

all our other great cities. The municipal problem has various phases in different sections, but at bottom it is the same problem in every part of the country, and it is a truism to add that it is in many respects the most difficult and perplexing problem which awaits solution on this continent. So far we have practically failed in municipal government.

Europe becomes more and more interested in the questions at issue between Norway and Sweden as the time for the general election in the former country approaches, because that election will show the drift of public opinion, and may decide the vital question of union or separation between the two countries. We reported last week various incidents which show the high spirit of the Norwegians and the bold line which they are following. The attitude of the American colonists on the eve of the Revolution was not more pronounced and audacious. There is no people in Europe more sturdy and independent than the Norse, and they have had of late years a good deal of that inner awakening which carries with it the stirring of the national spirit. This temper is well illustrated by a story told of a peasant woman who, several years ago, when King Oscar had thrown his palace open and was receiving all comers by way of making himself popular, was conversing with the King. During the conversation the latter asked her how many sons she had. The woman replied that she had five. The King said to her that, now that she had seen him and knew that he had the interest of the people at heart, she might induce her husband and her sons to change their opinions and support him. The old woman promptly replied: "King, my men do not change their opinions with their shirts." As a rule, the Norwegians are not excitable, but a good many things have happened of late to agitate them; among them the reported plot, commented upon last week, to rob Norway of its power of resistance, and the rumor that King Oscar had been taking advice as to the best way of bringing Norway to terms. The radicals are evidently determined to push the issue to its logical conclusion, and to bring about a separation, even if an armed struggle with Sweden is necessary. To this point the Norwegian people have not yet come, but it looks as if they were moving to it with great rapidity. Meanwhile the patience of the Swedes is giving way under the strain, and if the approaching general election shows a strong popular tendency along radical lines, an outbreak may be close at hand.

The repeated earthquakes last week at and near Constantinople have proven more serious than was at first supposed. It is now estimated that two hundred people have been killed, and great damage has certainly been done to property. The towns of Galataria and Jalova have been completely wrecked. With the first shock at San Stefano (of treaty-making fame), the sea suddenly receded for a great distance, and, as suddenly returning, demolished quays, ships, and buildings. Brusa and Ismid, however, towns about fifty miles south of Constantinople, seem to have been the center of the disturbance. At the capital itself the squares and the parks in the city and the beautiful gardens of the various foreign embassies overlooking the Bosphorus are filled with improvised food stations and beds, and the people are terrified, the slightest noise in the streets serving to send any still in their houses headlong outside. The Imperial Ottoman Bank has loaned two hundred and fifty thousand Turkish pounds to the Relief Commission with which to provide food, clothing, and shelter for the homeless. Many of the afflicted have

betaken themselves to the mountains, and others, despite the warning at San Stefano, to the sea, so that all the boats lying in the Sea of Marmora or on the Bosphorus are crowded to suffocation. The shock at Adrianople, nearly one hundred and forty miles north of Constantinople, has also been a very serious one. Thus the seismic disturbances have extended over a section of four hundred miles. The question naturally arises, Have they any connection with the recent earthquakes in Greece and in the adjacent islands?

So far everything remains quiet in Morocco, although a great deal of dissatisfaction exists in certain quarters. Abdul Aziz, the new Sultan, has been recognized by all the Great Powers except Germany; which means that there is to be no foreign interference for the present. The new Sultan has promptly imprisoned his chief competitor, and has had himself formally proclaimed Sultan at Fez. If he follows the example of his predecessors, he will decapitate his rivals and secure a clear field for himself. The youth of the Sultan, his inexperience, and the fact that he is in the hands of the old politicians who surround him, do not encourage the hope of any improvement in the government of the country under the new ruler. There is but one thing which keeps the different tribes over which Abdul Aziz rules in any kind of harmony, and that is the fear of foreign intervention. It is probably safe to say that there is no real, healthy political life in any Oriental country, and that government in such countries is carried on mainly by intrigue and by balancing one interest against another. Morocco is full of races jealous of each other, and of politicians who are scheming to push each other down and to stand in each other's shoes, and the new Sultan is a mere boy.

The Strike: Suggestions of Remedy

The newspapers announce that President Cleveland has informed a delegation of workingmen that, at an early date, he will appoint a commission to investigate the causes leading up to the present labor disturbances in this country. This resolution is as wise as his previous action in ordering out the Federal troops to sustain the laws was courageous. We trust that in the one action he reflects the sober thought of the American people as correctly as he reflected in the other their loyal resolve to maintain the laws.

The immediate occasion of this strike needs no investigation. The attempt to boycott an entire nation was preposterous; such levying war upon the public because one employer was charged with treating his employees with injustice was monstrous as well as preposterous. Until the right of the people to freedom of travel on the Nation's highways was established, there were no other questions to be considered. But now that this right is re-established, it is wise to inquire into the causes which led up to it, and to consider preventive measures for the future.

