

basis. In these circumstances the 3-cent-fare movement in Cleveland will probably gain more from the good influence of the adverse decision on public sentiment than it will suffer from loss of revising power over franchises by the city council.

A crusade against salary "loan sharks" is being made by the Chicago newspapers in the "interest of the poor." How easy! How very much easier than attacking the really dangerous enemies of the poor—the enemies that make them poor. "Loan sharks" may be very bad men, but even if they were the worst alive they could not force people to borrow from them nor to pay them exorbitantly for loans. They do not coerce people to borrow. What they do is to refuse to lend except on their own terms, and where is the wrong in that? The borrower is at perfect liberty to reject the proffered terms. To enact legislation limiting those terms can result in only one or both of two things: (1) devices for circumventing the restrictive law, or (2) a lessening of opportunities for borrowing. And pray how are the poor to be benefited by legal restrictions upon borrowing opportunities? What they need is to be freed, not from lenders who cannot lend to anyone who refuses to borrow, but from legal monopolists, who, by denying them their natural rights, force them to forego a lion's share of their earnings. These "loan sharks" are to monopolists as a sunfish to leviathan.

#### THE COLORADO LAWLESSNESS.

"A gigantic combination of American mines" by the Standard Oil "crowd" and under the leadership of John D. Rockefeller himself! Such is the startling disclosure of the news reports of the present week.

The par value of the stock of this gigantic combine is reported to be no less than two billions and a half in dollars; and the combine is to control the whole mineral

output of the United States, with the possible exception of the Calumet and Hecla copper mine in Michigan. Thus doth the pious process of subduing the earth and the inhabitants thereof go on at a thrilling pace.

It appears that the plans for this great monopolization have been secretly in the way of execution for a decade. "For ten years," say the press reports, "the Standard Oil millionaires have been acquiring the mines of America through their banking interests. In Colorado David Moffat and Dennis Sullivan, of the First National Bank of Denver, have paid out many millions in the past six years for productive mines, and are said to control 70 per cent. of the productive gold, silver and lead mines of the middle Rocky Mountain district."

In the last clause of that report there is much food for serious reflection with reference to the present disturbances in the mining regions of Colorado. That the Standard Oil "crowd" owns the fuel mines of Colorado and large connecting railway interests was already known; but that this lawless "crowd" also owns controlling interests in the gold mines there, was only suspected. The fact that they do control those mines is enough to account for much—for very much indeed.

It accounts for the scandalous bribing of the Colorado legislature (p. 154), for the purpose of overriding the lawfully expressed will of the people, which is described in McClure's for May; this is one of the Standard Oil's well known methods of riding rough-shod over public law and popular rights.

It accounts, moreover, for the contemptible subserviency of the Governor of Colorado; the control of public administrators, whether by corruption or intimidation or Mephistophelian "jolly-ing," is another well-known method of Standard Oil lawlessness.

It accounts, also, for the employment of troops, not to maintain the law of the State impartially,

but to overthrow it in the interest of these millionaire monopolists; this also is a Standard Oil method, although detectives instead of State troops have hitherto been used when the monopolists have furnished the funds.

It accounts, likewise, for the effrontery with which this monopoly revolution has been executed; effrontery in lawlessness is peculiarly a characteristic of the Standard Oil "crowd."

It accounts even for the diabolical explosion at Independence; for explosions, with cruel indifference to human life, are among the methods to which the Standard Oil "crowd" resorts when it has any advantage to gain thereby, as Lloyd's "Wealth Against Commonwealth" clearly proves by reference to several instances, including that of the competing oil refinery at Buffalo in the 'eighties.

The Colorado explosion certainly has served the mine owners' purposes; and if the mine owners' interests and the Standard Oil "crowd's" interests are the same, it has served the Standard Oil "crowd." They charged the infamous thing to the strikers, thereby securing an advantage with public opinion and affording an excuse to their tools in the official service of the State for overthrowing all law and turning the militia into an armed and organized and nominally legal mob. It is evident, then, that the Standard Oil "crowd" had a motive, sufficient according to their past record, to account for resorting to this piece of diabolism. They had much to gain and only a little to risk. To find a motive for it on the part of the strikers is not so easy. The strikers had much to lose by it and nothing to gain. The only guilty motive that can with any show of reason be attributed to them would be revenge, or insane anger. This must have been individual if it existed at all; it could not have been organic. So far as motive is concerned, therefore, it points most strongly not toward the strikers but toward the mine-owners; and if they are dominated by the Standard Oil

"crowd," the trail becomes fresher, since Standard Oil methods stop short of nothing, not even of bribing the underlings of an adversary to destroy property and human life by means of explosions.

