they deprive the accused of the right to be confronted by and to cross-examine his accusers, not only do they throw down these and other constitutional safeguards established for the protection of the innocent when charged with crime, but they also usurp the functions of the legislature, and treat as a crime, punishable with arbitrary imprisonment, that which is not a crime by law. Such, in brief, is government by injunction when this innovation is adopted by the state courts.

When the federal courts set up government by injunction, they become guilty of still further usurpation. By this means, the federal courts and all their officers, the president as commander in chief and the regular army he commands, together with all the other powers that center at Washington, are brought into play for the regulation of the local peace. State lines are broken down, and the police power of states and municipalities is lodged with the commander in chief of the American armies. "Persuasion," for instance, such as the term "picketing" in labor strikes includes, if by long continuance or for any other reason it becomes an offense, is most clearly an offense not against the federal power, but against the local peace. The same thing is true of every possible act of strikers, however criminal. These crimes are breaches of the local peace. If the municipal authorities cannot restrain them, they may apply to the state authorities for aid, and the state authorities may in turn invoke the aid of the federal authorities. In that way the federal army might legitimately be called upon to preserve the local peace. Let it be observed, however, that the call for such interference then goes up from the locality. There is no usurpation, no invasion. But if a federal court enjoins these breaches of the local peace, and then, upon pretense of violations of the injunction, punishes for contempt, it may call in federal marshals and federal troops over the heads and it may be against the protests of local authorities. Thus it does away with local grand juries, local petit juries, local officers of all kinds. It turns the local peace of every community over to the regulation of judges appointed by the president, whose interests and ambitions tend to alienate them from local interests and sympathies. Back of them are as many deputy marshals as they wish, also alienated from local sympathies, and a federal army of hirelings if they need it. In a word, federal injunctions for the preservation of the local peace, lay firm foundations for an autocracy as irresponsible as any that ever cursed Europe.

Persons who believe in a strong central government, reaching out with obsequious deputy marshals and disciplined soldiers as its unquestioning instruments, into every nook and corner of the land, for the regulation not only of national affairs, but also of affairs strictly local, will not be concerned about the usurpation of federal judges in labor cases. These judicial innovations lead on to what they want—namely, to the relegation of the states to a place analogous with reference to the nation to the place of counties with reference to the states. Its end will be subordination of the states as sovereignties and the transformation of the federal Union not merely into a nation with a big N, but into an empire with a big E,—an empire with all power concentrated at Washington, and local self-government only an historical remnant as it is in Russia. Such imperialists cannot be argued with. They are only to be reckoned with. But persons who do not look with complacency upon this imperial outcome, will do well to suppress their hostility to labor organizations long enough to stamp out this federal usurpation in its small beginnings. The regulation of local labor disturbances by federal injunctions is becoming a settled policy of the federal courts. Once established it will not stop with the regulation of labor disturbances. This policy is loaded with imperial dynamite.

How much more truly American in spirit than many of the utterances of American statesmen in the imperialistic times upon which we have fallen are these sentiments of Wu Tingfang, the Chinese minister to the United States, put forth by him in a Fourth of July oration this year at Philadelphia:

This nation, it seems to me, has not sprung into existence without a man-