

seen the Presbyterians, proudly pointing to their rigid ecclesiastical system and their definite and obligatory creed as effective bulwarks against all innovation. They sadly shake their heads when they talk of the "New Departure" in the Congregational Church, and begin planting missions of their own in New England so as to be ready for anything that may happen. Yet some of them are half-conscious that they may be making the same mistake which Principal Tulloch showed was made, in supposing that the Scottish churches had remained quiescent in religious thought because they maintained the old Calvinistic creeds intact. It must cause a sense of hollowness in Presbyterian self-satisfaction to remember that some of the most outspoken leaders of the Andover movement were, until recently, Presbyterians, honored and unquestioned leaders.

Then there must be some ground for disquiet in the attitude of the hyper-orthodox Presbyterian Church of the South. That body makes no concealment of its conviction that the Northern Presbyterians are not safely orthodox. This conviction is now, probably, the greatest obstacle in the way of a union between the two churches. In fact, it would seem that one effect of these recent theological disturbances will be indefinitely to adjourn the question of a general union of the Protestant sects—a union heralded by many as an event of the near future. All attempts towards such a consolidation, thus far, have been rather sentimental than practical. Aside from an extremely limited co-operation on some missionary fields, little has been accomplished beyond the exchange of vague inter-denominational compliments and greetings. It has not been possible to form a basis of doctrinal agreement. It seems certain that these recent revelations of theological differences so marked within the bounds of a single denomination will make a general Protestant union still more out of the question.

We should be sorry to be thought to see in these movements within religious circles nothing of significance for the larger interests of truth and liberty. These varied theological opinions and disturbances seem to be necessary stages in the slow education of mankind. Count Tolstoi speaks of the curious way in which an individual often reproduces in his personal development the historical progress of the thought of the race, as in the embryo the different steps in the evolution of its ancestry are displayed. In a similar way it would seem to be sometimes the fate of a denomination to represent in epitome the whole history of religious thought. Certainly we cannot hesitate to pronounce fragmentary and divisive Protestantism vastly better than the dead solidarity of religion in Spain and Turkey. It is as much better as liberty is better than slavery, intelligence than superstition, progress than stagnation.

COÖPERATION AND CHARACTER.

THE British diplomatic agents have made a report on coöperation in various countries, and it has been issued in a small volume, of which we find a summary in the *London Daily News*. Nothing can be more interesting than

experiments in coöperation, because it is the only one of the proposed solutions of the "labor problem" which has even a flavor of rationality about it. We include profit-sharing under the same term, for it is a form of coöperation, and depends for its success on an appeal to the same motives. Among European countries, France occupies by far the foremost place in the field of coöperation in production. Coöperation in consumption, which has been so successful in England, the French, for some unexplained reason, have never taken to. But they have set up more coöperative societies for production, and carried them on more successfully, than any other country. Before the Franco-German war they were numerous, and some of them very successful. A society of working pianomakers, for instance, starting with simply their own little savings, were worth \$8,000 in two or three years. The war and the Commune ruined most of them, and there has been no revival of the movement. Those who are disposed to try industrial experiments have for the most part joined the Socialists and Anarchists, and are clamoring for the conversion of the whole State into a coöperative association. In fact, the success of the coöperative associations in France destroyed or greatly damaged coöperation as a solution of the "labor problem," in the eyes of the discontented working class in France. This is an extraordinary and at first sight-puzzling fact, but the explanation of it is easy, and we commend it to the attention of all who are pottering over the labor problem in this country.

