

in pointing out the strength of the steel trust in the possession of its coal and ore deposits, on which he places a valuation of \$800,000,000; Mr. Cassatt recognizes it in the great increases which he has made in the Pennsylvania railroad terminal properties during the past few years; Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Rogers recognize it as their only and exclusive strength in the oil monopoly and in the copper trust; and finally, these men all recognize it in their increasing acquisition of and large investments in urban and inter-urban traction and lighting companies, and metropolitan and realty corporations. In confirmation of the latter, witness the United States Realty & Construction company, now being formed in New York city, to develop metropolitan real estate, with a capital of \$66,000,000 and with Charles M. Schwab, James Stillman, Charles Steele (of J. P. Morgan & Co.) and John J. Mitchell on its executive board.

Even a very casual examination of the subject will reveal the astonishing breadth and reach of this "railroad trust." And it is not only through the transportation industry that its influence is paramount. As indicated above, the men who are at the head of the railway industry are also the "powers that be" in all the other large consolidated industries; and particularly in those which require transportation facilities. Nor are the ramifications of the "railroad trust" confined to the United States. Earth-girdling offshoots of this trust are among the possibilities of the near future, and Mr. J. P. Morgan is already experimenting along that line.

It is not the purpose of this article to attempt to point out either the good or bad effect of the existence of the "railroad trust" upon the community at large. But I would ask the reader to reflect a moment on what the condition of modern society would be if all the railroads were suddenly eliminated from the face of the earth. By reflecting upon this impossibility one can at least partially realize the strength and security of the "trust" or "community" which owns or controls the entire industry of the American people.

JOHN MOODY.

NEWS

On the 31st state troops began to pour into Shenandoah, where the riot in connection with the anthracite strike (p. 262) occurred on the 30th. Gov. Stone had refused to order troops to the strike region until they should have been petitioned for by the local business men and property owners as necessary to protect life and property. But when, on the 30th, after the outbreak at Shenandoah, he received from the sheriff a telegram giving particulars of the riot, asserting that the town was without police protection, that the local authorities were terrorized by threats of the mob and therefore feared to sign a petition, adding that the "mine workers admit foreign element beyond their control," and advising the governor that the sheriff was powerless "for want of sufficient assistance," and asking for troops immediately, the governor ordered troops to the scene. They camped on a high hill overlooking the town—two full regiments, two companies of a third regiment, and a troop of cavalry, all under the immediate command of Gen. Gobin.

The troops found the town perfectly quiet. Strike leaders there asserted that the request for military assistance was based upon exaggerated statements of fact; that none were needed; and that the outbreak of the day before had been caused by the unwarranted firing with a revolver upon strikers by a deputy sheriff, a nephew of the sheriff, who was escorting strike-breakers to the mines. They accordingly telegraphed the governor requesting that the troops be withdrawn, at the same time asking him to send a personal representative to investigate the situation. But the governor replied on the 2d, saying that "upon full consideration, he was of the opinion that it would not be wise nor safe to withdraw the troops at present."

Attacks with stones were reported on the 3d as having been made upon sentries and guards by gangs of men from ambush. Shots in reply were fired by the sentries, but without effect. Gen. Gobin is quoted in the reports as having in consequence of these ambush attacks ordered his men to "shoot to kill and investigate afterwards."

Newspaper reports are growing more and more sensational, but they are apparently confirmed by Maj. W. S. Miller, of Wilkesbarre, inspector general of the Third brigade, who describes the situation at Shenandoah as follows:

A more God-forsaken country I have never seen. Eighty-five per cent. of the population are foreigners, and 8,000 or 10,000 are anarchists. The Lithuanians [natives of Lithuania, a section of Poland in east Prussia and west Russia south of the Baltic] fear neither man nor God. They have no regard for law or order or anything. They run everything their own way and the priests say that nobody has control of them. The English-speaking miners are all right and have done a good deal to help the troops there. Nothing short of shot and shell can keep the foreigners subdued. We are not down there to run the mines but to see that law and order are maintained, and that we shall do, come what may. If the foreigners attack us there will be bloodshed. Shenandoah is a veritable hell hole. Ninety thousand barrels of beer are sold there annually to the miners.

