

Committee points out the fact that the superintendents most guilty are still in the Company's service. Yet it hardly seems possible that the general managers can have done more than fail to supervise their unscrupulous but profitable subordinates. Wherever the responsibility is located, we agree with the Committee that the prosecution should be criminal and not merely civil. We can remember of no frauds commensurate with these since the shameful shoddy furnished by contractors to the British army in the Crimean War led Parliament to establish Government shops for the making of soldiers' clothing.

A good deal of interesting testimony has been taken by the National Commissioners investigating the Pullman strike. The first week most of the testimony came from the participants in the strike. Several of the subordinate officers of the American Railway Union testified that the strike had not been ordered by the officers, but voted for by the Union, and that the Union had not only opposed resort to violence, but had successfully opposed it so far as its own members were concerned. The leaders of the strikers at Pullman testified to treatment incredibly bad. All the strikers said that the object of the strike was to cut off the revenues of the Pullman Company, as the only possible way of forcing it to accept arbitration. All of them believed that the public ownership of railroads was the only just and effective way of preventing recurring suspensions of traffic through strikes and lockouts. Professor Bemis, of Chicago University, was the only witness who had any other suggestion to offer. His plan was compulsory arbitration accompanied by the licensing of railway employees, in order that the decisions of the arbitrating tribunal might be final with both parties to the strike. If the railroad refused to submit, let its charter be forfeited; if an employee refused to submit, let his license be forfeited. This suggestion answers completely the contention of the opponents of compulsory arbitration that the law "cannot force a man to work." The law can refuse to license a man to work, and already does it in trades where the public interest in good work is less than in the case of railway employees. This plan of Professor Bemis was fully indorsed by President Debs, of the Railway Union, and partially by Mr. St. John, General Manager of the Rock Island Railroad. These two men, together with Professor Bemis and Mr. Pullman (whose testimony is commented upon elsewhere), were the most important witnesses.

Mr. Debs stated that he not only did not order the strike, but that he could not have ordered it under the rules of the Union. The deliberations of the Union respecting the strike had been entirely public, and there was in no sense a conspiracy. The strike was suppressed, said Mr. Debs, not by the military but by the courts, which, by arresting everywhere the leaders of the unions, threw into confusion the rank and file, and so brought about defeat. General Manager St. John, of the Rock Island road, rebutted the testimony that the strikers had not participated in the violence. On this point he submitted a good deal of evidence furnished by the detectives of his company. When questioned as to the General Managers' Association, he denied that it was formed for the purpose of crushing labor organizations. The considering of strikes was, he says, "the smallest part of our business." Commissioner Kernan was not satisfied with this statement, and the following dialogue ensued:

Mr. Kernan—Is it not true that if a strike occurred on a line belonging to the Association, your organization would unite to defeat the strikers?

Mr. St. John—Yes, sir.

Mr. Kernan—Well, then, why did not the General Managers' Association recognize the right of the A. R. U. to organize men in a common cause when one part of the A. R. U. was being affected?

Mr. St. John—We did not believe these men who were destroying our property were worthy of recognition.

Apparently, then, the General Managers' Association stood for the solidarity of capital in the same way that the American Railway Union stood for the solidarity of labor. Organizations of this sort on either side inevitably develop corresponding organizations on the other, and the unfortunate division of society into two sharply defined classes is thus carried forward.

The strike or lockout of the cotton operatives at Fall River and New Bedford, Massachusetts, is an extremely serious matter. At Fall River one of the great cotton-mills continues running with a full set of operatives who have submitted to a ten per cent. reduction, and at New Bedford three mills under a single management have not joined in the general "shut-down." But, aside from these, apparently all the cotton-factories of these two great cotton centers are now idle, and something like thirty thousand operatives are out of work. What adds to the seriousness of the situation at Fall River is that the members of the Manufacturers' Association have agreed not to reopen until the owners of three-fourths of the spindles represented shall so decide. At New Bedford the State Board of Arbitration gathered a good deal of evidence last week, but has been unable as yet to effect an agreement. One of the officers of the Spinners' Union testified that one reduction had followed another during the last two years until the total was now twenty-three per cent. The representative of the manufacturers said that this was an overstatement, and that the recent dividends of some of the mills were not paid out of earnings. The Springfield "Republican" gives the official figures of the State Labor Bureau respecting the scale of wages in 1889. These were, by groups, as follows:

	Males.	Females.
Under \$6 a week.....	9,000	19,000
Over \$6 but under \$12 a week.....	11,000	7,000
Over \$12 a week.....	1,600	50

The "Republican" very sensibly observes that, after the ten per cent. reduction recently made, "these do not seem to be wage-rates that can stand much cutting now."

The charges against Professor Ely, which began as a scandal, ended as a farce. At the second sitting of the committee of the Wisconsin Board of Regents to investigate the matter, State Superintendent Wells declined to be present to substantiate his charges. He excused his absence on the ground that the committee had unfairly limited its investigation to Professor Ely's writings, teachings, and doings since his call to the State University, and had demonstrated its bias in favor of Professor Ely at the first sitting. Inasmuch as the charges which led to the investigation had related to Professor Ely's conduct while at the State University, the excuse was hardly satisfactory. Possibly Superintendent Wells felt as much, for he submitted to the committee a long criticism of Professor Ely's latest work, "Socialism and Social Reform." Unable to cite any passages indorsing Socialism—to say nothing of Anarchism—Superintendent Wells falls back upon such declarations as the following:

"The remedy that Socialism offers for every ill that society is heir to is stated with almost endless iteration, often with such commendations as 'This is a very strong argument,' or 'This would be an effective remedy if Socialism will work.' Nowhere is the student told that the reason that Socialism cannot work is grounded in the nature of men—nowhere does he show that the condition of society that

would render government by Socialists possible would be a condition in which government would be needless, or its form indifferent."