The explanation is this: All the experiments made brought out, more clearly than is possible under the wage system, the part played by character in producing industrial success. "The fate of these institutions," the *Daily News* says, "was in exact conformity with the law of all human endeavor. Where the associated workmen were prudent, honest, laborious, and self-denying, they were prospered; where they were not, they failed." The result was, that in spreading they tended to create a sort of natural aristocracy in the working class, and to mark off the prudent, honest, laborious, and self-denying from the shiftless, dishonest, lazy, and extravagant. The associations had to get rid of their less capable and trustworthy members as a condition of success, and associations which were not made up in the main of picked men soon went to the wall. This ruined them in the eyes of the inferior workmen and in the eyes of the labor agitators. These last in France are now the worst enemies of coöperation. They discourage all attempts at it, and preach in more and more savage tones the great gospel of "Collectivity," which proposes to have the "State" take possession of all property, and hire each person to do his particular kind of labor.

This is a very instructive phenomenon, which we advise our professorial and clerical Socialists to study carefully. Trades unions, including the Knights of Labor as at present conducted in the United States, all have in view the concealment of those differences of character and capacity which the coöperative associations

bring to light. The object of the former is to arrange the work of production in every field, in such a way that it shall not be possible to perceive which of any dozen men working together is the ablest, or most skilful, or most industrious; and that the lazy, or shirking, or incapable man shall escape the penalties with which he is, under our present civilization, remorselessly pursued. In other words, they want to eliminate from industry the influence of character on success. They seek to overthrow in the moral world the law of the survival of the fittest. They insist that all shall survive, both the fit and unfit; that virtue shall not have even the reward of achievement, and that the qualities which most distinguish man from the brutes shall not profit any individual man materially. The savage war on non-union men to force them to enter the unions is carried on in furtherance of the same idea. They are hindrances to the dead-level system. Of course the unions might be conducted without this system. They might give free play to individual superiority; but to do so without exciting heartburnings and jealousies would call for greater skill in management than has yet been displayed.

Correspondence.

REPUBLICANS AND FREE TRADE IN MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You seem to think that the nomination of Mr. Robinson, "a pronounced anti-protectionist," as you call him, by the Republicans of the Detroit district is an indication of a change of opinion on their part regarding the tariff. Permit me to call this an error, and to tell you why Robinson was nominated and who he is.

Your article in the same number of your paper regarding Henry George's candidacy for Mayor of your city makes me think that the information might interest you, as their cases are to some extent analogous, and perhaps your readers would like to hear a little about practical politics in Michigan. Mr. Robinson has for many years been an enthusiastic leader of the Greenback party of this district, but has not refused outside help to get an office. At present he is a justice of the peace, the election to which office he obtained on a Greenback-Labor nomination, supported by a bargain under which his party supported the rest of the Republican candidates in return for their endorsement of Robinson. Mr. Robinson has been one of the leaders of labor organizations that have exercised a reign of terror in this city during the last year, crippled business, and compelled workmen to suffer want when they had a fine chance of earning good wages. He has never advised deeds of violence directly, but has made speeches at socialistic meetings denouncing capitalists, banks, etc., which must of necessity have had a pernicious effect on his uneducated hearers. Some of those speeches he would now like to have forgotten, and in a discreditable manner he *now* denounces the then reports of the same as false. In short, Mr. Robinson might be called a demagogue, for he has the character and ambition to be one, but lacks the ability even for that rôle. His election would in some respects have the same results as that of Mr. Henry George, which you consider so very grave.

Some time ago the labor organizations of this city nominated him for Congress on a free-trade, greenback, silver, anti-monopoly, etc., platform.

Subsequently the Democrats nominated a very able though somewhat dissolute man on a free-trade platform, and then the Republicans, knowing what little chance they had in this Democratic district against those two candidates, began to look around for a candidate of their own. Disregarding Robinson's political character and history, his principles, or those of his party, so antagonistic to their own, they nominated or rather endorsed him as the only man who, owing to his labor associations, had a chance of being elected, adopting, however, a high-tariff plank in their platform; and Robinson, carried away by ambition, accepted their endorsement, and now stands before us as a candidate on two platforms as much opposed to each other as possible.

