

Wisconsin," in which serious charges are preferred against Professor Ely, of the Wisconsin State University. These charges are made the basis of an editorial attack by the "Post" upon Professor Ely. Professor Ely, in a personal communication to us, pronounces this letter of Mr. Wells "absolutely false." "I do not," he says, "hold the views of which I am accused, and I have never been guilty of the acts with which I am charged." This is sufficiently explicit. Into the issue of fact thus raised between Mr. Ely, whom we do know, and Mr. Wells, whom we do not know, we do not propose to enter. But we protest, in the name of fair and equitable dealing, against the course of Mr. Wells in writing this letter, and against that of the "Post" in publishing it. If Mr. Wells had reason to believe that Professor Ely had been guilty of acts unbecoming a professor in the State University, he should have presented charges to the Board of Regents, by whom the accusation could be investigated. Instead, he sends the accusation to a journal published over a thousand miles from his own and Professor Ely's home, and this journal gives it to the public, apparently without making any inquiry into the truth of the charges. The "Evening Post" has, from time to time, made some wise and just remarks respecting editorial responsibility and the general nefariousness of personal attacks of this sort; but it seems to be easier for even a great newspaper to preach than to practice. Since Mr. Wells's accusations are characterized as "absolutely false" by Professor Ely, the least the accuser can do is either to withdraw them or to present them formally to the Board of Regents and offer the proof of them. We venture to say for Professor Ely that he will court an investigation. We may add that we are somewhat familiar with Professor Ely's teachings, and if Mr. Wells has not represented the man any better than he represents the published teaching, he will probably not attempt to substantiate his accusations in the manner which we have suggested.

The Korean trouble has now taken on a new phase, and one which more nearly concerns us. Acting independently of the other Powers, it seems that our Government has made overtures to China and Japan, through the American Ministers in those countries, looking to a peaceable settlement of the Korean controversy. Secretary Gresham has even been accused of taking upon himself to reproach Japan with "waging an unjust war upon Korea," but this assertion has not been substantiated, and until the official correspondence is made public it is impossible to judge whether or not it has been wisely phrased. It is stated that, about ten days ago, Great Britain, Russia, France, and Germany sent a suggestion of intermediation to both China and Japan, our Government abstaining at that time from joining in this action. Later, however, Ministers Denby, Dunn, and Sill were directed to express the hope that an amicable settlement could be reached. It is believed that this was intended as an intimation that the United States, if requested, would act as intermediary. The second article of the Treaty of 1858 with Japan reads: "The President of the United States, at the request of the Japanese Government, will act as a friendly mediator in such matters of difference as may arise between the Government of Japan and any European Power." The first article of our treaty with Korea reads: "There shall be perpetual peace and friendship between the President of the United States and the King of Korea and the citizens and subjects of their respective Governments. If other Powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either Government, the other will exert its good offices, on

being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement." The excellent position which the United States holds in the estimation of China, Korea, and Japan leads to the belief that our arbitration would be more acceptable to the Asiatic nations than that of any other Power. It is, generally speaking, contrary to our policy to offer intervention unless requested by the countries interested, but these treaty agreements make this a special and peculiar case. As before stated in *The Outlook*, China and Japan have long exercised the right to send troops to Korea to protect their respective interests, each giving the other proper notice. China is willing to withdraw her troops when Japan does the same. The latter country, while disclaiming any design upon Korea, declines to remove her soldiers until more satisfactory measures have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the recent revolt. Up to the present time Korea has not requested any such withdrawal, but it is now stated that she has changed her mind. Most of the information comes through dispatches from Yokohama or Shanghai, and hence is of a constantly contradictory nature. If China and Japan come to actual blows, it will be an interesting spectacle to see the army of the Flowery Kingdom, nominally 1,200,000 strong, but of which force only a third could be brought into the field (and of this part only a fraction versed in the methods of modern warfare), pitted against the standing army of Japan, consisting of 80,000 men, but which can be multiplied three times by calling out the reserves and militia, all of the troops accustomed to modern arms and organization. The navies of the two countries are about equal.

