

give him his birthright and title" as "a normal man."

It would hardly be worth while commenting on ravings of this kind if they were not copied verbatim and at considerable length by leading morning newspapers as an important contribution to the discussion of the case. This requires something to be said in behalf of the common sense of the community now when the city is so full of strangers.

We do not mean to go into a discussion of the anti-Jewish prejudice apropos of this incident. It would be as useless to do so apropos of Mr. Seligman's being blackballed as apropos of the general failure of Christians in New York to associate more freely with well-bred, attractive Jewish ladies and gentlemen, of whom there are large numbers. What we are now about to say, we say in behalf of private life and private tastes, and not in behalf of either the Union League Club or Christian bigots in general. A club is simply an extension of a private dwelling, in which men of similar tastes, and it may be general agreement on a certain class of social and political questions, may meet in comfort, with certain guarantees that they will not be incommoded by bad manners, by disagreeable personal habits, by the proclamation of offensive opinions by others, or by the presence of persons who for *any reason* may interfere with their enjoyment of the club-rooms. To insure this, the power of selection is left with a committee, and, in some cases, as that of the Union League Club, an absolute veto is given to a minority large enough to prevent a candidate's being victimized by one individual or a small clique. That is to say, it is required that a certain reasonable number shall declare that his presence would render the Club less agreeable to them. But to insist on their giving their reasons, or to blackguard them because the reasons do not seem good to outsiders, is just as "irrational and inhuman" as to berate a man for the principle on which he selects the guests at his own dinner table. This principle may be base, or mean, or cruel, or show a bad heart or an ill instructed mind, but to interfere with it would make him a slave; and any one who suspected that the motives which prevented a host from asking him were unworthy, and should write to the newspapers to claim an occasional dinner of him as the natural right of "a normal man," would make himself ridiculous. This right to select his guests and associates for reasons best known to himself is one which every man carries to his club, if it be a social club, and he exercises it under such restrictions only as the association of a large body of men under one roof may make necessary.

It is said, of course, that the Union League Club has some sort of public functions, including the care of the Republican party, which make it rather a political association than a social club. But it was a social club from the very beginning.

It was intended to be a club composed of men reasonably agreeable to each other, who held the same political opinions on the great questions of the day in 1862, and to exert a social influence in favor of the Union in this city. It has been since then converted into a club composed of men who approve of a high tariff; but this, though in our view a perversion of the original aim, does not deprive it of the right to select its members on grounds of social taste, and does not make the social tastes of club members, any more than the social tastes of individuals, proper matter for journalistic and pulpit denunciation. The exclusion of a man because he disapproves of the McKinley Bill, or did not vote for James G. Blaine, is in our minds as irrational and indefensible as the exclusion of a man on account of his race; but the tariff-reformer or Mugwump who tried to force his way into the Club in spite of this objection, as a natural right, would make a great blunder. The part of good taste and good manners is to avoid fighting one's way into clubs, private houses, or society of any description in which one's presence would be for any reason objectionable to any portion of the company. If a man finds that his admission to a club is likely to meet with formidable opposition, dignity and good sense and respect for club life prescribe his withdrawal of his name without a contest. The large number of clubs now existing for men of different tastes or pursuits shows that social clubs are organized on the basis of taste simply, and that if people could get into them by the aid of the Declaration of Independence, or by mandamus or injunction, they would all soon come to an end. No gentleman tries to impose his presence on a circle of people who do not want him, and no sensible man makes their failure to appreciate his society a ground of public complaint, much less of uproar.

#### THE LANCASHIRE STRIKE.

It is generally believed that trade-unionism is a stage further advanced in England than in the United States. Those who hold this view point to the greater respect which public opinion has in Great Britain for the older combinations among employees, to the more conservative policy which in general governs labor organizations there, and to the relief, as compared with our own country, from unnecessary and unjust strikes, which age and a greater sense of responsibility have secured from English trade unions. Certainly, if the labor strikes with which the United States has been cursed for a year past are specimens of unionism as it will continue to be, we may well hope for such radical defeat as will suppress combinations of employees for a long time to come. But, if we assume that such combinations have a right to exist for good purposes, and will continue to exist and must be reckoned

with, then our hope lies in the probability that defeat will bring about wisdom and a better understanding of the proper limitations of labor organizations.

