

thority and responsibility would be the President's.

The people of the United States are not, and are not likely to be, in favor of free trade. They are not in favor of a Chinese wall tariff. They want a tariff that will provide revenue and protection. It is idle to denounce particular tariff measures for particular sins, since any substitute tariff is going to be also denounced for its particular sins. Such criticism of the tariff in detail furnishes no guidance for public opinion. Even less illuminating is general denunciation of a measure as a tariff of abomination—as the present tariff bill has been called. Either Congress, employing its own committees for investigation and drafting measures, must provide such regulation and adjustment as expediency for the time being indicates, leaving the tariff as the troubler of politics, or else it must intrust this adjustment and regulation to an administrative body under the authority of the Chief Executive. Is there any other alternative?

IS IRELAND LEADERLESS?

THOSE who fear that the deaths of Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith may prove fatal to the cause of the Irish Free State do less than justice to the strength of that cause. Yet it is true that the progress already made would never have been achieved but for the courage and insistence of these two men; for they stood so high in the regard of all Irish patriots that their word carried weight. When Collins and Griffith said that the London treaty paved the way to self-government, Irishmen believed them. So the strength of the Dominion plan grew and the dream of absolute independence faded away.

"Ninety per cent of the people of Ireland are for the Free State," says ex-Governor Glynn, of New York, "and the threats of fanatics and slaying by gunmen cannot alter this fact." And Archbishop Mannix cabled from Australia that the death of Collins emphasizes the need of an arbitrament of reason. Moreover, the discussion as to fit successors to the dead leaders has brought out the fact that there had been formed under them a group of serious and well-equipped men who are working steadily at practical problems of government and organization. Mr. W. T. Cosgrave, who now temporarily heads the civil side of the Provisional Government, is such a man. There is quiet resolution in his reply to a despatch from Winston Churchill, of the British Ministry, who had declared that his Government had full confidence that the treaty plan would be faithfully



International

MICHAEL COLLINS (LEFT) AND ARTHUR GRIFFITH, DEAD LEADERS OF THE IRISH FREE STATE

and resolutely maintained. Mr. Cosgrave said:

President Griffith and General Collins had selected and attracted to whole-hearted co-operation with them a number of colleagues, some of whom you have met. The Government so formed has stood, as you know, with unswerving consistency to the programme of carrying into full effect, in accordance with the declared will of the Irish people, the treaty which was entered into between our plenipotentiaries and recommended by President Griffith and General Collins as offering the fairest hopes to our much-tried people. We, their colleagues, have the same faith and stand by the same policy, and, though overwhelmed with sorrow, take up the same task with the same determination and confidence.

It has been a weakness of Irishmen that, while they have been able to die for a cause, they have rarely shown ability to govern. Now, under the moderate and reasonable terms of the Free State, they have the finest opportunity conceivable to develop that capacity. If the draft of a Constitution now being drawn up by the Free State leaders and the British Government follows liberally the lines of the London treaty and makes it clear that the Free State in all essentials will be as self-governing as is the Dominion of Canada, it will be endorsed by the bulk of the people of Southern Ireland, and the most promising political era of Ireland will begin.

The hope of the insurgent forces now infesting the Free State is not to defeat its army, but to make the condition of Ireland so bad that Great Britain must intervene and the old order of resistance and general turmoil be resumed. Their "war" has resolved itself into a series of local skirmishes and attacks from am-

bush such as that which resulted in Collins's death. In fact, although this killing has been called a cowardly assassination, it was as near to a military engagement as most of the insurgents' so-called battles. Collins with other officers in uniform was inspecting military positions near Cork when the ambush was sprung by a superior force, and a brisk fight ensued in which Collins played his part bravely. The whole affair was typical of the guerrilla fighting now carried on by De Valera's desperate followers.

No other man's death, not even Griffith's, has affected the common people of Ireland so deeply as that of Collins. His was a romantic and adventurous personality; he was intrepid, resourceful, and devoted to his country. Other men might be suspected of treachery or self-interest; no one has dared to call Collins a traitor, and no one is surprised when the Prime Minister of the Government which had once put a price on his head speaks of him as "a leader of great energy and devotion and a man of remarkable personal charm."

When one remembers that the population of Ireland is somewhat less than that of New York City, it certainly induces the feeling that Ireland has had too much turbulence for its size; the world is decidedly tired of reading of rancorous partisan fighting, sectarian hatred, and the warfare of assassination. The majority of the people want quiet and—as an Irishman might say—are willing to fight to the death for it. The opportunity for peace and prosperity was never better than now if only the workers of the people can prevail against the intolerance of the comparatively few "bitter-enders."

