

feriority, yet feel in his conscience that he has done his duty?

When our country is assailed we are told that it is our duty to defend it with our lives. When a countryman, however humble, is wronged in another land, we are told that it is our duty to pour out blood and treasure to the fullest extent necessary for his vindication. Have we then no duty to defend (at home, with our influence and vote) the principles of political equality upon which our national fabric rests? Have we no duty to defend the rights of even the humblest of our countrymen as valiantly against domestic aggression as against wrongs abroad? If there is no such duty, then let us stop prating of morality and religion and the civic conscience, and candidly live out the brute life that belongs to creatures with no duties to perform nor rights to enjoy. But if there is such a duty, let those who are conscious of it realize that this advancing movement for the disfranchisement and subjugation of the Negro race in America furnishes the occasion for devotedly performing it. Wholly regardless of the evils which neglect of that manifest duty will bring upon ourselves, let us stem the tide of this wave of unrighteousness.

Nor let us be deterred by fear of sectionalism. The Negro question is no longer a sectional question. North as well as South is now heaving with hostile sentiment. A vicious hatred of the Negro as a Negro is sweeping over the entire land. By common consent he is to be put down. In the country of his birth he and his children are to be outcasts forever. In a land of equal political rights he is to have none that white men need respect. What the Jews were in Europe in the middle ages (save their skill in finance) such the Negroes are to be made in the United States in the twentieth century. And this is to be done by a "superior" race. God save the adjective! Where is the courage, where the chivalry, where the sense of duty of white men who stand

silently by while this second great stultification of our national ideals moves on to its shameful consummation?

City and State, of Philadelphia, has published as a supplement Senator Carmack's telling speech in the Senate in exposure of the strenuous efforts of the administration and its senatorial supporters to suppress the facts regarding army atrocities in the Philippines. This speech should be a familiar document in every village in the country—not that the shame of the nation should be exploited wantonly, but that her shame should be made widely known to the end that it may be duly atoned for.

The St. Louis scandals are paralleled by Fort Wayne. Some forty arrests were made last week, under seventy odd indictments found in connection with the corruption of the city council by franchise seekers. Corruption of this kind speaks eloquently of the impropriety of granting franchises for the performance of public functions. It points directly to the difference between public business and private business. A grocery store, for illustration, is a private business. Whoever would engage in this business does not need to procure the consent of a city council. But the street car business is a public business. No one can engage in that without the consent of the city council. This difference distinguishes the two businesses, not accidentally but in their very nature. And it explains why corruption characterizes the conduct of the one kind and not that of the other. Since the consent of the city council must be obtained in order to carry on a street car business, corruption is almost inevitable. If the councilmen do not insist upon being corrupted, franchise seekers tempt them. But the important lesson of the whole matter is this, that when a business is such that in its nature it cannot be carried on without public consent, it is a public business and ought to be publicly managed. There might be some corruption in public

management, but it could not compare with the corruption that is bred by private management.

During the coal strike last Fall, the Pennsylvania militia was called out to protect non-union miners from assaults by strikers. The non-union miners were anxious to work, so it was represented, but were prevented from doing so by the wicked strikers. Thereupon a great sigh of sympathy went forth over the land—sympathy for those industrious miners who really wanted to work for their good employers but dared not because the naughty strikers threatened them with personal injury. Now for the sequel. News dispatches of last week from New York tell of lawsuits begun by 22 Italian laborers against the Pennsylvania Coal company and the Erie Railroad company in which the plaintiffs assert that they were forcibly transported from New York city to the mines and there imprisoned in the mines and forced to work in the places of the strikers. They further assert that when they were taken into the mines they were not allowed to leave, but were compelled to work in the pockets against their will, and that their protests were not listened to when they demanded to be set free. It would seem that the militia was used to protect non-union men against the wrong persons.

It is gratifying to be able to quote from so representative a Republican paper as the Chicago Inter-Ocean the following just criticism of the Federal injunctions in West Virginia which have provoked a bloody conflict in the mining regions of that State. After discreetly condemning the men who defied the injunctions to the death, the Inter-Ocean of the 27th says:

Yet in fairness it would seem that some blame for this deplorable conflict should rest upon the Federal judges granting the injunctions that these men were resisting. Their resistance was wholly unjustifiable, but was the intervention of the Federal courts justifiable? . . . Practically all the popular agitation against "government by injunction," so called—practically all the widespread feeling that the Federal courts are used to oppress labor—is aroused by Fed-

eral judges, who virtually load 13-inch guns against sparrow hawks. That what amounts to an army should be mobilized to put down what is little more than a barroom brawl is such evident absurdity—such glaring disproportion of means to ends—that popular resentment is often excited. . . . Federal judges who forget these facts of human nature—who even hurry from vacations, as in this city not long ago, to hurl the menaces of the United States against disorderly men whom a police squad could easily control—are doing the nation ill service.