Success is what the Republicans want, cost what it may; success is the consideration for which Robinson casts aside, or rather embraces, all principles. It is touching to hear how Republicans try to reconcile their tariff views with their wishes for the welfare of the laboring men who suppose that their candidate stands on a free-trade platform. They of course point out the difference in favor of American laborers between them and their brethren in Europe, and ascribe it to the results of a providential Republican tariff legislation. This must be puzzling to many. The laboring man who votes for Robinson has, however, his choice between a free-trade and high-tariff candidate combined in one individual, and is sure to see his condition bettered in any event. This, again, must be most gratifying to the laboring man.

The Republican party managers, however, understand their business and know their man. They perceive how even now the flattery of a Republican nomination, the friendly smile of their prominent men, has intoxicated Robinson, how he is now already polishing up his old Republicanism; and they correctly assume that, if by any chance he should be elected, he will be one of theirs, and his further political career will be under their control, for he is ambitious and weak, and they are powerful and influential. The Republican party in Michigan is a lumber, copper, and iron party, and will see to it that no free-traders are elected with its assistance. As a matter of fact, there is little chance of Robinson's election, but his endorsement is a shrewd scheme to catch the labor vote with a Republican hook to be used on future occasions.

Yours respectfully,

W. E. H.

DETROIT, MICH., October 5, 1886.

MICHIGAN'S SALOONS AND FOREIGN POPULATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As bearing upon the labor problem and the liquor traffic, the following statistics drawn from vol. i, Census of Michigan, 1884, just issued by the Secretary of State, Lansing, Mich., are of peculiar interest.

In Michigan in the year 1884, 80,131 persons, ten years of age or over, were returned as unable to read or write. Of this number 225 were of unknown nativity; 15,743 were born of native parents; 6,338 had foreign-born parents; 2,359 had one parent foreign-born; and the remaining 53,053 were themselves foreign-born. The total population of the State was 1,853,658, and the total of inhabitants whose parents were one or both foreign-born was 975,144. In other words, 54 per cent. of the population furnished 80 per cent. of the illiteracy.

The number of saloon-keepers and bar-tenders was returned at 3,894, and the number of brewers and malsters at 557. "Expressed approximately, the foreign-born inhabitants who form but 26 per cent. of the total population, furnish

57 per cent. of the saloon-keepers and bar-tenders, and 78 per cent. of the brewers and malsters."

In the light of such a showing, the wisdom of the aggressive immigration policy pursued by Michigan until recently appears to have been foolishness, if not something worse.—Respectfully,

ERWIN F. SMITH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 9, 1886.

THE MADISON POST-OFFICE AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your issue of September 30 contains a letter from "Civil-Service Reform" which, uncontradicted, might mislead many of your readers and give forth wrong impressions. He says: "The Post-office here had been pretty thoroughly cleared of its old employees before this,* and their places given to inexperienced men; but there remained a Mr. Hastreiter, mailing clerk, . . . and a Mr. Helen, superintendent of the special delivery, likewise possessed of information which it takes years to acquire." He says, further: "These men were notified that after the first of the month they would no longer be wanted, and new and inexperienced men were appointed in their places—a most flagrant disregard of the city's interests," etc.

As to Mr. Hastreiter, he is one of those good-natured souls the public would rather not have disturbed—but he is a Republican, and must go. As to Mr. Helm (not Helen), he is a younger brother of the Assistant Postmaster, and, before his advent to the position of one of the four route-carriers, was delivery clerk—a place in which he rendered himself so obnoxious to those who had business at the "general delivery," that his displacement was loudly clamored for by Republicans and Democrats, women and children. To appease this clamor, Gen. Bryant, then Postmaster, relieved him from the delivery window and put him upon one of the carrier routes. That he has been faithful in the discharge of his duties, I have never heard questioned; but it goes without saying among those with whom he came in contact that he was always grouty, ill-tempered, and never deigned to give a civil answer to any one on any occasion. There never has been an employee in the Post-office here about whom there has been so general and warrantable complaint as this same man Helm, and it is immensely gratifying to all who have any business with the Post-office that his head has gone to the basket; and there is little doubt that "Civil-Service Reform" is as pleased over it as any one else, only that he is shy of acknowledging it.