The Conservatives have evidently lost confidence in their power to drive out the Liberal Ministry at an early date, and it seems to be the opinion now that the Rosebery Cabinet will have another year of life. In the House of Commons, on Wednesday evening of last week, Sir William Harcourt announced the Government programme for the remainder of the session. He declared that it was impracticable to proceed with some of the measures to which the Government was pledged, such as the Welsh Disestablishment Bill and the Local Veto Bill, but that there would be time to dispose of the Evicted Tenants Bill, the Scotch Local Government Bill, and the Miners' Eight Hours Bill. Of these measures, in the opinion of the Government, the Evicted Tenants Bill is of the most pressing importance, and will be pushed with the utmost energy. Mr. Balfour criticised the Government's programme as being far better suited to the beginning than to the end of the session, and the consensus of opinion among Liberal members seems to be that it will be impossible to push through the House the bills mentioned by Sir William Harcourt, and that the Evicted Tenants Bill will be the only measure which can be carried through at the present session.

The rule that violence always creates reaction is illustrated anew in the attention which is now being given to anti-Anarchist legislation abroad. The Anarchist, instead of being the enemy of oppression and absolutism in their various forms, is their most effective ally. It is his mission to undo the work of true liberalism. The attempt to assassinate Premier Crispi and the unfortunate success of the attempt to assassinate President Carnot, following close upon so many other Anarchistic outrages, have aroused all Europe to the necessity of repressive measures and of co-operation against these enemies of society—for it cannot be too often said that the Anarchist is an enemy of society; he is as much opposed to a free government as to an abso-

lutism, to the President of the French Republic as to the Czar of Russia. There is no compromising with him. He is always, when he acts, a criminal, and there is reason to believe that he is, in nine cases out of ten, insane. Insanity of this sort is contagious. Its spread can be arrested only by prompt and decisive measures. These measures the various governments are anxious to devise, and to act together in their application. Lord Salisbury has introduced into the House of Lords propositions which, if they become laws, will prevent that country henceforth from being a refuge for assassins; France is considering a series of repressive measures, the rigid character of which is evidenced by the rage inspired by them in the Socialists; Italy proposes strong measures; the Emperor of Germany is very much aroused on the subject, and appears to be ready to adopt any measures looking to repression and co-operation. There is always danger that, in the reaction which follows such outrages, true liberty of speech and action will be seriously interfered with; but society has come to understand very clearly the aim and spirit of the Anarchist, and it is probable that laws can be devised which will strike him without striking the legitimate agitator.

The departure of our fine new cruiser, the *Columbia*, for Bluefields indicates that our Government is of the opinion that further disorders are extremely likely to occur in the Mosquito region. On July 4 a skirmish took place between the Mosquito Indians and the Nicaraguan forces at Bluefields, and at present the former, supported by most of the foreign residents, are in power. Chief Clarence has issued a declaration of sovereignty. The battle, if it can be so called, engaged only fifteen or twenty men on each side, and seems to have grown out of some very trifling quarrels. There can be little doubt that Nicaragua will send a larger force and will attempt to maintain the military supremacy which it has of late asserted, despite its treaty agreement to respect the autonomy of the reign. The American residents of the place evidently distrust Nicaraguan rule and fear high taxes and interference with business. On the other hand, the Mosquito native chief and his native supporters inspire slight respect in themselves, and do not present the elements of a stable government. It is a matter of congratulation that, simultaneously with the dispatch of the *Columbia*, our Government has issued a semi-official declaration of its purpose to abstain entirely from interference between the Nicaraguans and the Mosquito Indians, and to confine itself altogether to protecting the persons and property of American citizens. There can be no doubt that this statement of intention is sound, and defines the only proper course for the United States.

