

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC AND THE DEBS
INSURRECTION.

BY MR. Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK.

[*Concluded from page 152.*]

BUT the times have changed. That tree planted by the rivers of water, that brought forth its fruit in due season, whose leaf did not wither, and whatsoever it did prospered, is now bearing sour fruit. Those branches may be, for the most part, the engrafted ones, but they are none the less a part of the tree. It may not have been wise to engraft so many, but it has been done, and it is our duty faithfully and with confidence in God, to treat them as a part of the tree. for whose fruit, be it good or bad, we are responsible, Let us examine the tree and its fruits.

And the first thing we notice is the swarms of parasites that are living upon it and eating into its very life. The ideas which were once considered an inspiration are being superseded, though we believe only temporarily. They are like the pulpit behind which once officiated an eminent New England divine, whom Judges and Governors delighted to honor, but which is now stored away under the hay in the loft of an old barn. And when it is the fashion to copy the

old New England homestead,—its colonial architecture, so severe and simple; its low ceilings, small windows; its open fireplace, with the crane, the spit, the kettles, the bellows, and even the andirons and tongs,—who knows but it may yet be the fashion, and our clergymen will yet esteem it an honor, to preach behind those old pulpits, and again exalt the sovereignty of God and the exceeding sinfulness of sin with its sure reward. Who knows but the great mass of common people may yet learn, by bitter experience in the wilderness, that the way to the promised land is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; not by materialism and rationalism, which give expediency in the place of faith for a rule of conduct, but by following religion, morality, and knowledge as leaders, instead of politics and economics.

But that tree under whose branches the fowls of the air have found lodgment and shelter; which poet and scholar in every age have praised, from Coleridge to our own Whittier and Holmes; from De Tocqueville to Bryce and Von Holst, is now passing through a new experience. Cut it down, shrieks the anarchist; Replant it, cries the socialist; Shower it with acid, says the economist; Let me manage it, says the demagogue. But the true husbandman has it under his own care. He planted it, he digged about for it, he trimmed it, cared for it when it was a sapling, and now he is simply pruning it that it may bring forth more fruit.

We cannot agree with President Eliot, that the Mormons resemble, in any particular, the founders of this republic; nor are we attracted by the intimation of doubt in his latest inquiry as to whether this country can endure.¹ T. P. O'Connor, member of Parliament, has even gone so far as to revile our Constitution. He said:—

"The Constitution of the United States is, in my judgment, one of the most unjustly eulogized instruments of political history. . . . It is a machine, which to a large extent means not the regulation, but the paralysis of government."²

¹ Forum, Oct. 1894. ² Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1894.

Von Holst pertinently asks if the United States Senate ought to be abolished.¹

That scavenger, the sparrow, imported in an evil hour, is making war on our native birds of plumage and of song that have delighted the eye with their beauty, and have filled our trees with their melody. As Senator Edmunds said before the Squantum Club, "We are suffering from an overdose of Europe." Howells called upon Hawthorne forty years ago, and Hawthorne said he 'would like to see some part of the country on which the shadow of Europe had not fallen.'² In 1840 William Ellery Channing wrote:—

"Sooner than that our laboring classes should become a European populace, a good man would almost wish that perpetual hurricanes driving every ship from the ocean, should sever wholly the two hemispheres from each other. . . . Anything, everything, should be done to save us from the social evils which deform the old world."³

Washington urged the American people to remain so far as possible isolated from Europe. President Woolsey showed that the question of "Equilibrium," which occasions so much solicitude and diplomacy in foreign nations, could never disturb us, owing to our isolation. But the equilibrium of forces within our nation is a far more serious question and an inviting field for thought. And this question arises because of the rapid development of our manufacturing industries paying much larger wages than in Europe, and our untilled lands offering hope of reward. The consequent result is an enormous influx of foreigners, and especially of the dependent, deficient, and delinquent classes.

We cannot here give all the statistics of immigration. They are alarming. Dr. Strong estimates the foreign population from the Tenth Census to be 15,000,000, and in 1900 estimates it will be 43,000,000.⁴ He says:—

"During the past four years we have suffered a peaceful invasion by

¹ *Monist*, October, 1894. ² *Harper's Magazine*, August, 1894, p. 444.

