The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1892.

Subscription by Mail—Post-Paid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70
WEEKLY, Per Year	1 00

Postage to Foreign Countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for the purpose.

Arbitration.

The talk of the fools about settling the Homestead strike by arbitration reminds us of the proposition made by Mrs. NICKLEBY to settle the dispute over the custody of SMIKE, when the wretch SQUEERS was trying to get him into his power. She said that "if some fair arrangement was come to, so that we undertook to have fish twice a week, and a pudding twice, or a dumpling, or something of that sort, I do think that it might be very satisfactory and pleasant for all parties."

The Homestead strikers demand not only that they shall be paid wages to be fixed by themselves, but that no other men willing to work for the wages they refuse shall be allowed to work at all; and were it not for the presence of the military, they would beat, wound, and even kill every man not belonging to their gang who attempted to enter the mill.

We should like to have the fools explain what it is, under these circumstances, that they propose shall be arbitrated, and how they propose to enforce the award of the arbitrators when it is made.

The Sympathetic Strike.

That supreme council of striker sovereignty, the Advisory Committee of the Amalgamated Association, labored on Sunday afternoon with a delegation of railroad men, representatives of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the organizations of conductors, brakemen, firemen, and so on. Having pretty good evidence that they have failed in their own strike, the striker sovereigns of Homestead are anxious to arrange for a repetition of that inevitable sentimental failure, the sympathetic strike. This has already been tried in the CARNEGIE mills at Duquesne and other points, with the customary attempts or threats of violence against non-sympathetic and non-union men who are foolish enough to stick to the exploded notion that this is a free country in which even a man without the tag and label of a union has a right to live and try to make an honest living. After getting out the workmen who run the CARNEGIE plant, the Advisory Committee seeks to persuade the employees of the railroads to refuse to handle the product which may be turned out by such non-union men as fear of the militia may induce the striker sovereigns to allow to occupy temporarily the various CARNEGIE works. If a general railroad strike can be brought about, the opportunities and the area of violence will be greatly extended, the Pennsylvania militia will have other and perhaps stiffer work to do than watching Homestead, and the striker sovereigns can resume control of the property of their former employers, and make life interesting to the nefarious scabs and rats who have been willing to earn an honest dollar in the face of the commands of the striker sovereigns.

Let us lay bare, if you please, the sympathetic nerve which the Amalgamated Association is touching for the purpose of producing a sympathetic strike of the employees of the railroads in Pennsylvania.

The railroad employees have been warned that "their lives will pay the forfeit if they switch a single car in the interest of the CARNEGIE Company."

*For several days freight crews who run through Homestead have been warned that a terrible fate would befall them should they presume to move a car in or out of the CARNEGIE works.

"Two weeks ago a striker jumped onto a freight engine at Munhall station, and threatened to blow out the brains of the engineer if he dared to shift a car."

Oh, sympathy; oh, heavenly sympathy! Your money or your life, says the road agent, and the gentleman thus pungently addressed hands over the cash, not from compulsion, but from sympathy.

The Case of the Punished Soldier.

We have received a number of letters condemning, in terms more or less vehement, the punishment inflicted upon a private soldier in the camp at Homestead, for publicly rejoicing in the attempt to murder Mr. FRICK. The subjoined is a specimen of these letters:

"SIR: Has THE SUN the courage to condemn the cowardly and inhuman conduct of Col. STREATOR in ordering that a private soldier should be strung up by the thumbs for saying, as he had a right to say, that he was glad that FRICK had been shot? Does such high-handed outrage tend to maintain order or military discipline, or will it not tend to increase the natural hatred that the people have for the military power?"

In order to judge aright the conduct of Col. STREATOR and Gen. SNOWDEN in this case, it would be necessary to understand the military law of Pennsylvania and to know whether the punishment of holding up by the thumbs is allowed in it. It is an old military punishment, and it may still be retained as a part of the code of Pennsylvania; and the presumption that it is in force there is strengthened by the fact that Gen. SNOWDEN, who certainly must be familiar with the whole subject, approved of it and added to it the additional punishment of having half the head shaved and being drummed out of camp and dismissed in disgrace from the military service of the State, which carries with it political disfranchisement.

