

The Independent

VOL. L

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1898

No. 2603

SURVEY OF THE WORLD

Labor Riots in Illinois.

Last week, Wednesday, a battle occurred at Virden, Ill., in which fourteen men were killed and twenty-five wounded. This destruction of life, greater than that of many a battle in wartime, was the result of a fight between striking coal-miners and guards on a train bringing negroes from the South to open up the mines of the Chicago-Virden Coal Co. The Columbus convention of a year ago made a rate of forty cents a ton, to go into effect on April 1st. The old rate had been thirty cents a ton, but the miners agreed to thirty-three cents a ton. The operators refused to give even that rate. The State Board of Arbitration thereupon made an investigation; but the operators declined to join. Then the lockout began. Both sides were firm till the end of August, when the mine owners decided to import negro miners from Alabama. The first trouble was at Pana, Ill. The strikers armed themselves; but the sheriff guarded the negroes, and they were kept working behind stockades. The town was given over to riot, and a general battle was feared at any moment; but the culmination occurred at Virden last week. The situation was the same as at Pana; and the company, in anticipation of receiving the negro miners, built a heavy stockade about their property, and erected a tower at one corner which commanded the railroad track. Thirty-two ex-policemen were brought down from Chicago, armed and installed in the stockade. When the train arrived, bringing the miners, it was a foregone conclusion that blood would flow, for the miners had been gathering from all the neighboring mines to augment those at Virden. The miners ranged themselves along the tracks in the vicinity of the stockade, and when the train stopped and attempted to

transfer its men into the stockade, the battle commenced, but which side fired the first shot is uncertain. The firing lasted for fifteen or twenty minutes, and thousands of shots were fired. Then the train was rushed on, none of the negroes being unloaded. Governor Tanner did not send troops till the next day. Then the town was placed practically under martial law, and has been so ever since. A civil investigation is now being made, and all over the State there has been talk of impeaching the Governor. The mine-owners declare that they will take full legal procedure in obtaining their legal rights, and to secure redress against rioters, whether in the person of rioters or State officials. But the company, it is said, will make no further attempt to import negroes.

The President at Omaha.

When it was announced that President McKinley would attend the Peace Congress in connection with the Trans-Mississippi Exposition at Omaha, there was great interest to see whether his address would outline the policy of the Government as to its new possessions. In this particular he was, however, very reticent. He recognized that the nation is confronted by new and grave problems affecting not alone ourselves but others of the family of nations, and that this involves a departure from the course hitherto followed. As to the solution of the problems, he said very little more than that "we cannot shirk our international responsibilities if we would; they must be met with courage and wisdom, and we must follow duty, even if desire opposes. . . . We must avoid the temptation of undue aggression and aim to secure only such results as will promote our own and the general good." The greater part of the address was

AN ANGLO-SAXON POLICY UN-AMERICAN.

BY ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD, LL.D.,

PRESIDENT OF LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

HIGH ideals are essential to the political welfare of a free people. They are somewhat dreaded by the conservative, who are conscious of practical shortcomings in the more prosaic of public duties, and even more dreaded by politicians who fear to be tried by any lofty standard of achievement. But patriotic conservatives and self-satisfied public officials to the contrary notwithstanding, we must have progress, and in order to have progress we must have noble purposes.

Without discrediting the sound judgment which is essential to any high thought, the citizen of the United States who is worthy of his national traditions must plan and strive for an enlarged national horizon. The danger, indeed, is not, as some would have us think, that we shall plan too largely, but rather that our fundamental ideas shall be too narrow. For instance, from the current discussions in the daily press it is plain that attention is being directed entirely too exclusively to commercial problems on the side of the advocates of expansion, while the opponents of such a policy concentrate their attention on problems of public administration. There is a question, however, antecedent to all such questions, which demands our thoughtful consideration. It is nothing less than the test of our fidelity to our own past on the one hand, and of our capacity to rise to a world-wide philosophy on the other. It is put to us by the oft-repeated urging of those who are dominated by English ideas of an "Anglo-Saxon" federation.