Africa's Mahdist dominion has of late received two rude shocks, one from the British control to the south, and the other from the Italian to the east. The first shock consisted in the permanent establishment of Uganda as an integral part of her Britannic Majesty's possessions in Africa. The Government's proclamation has now been sanctioned, at least, by the House of Commons, which has just voted \$250,000 as an initial sum for the new colony. Uganda proper is bounded on the north by Unyoro (the King of which country has been recently subdued by the English forces), on the east by Usoga, on the south by the Victoria Nyanza and Koki, and on the west by Toru and a part of Unyoro. The territories between Uganda and the coast are not included in the British protectorate, but, as the meaning phrase goes, are under a British

"sphere of influence." In many respects this is tantamount to a protectorate. At all events it sufficiently protects the proposed and necessary railway from Mombasa on the coast to the Victoria Nyanza. As for Uganda itself, there will be a special Commissioner appointed by the Government, with adequate force and staff. The occupation of Uganda is most significant when we take into consideration the route to India, the retention of Egypt, the rivalry to England of other African colonizing Powers, but, above all, the constant menace to Egypt of the Mahdist Soudan. Uganda will thus be of much advantage as an "advanced base" from which to deal with inimical machinations; and recent events in Morocco, in the Bahr-el-Ghazal country (leased to King Leopold), and in the Congo Free State itself show that the work of the late Sir Gerald Portal was an intelligent and far-seeing one. The second shock to the Mahdist power has been in the victory last week of the Italian troops at Kassala over three thousand Mahdist soldiers. The Italian loss was slight—one officer and several native soldiers—while hundreds of the Mahdists were either killed or drowned in attempting to escape by swimming across the Adbara, a great tributary of the Nile. Kassala lies due east of Khartoum, and is the old headquarters of Osman Digma. The town contains about fifteen thousand inhabitants, and, except Dongola, is the nearest considerable Mahdist settlement to European influence. General Baratieri is in full possession of Kassala, and the Italians are now only about two hundred miles from Ondurman, the Mahdist capital.

GENERAL NEWS.—The Hawaiian Republic was proclaimed on July 4 under the Presidency of Sanford B. Dole; there has been no opposition to the new Government, although commissioners have been sent by the ex-Queen of Hawaii to obtain an answer from our Government with regard to its intentions about carrying out former intimations that the Queen should be restored to the throne.—The latest report indicates that the plague in China is spreading, and the number of fatal cases is constantly increasing; Surgeon-General Wyman has received a report from his agent at Tokio warning this country to regard suspiciously articles imported from China, and saying that a careful watch is being kept upon Japan, which in a way serves as a bulwark between China and the United States.—There are many new cases of cholera in St. Petersburg, and a few cases scattered here and there through other European cities.—The tenth Wagner festival at Bayreuth opened on Thursday of last week.—Lega, the Anarchist who lately attempted to assassinate Signor Crispi, has been sentenced to imprisonment for ten years.—The recent earthquakes in Constantinople occasioned greater loss of property than was at first supposed; the suffering in several provinces among the homeless people is very great.—The American Bimetallic League is to hold a conference in Washington, beginning August 16, of those who favor the restoration of the bimetallic standard with free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1.—The House of Representatives last week passed a resolution in favor of a constitutional amendment providing for the election of Senators directly by the people.—The trial of Police Captain Doherty and Ward-men Hock and Meehan is now in progress in New York City before the Police Commissioners.—It is stated that another operation upon Mr. Gladstone's eye will be necessary.—In the English House of Commons the Evicted Tenants Bill passed its second reading on Monday, after an interesting debate between Messrs. Chamberlain, Morley, Balfour, and others.

The Solidarity of Labor

We have never doubted that it is both right and wise for workingmen to form labor organizations. History proves beyond all reasonable controversy that the laborers have benefited thereby. Their condition is always better where they are organized than where they are not: better in England and in the United States than in India and China; better in this century than in the last; better in the Northern States than in the Southern; better among men than among women; better in the organized than in the unorganized trades. Notwithstanding the American Railway Union, we believe in trade organizations.

But not in the "solidarity of labor."

The "solidarity of labor" involves the "solidarity of capital." It means all employed and all employers organized in two hostile camps. It means chronic suppressed war between the two, breaking ever and anon into open war. It means envy, suspicion, jealousy, if not active and open hostility, in every town and every trade. The only division readily conceivable, worse than such a class division as this, is an analogous one between religious sects. The man who consciously or unconsciously helps to set employer and employed against one another is an enemy to his country only less dangerous than he who sets Roman Catholic and Protestant against each other. The worst conceivable war is a war of religious factions; next to that is a war of industrial factions. The ominous fact in the recent railroad strike is not the brief midsummer madness, nor the acts of violence perpetrated in a few localities; it is the widespread nature of the strike and the widespread sympathy with the strikers. For these facts indicate that the solidarity of both labor and capital are more nearly accomplished facts than the public had generally supposed; that the two camps are more thoroughly organized and more hostile than ever the prophets of a possible industrial war had perceived.

