

tial candidate of the great Hanna-Rockefeller-Armour-Vanderbilt-Morgan combine virtuously denounce Mayor Van Wyck as a partner in an infamous and perhaps criminal trust. It could be done with so much composure only by a dupe or a demagogue.

The St. Louis strike, with the violence attending it, is a mere external manifestation of conditions which the classes that are most ready to resort to official violence have themselves brought on. It may be likened to skin eruptions caused by impure blood. The street car system had been consolidated, all but one line, upon pretense that this would enable the companies to render better service. What it did enable them to do was to water their stock enormously and encourage them to oppress their employes. The employes met the movement against them with the strike. It was quickly settled, so far as it affected the one line which had not been consolidated with the others; but the consolidated lines arrogantly fought the men in ways that are more exasperating and more dangerous to the public peace than labor riots, but which have an outward appearance of legality. Then came sporadic acts of violence on the part of the strikers and worse violence on the part of some of their friends. But the violence has not been at all what the press has represented it to be. The stories about stripping women, and the like, were grossly exaggerated; and the only disorder worthy the name of riot was brought on by a so-called posse comitatus. The governor had been urged to order out the militia. He very properly declined to do so. His motives for refusing are impugned, but it is not his motives that are in question. The important considerations are that the true use of the militia is not to exasperate and cause disorder and destruction, but peace when there is rioting that cannot be controlled by the civil power, and that no such condition has existed. The sheriff was less particular

than the governor. Called upon to order out a posse, he organized instead, though under that name, an impromptu military force, composed of a class of men who live in an atmosphere of contempt for people who earn their living with their hands, who were hot with a passion for the man-hunt, who were armed with military weapons, and were organized and officered as a military force. This unlawful military force wantonly caused the only real riot of the strike; and in that it did all the shooting. While strikers should be held accountable for the breaches of the peace of which some of them are unquestionably guilty, it is by no means an indication of a law-abiding state of mind to denounce their unpremeditated outbreaks while ignoring the deliberate though secret lawlessness of the monopolists whose grasping schemes were the real cause of all the trouble.

Before the industrial commission at Washington not long ago, Secretary Thompson, of a southern industrial organization, which carries on industry by proxy, made an onslaught upon labor unions for interfering with the right of nonunion men to work. Mr. Thompson proposed as one remedy that a law should be enacted which would—

make it justifiable homicide for any killing that occurred in defense of any lawful occupation, the theory of our government being that anyone has a right to earn an honest living in this country, and any endeavor to deprive one of that right should be placed in the same legal status with deprivation of life and property.

We doubt if Mr. Thompson would stand by his proposal to its logical end. Here, for instance, is a coal miner out of work, not because trade unions stand in his way, but because the owners of coal mines refuse to employ him. Here also is a coal field that no one is working. It is held out of the market, as many acres of coal field are, in order to lessen the supply of coal. Now coal mining is a lawful occupation, and this miner goes to work taking coal out of that field and

selling it. But the owner of the land endeavors to deprive him of his right to earn an honest living in that way; and, acting upon Mr. Thompson's suggestion, the coal miner thereupon kills the obstructive land owner. In harmony with the principle propounded by Mr. Thompson, this deadly act should be accounted justifiable homicide, because committed by the miner in defense of his right to earn an honest living. And as with that landlord, so with all landlords who shut men out from the only opportunity for earning a living that nature ever thought it necessary to provide; to kill them should be justifiable homicide!

We understand, of course, that Mr. Thompson would immediately retort that trespassing upon another's land is not an honest way of getting a living. But how does unused land come to be the land of anybody in particular? Why has the man who doesn't use it himself and forbids its use by others a better right to it than the man who tries to use it? Nature gives no such right. The only basis of the right is municipal law—mere human enactment. Would Mr. Thompson rest his case for landlords upon nothing more substantial than that? Would it be murder, in his estimation, to shoot a landlord for preventing your earning a living by working unused land to which he had only a legal title, and justifiable homicide to shoot a labor union "picket" for preventing your taking a job? Would the mere legal title make all that moral difference? If it would, then it would be murder to shoot the "picket" if he had a legal right to keep others away from a job he had struck himself. All the "pickets" need do, then, to avoid the penalty Mr. Thompson prescribes, would be to use their political influence to secure an act of the legislature giving them the same right to monopolize jobs that legislatures heretofore have given to landlords to monopolize land. The essence of it all is that while Mr. Thompson's moral

principle of the right of everyone to earn an honest living is sound, it is a principle that applies with no more moral force to a labor "picket" than to a land monopolist. Both interfere with the right of others to earn a living. But the land monopolist is by far the greater offender. For every man that labor "pickets" deprive of a job, land monopolists deprive millions of jobs.