Was this punishment cowardly and inhuman, as our correspondent alleges, or was it merely adequate to the offence that had been committed? That offence was of the most serious character, and to pass it over would have been to abandon any idea of maintaining discipline in the camp. An attempt at murder had been made. Mr. FRICK had been shot three times in the back, and had been stabbed with a knife in several places. So far as the assassin was concerned, the attempt was complete, and only good fortune and remarkable activity and tenacity had saved the life of Mr. FRICK. When the soldier declared that he was glad that this murder had been attempted, he declared himself in full sympathy with the murderer. He adopted the murder as his own. He praised it. He gloried in it. It is vain to argue that this is a free country and that he had a right to express his opinion. No man can have a right to glory in murder or to incite others to commit murder. Least of all can this be allowed in a soldier who is under arms to prevent murder.

It is evident that a soldier like this was not worthy to wear the uniform of Pennsylvania or to associate with honest and upright men on any equal terms. To dismiss him in disgrace was indispensable; and it was also indispensable to deal with him in a manner that should make his case a deterrent example in the mind of any other wretch, if there were such in the command, who might share his villainy and, like him, rejoice in assassination. The cutting off of his buttons, the shaving of his head, and the drumming out of camp were all in accordance with military usage and discipline. The only point about which there can be any question was the tying up by the thumbs; and on this point, as we have said, it is necessary to consult the military law of Pennsylvania before deciding. It is evident, however, that some style of physical punishment was in the line of military precedent in addition to dismissal in disgrace. If the event had happened fifty years ago the soldier would doubtless have been whipped in addition; and if it had happened a hundred years ago he would probably have been shot by order of a drum-head court martial. At any rate, whatever the pain he may have suffered, it could not equal the atrocity and baseness of his rebellion, and we do not think it likely that Gen. SNOWDEN went beyond the law in ordering it.

Facts About Pensions.

While there is no divergence of sentiment or of political conviction among Democrats, North or South, East or West, respecting the obligation of the Federal Government to assist and, if need be, provide for those persons disabled in its military service, or the survivors of those who fell in sustaining it, the pension question is a much more important issue in Western or Northwestern than in the Eastern or Southern States. Thus it is that while in Eastern States the subject of pensions is referred to by Republican conventions, and rarely by those of the Democracy, the two parties in the States of the West and Northwest vie with each other in expressions of friendly interest in the affairs of the old soldiers. The reason of this is better understood when the transactions of the various agencies are compared. The roll of army and navy pensioners is as follows in the States of the West and Northwest in which, according to the Federal census of 1890, the total population was 22,559,329:

Columbus	72,862	Milwaukee	84,041
Topeka	62,559	Detroit	36,387
Indianapolis	67,171	San Francisco	10,337
Chicago	54,336		
Des Moines	40,541	Total	367,725

The six New England States, and the three Middle States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, have, collectively, 17,401,545 population. Of the 2,300,000 troops who went to the front from the North, these States furnished 1,283,295, or more than one-half, and yet the roll of war pensioners in the seven agencies of the East is 150,000 less than are carried at the eight agencies of the West:

Boston	37,638	Concord	21,446
Philadelphia	37,529	Augusta	15,764
Buffalo	36,317		
New York	32,491	Total	212,899
Pittsburgh	32,040		

The Southern and border States, with a population of 22,601,376 (a little in excess of the North and Northwest), have three agencies and only 100,000 pensioners. In other words, the Western States appear to be more interested in pension legislation than, as we have said, are the States of the South and East, and the Republicans in Congress have shown themselves most solicitous for the Western applicants, as was shown by the act of 1890, whereby the largest volume of increase was in the Western and the least in the Eastern territory. Thus 13,000 names were added to the roll at the Columbus agency, against 3,900 at Boston; 15,000 in Topeka against 4,200 in New York, and 7,000 in Chicago against 948 in Augusta.

Ohio had, according to the latest report at hand, 15,000 more pensioners than New York, and Indiana 55,000 to New York's 60,000, though Indiana's population is 2,100,000 and New York's 6,000,000. The multiplication of pension charges against the Treasury, unpopular hereabouts except where dictated by indubitable evidence of justice and fair dealing, appears to be equally popular with both parties in the Western States. The Democrats are certainly liberally disposed in their willingness to bestow rewards to the old soldiers and sailors and their survivors. "We express ourselves," declared our friends, the Democrats of Nebraska, at their State Convention of Aug. 14, 1890, at Omaha, "as heartily in favor of pensioning every wounded and deserving veteran, and giving him such a pension as will secure him against want for the remainder of his days, and of making like provision for the widow and orphan." "The gratitude of a generous people, and a wise national policy," declared the Democrats of Oregon at their Portland Convention, "alike demand that the Government provide with a liberal hand for the wants of those who suffered by wounds and disease in the late war, and likewise for such dependent persons as were deprived of their natural protectors and supporters." "Liberal and just pensions" were favored by the Democrats of Michigan; "liberal pension laws," insisted the Democrats of Kansas; "just, liberal, and equitable pension laws for all invalid and dependent soldiers and sailors, their widows and orphans," declared the Democrats of Iowa; "a just and liberal pension system," was the demand of the Democrats of Indiana; "a system of pensions so liberal as to relieve from want the gallant veterans whose heroism successfully defended the republic, and such legislation as will secure relief to every deserving applicant for a pension," was what was favored by the Democrats of Minnesota, while the Democrats of Idaho and Montana demanded liberal pensions, and the Democrats of South Dakota favored a service pension for all participants in the struggle, whether wounded or not. "We denounce," added the Democrats of Indiana to their demand for more pensions, "the Republican party for making pledges to the veterans in 1888 which have not been redeemed, and we warn them against further attempts of deception from the same quarter."