"Civil-Service Reform" suggests that "if the public generally is so thoroughly disgusted with its dose as the better class of citizens of this city are with this incident," then "even Mr. Cleveland's chances of reelection are few." The writer hereof is a Republican, always has been, and is free to say there are hundreds of other Republicans in this city who vigorously applaud the author of "this incident," and only regret that it came not sooner.

REFORMER.

MADISON, WIS., October, 1886.

RESULTS OF BAD TEACHING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I was lately in a company of well-to-do gentlemen, a sort of circle of culture, in which the Anarchists of Chicago were discussed, and from them by an easy transition the conversation turned to the strikers and their evil ways. With singular unanimity the opinion was expressed:

(1.) That every man has the right to refuse

* Referring to Postmaster-General Villas's recent visit here—about the middle of September.

working at wages which he thinks too low, or on any other conditions which he dislikes.

(2.) That workingmen have the right to combine in such refusal in any numbers, in order to make this refusal effective; in short, they have the right to strike.

(3.) That they have, however, no right to prevent others who are willing to work at lower wages, or on less favorable conditions (in short, rats or scabs), by force from taking the places which they vacate; nor even to use the pressure of a "boycott" for any such purpose, though without such force or conspiracy their strike might fail. Hence, the strikers at Milwaukee, Chicago, and on the Missouri Railroad system were in the wrong; and any violence committed by them, if it resulted in death, was murder, both in law and in morals.

I agree with the reasoning and in the result reached; but I maintain that there are strong mitigating circumstances for all the violence and murder that was instigated by Martin Irons and August Spies, and their ignorant or crackbrained associates—reasons why society, why the people of the United States, should judge their doings mildly. I find these mitigating circumstances in the bad teaching which has come from the leaders of both of our great political parties, in the emission of false doctrines from the high places where wisdom and truth should have been expected.

In Chicago itself, where mob violence took the most dread-inspiring form and the most colossal dimensions, these false and misleading doctrines had been most loudly and most authoritatively preached. Not to speak of the platform of the Republicans, we need only look among the resolutions of the Democratic National Convention, held in the great City of the Lakes in the summer of 1884, to find such socialistic rant as this: that in order to secure the American laborer (say, an unnaturalized Bohemian or Slovak) against the pauper labor of Europe, a customs duty should be imposed on imported articles sufficiently great to make up for the difference in the scale of wages. Translate this into the language of the strikers:

(1.) A hand in a pig-iron furnace can refuse to work for less than \$2 a day.

(2.) All the hands in all the American pig-iron furnaces can combine in this refusal, and thus keep the rate up to \$2 a day.

(3.) If any workman in England, Sweden, or Belgium propose to work at \$1 a day and thereby furnish to the American consumer cheaper pig iron—ah, what then? Then the ships bringing the product of this labor of scabs or rats to our shores are to be forced by the revenue cutters of our Government to turn back, and if they disobey, ships and cargo will be sunk rather than that scabs should be allowed to compete with that great trades union which the tariff has established among all pig-iron workers in the United States. Or say, instead of pig-iron workers, all the silk-weavers, all the wool-growers, all the cotton-spinners, etc. (By the by, the Oleomargarine Bill has extended this socialistic principle a little; the "bull-butter men" are simply scabs trying to compete with the Dairymen's Association.)

Now, what is the difference in morals between Martin Irons and his followers, who ditch trains and "kill" locomotives, to prevent men not belonging to the order of Knights of Labor from working for Gould's railroad companies, or August Spies, seeking to drive unpaid scabs out of the McCormick Reaper Factory, on the one hand, and Randall and Kelley, using the armed vessels of the United States to prevent English and Belgian miners or French weavers from working for the American iron or cloth market? There is a marked difference in law between them: Martin Irons and August Spies have not