

should, and doubtless will, be followed by other states. A few such local evidences of the real convictions of the party towards the Nebraska dictator should bring new hope and new determination to the rank and file, and insure the selection at the next national convention of a leader upon whom all factions of the organization can unite.—Kansas City Star (ind.).

Other states will follow the lead of Ohio. In the East and the middle West the machinery of the party is in the hands of men who, though they have kept themselves regular, have little or no sympathy with Bryanism. One thing that has held them in line has been their desire to keep control of the organization. So the Ohio precedent is likely to be popular. In a word, the counter-revolution has begun. It will not be arrested. It may be checked occasionally, but it will go on. For all the great influences of the time are in its favor. The truth is that the country itself has moved wholly away from the cheap-money idea.—Indianapolis News (ind.).

Ohio politics is practical or nothing. On the republican side it has become a national by-word. On the democratic side it is only less familiar because it has less opportunity and is less successful. If it were to be Bryan again, Ohio would have said as much. The fact that Ohio has said quite the contrary sounds more distinctly the knell of Bryanism than similar action in almost any other state.—Waterbury American (ind.).

What the action of the Ohio democrats means, is perfectly plain. It is a decided step towards the reorganization of the party. It proclaims to democrats throughout the country that the time has come for democracy to return to the old party standards, and to put its destiny in the keeping of leaders who can command the respect and confidence of the intelligence, the patriotism, and the substantial interests of the country. And it is a proclamation which there is good reason to believe will be very generally heeded.—Omaha Bee (rep.).

A HATER OF AUTOMOBILES.

A newspaper published in Nice, France, says of the automobile: "These vehicles are bringing about the complete ruin of the coast, as well as of all the watering places by taking possession of the principal roads and driveways and speeding over them. Persons who walk on the roads or who ride in other carriages are virtually taking their lives in their hands. The so-called automobile week which we have just had at Nice has been a veritable scandal. During whole days the public was debarred from the Promenade des Anglaises. More than one hundred thousand persons were affronted in order that a few millionaires might be satisfied."

"PROTECTION" AFFORDED BY TRADE UNIONS.

Mr. D. H. Caldwell, the editor of the Iowa Unionist, says, in part: "As this misrepresentation of trade unionism has been given prominence by a conservative editor of a very conservative and worthy journal, it becomes our duty to answer at least one of the statements made."

This obligation refers to an article which appeared in THE CONSERVATIVE, over my signature, June 27th, entitled, "Trades Unions." In this short expression of opinion, the writer asked, "What protection do labor unions afford their members?" The answer given was to the effect that there were legal and established means for the protection of all citizens against physical violence, and that protection against economic dangers must come through economic sources; therefore, in what way do they protect?

The editor, above mentioned, either grants the truth of the other arguments in the article, or admits that they are of less consequence than the one he assumes to answer.

He says: "Can it be expected that the laws are made impartial by legislators, elected in the different states by the combined interest of the money power?" He cites the instances of the militia and the Pullman strike at Chicago, the Pinkerton "murderers" and the Homestead strike and the "Bull Pen" incident, to prove the partiality of law. Then the worthy editor sums up his argument by laying the blame upon the shoulders of the "poor laboring man," in these words: "Can you expect impartial laws until the working people of this country will take a hand and assist in electing members of the legislature in the different states, regardless of party, who will feel that they are under no obligations to corporations, or their tools?"

First, I wish it understood that I am not identified with any "money power," that I am not employed in any capacity which could in any way be unionized, and also that I have no interest in the question further than the application of the principle of economics to the condition.

I ask the editor this question: Under the most impartial law, what right has a body of citizens, bearing the name of a trades union, to protect itself as a body from physical violence?

I admit that self-defense is lawful under certain restrictions; this only, however, when applied to individuals. The law of self-defense cannot apply to associations outside of those military organizations which are sanctioned by the general government.

The citation of the conflicts above mentioned, in this connection, would imply that under an impartial system of law, the members of trades unions could

organize themselves into a temporary army, and, thoroughly armed and equipped with all the weapons of modern warfare, protect themselves in a labor war against capital.

This is unreasonable, Mr. Editor, and I cannot bring myself to the belief that you would advance such a war-like function as an adjunct to labor associations.

But the most conspicuous, and to a certain extent, truthful statement in your editorial, is, that impartial law cannot be realized until the individual laboring-man rises to the full height of his obligation, and regardless of party affiliation, exercises to the most complete extent, his constitutional independence and his high duty of franchise.

The remedy for prevalent discord in law, if there be any, is not with the bullet, but with the ballot.

You ask several questions, one of which I have answered. Another I quote: "Do you think the laws were impartial that allowed a president of the United States to call out the regular troops to butcher the laboring people during the Pullman strike at Chicago, when this difficulty could have been settled by arbitration?"

The writer was a resident of Chicago at that time. It was then that the members of the American Railway Union took into their hands the weapons of warfare, and heedless of the rights guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, they destroyed property and hazarded the lives of the citizens of Chicago both day and night. During that period the walls of my bed-room were painted blood-red from the reflection of the fires which were destroying thousands of dollars of private and public property.

For his action in calling out the regular troops of the United States army, I shall always commend Grover Cleveland.

I am not a believer in licensing and granting unrestricted liberty to any man who carries a torch in one hand and war's weapon in the other. If arbitration could have settled this difficulty, why was it not resorted to? Because Eugene V. Debs was the general of the striking army. He would listen to no proposition of peace, no compromise, and entertained himself solely with the hope of ultimate victory over government, law and order.

You can bring your organization to the respect of all decent citizens, when their management is deposited in the hands of men who are broad enough to appreciate the principles of cause and effect. Your present mode of control aggravates economic and social conditions. With you, I believe in the impartial protection afforded by the constitution to life, liberty and property. With you, I believe that no man, or body of men, has the right to deprive any citizen of these privileges without "due process of law."

If the law is imperfect, let it be perfected by legitimate, constitutional methods, and not by violence on the part of either industrial combinations or combinations of labor.

LEWIS M. HEAD,
Nebraska City, Neb., July 20, 1901.