

President determined that at all hazards riotous acts must be suppressed and law must resume its sway. In ordering United States troops to the scene of the disturbance without an application of the legislature or governor of Illinois he accomplished a fresh extension of executive power without an infraction of the Constitution.

The constitutional observation here is self-contradictory; and the history, besides being erroneous, is not taken from the best available sources.

On the constitutional point, Mr. Rhodes recognizes the truth of what he immediately denies, that President Cleveland did override the Constitution; for he describes Cleveland's act as an "extension of executive power." It is conceivable, of course, that, without an infraction of the Constitution, a President may exercise an executive power never used before; but how can executive power itself be extended without an infraction of the constitution which defines the limits of that power. To extend it is to go beyond the limitation; and to go beyond constitutional limitations under a constitution which confers no powers except such as are expressed or necessarily implied, is a breach of the constitution. Not only does Mr. Rhodes thus join issue with himself, but his very statement of what Cleveland did shows that Cleveland overrode the Constitution. For, according to Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Cleveland invaded the State of Illinois with Federal troops, not to protect the mails nor to enforce the mandates of Federal courts, as some of his apologists contend, but to suppress a local riot; and he did so without any application from the local authorities. Nothing could well be clearer than that this "fresh extension of executive power" was an infraction of section 4 of article iv. of the Constitution.

Mr. Rhodes's history of the event to which he refers is evidently drawn from newspaper reports, irresponsible or worse, and either in inexcusable ignorance or culpable disregard of the documentary evidence. The

proof is abundant and irrefutable that Mr. Rhodes's wanton accusation against Gov. Altgeld, that he "would not preserve order," is false. It is so abundant and so convincing that no writer who cares for his reputation as a historian can afford to allow his name to remain associated with the statement we have quoted.

Criticism is made of our comment of two weeks ago (p. 658) upon the curious action of the Cook Co., Ill., special grand jury in finding that the coal famine was not due to any conspiracy in restraint of trade, and then indicting coal dealers for a conspiracy in restraint of trade. Since the grand jury had said in effect, asks our critic, that "we do not find that the present increase in prices for coal is due to a conspiracy; but we do find that for a long space of time certain dealers have been engaged in a conspiracy intended to produce and actually producing abnormally high prices, for which they are criminally liable under Illinois law, and for this we indict them," is there anything inconsistent in it? Isolated from the circumstances under which the special grand jury sat, there is, indeed, no inconsistency. For the same reason there would have been no inconsistency had the grand jury, though finding that the coal famine was not due to a trade conspiracy, nevertheless indicted one or more persons for sheep stealing. Grand juries may find various indictments for various crimes. But the circumstances make a vast difference in the case referred to. This was a special grand jury. It was called for the special purpose of investigating the causes of the coal famine. Its indictments, therefore, are properly regarded as the result of that investigation. And so it regarded them itself, for it did not indict the Manufacturers' Association nor any other similar conspiracy which "for a long space of time" had defied the laws of Illinois. It confined its indictments to coal dealers, thereby making an im-

pression upon the public mind that it had traced the coal famine to those men. That action of this particular grand jury was inconsistent with its report, in which it found that the famine was not due to any trade conspiracy. The whole thing has the air of an attempt by somebody to divert public attention from the great railroad monopolies, which own both roads and mines, and toward which a well founded suspicion runs in connection with the famine.

A Baptist paper of Cincinnati, the *Journal and Messenger*, comments very sensibly upon the proposed method of settling the land question of Ireland by buying out the landlords at something less than the value of their holdings. "By no hocus pocus can it be made to appear," says that paper, "that when an owner is receiving \$5 per acre rent for his land a sale for an annual payment of \$4 is not confiscation of a considerable part of the property." That is perfectly true. In the forum of morals it is just as clearly an invasion of property rights to confiscate a part as the whole. The real question that inevitably recurs in either case is, Is it an invasion of property rights at all to terminate such tenures as the Irish landlords claim? If it is such an invasion as to full value, it is equally so, morally speaking, as to part of the value; and if it is not so as to part, it is not so as to the whole. Let us ask, then, whether it is so at all with reference to these Irish lands? The answer may be found in the same Baptist paper. It truly says that the fact that the landlords' claims to Irish lands rest upon conquest is of no importance, "since the value at the time they were conquered was trifling;" and then it adds, also with truth and force, that "the real value of all land has been given by the development of civilization, and by the people of the entire country," and "this is as true where land was purchased for a few shillings an acre as where it was taken by a conqueror." Does not that completely answer the

question of the right to terminate such claims? By what moral authority does any government maintain the vitality of land tenures which operate to endow a few in every generation with those values that are "given by the development of civilization and by the people of the entire country"? Is it not confiscation from the people to continue enforcing such a system, rather than confiscation from landlords to stop enforcing it?