³ *Channing's Works*, p. 65. ⁴ *Our Country*, p. 40.

an army more than twice as vast as the estimated number of Goths and Vandals that swept over Southern Europe and overwhelmed Rome."¹

And what does life in the slums show? The Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in his seventh special report to the President, reports that liquor saloons and illiteracy flourish in the slums and among foreign born nearly as two to one, compared with native born. The foreign-born voters are as follows: Baltimore, 20.13 per cent; Chicago, 50.62 per cent; New York, 49.93 per cent; Philadelphia, 29.94 per cent. Vice, disease, and crime follow these statistics intimately. Venality in voting is increasing rapidly, for politics is not slow to trade on the miseries of the poor. Demagogism is rampant, and the thought which once held men seems no longer able to control them. As Kidd says, "The fact of our time which overshadows all others is the arrival of Democracy."

We agree with him, but it is not that Demos whom our fathers knew who has been honored and respected in this country as a familiar figure for two and a half centuries. It is a foreign Demos who frequents the saloon; sells his vote, which the American people have so generously bestowed upon him; who shouts for Coxey and Debs. It is not the Demos who was a friend to Thomas Hooker in 1639. It is a foreign Demos who has had good cause to find fault abroad with the laws of primogeniture, entailment, landed aristocracy and titled nobility. Such an environment as European nations furnish, makes Demos a divine missionary there, but he cannot frame the same indictment against American institutions that he would against monarchies and have it hold.

The great friend and ally of Demos is Politics. Some evil spirit has led Politics upon an high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and said unto him, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Of course Politics says: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" And, as Dr. Bacon said,

¹ Our Country, p. 30.

“the dog did it.” We know there is one flaw in that promise of that evil spirit to Politics: he cannot deliver the goods. But politics has no faith,—it is selfish, materialistic, rationalistic, full of expedients and of demagogism.

The influence of politics upon thought is most marked. Economics has already begun to bow the knee and worship at the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer; but there are three, like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who will never bow the knee to the golden image. They are Religion, Morality, and Knowledge. They are passing through the fiery furnace of experience, and for centuries have been tried.

There is a deal of misapprehension in this day on the wage question. There are many industries in which the toilers are underpaid; and many, in which the women and children compete, that are positively wicked and shameful. But these are forgotten in the scramble of well-paid men for more, and are used largely as texts merely to show up the miseries of the poor and oftener as pretexts, or a justification of violence. The great body of intelligent workmen employed in the manufacturing industries in the United States are well paid, considering the qualifications required; for it is ever true that the more mind that is mixed with muscle, the greater the reward. That is all that distinguishes “skilled” workmen. Few millionaires, comparatively, have made their fortunes in manufacturing, and the few that have so acquired it were, for the most part, protected by patents, which is a testimony to brain, and not to brawn.

The American people are sympathetic, they love fair play; hence, they are easily misled by demagogues of the press and platform upon the subject of the relation of capital to labor. The truth is that both capital and labor are drugs in the market to-day, and what is needed, is men of executive ability and brains to bring them together to their mutual advantage. Brains are never a drug in the market. It costs

more to sell a piano than to make it. The laborers imagine that when an article is created it is sold. They seem to think it sells itself. They find no use for executive ability, and very little for capital. The everlasting proposition of economics, overlooked by many, is this: *Every manufactured article is the product of brains, capital, and brawn.* The laborers say: "We move the world because you cannot do without us"; but capital and executive force have an equal right to make the same claim. It is a tripartite agreement, and no one of the three partners can claim the entire honor or credit for the result. Interest for capital, salaries for the brain-worker, and wages for the manual toiler. Capital is the heart; brains the head; and labor the hands. One cannot do without the others; but, taken together, they produce results. Capital and ability are under the same obligations to share with labor their part of the product that a woman is to divide her wardrobe with the cook; or, a clergyman on a good salary to share his earnings with the sexton; or, the lawyer to pay the office student for the first year's work in his office. It is a matter of Christian duty, and not of legality; it is a question of Christian stewardship, and not of law. When labor organizations, therefore, demand, as a legal or moral right, what is theirs only by the higher laws of the spiritual kingdom, and then only as the free gift of the steward, they are making their necessities the ground for legal action. This is precisely what the anarchist does. Just here is where so many clergymen find themselves on the same platform with violators of law. Poverty, from whatever cause, becomes not simply a misfortune, and deserving of help, but the ground for an indictment against society; and, therefore, a legal demand.