ONE LAW FOR ALL

A REVIEW OF THE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND SOCIAL RESULTS OF THE GREAT STRIKES

I—THE HISTORY OF THE STRIKES

BY ROBERT D. TOWNSEND

THE strike of the coal miners began on April 1; the strike of the railway shop men on July 1. In the first case, therefore, five months have been spent in argument, debate, and attempts at an agreement; in the second case two months have elapsed. As August ends in neither case does there seem to be immediate prospect of complete or satisfactory settlement. From week to week and month to month we have had proposals, counter-proposals, public remonstrances, Governmental urging, and yet the public, which, after all, is the party most deeply involved in the injury, has been fed upon hopes only. As Don Marquis, in his "Sun Dial," remarks of the anthracite strike: "Every paper we pick up we see that the miners and operators are still hoping for peace. We hope that hope will warm a house next winter."

The cost of this summer of labor troubles to the workmen, to the railway and mine owners, and to business at large has mounted into hundreds of millions of dollars. So far as business and the household are concerned, the prospective loss in the coming fall and winter will continue indirectly even if the strikes are now settled promptly. Probably one reason why the public have until recently been somewhat apathetic about the conditions is that they have not been directly injured seriously as much at this time of year as they would be in the full tide of railway business and when a supply of coal is absolutely necessary for business as well as for the home. Lately, however, the people and the Government have realized that action is needed, but are still debating as to what must be done. It is a good time to recall what Mr. Roosevelt said to the leaders of mine strikers and operators in 1902: "The evil possibilities are so far-reaching, so appalling, that it seems to me that you are not only justified in sinking, but required to sink for the time being, any tenacity as to your respective claims in the matter at issue between you. The situation imperatively requires that you meet upon the common plane of the necessities of the public."

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

The railway strike resulted from a decision of the United States Railroad Labor Board by which a wage reduction was ordered, while, on the other hand, the practice of sending repair and construction work into shops not owned by the railways was disapproved. It is odd, at this distance of time, to note how

completely these two issues have gone out of the discussion, which now turns almost solely on the question of seniority. The reason is that public and press were so strong in their declaration that the proper course of the railway men was not a strike but a request for a new hearing that the unions soon showed willingness to resubmit the question of wages to the Railroad Labor Board.

Their claim was that the wage cut was not fairly arranged; that the total reduction of wages (put at about \$110,000,000) was excessive in comparison with the cost of living, and that particularly the minimum wages for some classes of shop work and maintenance work were below the needs of American workmen—some of the maintenance-of-way men under the schedule arranged would receive less than twelve dollars for a normal week's wages. The labor members of the Railroad Labor Board declared that the majority report was made "with no consideration of human needs."

Whether the decision was fair or unfair, it was the outcome of the work of a Governmental board authorized to deal with the questions which had been submitted to it. The Railroad Labor Board, established under the Esch-Cummins Transportation Law of 1920, has nine members, three each representing the railways, the workers, and the public.

The recognition of the fact that the shopmen were on the wrong track in striking rather than attempting to reopen the case and the apparent probability that peace would be reached at an early date held the maintenance-of-way men from carrying out a strike which the vote of the local unions had authorized.

The fact that the strike affected only one large class of railway workers, the shopmen, has made the strike a peculiar one, in that the general service of the roads has continued. It has not been perfect by any means, but freight has been carried and passengers have been taken care of. This is one more reason why public exasperation has not led to an early settlement.

The claim that was made by some local railway unions, that their members were in danger because of bad equipment and that others were endangered by the presence of guards in the railway yards, has never been sustained. Its object was to force the great railway brotherhoods into the fight. There never has been evidence of any serious danger or annoyance to the union men from these sources.

One result of this agitation, however, aroused the country to indignation and denunciation. President Harding, in referring in his recent address before Congress on the labor question to this matter, declared that the desertions of transcontinental trains in the desert regions of the Southwest "have revealed the cruelty and contempt for law on the part of some railway employees who have conspired to paralyze transportation."

The single proposal made by the President in his recommendation to Congress which applied to the railway situation was that of asking that Congress should give power to the Railroad Labor Board to enforce its decisions. In view of the power exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the recent decision of the Supreme Court which makes unions responsible for failure of their members to obey the law, it is hoped that relief from future railway disputes between the men and the executives may be found in such legislation.

For the last month the conflict in the railway strike has waged almost solely over the question of seniority. The decision of the Board did not touch upon this point. But the railways at once gave the strikers warning that they were in danger of losing their seniority privileges, and thereupon the unions refused to consider any settlement which did not secure to old workers those privileges. The pensions and retiring payments by the roads to old employees were not involved, with a few possible unimportant exceptions. The seniority rights relate to the men's relative standing in the distribution of desirable and profitable positions.

Logically, the railways are clearly right in holding that when the men deserted their work they were bound to take the consequences of their acts. The roads also clearly have a duty to those employees who have retained their positions during the strike and to those newcomers who have proved efficient and loyal.

President Harding at first tried to induce the railways to restore seniority rights unimpaired to returning strikers, but without success. He then withdrew that effort and urged both sides to submit the matter to the decision of the Railroad Labor Board. An interesting résumé of public and official opinion on this question of seniority will be found in the issue of *The Outlook* for August 16, in which, in reply to the request of *The Outlook* for an expression as to public sentiment, a number of Governors