It should be the object of every moralist, preacher, editor, public teacher, leader of men, and patriot to do what he can to break up the solidarity of both labor and capital, not by making either organizations of laborers or of capitalists illegal or even difficult, but by making them conform to certain fundamental principles. We mention here three:

1. The labor organization should be a "trades-union"—that is, a union of men of one trade, united to promote the interests of their trade, not a union of the men of all trades to promote the interests of what is called "labor." It is quite rational that the locomotive engineers on any railroad should unite to promote their common interests, but quite irrational that the switchmen should have power conferred on them by the engineers to determine authoritatively what are the engineers' rights and wrongs, and when they should work or quit working. It is quite rational that both day-laborers and skilled workmen should organize for the benefit of their respective vocations, but quite irrational that laboring men working with pick and shovel at a dollar a day should decide the conditions under which skilled artisans may carry on their work. There is a Bar Association, a Medical Association, a Ministers' Association; but the Ministers' Association would never think of allowing the Bar Association to determine what are the standards of orthodoxy, nor would the Bar Association allow the Medical Association to determine the ethics of the bar. Still less would either body allow the other to determine for it the conditions of employment and compensation. The American Railway Union is based on a fundamentally wrong principle; the Brotherhood of Loco-

motive Engineers on one which is fundamentally right.

2. The labor organization should maintain local self-government. Local self-government is not only the "American idea," but history proves it to be essential to liberty. If Chicago were allowed to exercise authority over Sacramento in its local affairs, the liberty of Sacramento would be gone. If a conference of men at Chicago is permitted to determine whether trainmen may work in Sacramento, the liberty of the trainmen in Sacramento is gone. Such a labor union is in its very organization despotic. The surrender of local self-government is the surrender of personal liberty. It is difficult to conceive any conditions which make it expedient or even right for the employees of one concern—be it railroad or not—to give to the employees of another concern a voice in determining whether they shall work or not, or under what conditions they shall work. Various local unions may co-operate in sustaining one another by their contributions of money; this is very different from the surrendering by one local union to other local unions, in whole or in part, the right to decide the terms and conditions of the former's employment. No imaginary strategic advantage in an anticipated industrial war can compensate for the abandonment of local self-government, because no such advantage can compensate for the loss of liberty.

3. The third principle is more difficult to define, but quite as fundamental. The labor organization should be a union to promote industry, not a union to make war. The radical difficulty in the present organizations is that they are yet in their first stage of development, and that is a semi-savage stage. Philosophers tell us that the first social organizations were not industrial but military. The tribe was a combination of families leagued together for war, defensive or offensive, with other tribes. In the animal condition combativeness and destructiveness are predominant; and therefore the first organizations are for combat. The most serious fault with many modern labor organizations is that they have not passed beyond this primitive stage. They are organizations for the purpose of industrial war. Their favorite motto, "An injury to one is an injury to all," is the motto of an army. The higher the organization the less warlike is its spirit. The pacific character of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers was exemplified in the recent strike, and was one of the chief factors in bringing the strike to a close; and the warlike spirit of lower and less intelligent labor unions was unhappily illustrated in their almost military pronouncements. The pacific and progressive spirits in the labor unions have a not inconsiderable task before them in the endeavor to put industry, not war, before their fellows as the true object of labor organizations; and the country will need to exercise patience, as well as courage and strong resolve, while the lower and less intelligent of these organizations are being developed from the more primitive into the higher and more civilized forms, from military into true industrial societies.

The hope of the future certainly does not lie in the solidarity of labor and the solidarity of capital—and one necessarily involves the other; nor does it lie in suppressing either. It lies in a patriotic and intelligent endeavor to make labor organizations respect the fundamental principle of local self-government, and seek, as their ultimate and always conscious end, not equipment for industrial war, but the promotion of peaceful industry; not the creation of a collection of cliques and clans and belligerent factions, but the development of skill, character, and manliness, which always, by a law of nature, bring with them good wages.