A great industrial war like that through which we have just passed injures three parties—the employer, the employed, and the public; and when the war paralyzes the railways, the injury to the public is the greatest, and their rights are paramount. If a private employer and laborer fall out, society may perhaps leave them to settle the difficulty between themselves, only insisting that they keep the peace. But when the employer is a great railroad corporation, and the employed are thousands of trainmen, and on the maintenance of peaceable relations between them the mails, the food and fuel supplies, and the free transit of the community depend, the community has both a right and a duty to intervene, not merely to keep the peace as

against mobs, but to keep the railroad in operation. For this purpose it must both protect the corporation against unjustifiable strikes by its trainmen and the trainmen against unjust treatment by the corporation. It is true that in this case there was no injustice; the strike was a causeless one. But it is also true that the strike would have been impossible had not the relations between the great railroads and their employees been previously strained, partly by acts of real injustice perpetrated by some corporations toward their employees, partly by the fact that the law provides no remedy for such injustice except a labor organization, formed on military principles and prepared for war. What the public has to do is to protect its own rights by laws which will, on the one hand, make such a strike impossible, and, on the other, remove the temptation to it by providing for the wronged employee some other remedy.

It must be nearly or quite a quarter of a century since Senator Booth, of California, formulated the railroad problem of the United States in a sentence, saying (we quote from memory), "Formerly our means of locomotion were poor, but our highways were free; now our means of locomotion are excellent, but our highways are private property." Both law and custom at that time fully justified this terse characterization of the situation. Railroad managers operated their roads as private property; regulated charges solely by considering what the traffic would bear; had favored customers to whom they gave special rates, to the utter ruin of competition; if unscrupulous, were as ready to wreck a railroad as to develop it, if by so doing they could make more money for themselves. Their answer to complaining travelers and complaining employees was substantially the same: If you do not like our trains and fares, walk; if you do not like our employment, leave it. If the public attempted to mitigate the injustice by legislation, the legislators were bought; if by competing lines, competition led to combination, and the monopoly simply became bigger and more absolute than before. It would be grossly unfair to condemn all railroad corporations because some were viciously administered. But there are considerable sections in this country where the railroad is execrated alike by the public and the trainmen; and such universal execration does not exist without a cause.

Senator Booth's declaration is no longer unqualifiedly true. In other countries the community has taken complete possession and control of its highways. In this country a series of judicial decisions and legislative acts has practically affirmed that the railroad is not private property—that it is a public highway, that the corporation operating it is a public servant, subject to the control of the public, and as truly employed to carry its freight and travelers as to carry its mails. The course of the Administration during the recent strike, in interfering to protect not merely the mails but inter-State commerce, is a distinct recognition of this principle. It is in a further application of this principle that the country is to depend, in so far as it can depend upon merely legal measures, to prevent a possible future barricade of the Nation's highways.

We are not bold enough to imagine that we can formulate a law adequate for all future exigencies. But we venture to suggest for consideration, discussion, and criticism, two simple provisions, both based on the fundamental principle that the railroads are National highways, and that both corporations and trainmen are, in a peculiar sense, servants of the public and amenable to public control. The first provision would place trainmen in a relation to their trains similar to that of seamen to a ship; it would make it illegal for trainmen to abandon a train in transit; or to leave

their employment without giving some legally defined notice—as a week or a month; or to combine to leave in a body, for the purpose of stopping the traffic upon the road. Such a provision would be grossly unjust unless it were accompanied by another giving the trainmen some other remedy in place of the strike, which such a law would render unlawful. For this purpose complaints against any railroad corporation by its men should be submitted either to a permanent court or to a body of arbitrators constituted to consider it; the latter would probably be better because less liable to corruption. If the court decided against the men, they could still abandon their employment, provided they did it in such a way as not to involve interference with its traffic. If the court decided against the road, the managers would be required to accept the decision, or surrender the road to a receiver, whose duty would be, first, to pay the operating expenses; second, the interest on the mortgage bonds; and, third, dividends on the stock. It is true that in case of a strike the five or ten thousand trainmen could not all be arrested and put in jail; but it is also true that the leaders could be arrested, and such a strike is not practicable without leadership. And it is reasonable to hope that strikes would be less readily resorted to if men who thought themselves unjustly treated had any other resort provided. It is also true that the railroad manager will object that the owners of a railroad should be permitted to manage their own property in their own way. But this article assumes that a railroad is not private property; that it is a public highway, and the corporation, in operating it, is a public servant administering a public trust and subject to public control. If such a servant is not willing to submit to that control, he must relinquish it to some one else.

These suggestions are radical. They certainly cannot be, and ought not to be, accepted without careful consideration. But in considering them the unprejudiced thinker should ask himself, not, How will the trainmen like such a law? nor, What will railroad managers say to it? but, What will be its effect as a protection of the public? Not, Are there difficulties in such a law? but, Are they likely to be more serious than the difficulties which the community has repeatedly suffered under our present system? For ourselves, we think it quite clear that a system which treats the Nation's highways as private property, and which leaves the owners and the operators of such highways to settle their controversies by a strike, is unphilosophical, inconsistent with National welfare or even National peace, and must give place to something better.



Paul Heyse

Among the very few contemporary German writers known to the world, the distinguished novelist whose portrait appears on the title-page of *The Outlook* this week, and a very interesting talk with whom appears in another place, holds a foremost place. German scholarship is as productive and influential as of old, but literary activity and fertility have greatly diminished in the country of Goethe and Heine. Since the death of Freiligrath no German poet is widely known outside his own country; Herman Grimm is one of a very few essayists and critics; while among novelists (since the death of Auerbach), Spielhagen, Freytag, and Heyse only have international reputations; for Dr. Ebers, in spite of his popularity, can hardly be ranked with the greater novelists. Freytag has ceased to write fiction, and the work of Spielhagen has fallen so far below its old-time level that he can no longer be regarded as his own