This distinction is important, and must be kept clearly in mind; for the demands of labor to-day are not based upon grounds of brotherhood, good-will, and Christian stewardship, for that is benevolence, but upon grounds of legal justice and natural rights. Hence Commons' new book¹ says

¹ Distribution of Wealth.

that a right to employment is a natural right of man,—a most dangerous and absurd proposition to teach the young, but it is being taught in our schools. The *Chicago Journal of Political Economy* says the book is a disguised attempt at socialism.

The attack which is made on our industries by labor organizations in the form of demands for wages that are out of all proportion to those paid in other countries, is doing more to crush them than foreign competition or free trade. The protection which American industries need to-day is a deeper feeling of loyalty to invested capital, which must have its just reward or it will seek new fields for activity; and to executive ability, which is always the wise captain that leads to victory. These deserve protection no less than the manual toiler. The *London Times*, in commenting on the Debs strike, said editorially:—

“The questions of currency, depreciation, silver, etc., sink into insignificance compared with the immense reduction in the returns on capital due to a continual rise in wages.”

The *Wall Street Daily News* gives a list of three hundred million dollars of income bonds, not made of water, which have,—with the exception of eleven million dollars,—never paid a cent of income, and the eleven millions very little. Where can money be invested in manufacturing industries that are safe? The condition of our railroads—their earnings, and the number in the hands of receivers,—will reveal the undisputed fact that the wage-earners on railroads are receiving their full share of the product or receipts.

The Massachusetts “Report on Statistics of Labor” of 1890 will prove interesting reading. On “Net Profits” it says:—

“The year selected was a normal one. Returns from 137 cotton goods establishments show that allowing five per cent for capital and ten per cent for depreciation and selling expenses there was no net profit but actual loss. Allowing two per cent for depreciation and one per cent for selling expenses the profit left was 2.23 per cent to reward capital for its part of the product.”

The truth is, that monopolies and trusts began largely as economic necessities owing to the increased demands of labor. Trusts have thus increased and grown until now they menace the state. Capital is moved by the law of self-preservation, no less than other forms of life. Combinations of capital have arisen for the purpose of diminishing the cost of production, because organized labor has taken the lion's share of the product in many industries, not protected by patents or by a high tariff. The professors in our colleges and universities have far greater justification for organizing, and going on strikes, than the workmen in nineteen cases out of twenty; for our professors have a large capital investment in the form of an education. Imagine the professors of a college, as the chapel bell strikes for recitation, going out in a body, picketing the campus to keep out competition, and watching the railroad trains to inquire of every stranger who has unusual space above the eyes, if he is coming to supplant the poor, over-worked, down-trodden, and despised professors.

Seventy-one per cent of the nation's wealth is in the hands of nine per cent of the population, it is said. If so, it were a grievous fault, and grievously hath Cæsar answered it. The truer proportion, considering foreign born, dependents, delinquents, and deficient, is that fifty per cent of our wealth is in the hands of twenty per cent of the people.

Let us not be interpreted as saying a word against ameliorating the condition of the poor. This is a duty pressing upon the American people, not because, in the main, the lower classes have been exploited or robbed or deprived of any rights,—though the exceptions to this general rule are many and distressing, and deserving of legal redress in the form of statutory regulation; but because the great laws of brotherhood and good-will enforced by the spirit and precepts of Christianity make humanity one. This takes on the form of friendship and fellowship no less than of charity;

and of justice in the way of legal enactments regulating hours of labor, child labor, sweat shops, and any forms of injustice where man's greed overlooks the laws of humanity. Justice, also, can punish for violations of respect for person and property, whether on the part of the poor or the wealthy.

We are not arguing against the rights of the poor, nor restricting the full force of the laws of Christian brotherhood as taught and exemplified by Christ. We simply object to well paid organized labor, like the Indian, dodging behind innocent women and children, whenever it is likely to be punished for its misdeeds.

Politics is demanding not only that economics shall bow the knee and worship, but it is dictating terms to our courts and to the powers that enforce the laws. It cracks the whip over the heads of our Executive and of our Judiciary. It demands a new ruling on what constitutes contempt of court; it seeks favorable decisions on the rights of conspiracy, and strikes accompanied by violence; and it would, if it could, compel arbitration against constitutional rights whenever demagogues and wage-earners put their heads together and need more funds for campaign purposes. It protects gambling, prostitution, Sabbath breaking, and the saloon. Economics has awakened to find itself famous. It feels flattered by the attention it is receiving. It is beginning to bow the knee. We refer not entirely to the economics of the schools; but that of the common people believed in and acted upon by the allies of politics. May not standard thinkers be replaced by the popular writers in course of time?