[This phrase "Anglo-Saxon" is well enough in the way of a colloquialism for an older and less particular Englishry; but it stands for a narrow conception of what even England's vital force has been. Anglo-Norman were a better phrase, but that unduly disregards the Celtic infusion in English life and thought; and even British with all the composite elements that can be packed into any idea to be drawn from Greater Britain, girdling as it does the round earth, lacks liberality of usage and of thought to which we as Americans are forever pledged.]

We love England. We love its past; we love much of its history; we love its speech—when reasonably modified in form and utterance; above all, we love its literature. King Shakespeare's land is much more real to us than Queen Victoria's. Those of us who have been so fortunate as to look upon the green fields of old England care far more for Stratford-on-Avon than for royal Windsor, far more for the Tower than for Buckingham Palace, far more for memories of Raleigh, Sydney and Cromwell, than for associations of Peel, Russell and Disraeli. We love England; but we feel more at home in Westminster Abbey than in the Parliament Houses. In the Abbey we meet with kindred souls who have thought and sung and written with the larger zeal for humanity and God; in the Parliament House we cannot but feel that the largest policy has had for its central sun, not mankind, nor Great Britain, but little England. We bow the head with no small recognition of the vigor and the attendant humaneness of the policies here proclaimed. We can see that Scotland has been better for the Union, and we can hope that Ireland has been no worse for her incorporation into it. We can perceive that here a group of patriots finally succeeded in showing how foolish it was to alienate the goodly colonies of the New World; and we can rejoice both that we are free, and that we taught England how to rule her other colonies well. With somewhat growing admiration we can include India and Australia, and even South Africa and Egypt, in our estimate of what England in doing good for herself has done for others.

[But we are bound to be most happy that we learned from the mother land the unwisdom of a policy centered in a fragment of a State. We did not make the new West tributary to the original States. We broke the early limitations on the suffrage. We refused, with the one shameful exception of the Chinese, to discriminate in our conception of the unity of the human race. We ought to be able to see that even for Great

Britain to talk of an "Anglo-Saxon" policy for herself would be to be false to some of her most vigorous sources of strength. Certainly it is mere midsummer madness for Americans to shut their own horizon in by clouds of British prejudice. Without disowning our birthright of English freedom, without abating our respect for English law and precedent, without ceasing to think that the best things in our civilization came from England, we are not so unwise as to refuse recognition to the fine forces which have entered our national life from other lands and races. We owe a vast debt to little Holland, especially for her early outpouring on New Netherlands; our debt to Germany and the Scandinavian lands is not only great, but steadily growing; France contributed early and richly to our settlement, and other Latin races not a little; and the Irish emigration, both Scot and Milesian, Protestant and Roman Catholic, has been vast and vigorous. Who shall say that we are poorer as a people for having as real a right to count among our national forefathers Luther, Gustavus Adolphus, William the Silent, and Coligny, as Alfred, Simon de Montfort and Hampden? Nay, to claim for ourselves part and parcel in such later lives as those of Daniel O'Connell, Bismarck and Cavour, quite as much as in those of Cobden, Bright and Gladstone. Granting that we are nearer to the Englishmen if their policy can be sympathized with, are we not as near to the Continental foreigner as to any English Tory prime minister of a hundred years past?]

In short, what we are entitled to do is to seek the noblest inspiration to be found in every land, and to refuse every limitation which shuts us out from sharing the largest views of every nation. We can deplore the loss to Germany of her beloved Frederick the Noble, and her reactionary trials at the hands of William the Frantic; but we cannot in justice to ourselves decline to see how large a part of our citizens turn with just pride to Germany. And it is permitted us to hope that in a few years Germany will resume her share in a generous and humane effort to civilize the world. And surely we shall not lightly give up our long and closely knit friendship with France so long as the names

Franklin and Lafayette, Gallatin and

Rochambeau, are familiar reminders of many and varied ties.

[What we must desire is not the preponderance of one race—still less of one Government. An all supreme Anglo-Saxon Federation is the dream of petty selfishness.] What we must desire is that truth and righteousness shall prevail on the earth. Mutual understanding, mutual good will and a fair share in the markets of the world is a much higher policy than that of mutual suspicion, mutual hostility and medieval exclusiveness in trade. The steps toward this may lead to closer and more kindly relations with England first; but they must not stop there. We must not be bound to England for England's benefit solely, nor for our benefit only; nor even for the benefit of both, unless such benefit is compatible with the eventual welfare of the human race. There is a wide difference between seeking admittance to a share in the trade of a country and seeking the exclusive right to trade with a country. The former is fair for us and fair for any combination, actual or tacit, which we may form. The latter, popular as it seems with so many European Governments (I will not say peoples) at the present time, is beneath our standards of international right.