In a speech at a mass meeting of strikers near Scranton on the 1st President Mitchell, alluding to the violence in connection with the strike, said:

The one among you who violates the law is the worst enemy you have. No one is more pleased than the operators in New York to hear of disorder in the coal regions. I want our men to exercise their rights that inure to them under the laws, but I want that no man shall transgress the laws.

In similar spirit Mr. Mitchell replied on the 1st to a letter from the Citizens' alliance of Wilkesbarre demanding that he preserve order among the strikers. He wrote:

Permit me to say that I do not recognize your right to make demands upon me to specifically declare myself opposed to any specific classes of lawlessness. As a citizen of the United States and the chief executive of the miners' organization, I have declared on innumerable occasions and in language not susceptible of misconstruction, that I am opposed to lawlessness of every character; and I do not propose to alter my views to conform to the tenets of the Citizens' alliance, namely—wink at capital crimes while inveighing against minor offenses. I have never in my life sought to condone an unlawful act. I have thrown the full weight of my personality and influence on the side of law and order, and I can say without egotism that the miners' union and its officers have done more for the conservation of peace than all the citizens' alliances that

have been or could be formed by men like yourselves, whose sympathy with the poor and oppressed is like unto the friendship Brutus entertained for Caesar. I do not assume to say that there have not been some transgressions of law by members of the miners' union, but I do say, and defy you to successfully contradict the statement, that there has been much less lawlessness on the part of the miners—and that which has occurred has been less serious, in proportion to their number—than on the part of deputies and coal and iron police, who are charged with authority and are specifically commissioned to preserve the law, and against whom you have made no protest and your association has taken no action whatever. And, further, the records in the police court will demonstrate that a smaller number of miners have been convicted of crime in the anthracite mining towns during the progress of the strike than for a like period preceding it. Again, I have no hesitancy in saying that there never was a great upheaval, either industrial, political or social, in which there was as little real lawlessness as has existed in the anthracite region since the strike was inaugurated. As I said in my speech at Nanticoke—to which you took exception—the miners are as law-abiding, as patriotic, as liberty-loving as any other class of citizens in our country, and I shall not permit you to malign them or defame the residents of this community either by direct charge or insinuation without registering an emphatic protest.

A test of the legality of the injunction proceedings against the striking soft coal miners in West Virginia (p. 263) has been made by means of writs of habeas corpus. They were sued out on the 31st before Judge Nathan Goff, of the Federal circuit court for the Fourth circuit, which includes West Virginia, in behalf of Thomas Haggerty and other strikers who are in prison for contempt of an injunction issued by Judge John J. Jackson of the Federal district court for the northern district of West Virginia. The writs were granted on the 1st and made returnable at Clarksburg, W. Va., on the 5th. On the latter day the prisoners were produced and the hearing on the writs of habeas corpus proceeded. Judge Goff warned all parties preliminary to the hearing that while he owned no coal stock he did own coal land and that if objections to his sitting in the case were made he would have another judge take his place. No objection was made, and after hearing arguments on both sides he decided the case on

the 6th. The only question raised was one of jurisdiction. The strikers contended that the creditor corporation of New York, the plaintiff in the case, had no standing in court without the West Virginia corporation, its debtor and the owner of the mines in question, as a co-plaintiff. Had they been sustained on this point, the Federal court would have been without jurisdiction, for the defendants and the mine owners are citizens of West Virginia. But Judge Goff held that the New York company, the creditor, had the right to bring the suit, and that the West Virginia company, the mine owner, was not a necessary party. The strikers were therefore remanded to jail.

A further injunction was granted on the 31st (p. 263) by Judge B. F. Keller, Federal district judge of the southern district of West Virginia. It was granted on the application of the Chesapeake & Ohio Coal Agency company, a New Jersey trust controlling about 50 coal companies, and prohibits John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, Secretary Wilson, and about 150 others from intimidation by means of parading across or near the property of plaintiff, assembling on the property of plaintiff or in the paths or roads on said property leading to the mine from the home of the plaintiff's employes, or assembling in large numbers so near the property of the plaintiff as to intimidate its workmen.