Because of the light which it throws upon our own labor problem, the last word has not been said concerning the Lancashire strike which ended a fortnight ago. Cotton-spinning had suffered, as had every other branch of trade and manufacture in Great Britain, in 1892. The manufacturers decided that some measures must be taken to reconcile cost and selling prices. They therefore proposed to their operatives a reduction of 10 per cent. in wages, changed soon to 5 per cent. The masters' argument was a simple one: in view of the depression in the cotton trade, the ruling wages could no longer be paid. It was charged that the manufacturers were willing to force a strike so that stocks of yarns and cloth on hand could be worked off. There seems no justification for this insinuation, since the mills, it is admitted, lost more money by stopping than they would have done if they had continued running at the old wages. On the other hand, the Operators' Union (or rather unions combined), while acknowledging the depression and the willingness of the men to contribute their share of loss during the hard times, opposed a downright reduction in wages as an inadequate remedy for a commercial crisis, and proposed instead a reduction to eight hours' work a day, with a proportionate cut in the pay-rolls. The manufacturers resisted this proposition on the ground that the real cost of running the mill would not be reduced in proportion to the shortened hours, and that the general outlook for the trade, in the face of increased spinning in India, demanded a more radical solution. The compromise finally reached, after a costly strike, was a reduction in pay of 3 per cent. with the old number of hours per day.

The London *Economist* states the real object of the strike to have been the desire on the part of the Spinners' Union to pave the way for an eight-hour day in the future. While willing to accept eight hours now, with a corresponding reduction in wages, the spinners would have been in a position, when trade revived, to demand their old daily wages without any increase in hours of work. Though both sides yielded something in the compromise, the operators practically lost their case; for the slightly better outlook allowed the masters without too much loss to reduce their demand from a 5 per cent. decrease in wages to 3 per cent., while the effort toward an eight hour day at old wages some time in the future has failed. The terms of the compromise, outside the reduction, were to the general effect that wages once fixed are not to be changed for a twelvemonth; that wages shall be put back when equitable; that neither side shall ask for any change or institute a strike or a lockout without giving due notice and

explanation to the other, and that the general condition of the trade involving questions of profit and wages shall be considered from time to time by a committee composed of three members from the masters and three from the spinners.

The impression left on the mind by a survey of the whole strike is that it was unnecessary; that the money lost (estimated at \$15,000,000, taking all England into account) was wasted, and that the machinery devised to prevent a future strike or lockout ought to have stopped the one in question. The right of the workmen to know about trade conditions and profits, and to sit in judgment upon such matters, seems to be acknowledged, in theory at least, together with the fact that there is a relationship of some sort between profits and wages. Clearly enough, the acknowledgment of such theoretic rights would not have been made had not the masters believed the trade union to be strong enough to enforce its side of the contract upon the operatives, and able to understand business points when brought before it by the mill-owners. While, therefore, the fact that so disastrous a strike should have been undertaken at all argues ill for the judgment of labor leaders in England, the terms of the compromise are such as to lead to hopes of avoiding affairs of the kind for the future.

In the case of the Central Railroad of Georgia, Judge Speer expressed the hope that the engineers would, when necessary, come before the Court asking for their legal rights as a body, just as their employers had been doing. Evidently the thought in the Judge's mind was that of a responsible and compact body of employees asking for justice as they conceived it, law-abiding, and capable of fulfilling all contracts entered into as railway men. We assumed at the beginning of this article that trade-unionism was certain to flourish and must be taken into account. It is indeed a force in our commercial life which is to be considered good or bad according as it is well or ill directed. Hitherto in the United States its government has not been of the right sort. The greatest need of labor organizations to-day is good leadership. Railway men, cotton operatives, switchmen, and artisans have alike been inclined to follow demagogues, mouth workers, alleged laborers, who subsist by strikes, and whose personal profit has lain in encouraging disputes. The walking delegate has become a by-word. The leaders in England—some of them are in Parliament—are of a better class. If our American laborers would seek the advice of competent men, would cease to take mean advantages (as by strikes during the World's Fair, for example), would pay some regard to the capitalist and his right to a profit, and in general would act like sensible men in demanding only what on examination should prove to be just, they would turn public opinion a long way in their favor. We might then in

time cease to regard a labor union as a terror and menace to all business.