Kidd says:—

"Socialism seems to many minds to have been born again, and to be entering on the positive and practical stage."¹

But the theories of the newer school, simply enlarging the limits of economics to include all the wants of man,

¹ Social Evolution, p. 8.

must not be confounded with the popular economics which we may call "demagogical economics or the economics of the street and of the slums." The latter would have the equal distribution of the product artificial, and not natural; material, and not spiritual. It would have the common people believe they can be made happy by Act of Congress; by environment and externals; and no longer by homely honesty, vulgar industry, and plebeian thrift; not by reformation from within. Wealth comes by inspiration, not by perspiration, they think. Politics, therefore, in company with a vagabond economics, clothed in the garb of saviours, are in the van; while religion, morality, and knowledge, the fruitage of faith that once controlled men, have gone to the rear.

But a new school of Christian economics has arisen, endeavoring to meet the demand of the times and the wants of men.

"It is no longer the school of Hobbes, and Locke, of Hume, Adam Smith, Bentham, Ricardo, and Mill."¹

The influence of Ruskin and Carlyle, who never imagined themselves economists, and whose principal efforts were stray snarls or isolated indictments of the English environment, have found a fruitage calling for new writers like Jevons and Cliffe Leslie.

Professor Alfred Marshall has widened out the science into an attempt to explain all our social phenomena, so that Mr. Leslie Stephens' scientific principle comes nearer a standard by which to judge:—

"A genuine scientific theory implies a true estimate of the great forces which mould institutions and, therefore, a true appreciation of the limits within which they might be modified by any proposed change."

To meet these enlarged views of economics a comparatively new science has arisen which we call Sociology. If we expand economics to include a study of all the related phenomena of the science of life in its social aspects we shall have

¹ See Kidd, p. 23.

sociology. And this Professor Simon N. Patten is endeavoring to accomplish. Man as a bread-winner is giving way to man in his efforts to satisfy all his wants. In other words economics is usurping the place of religion and ethics.

The remarkable fact of to-day is the prominence given to social themes, therefore, and this is the result largely of the arrival of Demos. Economics and politics are leading the people. Karl Marx has been the Bible of the lower classes in England, and he was a materialist.¹

"The development which Marx contemplated is, it may be observed, thoroughly materialistic; it takes no account of those prime evolutionary forces which lie behind the whole process of our social development. The phenomenon which has been called the exploitation of labor is in no way new or special to our time."² "Social forces, new, strange, and altogether immeasurable have been released among us." "The one absolutely new and special feature which distinguishes the relations of the workers to the state and to the capitalist class as compared with all past periods is that the exploited classes, as the result of an evolution long in progress . . . have been admitted to the exercise of political power on a footing which tends more and more to be one of actual equality with those who have hitherto held them in subjection."

Kidd's generalization will hold in the American environment only as to the novelty of the spectacle. And Ruskin's definition of religion applies abroad, and not here:—

"Our national religion is the performance of Church ceremonies and preaching of soporific truths (or untruths) to keep the mob quietly at work while we amuse ourselves."

It is thus seen that Kidd's English Demos is not only different from our American Demos, as he has been known here for nearly three centuries, but he resembles very strongly our American politics. He is materialistic, rationalistic, and knows no morals but that of expediency.

This rationalism and materialism which result from following politics and economics as leaders will usher in a French Revolution, unless economics and politics are soundly con-

¹ See *Intro. to Das Kapital*, Kidd, p. 217. ² *Ibid.*, p. 218.

verted and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. As well might one hope for fruit in due season from a tree planted with its branches in the ground and its roots in the air, as to displace religion, morality, and knowledge with politics or economics, and expect good fruit. The result will be rationalism in the place of faith, expediency in the place of morality, and error in the place of truth. Politics and economics cannot pull the beam out of their own eye; how can they see clearly to pull out the mote that is in their brother's eye! We are realizing the words of Macaulay, that there is no tyranny like the tyranny of a democracy. Utilitarianism, materialism, rationalism, exalted by the vote of a majority,—in other words, resulting from the spread of the spirit of democracy among the ignorant and vicious,—marks one of the earlier stages in the line of development through which a free democratic republic must pass. If the children in the public schools could elect their teachers by popular vote, we should not be surprised to find a menagerie at the head of the school in the place of wisdom, until they learned by experience that wild animals are ignorant and vicious.