In other words, Professor Ely is denounced as a Socialist because he does not suppress the arguments of the Socialists nor utter the platitudes of the State Superintendent. That such charges should be brought by one State officer against another calls for an investigation quite other than that just concluded. Still more is it called for when we remember the scandalous character of the original charges published in the "Nation." For example, the following: "In conversation with one of the proprietors, he [Professor Ely] said that where a skillful workman was needed, a dirty, dissipated, unmarried, unreliable, and unskillful tramp of a union man should be employed in preference to an industrious, skillful, trustworthy non-union man who is the head of a family." It is perhaps needless to say that other professors of Wisconsin University corroborated Professor Ely's detailed denial of all the charges preferred. More important were some of the letters received by the committee from leading economists. Commissioner Wright, of the National Labor Bureau, wrote: "I believe the onslaught on Ely not only absurd but malicious." President Andrews, of Brown, wrote:

"I deem it wholly unjust to call Ely's teachings Socialistic in any sense in which the designation could constitute a stigma, although no doubt he believes, as all economists and sociologists do, in the enlargement of the State's powers at some points. Should Ely be displaced or even censured for his teachings, every intelligent Anarchist of this country or England would rejoice, for they know that the prevalence of views like his means the death of their cause."

It cannot be repeated too often that Anarchism is strong only where the abuses of capitalism are not attacked by teachers of the upper classes. The strength of Anarchism lies entirely in these abuses, and those who decry attempts to reform them are its most effective allies. Professor Ely has done more than any other one man in the country to convince the working classes that their claims of justice are not denied a hearing at the bar of public opinion.

The profound agitation needed in New Jersey to secure the repeal of the shameless race-track laws seems to have borne fruit in a strong demand for direct legislation. A bill giving the mass of the citizens a right to pass upon any measure for whose submission five per cent. of the voters have petitioned was defeated in the Assembly by a majority of only three—the vote standing 28 to 31. A similar bill was subsequently introduced in the Senate, and last week an important meeting in support of this measure was held at Asbury Park. Mr. W. D. McCracken, whose volume on Switzerland has so materially aided the popularization of the referendum in this country, made the opening address. After speaking of the success of direct legislation in Switzerland, and the growth of the movement in this country wherever the people have found that their servants support private interests, Mr. McCracken very sensibly defined the limits of its efficiency in the following words: "We do not propose a cure for all the social problems. Economic and social evils lie deeper than political ones. We are merely paving the way for fundamental reforms. We are making a peaceful solution possible." Representative McEwen, the Republican leader in the Assembly, dwelt at length upon the help the referendum would give in defeating corrupt legislation. Senator Adrian, the Democratic leader in the Senate, urged direct legislation as the logical outcome of the principle embodied in the present Constitution of New Jersey in the clause: "Government is instituted for the protection and benefit of the people, and they have the right at all times to alter and reform the same whenever the public good may re-

quire." The same measure came before the New York Constitutional Convention three days later, and was unceremoniously defeated by a vote of 83 to 30, one antagonist annihilating the reform by saying that we had imported our ballot laws from Australia, our civil service laws from China, and that his constituents were too tired of importations to accept this exotic from Switzerland. And yet New York claims to be far more progressive than New Jersey!

The Forestry Committee of the Constitutional Convention now in session at Albany has been engaged in labors of moment not only to New York, but also to every other State. An amendment is under consideration forbidding the sale of the State's Adirondack lands or timber from them. Furthermore, it is proposed that all of the Catskill and Adirondack sections be set apart to be always maintained as a forest preserve. The Governor would appoint a superintendent and assistants, who in turn would be authorized, under strict conditions of forest preservation, to lease tracts not exceeding five acres and for periods not longer than five years. Indiscriminate destruction of the forests has made this question a pressing one. In the coming century it is conceded that the Hudson River towns, including New York City, will have to depend for their water-supply on the Adirondack region, the present conservator of the State's river and canal system. How can that supply be had when droughts and freshets are increasing as a result of forest denudation? In the entire country the forest area has been diminished to less than 450,000,000 acres, or about twenty-six per cent. of the total area. Every year 25,000,000 acres are cleared of timber, the amount felled being double the increment of the woodland crops. We are thus cutting into our capital—an always reprehensible course. Omitting the damage done by forest fires, our wealth is being consumed twice as fast as it is being reproduced. Indeed, the Secretary of Agriculture says that the annual product requires the cutting of 1,600,000 acres every year of white-pine supplies alone. Now, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, the three white-pine States, have a total forest area of 60,000,000 acres. If two-thirds is allowed to be in the white-pine belt, twenty-five years would suffice to exhaust the supply. Should present conditions continue—and it is not in the nature of things that consumption will diminish—we may expect a timber-famine not many decades hence; this, of course, followed by a water-famine. Why not avoid such a prospect by instituting a system of State forest preserves and providing for their intelligent care? In addition to protecting every economic interest, a new industry would have sprung into being offering new opportunities for labor. Nearly two hundred thousand families in Germany find employment in this way, and receive millions in wages, the land owned by the State being one-third of all forests. Let us take a hint from the Fatherland, both in the system of preserves and in aiding schools and universities to disseminate instruction concerning, not only arboriculture, but, what is of even greater importance, silviculture.

The Society for Education Extension of Hartford, Conn., has determined to establish a professional school of Sociology, and has already completed its organization. In the attractive announcement, containing reasons for its establishment, the curriculum, and a calendar, which has been issued by the school, considerable reference is made to Mr. Benjamin Kidd's book, "Social Evolution." "This entire book," says President Hartranft, of the Hartford School of Sociology, "is a powerful incidental appeal for