The meaning of these injunctions has been explained during the week by both Judge Jackson and Judge Keller. Judge Jackson refused to be quoted, but consented to an interview with a trustworthy newspaper correspondent Walter Wellman, who reports:

He admitted that intimidation by means of physical violence was not necessary to constitute an infraction of the law. There was little or no evidence of actual physical intimidation in this case. But intimidation may be of several sorts. Moral suasion systematically carried out by means of meetings and marches is a species of moral intimidation. Assemblages near the homes of miners and the mouths of mines were interference with men who wanted to work. If the men did not want to work they had a right to quit at any moment, but the fact that they were in the mines day after day was evidence that they wanted to work and did not want to strike. The question then arose as to what extent the

organizers had a right to go in their efforts to change the minds of the workers. . . . "Would you regard mere efforts to incite men to quit work by argument, persuasion and moral pressure as a violation of the law?" He replied emphatically in the affirmative.

Judge Keller's explanation was made in open court at Charlestown on the 2d when he addressed strikers charged with contempt, saying:

The question, and the hard question for you men to solve, and for the court to solve, is as to what precisely you may do at any given time without violating the rights of those men who desire to peacefully labor. Now, at any time that you meet these men in the ordinary course, you have the right to persuade them to join your union, a perfect right. And if you can show to them that it is to their interest to join your union, why, do it. You have no right in any way to make those people think your way because they do not quite think it safe to think otherwise. Now, that in a general way is the limit of this thing. I take it, men, that you know that when a large body of men get together with the most peacefully declared purposes in the world, they have men among them who have made and are making threats, and they are close to another and smaller body of men who do not think as they do, and hold a ratification and rejoicing meeting of their own side; that has a different effect under those circumstances on the minds of men who desire to go on with their work, than a small gathering, peacefully persuading. Now, the point of the "nearness." There is no line, the injunction lays down no line, but it does say that you must not get close enough and act in a body of men in such way as to intimidate or interfere with those people who desire to work. In other words you must not make them afraid; you must not do things that will cause them to fear the consequences, to leave their work, or to be deterred from doing their full duty as they may see it.

Strikes seem to be multiplying. Among the larger ones is the boiler makers' strike at Chicago for higher wages—from 30 to 35 cents an hour for indoor work, and from 30 to 50 cents for outdoor work, with 25 cents for helpers for inside work and 30 for outside. A strike has broken out, also, in the Pullman car shops at Chicago, which may become formidable. It began with a demand by the blacksmiths' helpers for an increase of pay from \$2.75 to \$3.25 a day. Besides these new strikes the machinists' strike at the Allis-Chalmers shop, Chicago,

settled a few weeks ago (p. 171), was renewed on the 5th, when 250 men walked out because six union men had been discharged by the management in apparent hostility to the union. From Ironton, O., comes news of the stoppage by a strike of cars on the Ironton division of the Camden Interstate Electric railway; and from Catlettsburg, Ky., there are advices to the effect that Gov. Beckham has been appealed to for troops to preserve the property of the line on the Kentucky side, and has refused to act until he can send a representative to investigate.

The agricultural strikes in Austria-Hungary (p. 263), were reported on the 5th to have produced no less than 230 encounters between strikers and troops. In one case 13 persons were killed and 118 were wounded; in another 200 were killed or wounded. In an attack by a detachment of Uhlans on 500 peasants at Pothering, many of the peasants were wounded and the soldiers made 173 arrests.

Over the border in Germany the reichstag is struggling with a protective tariff bill, which provides among other things for protection on steel rails to the amount of a tax of \$2.50 a ton. Its object is to prevent the inundation of Germany with cheap American steel by the steel trust. At a hearing before the tariff committee on the 2d, the new member, Bernstein, leader of the opportunist faction of the Socialist party, resisted this tax. In the course of his speech he predicted a breakdown of the steel trust from overcapitalization and overconfidence of its managers. But if it did not go to pieces, he said, but came to a point where it had to sell steel at any price, it would so disorganize international markets that \$2.50 a ton would not protect German makers. He believed that nothing short of prohibition would do that. The committee is composed in a peculiar manner. Each of the nine political parties is allowed a fixed representation upon it, but is at liberty to name its own representatives and to change them at will. Consequently the personnel of the committee constantly alters, and as each new member makes a speech, the work of the committee proceeds but slowly.