Majorities cannot change the nature of things. The town pump cannot furnish milk by vote of the people; sixteen parts of silver to one of gold cannot be made a true ratio by Act of Congress, unless all nations agree to call it so for purposes of convenience; the principles of Euclid are not changed by time or by majorities. A nation must be true to the nature of things, and then it will be true to itself. Politics and economics have not, never did have, and never will have the qualities of leadership. They were present when Mary broke the alabaster box of ointment, and exclaimed: "Why was not this sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?" But religion, like the sweet perfume that filled the house with its fragrance, has never put a money value on affection or spiritual forces. It is politics that is trying to reward patriotism with pay; while religion and morality would provide for

the invalid from motives of gratitude and not as assumed equivalents.

The influence of politics is seen again in the demands of socialism, that the state shall assume charge of production both in the natural monopolies and in the competitive industries. Kidd seems to be misled at this point when he says:—

“Socialism seems to many minds to have been born again and to be entering on the positive and practical stage.”¹

Socialism is simply joining hands with politics to defeat the old conception of the duties and functions of the state: that state is the best which gives the largest individual freedom compatible with the common welfare.

Rev. Philip S. Moxom, who is a scientific socialist and makes the amusing claim that it is identical with Christian socialism, says:—

“England furnishes, perhaps, the most notable example of the present rapid progress towards socialism as evinced by its actual municipal and national collectivism.”²

Mr. Moxom, it seems to us, simply confounds the natural heat of an excited body with that which comes from a high fever. The natural monopolies, which he cites as being assumed by the government, are not evidences of the growth of socialism. When a government assumes exclusive control of the competitive and private industries, and begins to make soap and matches and shoes for the people, that will be socialism. England, Germany, France, America, have as yet taken no practical steps in this direction. Mr. Moxom attributes the struggle for bread to *selfishness*. He confounds selfishness with self-interest,—a most common and fatal blunder of emotional economists.³

When questions like the equitable distribution of the product are referred to Sunday pulpits for solution, would not Christ say: “Man, who made me a judge and divider

¹ Social Evolution, p. 8. ² New Eng. Mag., March, 1894, p. 24.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

over thee?" Economic falsehood does not become truth by pulpit indorsement. The economic instincts of men must not be violated by passionate and prejudiced judgments on such broad themes as distribution of property. The churches that imagine they have espoused the cause of wage-earners, and prejudge their case, will be the last to gain the confidence of these same wage-earners when the naked truth in its heroic aspects is demanded by all. Economics must be defined in terms of intellect and not of emotion. Just here is the wage-earners' indictment of society, and it certainly demands the most careful inquiry, for it can be conceived that John might say to nine out of ten, "Be content with your wages." Christ might say: "Take that thine is and go thy way. Can I not do what I will with mine own?" "Did'st not thou agree with me for a penny?" This reply came in answer to a demand for artificial distribution. As R. T. Ely truly says:—

"There is no possibility of escape from toil and suffering. . . . It is the duty of all those who have the ear of the masses to tell them this plain truth, even if it be not altogether palatable."¹

And that genuine economic scholar, Arthur T. Hadley, says:—

"A nation must let intellect rule over emotion whether it likes intellect or not. The alternative is political and industrial suicide."²

In a country so conceived and developed, with such enlightened principles for its foundation; amid forces so complex and perplexing, the Debs insurrection came.³

¹ Forum, Oct. 1894, p. 183. ²*Ibid.*, p. 190.