An example of one of the characteristics of imperialism, censorship of the press, when it is in smooth working order and not too drastic, is afforded by Russia, that model empire, which, with fire and sword, would carry its standards of civilization and Christianity to the inferior peoples, just as we are urged to carry ours. The example we refer to is the press instructions issued by the Russian minister of the interior to guide newspapers of Russia with reference to the Chinese situation. They are given by the American Associated Press in these words:

1. No reference to the movement of Russian troops or warships.
2. Papers must bear in mind that the czar is actuated only by a desire to maintain peace and good-will among the nations.
3. No gossip about differences among the powers that would be displeasing to the government.
4. No criticism of Russian diplomacy or of military or naval strategy.
5. Editorial writers should recollect that Russia is predestined to predominate in Asia.
6. Comparisons may be made between Russian and foreign troops and seamen when unfavorable to foreigners.

In reading these instructions an American must experience a crawly feeling. Yet to such press censorizing the imperialists are bringing this country. Don't smile incredulously. The American censorship of the press in the Philippines for the past year has not been one whit less autocratic and mendacious. Nor has it been confined to military secrets. Our press censorship in the Philippines has been distinctly political. What is worse, administration republicans assert the right to make it so in perpet-

uity; for, while they insist that the Philippine islands must be American territory, they declare that the liberty safeguards of the constitution do not protect the people there. Freedom of speech and of the press, then, should Mr. McKinley's colonial policy be sustained, is to be a mere matter of the grace of the sovereign power. It is even so in Russia.

When Mr. McKinley stated that he did not believe in "imperialism" it is evident to all that he was standing upon a definition. At the time he made the statement no dictionary, with the exception of Stormonth's, had added anything to the ancient and classical meaning of the term, though the citation from Pearson: "Roman imperialism had divided the world into master and slave," was not without instruction. But Stormonth, published in 1895, contained an addition, which is worth considering even from the McKinley point of view, as follows:

Imperialism, or Caesarism, as a party name, denotes the supposed government of a ministry, or the personal government of a minister of a constitutional country, hardly within the limits of the constitution; the supposed exercise of such a power as belongs to a despotic government.

The important connection made in this prophetic sentence between "imperialism" and "Caesarism" should not be lost sight of, nor the importance of the latter definition as implied in and logically proceeding from the former. But a still more authoritative signification is to be had from one of the recently issued parts of the Oxford dictionary, the only word-book in English which may be called international in the full sense of the term. The secondary meaning of "imperialism" is there defined to be—

the principle or spirit of empire; advocacy of what are held to be imperial interests. In recent British politics, the principle or policy (1) of seeking, or at least of not refusing, an extension of the British empire in directions where trading interests and investments require the protection of the flag; and (2) of so uniting the different parts of the empire having

separate governments as to secure that for certain purposes, such as warlike defense, internal commerce, copyright, and postal communication, they shall be practically a single state.

With this goes the further and more directly applicable American definition:

In the United States, "imperialism" is similarly applied to the new policy of extending the rule of the American people over foreign countries, and of acquiring and holding distant dependencies, in the way in which colonies and dependencies are held by European states.

That is what "imperialism" is generally supposed to mean; but then everybody was supposed to know just what "plain duty" was supposed to mean. What Mr. McKinley means is probably different, with phrases concerning "confidence in the American character," "belief in an overruling Providence," and "benevolent assimilation to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln," to make it clear to the plain people.

In a recent issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal, a publication which cannot be fairly accused of having free trade sympathies, there appears an item that protectionists might reflect upon very much to their enlightenment. After reciting the fact that of the 661,669 tons of coal imported last year into Chili, only 3,200 tons were from the United States, this item observes that "we ought to furnish a very much larger proportion, but we will hardly do it unless we become buyers of ores and other products from that country." The item indicates that its writer's mind is only in the early stages of economic development. He evidently supposes that profitable commerce consists in exchanging goods with this, that and the other country, by direct trade between those countries respectively and our own; whereas it really consists in exchanging domestic goods for foreign goods, regardless of the particular country or countries to which the domestic goods may go or from which the foreign goods may come. It is immaterial, that is, whether the United States sends