If They Shelve Home Rule.

We should be prepared for the disclosure of a desire on the part of some Gladstonians to sidetrack the home rule project, even in the absence of the warning uttered by Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR and of the declarations made by Prof. STUART and other English Radicals. Plausible, too, at first sight, are the grounds on which it is proposed to postpone the concession of self-government to Ireland until measures have been taken to more thoroughly propitiate the masses of English workingmen in town and country. Upon close scrutiny, however, it will be seen that Mr. GLADSTONE could not afford to take the course suggested, and that the Liberals would have more to lose than gain by deferring even for a short period the fulfilment of their promises to the Irish Nationalist party.

It is, of course, true that Gladstonian voters, like other Englishmen, have their share of selfishness, and care much less about restoring a Parliament to Dublin than they do about furthering reforms that would come much more directly home to their business and bosoms. Thus, what is particularly desired by working people in the British metropolis, which even now, be it remembered, under a most unjust apportionment returns 59 members to Parliament, is a great extension of the powers of the London County Council. Then, the English agricultural laborer is wrought upon by nothing so powerfully as by the hope of seeing the Allotments act, passed by the last Parliament, improved by making the allotments compulsory instead of optional with the landlord, and also by making the distribution of such allotments the function of a parish rather than a county council. There are other innovations which what may be called the masses, as opposed to the classes, are unanimous in wishing—as, for instance, the abolition of plural voting and the removal of other electoral inequalities by the adoption of the "one man one vote" principle. In the same category of highly popular reforms should be placed the payment of salaries to members of Parliament, which, once established, would probably be followed by the transfer of election expenses from the candidates to the imperial exchequer or to the constituencies.

Now, it may be true that the Gladstonians would have carried a larger number of seats in the new House of Commons if they had abandoned the idea of giving Ireland home rule and had confined themselves to putting forward the reforms above mentioned. But no one imagines that in any event they could have carried more seats than they did in December, 1885, yet in the Parliament that followed that election they were not strong enough to govern without the aid of Mr. PARNELL'S followers. They are much more disqualified for an independent course to-day, for even with the assistance of 71 McCarthyites and 9 Redmondites they can only muster a majority of 42. They are, therefore, utterly at the mercy of the Irish Nationalist party, and they must keep their pledges to it under penalty of being instantly driven from office, even if without the most decisive assurances they are permitted to form a government.

The Liberal-Unionists are not numerous enough—supposing that they and the Gladstonians might be brought together again on the basis of throwing over Ireland—to give Mr. GLADSTONE a majority. In the presence of such a combination the eighty Nationalists would support the Tories and retain them in power or restore them to it. There is, therefore, no escape for British Liberals from a loyal execution of their promise to give Ireland self-government, and we do not believe that Mr. GLADSTONE himself has ever contemplated retreat from the position which he took in June, 1886.

The Momentous and the Imaginary.

Our able contemporary, the *Buffalo Courier*, looks forward with high anticipation to a debate on the tariff by two of the most conspicuous members of the Senate:

"Before the final adjournment of Congress there will be two important speeches in the Senate. One will be made by Senator ALDRICH in defence of McKinleyism, and the other by Senator CARLISLE in opposition to McKinleyism. It is not improbable that Senator CARLISLE'S speech will be the big practical speech of the Presidential year."

These speeches may be interesting as literary exercises or as discussions upon topics of small present importance, showing what can be done by acuteness and learning to make debate interesting in spite of unfavorable circumstances. But as to exerting any influence upon the coming election, these speeches will be of very little value on either side. The tariff is not a decisive or even a momentous issue. What is to wake up the minds and stir the blood of Americans is the Force bill and the question of reviving Negro Domination in the South. In comparison with that, the tariff is almost as trivial as the silver question and the civil service reform question, which have both sunk so far out of sight that Mr. CLEVELAND did not once mention them or allude to them in his remarkable notification speech.