³ The question as to whether it was an insurrection has not yet been decided. Judge Grosscup said in his charge to the Federal Grand Jury that indicted Debs: "Insurrection is a rising against civil or political authority; an open and active opposition of a number of persons to the execution of laws in a city or state. Now the laws of the United States forbid under penalty any person from obstructing or retarding the passage of the mails and make it the duty of the officer to arrest such offenders and bring them before the court. If, therefore, it shall appear to you that any person or persons have wilfully obstructed or retarded

The forces which gave it birth had been developed by well-known causes, and are so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. They were hatred of capital by labor; the rise and growth of organized labor unions which look to politics for salvation; the growing disrespect of these unions for law, and their vicious practices in contrast with their honied theories; the increase of demagogism and of its friend and ally, the saloon; the natural envy and hatred of the unsuccessful and the unfortunate for the successful and well-to-do; false political economy of the slums as to the origin of value and the causes of poverty; emotional sympathy on the part of many for those who are reaping the results of violated law,—not distinguishing between the Lord's poor and the devil's poor; amiable answers to socialism, and sweetened rose-water for criminals; the pardon of the anarchists, and reviling of the courts by a demagogue Governor; monopolies and trusts that threaten to destroy the State; indifference of the educated classes to politics; wrong notions of liberty, equality, and the rights of property among the voting majority; and, finally, the inflammable material in the form of ignorant foreignism that welcomes any change as one for the better, that follows the beck and nod of demagogues, and, that, in our congested cities, creates our judiciary. Pullman's treatment of his employes, while it was apparently utterly selfish, was not the cause of the Debs insurrection. It was, at the most, merely the occasion of it, and need not

the mails, and that their attempted arrest for such offense has been opposed by such a number of persons as would constitute a general uprising in that particular locality, and as threatens, for the time being, the civil and political authority, then the fact of an insurrection within the meaning of the law has been established." The definition adopted by the court is from Webster's Dictionary. Anderson's Dictionary of Law defines insurrection to be: "A rising against civil or political authority; the open and active opposition of a number of persons to the execution of the law in the city or state." It cites *Allegheny County vs. Gibson*, 99 Pa., 417 (1879). The jury found a true bill against Debs on this ground, judging from the evidence.

again be mentioned. It was the best text that could be found to serve as a pretext for violence; but Debs' genuine regard for the Pullman employes finds as little convincing proof as the proposition that Pullman built fine houses to improve the character of his men through their environment rather than to make a fine appearing town which should bear his name and be profitable and creditable to him. Pullman's evident attempt to pose as a philanthropist and as the genuine friend of his wage-earners will not bear investigation. As such, he was, however, better than Debs.

But who was Debs? Was he to the manor born and in sympathy with our institutions, a lover of law and order? Did he go forth to battle in behalf of the down-trodden and oppressed, inspired by a deep sense of their wrongs; jeopardizing his own life and liberty by espousing conscientiously the cause of labor? Was he a John Brown or a Nathan Hale, who forgot self in his devotion to his notions of duty? Not at all. He was a graduate of an institution for the cure of drunkards. He lived extravagantly on poor men's money at the best hotel, smoked fine Havanas and sent wordy telegrams to his wife at the expense of the laboring men. He was probably sober while the battle was on, but was intoxicated with notions of his own importance and of his power and influence,—having just waged a successful battle with the Northern Pacific. He was desperate in his determination to show his power as a leader of organized labor, and was willing to paralyze the industries of a nation in order to do it. If he thought to increase the wages of the Pullman employes by ordering a boycott on all Pullman cars, and then on all railroads that sympathize with those roads that hauled the Pullman cars, he was simply beside himself. Debs knew well the import and result of his orders. On July 15th he said:—

“This is not a strike. This is an evolutionary revolution.”

To the Railway Managers he wrote:—

"The strike, small and comparatively unimportant in its inception, has extended in every direction, until now it involves or threatens not only every public interest, but the peace, security, and prosperity of our common country. The contest has waged fiercely. It has extended far beyond the limits of interests originally involved and has laid hold of a vast number of industries and enterprises in no wise responsible for the differences and disagreements that led to the trouble. Factory, mill, mine, and shop have been silenced. Widespread demoralization has sway. The interests of multiplied thousands of innocent people are suffering. The common welfare is seriously menaced. The public peace and tranquillity are in peril. Grave apprehension of the future prevails."

It thus appears that Debs knew well that he was virtually inciting to riot and insurrection. The telegrams which he subsequently signed with his own hand, and all of which he denied in his defence, were, by reason of this knowledge, criminal and insurrectionary. And he did sign them himself, for the Grand Jury that indicted him took pains to select such telegrams, out of several thousand, as bore his own handwriting, knowing that he would probably deny all others.¹ And what did the Mayor of Chicago do? He took from this Dictator the permit to remove some dead animals for the sake of the public health. Who shall say that politics has not usurped the place of morality in the leadership of the common people? What is treason?