In Russia this question of underselling foreign goods to the injury

of domestic sellers, which has inspired the calling of an international conference by the czar (p. 251), has led on to a public official explanation of that call by the Russian minister of finance, in which he says:

In view of the erroneous interpretation by many organs of the American press of the object and meaning of the recent note of the Russian minister of finance sent to various governments whose representatives have signed the Brussels convention on suppression of bounties on sugar, M. Routkowsky, financial agent of the Russian government in the United States, has been instructed to communicate to the American press that in case of the negative answer of powers to the above-mentioned note and the establishment of a countervailing duty on Russian sugar the imperial Russian government shall consider the establishment of such a duty as an infraction of its commercial treaties with powers so doing, and, therefore, free from obligations imposed by them and at liberty to comply with their stipulations whenever it will be to the advantage of Russia.

The Russian censorship of the press is being conducted more strictly than ever. The only paper of liberal tendencies it has left in St. Petersburg is the Viedomosti, which is leased from the government by Prince Oukhtomsky and conducted by him. The prince is an old friend of the czar, and has long been able to keep his readers supplied to a degree with news from the Russian provinces, something the other papers could not or did not do. But delayed correspondence from St. Petersburg tells of the summoning of Prince Oukhtomsky on the 12th before the new minister of the interior, H. von Plehve, successor to Sepuaguin, who was assassinated last April (p. 40, 56), when he was admonished. Minister von Plehve told him that the paper had become the organ of liberals and revolutionists, especially in its provincial departments, demanded the immediate dismissal of its editor, and threatened to cancel the lease of the paper, which has several years yet to run.

It is believed now that the Catholic troubles in France, which were so threatening last week (p. 264), are over. The prime minister explains that out of 6,000 congregations affected by the new law, about one-half have complied in good faith with its terms, and that the rest, excepting only about 400, have expressed their

willingness to submit, and were only awaiting the signature of President Loubet to a decree of closure. As he signed this on the 1st the prime minister regards the affair as closed. But reports from Rome are to the effect that there is a possibility of the Vatican's assuming a hostile attitude toward France in this connection, to prevent the passage of further anti-clerical laws.

Great Britain has received President Steyn, of the late Orange Free State republic. He landed at Southampton on the 2d, with his family, but in a broken down condition physically and unable to go to London, though the government had sent a luxurious saloon car to Southampton to bring him. Being carried on a stretcher to a Dutch steamer in the harbor, he sailed for Holland, where President Kruger met him on the 4th. That he would have been cordially welcomed had he gone to London as the British ministry evidently desired, is indicated, not only by the official attention shown him, by sending the car to meet him, but by the extraordinarily friendly treatment Gen. Lucas Meyer and his wife have received at the hands of titled and fashionable British society, as well as by an offer made by the king to receive Gens. Botha Delarey and DeWet as his guests.

There is apparently a feeling among some of the Boer leaders that the surrender (p. 264) was improvidently and perhaps inexcusably made. The secretary of Mr. Leyds is reported from Paris as saying that a copy of the letter of Kitchener, which has not appeared in the British blue book, is in the hands of a trusted Boer leader, and indicates a sinister part played by certain leaders in procuring peace. When Mr. Leyds was interviewed about this remark of his secretary he said, according to the same report:

I can't affirm or deny anything until I see De Wet, Botha, Delarey and Meyer themselves. You may say, however, that President Steyn is the noblest man of the century. Advantage was taken of his physical breakdown to compass peace. Many hold that in ten years' time England will have lost South Africa. Hatred and an element hitherto unknown has been established there and the English government is now embarked on a shifting policy. Wessels, Wolmarans and Fischer, the Boer delegates who went to the United States, have been