And when we consider opportunity for the crime, the element that comes next in importance to motive, it is evident that the strikers had almost no opportunity, while the opportunity of the mine owners' tools was perfect. What opportunity was there to plant an elaborate infernal machine under a railroad station, with connections for exploding it extending a hundred yards or more away—what opportunity could there have been for strikers to do this, when the whole place, in the hands of the company, was guarded day and night by detectives? The strikers were under surveillance. It was therefore practically impossible for them to place and explode so elaborate a contrivance as the infernal machine at Independence is described to have been. But a Standard Oil detective, or a bribed miner under the protection of such a detective, could easily have done the deadly work, and thereby have served the mine-owners' purpose.

It is by no means at all improbable, then, that the suppressed story of this explosion from Cripple Creek is true—the story that when bloodhounds were put upon the case they ran to the houses of the company watchmen, and that thereupon the attempt to run down the criminals with bloodhounds was abandoned.

The advantage which this explosion has given the mine owners over the strikers, and which could by either side have been foreseen, is clear. It has enabled them to throw down with impunity every legal barrier to the end they seek.

They have suspended the civil law; they have driven officials out of office and put mine owners' tools in their places; they

have censored a newspaper and then destroyed its plant; they have gutted cooperative stores and destroyed the goods they contained; they have arrested men in shoals and deported them from the State by scores, for nothing but refusing to join the mine-owners' union; they have governed without right or justice and slaughtered without reason or mercy. This they have done in the name of law though against the law, under the orders of the governor who obeys their commands, by means of a militia paid by them and officered by their employes, and for the furtherance of their own schemes of mine monopolization.

They have even closed a peaceably conducted competing mine, where there had been neither disorder nor a strike, driving five hundred men out of peaceable employment, and by the orders of the militia officer in command forbidding the owners of the competing mine to resume operations with any other workmen than such as hold cards from the lawless combine (presumably the Standard Oil "crowd") permitting them to work.

Here is lawlessness worse than has ever been charged to labor unions, and all the more dangerous for being done falsely in the name of law and order.

Had labor organizations been half as lawless, either in hostility to officers of the law or in harmony with them in the name of law, the newspapers of the United States from coast to coast would have rung with denunciation daily, and the primary necessity for law and order would have been iterated and reiterated in their columns.

Why, then, are the papers so indifferent to law and order now?

In the editorial pages of the Chicago papers, Hearst's and Walsh's alone excepted (and the latter is brutally frank in defending the monopoly law-breakers), the silence on this subject is painful. This silence has been broken in only two or three instances, and

then so weakly and apologetically and pusillanimously, as to inspire contempt.

A press that stands up for law and order only against a puny element of lawlessness in trade unions, not daring to demand law and order nor to denounce lawlessness when the law-breaker is the Standard Oil "crowd," is but an apology for journalism. Can it be true, as workmen in growing numbers assert, that law and order, no longer a bulwark for all, is only a luxury for the rich? Is it true that respect for law is a card to be played when the monopolists' game needs it, but to be discarded whenever it weakens their hands?

In this emergency, when their erstwhile "law and order" song has no charms for the newspapers, it is unhappily true that but little encouragement in restoring just and orderly government comes from the trade unions. Their most influential leaders seem to have no conception of the importance and magnitude of the struggle in the opening battle of which they are especially involved.

To some, the Colorado affair means only the suppression of a rival labor organization; and why should they bother about that?

To others, the sun will shine and the rain will fall as long as "business agents" can bargain with "capitalists" about trifling questions of hours and wages; and why should they get excited over the arbitrary arrests and lawless deportations of workmen whose "business agents" couldn't bargain.

To nearly all, the issue is only a "labor" issue at most, and in an emergency like this they are stunned. Pathetically they find it "a' a muddle, a' a muddle."

Perhaps the worst exhibition of the incompetency of labor organizations at this crisis was the demand, both from Denver and Chicago labor organizations, that President Roosevelt intervene. Roosevelt might be worthy of more respect if he had replied with courtesy, at least to the Denver application. The rudeness of silence, such as he has exhibited

toward the miners of Colorado who appealed to him, he never exhibits toward "business" classes when they appeal. But bad manners aside, Roosevelt is right in refusing to send troops. True, Cleveland sent troops to Chicago when the railroad combine asked for them; but he was able to say the Chicago strike interfered with the United States mails. That was a subterfuge, to be sure, but it was a plausible subterfuge. Roosevelt could have made no such excuse even if he had wanted to comply with the demand of the miners. But suppose a plausible subterfuge had been available, what is to be thought of labor leaders who invite the worst forms of tyranny by committing themselves to the theory that the President may invade a State with Federal troops whenever he wants to? Have they no notion at all of the kind of conflict in which we are all involved? Do they not realize that American liberty is at stake in the lawless use of military power against workingmen, and that if the man-on-horseback has not yet come the corporation-on-horseback is already here?