Article III. Section 3 of the Constitution says:—

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

Did Debs give aid and comfort to the enemies of this government, or are the enemies of a nation only hostile foreigners who would destroy it?

Article V. Amendment of the Constitution says:—

"Nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The Debs insurrection cost nearly a hundred lives and as many millions of dollars. Was this constitutional?

¹ The writer of this article was a member of the Grand Jury.

Article VIII. says:—

“Cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted.”

Debs said:—

“The public need not come to us with supplications, for we shall not hear them” (July 13th).

And what say the leaders of the labor organizations of this insurrection? Not one has condemned it, nor have the unions done so by any resolutions. Mr. Robert Bandlow, of Cleveland, Ohio, takes exceptions to this statement, and says that Mr. Sovereign's order to strike was not obeyed, and that Mr. Gompers' opinions must not be confounded with those of the individuals who compose the unions. Mr. Arthur's refusal to join the Debs strike and to order out the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is also cited. The writer refers to public utterances of labor unions, not on the folly of the strike, but on its wickedness. They condemned President Cleveland for interfering to protect the lives and property of innocent citizens who had looked in vain to a sycophant Mayor and a demagogue Governor for protection. The representatives of three hundred and fifty labor unions sent word to Governor Altgeld:—

“We insist that your excellency take legal steps to compel the withdrawal of said army forces at once.”

On July 13th, the American Federation of Labor passed the following resolution:—

“The heart of labor everywhere throbs responsive to the manly purposes and sturdy struggle of the American Railway Union in its heroic endeavor to redress the wrongs of the Pullman employees.”

But they deemed a sympathetic strike at that time *inexpedient!* At the head of this organization is the man who usually prefaces his public addresses with the statement that labor produces all value¹; that the laborers are the exploited classes,

¹ See Gompers' address in Boston at the time of the Homestead riots, and in Chicago on the Lake Front in 1893.

and that capital is a parasite of labor. This is Karl Marx pure and simple. It may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that the wage-earners in the main hold the following to be self-evident truths:—

1. Value is created by labor alone.
2. Capital may be the fruit of yesterday's toil, but it takes an unjust part of the product.
3. Executive ability plays little or no part in production.
4. Poverty is largely the result of unjust distribution.
5. The church is the friend of entrenched capital, and not of labor.
6. The hope of wage-earners (who are "slaves") is in artificial, and not in natural, distribution, which must come by law through the friendship of politics.
7. The true friends of labor are, therefore, not religion or morality, but politics and economics.
8. Christ was poor and a day laborer, a "walking delegate"; hence he is the wage-earner's friend, but the churches neither know him nor have seen him. Hence we cheer for Christ, and hiss the churches.

The Woman's Federal Labor Union has resolved that it—

"Takes its stand with the laborers and against the parasites who fatten upon them, for humanity and against inhumanity, for man and against mammon, and with our feeble strength we join in the fight to prevent this republic from being destroyed by a plutocratic despotism."

Was it a chance that the Debs insurrection occurred in a city like Chicago, the new centre of manufacturing industries, whose population is so largely foreign; where the anarchists were hung, and where the most daring projects, bad as well as good, are carried out,—a city distinguished for its ambition, enterprise, heroism, philanthropy, and faith no less than for its crimes, pauperism, and dirt. Was it a chance that it came in a city whose Mayor is a demagogue; in a State whose Governor is ineligible to the office of President of the United States because he was born in Prussia.¹ Where was the spirit of the Revolution when that insurrection came;

¹ A foreign citizen is one who remains alien to the spirit of our institutions and ignorant of American ideas of liberty and law. He may be born abroad or in America.

where were the ideas of law and order so essential to the permanency and safety of a self-governed people?

Von Holst says¹ the highest type of commonwealth conceivable to the human mind is that in which the rule of men is wholly supplanted by the government of law in the sense: (1) that no authority is possessed by the rulers except as organs of the law; (2) that all the members of the commonwealth are equally and absolutely subject to the law. This is precisely the conception of Thomas Hooker in 1639. Must these conceptions be laid aside at the behest of labor organizations that war on our Republic no less than on capital for the sake of a little more gain?