The Christian people of England and America have for many years shown by their efforts to Christianize the heathen world the practical possibilities of a sentimental love for mankind. The public policy of America has always been influenced, if not always directed, by the Christian sentiments of her people. It is not too much to expect that these two things will be brought more and more closely together. Trade will follow the preacher of righteousness, and the preaching of righteousness will become a part of the business of trade. In order to do this we must have sympathies infinitely larger than can be included in an "Anglo-Saxon policy." We must own a real brotherhood with Celt and Teuton, Spaniard and Slav; we must feel it obligatory to deal fairly with Malays and Negritos, and that China exists for some other end than international robbery.

We have fought a great battle for the oppressed of alien races in the name of humanity. In the name of humanity and of God, let us maintain a national warmth of heart

and breadth of sympathy which shall know no blind prejudice of race and own all honorable impulses toward world-wide justice, friendship and liberty. This can be most surely forwarded by continuing our long-settled policy of friendly but untrammelled re-

lations to all nations, doing meanwhile our utmost to fix and foster a strong international law, and a general acceptance of international arbitration of all matters of dispute.

EASTON, PENN.

NOTES FROM ENGLAND.

BY JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M. P.

THE appeal of the Czar has, up to the present, produced hardly an echo, in England at least. I should not like to say that it has dropped dead; but it certainly has not made much of a vital impression on the English public. Of course, it has been duly considered by statesmanship and by diplomacy, and its basis of negotiations has been formally accepted, and the Peace Commissioners from America have already arrived in London on their way to Paris. The Commission, no doubt, will hold its sittings, and the proposals of the Czar will be duly considered; and I do not pretend to be such a prophet of evil as to say that nothing will come of them. But I confess to a sense of profound disappointment at the want of public interest with which the Czar's proposal has been received in this country. The time of its issue was rather unfortunate, so far as what may be called dramatic effect was concerned; the triumph of English arms in the Sudan drew public attention away almost at once; we were too full of the glory of a warlike campaign and a triumph in war to have much interest left for a proposal in favor of universal peace. Then the Dreyfus case took up a great space in the newspapers every day, and there was the assassination of the Empress of Austria, and there were fears that the French were about to come across our war-path in the Nile Valley; and the truth is that the readers of newspapers generally soon forgot all about the Czar's proposal.

People in this country do not care much at present about abstract propositions in favor of peace. There is a common impression all over the country that England has not been doing very well in foreign affairs of late; that she has been outwitted by Russia; that she is intrigued against by Germany; that the French are as likely as not to come

across her path in one part of Africa or the other; and, on the whole, that it is about time for her to be doing something very big if she wants to maintain her place in the music-halls of London. I have asked several intelligent persons who profess to feel very strongly on the subject; but I have not as yet got any answer that seemed to me quite satisfactory. One friend tells me that the great thing would be to "chaw up" Russia; but I am a man ignorant of military affairs, and I do not exactly know how that operation is to be instantaneously accomplished. Another friend is of opinion that we ought at once to annex the greater portion of China; but this, too, seems to my un-instructed mind an achievement which, even if easy of accomplishment in itself, would hardly tend to increase the good will of the great Powers of Europe toward us. In the meantime the proposal of the Czar hangs fire. We are sadly in want of some strong, commanding voice to speak out for a peace policy in England; we have no one now who even tries to play the part which was once performed by Cobden and Bright; nor have I heard that from the pulpits of England has come any general appeal in favor of a policy of peace. The idea seems to have gone out of fashion somehow; and I am strongly inclined to believe that the Minister who first gets us into a war with some foreign Power will be, for a time at least, the most popular Minister England has lately known. I am sorry for it. I think England would have done a wise and a great thing by giving a cordial and universal welcome to the proposal of the Czar, and by setting about earnestly with heart and brain to make the scheme for general peace as far as possible a reality. But then, as the readers of THE INDEPENDENT are probably aware,