This is no mere labor fight. It is a great conflict between interests—the centralizing interests of monopoly on the one hand, and unorganized or only loosely-organized non-monopoly interests on the other.

The line between them is not yet sharply drawn, but it will be soon. At present the centralizing monopoly-interests are getting control everywhere of the machinery of government. When they shall have accomplished that, and after it is too late for the people to divest them of their enormous centralized power, then will the line be drawn; and, amazing as it may sound, then also will "business" men who are now helping the monopolists, find themselves on the nether side of the line along with workingmen.

The significant thing about the present stage of this acquisition of power and division of interests is not the explosion at Indepen-

dence nor the arbitrary arrest and deportation of Colorado miners. The most significant thing in Colorado is the lawless closing down, by soldiers under command of the centralized mining corporations, of a competing mine.

Let no one suppose that this is a partisan question. The Standard Oil "crowd" is as non-partisan as a citizens' league. Republican officials are doing their work for the most part, but that is only because Republicans are in power for the most part. Monopolists can find the necessary tools among the politicians of both parties. In the Democratic party nationally they would be as well content with your Cleverlands and your Parkers as with such Republicans as will dominate the convention at Chicago next week. In Colorado it happens that their subservient governor is a Republican, but might they not have gained the good will of a Democratic governor had one been in the chair?

Like Jay Gould in the early days of the present trend toward government of the people by and for privileged corporations, the Standard Oil "crowd" are Republican in Republican localities and Democratic in Democratic localities, but for Standard Oil interests everywhere. Significantly enough they have not yet been detected in the disguise of Bryan Democrats or La Follette Republicans. From that fact a valuable lesson might be learned by intelligent voters in both parties.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK.

Lake Mohonk, N. Y., June 4.—Perhaps the newspapers are not to be blamed for slighting the Mohonk peace conference. When a number of men, most of them men of influence in their respective communities, who gather together to ask for international arbitration pride themselves on their "practicality" and take advantage of every opportunity to insist that they are not "fanatics," "dreamers," "visionaries," it is not surprising that they are taken not quite seriously by chroniclers of the doings of the world. They were so intensely practical that while assuming to be leaders in this cause, they were forever

fearful of getting ahead of public opinion. Their chief proof of being practical was their insistence on the inevitability of war "under present conditions," one of their spokesmen who has taken part in several previous gatherings even declaring his belief that wars would continue "until God shall change the hearts of men." If such men are determined to find a scapegoat upon whom to lay the blame for the greed and lust of kings, emperors and other rulers, surely it would be more fitting and less irreverent and illogical to blame the devil. While men who affect to lead in the cause of arbitration are open fatalists, those who profit from war and warlike preparations need not worry that their business of supplying \$7,500,000 battleships and 100-ton guns will come to an end. It was not necessary to scratch very deep to find even in this "peace" gathering many who are worshipers of war. So wedded to the old idea were they that they saw nothing inconsistent in a suggestion that an international army be created to compel obedience to the decrees of The Hague court. Force, force, force! One might think that moral considerations or influences have no place in the world.

Much importance was attached to the formation during the recent session of Congress of an American section of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for Arbitration. The Union is said to number some 1,500 members, or about half the entire membership of the parliamentary bodies of which they are members. How intense is their devotion to the cause of universal peace and good will among the nations of the earth is seen in the fact that each of the parliamentary bodies in Europe of which these men are members is annually increasing army and navy appropriations. If anything like half the membership of European parliamentary bodies were sincerely desirous of establishing a world's peace, would they in their several bodies vote increasing taxation upon the poor to provide funds for larger and ever larger armies and navies? They cannot now, if the total membership in the Inter-Parliamentary Union is correctly stated, plead that they would reduce the appropriations for their own country if other countries would do likewise. To do that is to impeach the good faith of their fellow members in the Union.

I fear that little importance can be attached to the numerical strength of the I. P. U. for A., for its European members treated it about as seriously as the Americans do. How seriously it is regarded here, and how little it affects their official acts, is shown in the fact that although 43 members of Congress were present at the meeting in January when the American group was formed, and about 100 others subsequently gave in their names, only one other member