#### THE SECRET OF GLADSTONE.

THE ascendancy over his party and over the middle and working classes in England which Mr. Gladstone continues to hold, and indeed seems to have strengthened considerably since the opening of the present session of Parliament, is exciting more and more bewilderment among his opponents, and this bewilderment is of course much increased by his marvellous mental and physical activity. *Punch*, in its "Essence of Parliament," the clever *jeu d'esprit* contributed weekly during the session by Mr. H. W. Lucy, gives the following sketch of one of the old gentleman's recent days, which, though humorous, is strictly accurate:

"Earned a night's rest and a longer Easter holiday than he has allotted to himself and us. His work to-day should make the eight-hours man blush. At bay in Downing Street since twelve o'clock with two hostile deputations. Came from Ulster and the City, resolved to beard home-rule lion in his den. Alone he met them; one down, the other come on; no interval of rest. Picked men from Ulster, selected captains from the City, surged around table at which he sat. Hardly left him time to reply. Having politely conducted Ulster to door, enter the City Fathers, fresh and eager for the fray. Told him over again, in varied phrase, how he was bringing country to verge of ruin; listened with perfect courtesy, as if they'd been discussing some one else—say, his next-door neighbor, Squire of Malwood and Junior Lord of Downing Street. Up again when last in list of City speakers had concluded. Almost persuaded John Lubbock to be Home-Ruler; then down to House, dealing with mass of correspondence littering his table in room behind Speaker's chair; alert on sound of division-bell; comes in to move closure; remembers that in long list of speeches never made this particular one before; looks up Palgrave's 'Handbook'; cons his lesson and declaims brief formula in deep rich voice that lends touch of eloquence to its unadorned, remorseless demand. All this, too, following on a day like yesterday, when two other deputations stormed Downing Street; drew from him weighty reply; followed, after hasty dinner, by a speech in the House on the eternal Irish question, which Grandolph rightly termed 'entrancing.'"

To this almost preternatural activity and endurance must be added the fact that he not only has held together the very fragile-looking majority with which he took office, but seems to have increased it, and given it a solidity which grows stronger under every attack of the Opposition. Indeed, he told his supporters, with much gayety of manner, at the recent meeting in the Foreign Office, that the majority he had not only was enough for him, but ought to be enough for any reasonable man, for he reminded them that one of the longest Ministries England has ever had, Lord Melbourne's, which lasted six years and a half, never had more than thirty majority, and Lord John Russell's had not so many. In fact, he intimated that a small majority was on the whole better than a large one, because it held together better, and that there must be no more anxiety in the Liberal ranks on that score.

The effect of all this on the Conservative mind is, as we have said, so bewildering

that the philosophic observers of the party have begun to study Gladstone as an abnormal political growth, on which no previous experience of English public life throws much if any light. The last number of the *Economist* makes an elaborate study of the causes of his ascendancy from the standpoint of the "historian of the future." It makes this personage admit that Gladstone's position in 1893 was an amazing one, almost, if not quite, without precedent in English history, but it makes him "hesitate in describing its final causes." "The historian's" attempt at the solution of the problem, however, cannot be considered satisfactory, and indeed is in the main self-contradictory. No amount of popularity among the workingmen, for instance, and no democratic or friendly tone about "the intelligence of the people," could possibly enable Mr. Gladstone to "dominate the great men in his own party," or relieve him of the necessity of even consulting them, or "make him supreme in his own Cabinet," so that his colleagues not only did not consider themselves his equals, but did not even venture to remonstrate with him. His colleagues, it must be remembered, number such men as Sir William Harcourt, Lord Rosebery, Lord Spencer, Lord Acton, Lord Herschel, Lord Kimberley, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Fowler, Mr. John Morley, Mr. James Bryce, and several others of long and good standing in public life, of great weight with the country, and of remarkable intellectual acumen. They could not be reduced to this tame acquiescence in all the dicta of their chief by the mere fact that he was very popular with the working classes, and flattered these classes by his deferential treatment of their opinions.

During the past fortnight there have been two remarkable illustrations of the impression he makes as a debater, not on his colleagues, but on opponents who look on him as a dangerous politician, and who absolutely refuse to follow his lead on the Irish question. One of these is Lord Randolph Churchill, not perhaps a very weighty personage, but weighty enough to have been Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Salisbury. Lord Randolph, after hearing Mr. Gladstone's speech in the debate on that motion of censure on the Irish policy of the Ministry made by Mr. Balfour a fortnight ago, which collapsed so completely, declared, on rising to follow him, that it was an "entrancing speech," and confessed in advance his inability to meet it. More striking testimony by far to Mr. Gladstone's powers of exposition and persuasion is to be found in the article by Mr. Leonard Courtney on bimetalism in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century*. Mr. Courtney is well known as an economist, and as Chairman of Committees in the last Parliament, a place which he was universally acknowledged to have filled better than it had ever been filled before. He