A scientific formula for producing insurrection and riot that will destroy a free democratic republic may here be given:—

1. Adopt a high protective tariff, thus increasing wages. Thus close the gates to foreign goods.
2. Open the gates wide to the toilers who make the goods. Put no restriction on immigration.
3. Make the price of an ocean passage ten dollars.
4. Adopt these foreigners into our national family as citizens with the right of franchise without property or character qualifications.
5. Elect the executive and judiciary by popular vote.
6. Make the cities attractive by taxing the property owners for parks, boulevards, free concerts and amusements.
7. In such congested centres where wealth and luxury are side by side with squalor and filth let the demagogue incite to hatred and passion by false teaching as to the causes of poverty.
8. Elect these demagogues guardians of the peace; let them make, interpret, and enforce the laws.
9. Organize the wage-earners into unions and then confederate these unions. Elect leaders whose commands are authoritative.
10. Warn them against religion, morality, and knowledge as allies of capital; exalt politics and economics as their friends.
11. Put a drunkard, an atheist, an alien at the head of all for absolute dictator, and then await the result.

The result will be riots, mobs, insurrection, revolution, anything that is lawless and destructive.

¹ Journal of Political Economy for September.

And this was the environment: churches for the wealthy, jails for the poor; hungry children trying to support widowed mothers by selling papers on the street for a cent apiece while they stare through the windows at children with hundred-dollar dolls and fifty-dollar poodle-dogs; the common people, hungry and hollow-eyed, like sheep without a shepherd, rushing after every new ism like anarchism, communism, socialism, Georgeism, Bellamyism; or after every false Christ like politics or economics, only to be deceived and used, and then to become discouraged, hardened, desperate. Then come suffering, want, degradation, starvation. Then organized charities with alms-giving and consequent pauperism. Is it a wonder that Debs paralyzed the industries of the country? But unless law is upheld, and Debs I. is punished for his crimes, Debs II. or Debs III. will overturn the government.¹

Debs is now trying to form a new secret organization with the same hatred for law and order; with even greater confidence in politics and false economics for breastworks. From their new vantage-ground such men will again try their hand when a President is in power who does not wear a number 19 collar; when a more desperate set of demagogues dares the United States to call out troops in defence of person and property. Their ranks will be filled with the hungry, the criminals, the haters of mankind. That most despicable and dangerous demagogue that trades on the miseries of the poor—the cheap newspaper—will encourage and applaud their rioting, and endeavor to make public opinion to justify their action.

Surely the times *have* changed. To many they seem to have changed for the worse; but a step in the line of development, even if it be downward, must not be interpreted as retrogression. Society sometimes seems, like a huge wave, to go downward, before rising with renewed momentum to a greater height. There are greater hopes awakened

¹ Von Holst.

among the world's weary toilers than history has heretofore witnessed, and it is an omen for good, though attended with temporary frictions. We should not interpret society's growth in the spirit of pessimism, or have a thought of doubt as to God's evident plans for the raising of humanity to a higher level than the world has yet dreamed of. But the mistakes of humanity which retard and postpone the fulfilment are the real enemies of the people; and the mistaken and misled are easily enrolled in the ranks of anarchy and disorder.

The emancipation of the masses must surely come. Those who have been bound, for these many years, will be set free. But it must come from him who was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor; who came to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, the recovering of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty them that are bruised. In other words,—religion, morality, education, must be the divine leaders of politics and economics, in a free democratic republic. The wage-earners will be won not by emotion, but by heroic truth and genuine good-will. But what will this liberty be? Will it be freedom from effort, from industry, from economy, from the need of thrift, from the inexorable laws of the economic world which are as permanent and universal as the laws of gravitation? As well might we look for the sun to rise in the west, or for all the angles of a triangle to equal three right angles. As well might we ask that the laws of the universe be suspended or abrogated for our selfish benefit. But it will come by revolution of character, more than from environment, giving a love of toil, a desire to overcome and succeed by self-denial and thrift; by careful observance and obedience to law. But every form of oppression must cease and good-will must reign. The wage-earners, whom the world needs, must always be, and the reward for physical labor can never be great. It must, however, be a living wage, and the wage-earners must be

helped and respected as the children of God and our brethren. We are all the children of a common Father. A nation can never be civilized with its masses brutalized. It is the one opportunity of the ages to win the world by genuine friendship, earnest devotion to truth, sincere loyalty to the eternal principles of the gospel of Christ, the Alpha and Omega of which is heroic love.