

# Calamity! and From Republican Newspapers!

Following are three editorials from republican newspapers whose editors have often complained because democrats talked "calamity:"

## HARRIMAN AND BRYAN

Under the headline "Harriman and Bryan," the Minneapolis Journal, republican, prints this editorial:

"The testimony of E. H. Harriman before the interstate commission has probably done more to dignify the issue of government ownership of railroads raised by W. J. Bryan, than any other one thing that could have happened. The public was inclined to treat Mr. Bryan's remarks on his return to this country as further evidence that the democratic leader was too shallow to be trusted with the presidency. It was put down, along with his radicalism on the money question, as indicating a mind economically unsound, and Mr. Bryan lost prestige very rapidly. The public, in jumping so hard upon Mr. Bryan, had evidently overlooked the fact that he had just come from a tour of Europe, where the very system of railroad management which he advocated is in practice. In Germany the imperial government owns and operates a number of through lines, while the different states own many connecting branch lines. Government ownership of railroads is spreading in Europe. It prevails in Austria, where the zone system of tariffs has also obtained vogue. Russia has built and is operating her own railroad lines. It is true the government in these countries is military in character and the ownership of railroads was first thought of in connection with the national defense. However, that was merely an incident. The governments, having taken over the railroads, were under the necessity of making them pay. Mr. Bryan observed these things in Europe, and while he was not the first man who had done so, he was the first political leader who attempted to transplant the idea and set it before the American people as an issue. It would have remained a chimera of the Nebraska system of political economy without Harriman, but plus Harriman it is discussed with soberness. Coupled with the disconcerting testimony of Harriman comes the complaint of C. S. Mellen, railroad president, that the new rate law is punitive rather than protective. Between the two one begins to see dimly that the railroad question is far from settled. If the railroad presidents are content neither to use the new law nor to depart from the old practice, the remedy must be more and more

drastic law, or the wiping out of private ownership. What the railroad men do not appear to be able to see is that the people, having put their hand to the plow, will not turn back. They will give private ownership a fair trial, but no railroad president need imagine for a moment that the people would not as soon go forward to the unknown perils of government ownership as back to the humiliations of the private ownership of the past, to-wit, the very kind about which Mr. Harriman testifies with such hardihood."

## ANARCHIST HARRIMAN

Under the headline "Anarchist Harriman," the Chicago Record-Herald prints this editorial:

"Mr. Harriman appeared on the witness stand as the typical anarchist of the swollen fortune. He announced in effect that he always had acted and always would act on the rule—

That they should take who have the power,  
And they should keep who can.

"This sums up his whole conception of life. He admitted that he might be restrained and coerced by law, but made it clear that he was intolerant of the law. In the words of a lowly Chicago anarchist who spent some time where many anarchists of high finance ought to be, he would stab the law and throttle it if he had the chance. Such is one impression left by his testimony. Another is that with all his show of alertness he was singularly obtuse in a matter that is just now of supreme importance to himself and his associates. This man who should be making every effort to placate the public stupidly irritated old wounds. Thousands of people who read his testimony have felt the desire to club him. He gave a new impulse to every legislative scheme for curtailing the power and diminishing the profits of great corporations. An army of ranting demagogues spouting through many campaigns could not do as much to incite voters against corporate wealth as he did in his brief exhibition of arrogance, greed and utter insensibility to the rights of others.

"As a result of this brilliant performance we may expect renewed difficulty in preventing reckless, indiscriminating attacks on capital. Naturally the people do not pause to make nice distinctions or even fair distinctions. They know that Harriman and the Rockefeller coterie with which and for which he acts control the largest railroad system in the country. They know that they are reaching out in every direction and adding monopoly to monopoly with their enormous profits. They

know that their methods are imitated by others of their kind, and with their minds inflamed as they are their first thought is of rough retaliation in which the innocent may suffer with the guilty. It is to be hoped, as we have repeatedly indicated, that this fever may be checked in spite of such irritating anarchists as Harriman, but if the people need a warning so do the railroad managers. They cannot afford to stand as a class with Harriman. They must meet the people half way, conciliate them, and fully recognize their own public duties, or they will fall between the anarchy of Wall street and the anarchy of the mob."

## HARRIMAN IMMUNITY

Under the headline "Harriman Immunity," the New York Press, republican, prints this editorial:

"Washington dispatches suggest the possibility that the examination of Edward H. Harriman is welcome to him for the reason that, although he can defy the authority of the interstate commerce commission and refuse to answer embarrassing questions, his testimony will have the effect of an 'immunity bath,' scrubbing off the stain of criminal guilt in connection with the consolidation of the Pacific and other railroads. Whether this is the fact or is not the case, a mistake has been made in the method of dealing with the gigantic conspiracy headed by Harriman. The present proceeding, if it is not an irretrievable blunder, is a serious mistake. Many of the undisputed facts upon which the puerile and almost frivolous examination of Mr. Harriman is being conducted by Mr. Kellogg (who seems to be anything but a Hughes) warrant an inquiry not by an impotent interstate commerce commission, but by a United States grand jury. The facts admitted, and those that would be disclosed under the powers of a grand jury, warrant presentation by the department of justice with a view to the indictment of Harriman and his confederates on a charge of conspiracy against trade under the criminal clause of the Sherman act. If an ordinary breaker of the law stood accused of as much against the federal statutes as is charged against Harriman there would be no polite commission sitting on him, and having defiance flung in its face for its pains. The United States marshal would take charge of him. We can think of no single reason for showing so much consideration to Mr. Harriman save that the operations constituting the offense charged against him were upon a large and impressive scale."