### THE GREAT ORDER OF THINGS.\*

We live in a time when Deborah's allegorical allusion to the rout of Sisera is big with meaning. Even as "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," so do the eternal forces of moral righteousness, circling majestically on in their appointed orbits, fight against the sordid utilitarianism that holds the moral sense of our generation in captivity. The victory of right over seeming might is thus assured. At all times when "the stars in their courses fight against Sisera," his chariots however numerous and his hosts however mighty, are predestined to utter destruction.

There is a great order of things. As to this all doubt has vanished with reference to the material universe. Fighting with "the stars in their courses," materialistic science has upon this distinctive plane of human experience routed the Siserian hosts. The powers that came of a bigoted rejection of rational truth promoted by a priestly utilitarianism in the disguise of religious faith, those old forces generated by a union of superstitious credulity and irrational incredulity, have here yielded to an enlightened recognition of the dominance of natural law.

We know now that the material universe, from largest to least, is a universe of law—invariable law. Except in obedience thereto, no man—whether greatest of inventors or humblest of mechanics—would any longer think of pursuing his vocation. He perceives that disobedience would

but waste his labor and cripple his powers. He realizes that it is as he conforms, and only as he conforms, to the laws of matter, that his undertakings in the utilization of matter can succeed. He knows that unless he harmonizes his efforts with "the stars in their courses," all he attempts, promising though it may seem at first to be, must utterly fail. In the sphere of material things, disobedience to natural law is fully seen to be as a process self-destructive and as a result impossible.

The law of gravitation, for instance, always holds sway. It can be neither frustrated nor disturbed. Whether we work with it and build ourselves a house, or defy it and dash our bodies to pulp at the foot of a precipice, it is the same law working irresistibly in the same way. It serves the just and the unjust, the righteous and the unrighteous, those who seek its aid for construction and those who seek it for destruction. All these it serves alike, according to their several purposes. If they would build for themselves, they have but to go rightly about it and the law of gravitation helps them. If they would destroy themselves, it permits them to do so. But its constant lesson is the invariableness of its processes, the wasteful futility of opposition, the splendid possibilities of conformity. "The stars in their courses" fight against every Sisera who defies this or any other law of the material universe.

So it is, also, in the moral universe. There, too, the great order of things holds resistless sway. Its laws, analogous to the courses of planets and suns, no human power can overcome nor any antagonism disturb. More than that. Not only is the moral universe, equally with the material, a universe of invariable law, but its laws are sovereign over those of matter. This must be so, for matter is merely a medium for the expression of moral purpose. Except as it is subservient to that end, its existence is inexplicable upon the hypothesis of universal design.

As certainly as physical law dominates matter does moral law dominate the physical. Though conformity to the laws of matter alone will enable us, for illustration, to forge

a knife of keenest blade, the uses of the knife—without which it has no reason for existing and would not be made—fall within the jurisdiction of moral law. We may use it to carve things that minister to human needs or the human sense of beauty, thus serving our brethren and moulding our own characters more and more in the divine likeness, while conquering the stubbornness of external nature; or we may make it an implement for torture and murder. In the one case we advance in moral righteousness by conformity to the moral law. "The stars in their courses" fight with us. In the other case, we defy the moral law. But we cannot overcome it, for "the stars in their courses" fight against us. Though the torture be inflicted and the murder done, the unrighteous purpose they were intended to serve will in the outcome inevitably fail. The stars in their immutable courses fight always and everywhere against Sisera.

Unrighteous we may be in thought and deed, but we can no more establish anywhere in the universe the sovereign sway of moral unrighteousness, of moral lawlessness, of moral disorder, than we could establish a sway of material lawlessness upon the plane of physics. The enemies of Sisera, though captive for a time, cannot fail if their cause is allied to "the stars in their courses." Be their cause what it may, whether material or moral, that of an inventor like the unknown discoverer of fire or the forgotten maker of the first wheelbarrow, of a persecuted and disheartened explorer like Columbus, of patriots on the scaffold or of saints upon the rack, of the philosopher with his deadly potion of hemlock or the Nazarene carpenter upon the cross—whatever the cause, it always has and always must conquer, in so far as it is in harmony with the great order of things.

That this universal truth lacks recognition as such, is evident from the manifest tendency to subordinate what is morally right to what seems to be practically more expedient, to displace loyalty to moral principles with slavery to material utilities—in a comprehensive phrase, to place utilitarianism above idealism.

\*By Louis F. Post, editor of The Public, in the Christmas, 1902, number of The Mirror (St. Louis). Reproduced here by special permission of William Marion Reedy, editor of The Mirror.