

THE HESPERIAN.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

VOL. XV.

LINCOLN, NEB., OCTOBER 22, 1886.

No. II

"ENTRE NOUS."

In the October number of the *North American Review* there appears an article on "Arbitration" by Prof. Richard T. Ely. Prof. Ely is associate professor of political science at John Hopkins; and is perhaps the most widely informed student in America on the "labor problem," the subject which is now uppermost, among subjects of world-wide interest. His treatises on this question are characterized by a degree of fairness which is seldom found in the writings of others of note whom we could mention; indeed we believe him the least biased writer of the times on all subjects which have to do with the American phase of this problem. In the article mentioned he treats of the intrinsic worth of arbitration, and the historical part played by it in the settlement of wage difficulties. He recognizes the true importance of labor organizations in the effort to settle the difficulties by arbitration, and laments the fact that such organizations are not stronger, and less liable to be overthrown by those of their members who do not have at heart the best interests of the laboring classes. The article is intended to place the method of arbitration before the people in its proper light, to give it due importance, and we think the task admirably performed.

Since the appearance of our last number, the editor of this column has more than once been taken to task for his remarks on the future of the republican party, the signification of its course in the last state convention, and in particular, his well-intended remark about the predicament into which our friend, the *State Journal* has been thrown. It has been intimated in a very confidential and, withal, kind way that we "hadn't better" say anything about politics in our college paper. Well now! we do not wish to be accused of rashness, or being a prohibitionist of the New Republic style, but we do intend to talk politics when we have anything of interest to talk about. Moreover we do believe that college students above all others should be interested and alive to political questions, and problems of government. We believe that all live political questions should be studied along with the other allied subjects and sciences. Our universities and colleges are but citizens' training schools; and upon the character of that training hangs the destinies of nations; in it lies the only hope of republican governments.

The question of prohibition is then ours to discuss, and if the *State Journal* and the Republican party in this state fail to agree on the question of submission, and we think we have discovered the *Journal* to be trying to hold an untenable position, we will sound the warning call. We believe in prohibition; and lacking space to discuss it fully, would recommend all who wish to know some of our reasons for so believing to read David R. Lock, [Petroleum V. Nasby] admiral's plea for prohibition, published in the October number of the *North American Review*. The closing paragraph we deem worthy to be republished here, and is as follows: "Prohibition is a certainty in this country, and that within a very few years. Every civilized nation is looking for some cure for the greatest evil that affects the earth. The fact that all

countries are trying to "regulate" it, is an admission that it is an evil, and the centuries prove that there is no sense whatever in trying to regulate an evil. Evils are to be killed, not regulated. The question of today is not whether the individual man shall have the right to poison himself, but whether an organization shall have the right by means of a poison to demoralize mankind for profit. It is a question in which every workingman, every employer, every father and every mother in the country has a direct interest. It is a question whether the law can be made to restrain the criminal maker, as well as the criminal, to prevent the manufacture of paupers, instead of supporting paupers; in short, whether the community has the right to protect its weaker members against organized demoralization. That communities have this right is the assertion of the prohibitionists, and who shall say that their position is not impregnable?"

It was generally taken for granted that the counsel for the defendants in the trial of the Chicago anarchists would appeal from a decision that gave their clients no hope; and it might reasonably be expected that so severe a verdict would be reversed and the judgment mitigated. The refusal of a new trial was, therefore, something of a surprise both to those who wished it, and to those who did not. Nevertheless, though a surprise, the almost unanimous opinion appears to be that it was strictly just. In their defense, and in speeches made before their sentences, the anarchist leaders sought to excite the strongest political prejudice of Americans. Few institutions are regarded with greater jealousy by us than a free press, and we can scarcely doubt that, could the anarchists convince the public that they were convicted for exercising what is claimed by every American as a sacred right, the force of public opinion would prevent the execution of their sentence. The fact that public opinion ratifies the judgment pronounced shows that public opinion is based on other grounds. It is not for the reasons assigned by the anarchist plotters that they suffer, but because they have violated a trust more sacred than any known to a European. The very fact that the freedom of the individual is so great renders the responsibility greater than under a despotic government. For this reason the American people, while they can well afford to let the effervescence of socialistic feeling dissipate under the sun of a healthy public sentiment, (so long as it remains but effervescence) must deal out well merited severity to those who seriously attempt to perpetrate their doctrines on American society. A sharp distinction must be drawn between the agitation of doctrines and the means used to carry on that agitation. The propagation of socialistic ideas, while distasteful to American sentiment, cannot be condemned so long as carried on by legal means; in fact a certain species of admiration may be felt for these efforts of the lower class to elevate themselves; but when criminal means are used to further such ideas such means should not share in the toleration given to the ideas themselves. So we say the sentence of death, while severe, is just, nor should any false sentiment prompt a pardon. Americans can afford to be lenient to a certain point, but beyond that point punishment should be sharp and decisive.