## Letters From the People

George D. Morgan, Newbern, Tenn.—I desire to call your attention to the recent decision of the United States supreme court in the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone case, and the dissenting opinion of Justice McKenna, in which he says:

"In the case at bar the states, through their officers, are the offenders. They, by an illegal exertion of power, deprived the accused of a constitutional right.

"A conspiracy is alleged between the governor of the state of Idaho and his advisers, and that the governor of the state of Colorado took part in the conspiracy, the purpose of which was 'to avoid the constitution of the United States and the act of congress made in pursuance thereof; and to prevent the accused from asserting his constitutional right under clause 2, section 2, of article IV of the constitution of the United States and the act made pursuant thereof.'

"No individual could have accomplished what the power of the two states accomplished. No individual could have commanded the means of success; could have made two arrests of prominent citizens by invading their homes; could have commanded the resources of jails, armed guards and special trains; could have successfully timed all acts to prevent inquiry and judicial interference. The accused, as soon as he could have done so, submitted his rights to the consideration of a federal court. He could not have done so in, or on the way from, Colorado. At the first instant that the state of Idaho relaxed its restraining power, he invoked the aid of the habeas corpus. He should have been heard, not dismissed from court, and the action of the circuit court in so doing should be reversed."

The court decision says, among other things: "Looking first at what was alleged to have occurred in Colorado touching the arrest of the petitioner and his deportation from the state, we do not perceive that anything done there, however hastily or inconsiderately done, can be adjudged to be in violation of the constitution or laws of the United States.

"Even if it be true that the arrest and depor-

tation of Pettibone, Moyer and Haywood from Colorado was by fraud and connivance, in which the governor of Colorado was a party, this does not make out a case of violation of the right of the appellant under the constitution and laws of the United States.

"It must be conclusively presumed that those officers proceeded throughout this affair with no evil purpose and with no other motive than to enforce the law. The decision of the lower court is, therefore, affirmed."

Is not this decision of more vital importance to the common people than the ship subsidy, elastic currency or tariff reform?

In the case of ex-Governor Taylor, of Kentucky, we see a wealthy politician who fled from a state in which a crime was committed, and the friendship of the governor of the state of Indiana prevents the officers of the law from arresting him: But these three laboring men, who had the misfortune to be the leaders of the Western Federation of Miners, were seized at midnight, denied the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus, denied the privilege of communicating with lawyers, or even with their families, and conveyed to another state, in which they had not been for ten years, and in which the crime of which they were accused had been committed two years before.

It makes no difference whether any or all of the persons named are innocent or guilty. Neither the friendship of the governor of Indiana, in the one case, nor the enmity of the governor of Colorado, in the other, should influence the execution of the law.

I have often wondered why so few people have ever heard of the almost unspeakable crimes that have been committed in the mining camps of the west, in the name of "law and order." In democratic Idaho, a few years ago, defenseless women and children, whose only crime was that their husbands or fathers were strikers, were thrown into the prisons, where they were treated with about as much consideration as the reconcentrados during the Cuban war. Yet not one of the prominent newspapers had as much as a word of protest. In republican Colorado the same atrocities were committed, and finally men, women and children

were "deported" from their homes, simply because they demanded an eight-hour work-day and decent wages. Still nothing doing among the newspapers.

This wholesale deportation of members did not break up the miners' union. As a last desperate resort it determined to arrest the officers of the union, and by means of perjured testimony to "railroad" them to the gallows. To the disgrace of the American commonwealth this infamous conspiracy is now being carried out, and a justice of the supreme court of the United States is authority for the statement that the governors of Idaho and Colorado are partners in the conspiracy. Yet there are perhaps not a dozen newspapers in the whole United States that have the courage to say a word in defense of these men. Shame on American journalists!

## VESPERS

The day long have I toiled at oars,  
The river broadened as I went,  
And now each herb of evening pours  
Upon the air its inmost scent.

Fast gathered to their mother hill,  
The young plantations drowse and dream  
And down the valley bright and still,  
Like golden satin shines the stream.

While red behind their bars of elm  
The sunset fires begin to fade,  
And tender mists to overwhelm  
The pastures with a silver shade.

Till presently there comes to me,  
For requiem of this good day gone,  
The tranquil benedictio  
Of twinght bells from Basilidon.

So silken clear, so soft and far,  
It seems the dusk has scarcely stirred;  
While o'er the reeds one silver star  
Remains God's last unspoken word.  
—H. H. Bashford, in London Spectator.