But "government by injunction" is too tempting a power for the Federal judges to abandon it easily. So long as Congress refuses to check them, as the Republican Congresses persistently have done, they may be depended upon to carry "government by injunction" as far as the corporations want it carried. It is natural for the judicial branch of government to draw power to itself under any circumstances; but when the judicial branch is pretty thickly populated with corporation lawyers, the temptation to draw to itself the kind of power that corporations need is greatly augmented. The latest judicial exploit in the way of "government by injunction" has just occurred at St. Louis, where a Federal judge has, at the potent request of the Wabash railroad, granted an injunction against strikers before a threatened strike had begun. This prematurity is a novelty even in the novelty of "government by injunction." The Federal judge who improves upon this injunction must grant one not merely before a strike begins, but before it is threatened. He will have to do it on the ground that, although the defendants are not striking nor threatening to strike, they are thinking of threatening.

#### NATURAL RIGHTS.

It is fashionable in certain quarters to speak of human rights as if they were merely arbitrary, having no relation to nature. Certain things, it is said, are right or wrong, according to circumstances. Slavery is wrong, now, say these reasoners, but there may have been a time when it

was right. Suffrage is every man's right, because we have adopted that fashion; but no man has any inherent right to vote. People who happen to be deprived of these privileges may well strive for them, but have no reason for complaint. When they get strong enough they can succeed, and until they have the strength to win by force if necessary, they have not proven their title. Right really is founded upon might.

Let us examine this position.

Men's rights have relation to other men. Any question of rights is a social question. If there were no society, no such question would arise.

If it be a natural thing for human beings to associate, then their relations fall within the scope of natural law. That human societies are as natural as brute societies cannot be doubted. If every hornet were killed, leaving only larvae to replenish the earth, their progeny would form societies just like those of their ancestors. If every human being except one pair of year-old babies were destroyed, together with all memory and all records of past events, and were this couple to live and repeople the earth, their descendants would inevitably develop societies practically identical with those now existing. Societies are determined by the nature of man, just as the form of the cell is fixed by the nature of the bee.

Societies, therefore, are as natural to man as to other social animals. There must be a natural state of these societies, a natural order of development, and natural rights as between their members.

Social animals lower than man live together in conformity to law under the directive influence of instinct. Each bird, bee, or ant accords to each other member of the society, and to the society as a whole, its rights without the trouble of thinking about it. If man is to have a perfect social organization, he must think it out—just as he must think out a perfect dwelling if he ever has one. Bees naturally make approximately perfect homes; and birds and ants practically perfect nests; and all of them apparently perfect societies. Man alone, starting upon a low plane, must rise by the

power of mind, from bestial conditions toward perfection by the discovery of and conformity to natural law.

Societies being natural growths, they are subject to conditions of health and disease. When we examine the history of extinct societies in the light of this principle we must conclude that, in the absence of some destructive force from without, they died from disease because they failed to find and obey the law of social health. This does not imply a natural period of growth, and a natural time of death for societies; for, though individuals must die, the society which conforms to natural law, may live forever.

Social health seems to depend upon conformity to natural law in securing to every individual his rights as against his fellows and the society, and to the society its rights against the individual. If the society trenches too far upon, or fails to protect individual rights, or if individuals invade the rights of their fellows of the society, social disease results.

Disease in an individual organism is shown by pain. Social disease is shown by unrest, discontent, seditions, tumults, strikes, the arraying of class against class, and other social pains. When the people complain it is always with reason; when they are not wronged they are incapable of social discontent.

In every part of the world the society prevents the individual from acquiring knowledge, or from moving from place to place, or from transporting his property, or robs him of his product, or denies him, or permits his fellows to deny him, land upon which to labor, or allows a class to own the highways, or forbids or hinders trade, or compels or permits large numbers to cease labor so that others must support them, and does and permits other wrongs. And social disease results.

All over the world men occupy the land and highways belonging to the society, and make private property of them, and thereby rob the society and their fellows. And social disease results. When these violations of natural rights accumulate so that the units making up the society become enslaved, degraded and weakened, social death results. Had the Greeks