So long as there is danger of Federal control of all our elections, and of Negro Domination in some of the Southern States, the tariff is of no more importance than the peculiarities of last year's harvest or of next year's tides.

But let Messrs. ALDRICH and CARLISLE go ahead with their speeches, and let those who take delight in such gymnastical efforts pay to them as much attention as they like. Meanwhile let all free and untrammelled spirits prepare to vote against the Force bill and against Negro Domination.

It Can Never Be.

That sagacious observer and clear thinker, Mr. MATTHEW MARSHALL, is of the opinion that the present tendency of society is toward "a complete organization of all workingmen on one side, confronting a complete organization of employers on the other," and that the dealings between the two forces, which may be called respectively Labor and Capital, will come to resemble dealings between sovereign nations. "The individual workman will be reduced to the position of the individual citizen of a nation, and like him have to submit to the will of the majority, no matter what may be his individual preferences."

Such an outlook is not pleasing to the independent notions of MATTHEW MARSHALL, and it must be repulsive to every man who loves liberty and hates tyranny. If the opposing forces of Labor and Capital be thus organized, we shall have two distinct and fixed classes. The man who works for wages will not be an individual free to govern his own affairs, but a member of the class of Labor and subject to its domination. He may as well be designated by a number as by an individual name.

Belonging to the class of Labor once, a man will be likely to belong to it always. Son will follow father, and the chances of advancement which hitherto have stimulated ambition and provoked industry and thrift will be reduced greatly if not destroyed. The tendency will be toward class uniformity. Individual enterprise will be discouraged in the workman. He will be fastened to the class of Labor and will have to submit to its decisions. As the class of Capital will be his enemy, so it will treat him as its enemy. Neither will have any sense of obligation to the other. There will be no human sympathy between them. It will be as if the race of men were divided into two different and distinct species, the employers and the workers.

Every man will be born into the one class or the other, and his classification will remain and be distinguishable. If he is not a capitalist, he will have to join a labor union in order to get his bread; and he will be obliged to submit to its laws. He will have no freedom. He will be bound down to his class.

Can such a state of society ever come to pass in this country and this age? Will the individuality of men ever submit to such extinction? Will men consent to come under the tyranny of Labor, even as a remedy for what they may regard as the tyranny of Capital? While still subject to the laws of trade, of demand and supply, will they also, of their own free will, subject themselves to the despotism of Labor?

The instinct of freedom and the pride in individuality are too strong among men for them ever to go down willingly into such slavery and such self-effacement.

For Senator from Pennsylvania.

The office of Chairman of the National Committee of either political party in a Presidential fight is an unremunerated service. The incumbent is paid by the thanks and plaudits of his party, if the ticket is successful; and he is the recipient of the blame and censure of its members, if the ticket fails. Beyond the pleasure and satisfaction of laboring in the sultry months of summer to promote the interests of the party, the Chairman gets no return; his diligence is its own reward.

There is, however, what has been accepted by some persons as an unwritten law in politics, which permits the manager of a Presidential canvass, who has been faithful to his trust and has capably led his party, to return to his own State for recognition, usually in the form of an election to the United States Senate. Thus WILLIAM H. BARNUM, after the glorious TILDEN campaign of 1876, was sent by the grateful Democrats of Connecticut to the United States Senate; ARTHUR P. GORMAN, after his active efforts in the winning fight of 1884, was returned by the Democrats of Maryland to Washington; while CALVIN STEWART BRICE, after the gallant but unsuccessful struggle of 1888, was rewarded by the Democrats of Ohio by a seat beside JOHN SHERMAN.

MATT QUAY'S seat in the United States Senate from the State of Pennsylvania becomes vacant next year. The present Legislature has, it is true, a Republican majority of 86 on joint ballot, but that is no reason why next year's Legislature should not, if so disposed, return a Democrat from Pennsylvania to succeed him. What other Democrat would be thought of under these circumstances but WILLIAM F. HARRITY?

What is the matter with enforcing the confidence and backing up the sanguine hopes of the Pennsylvania Democrats who voted solidly as sixty-four Spartans, under the operation of the unit rule at Chicago, by making Mr. HARRITY the Senatorial candidate of his party in Pennsylvania? If all Democrats rally heartily to his support, and a sufficient number of Republicans assist, nothing could prevent his success, and who would there be to say a consoling word for QUAY then?

The Democrats of Pennsylvania, standing by HARRITY like men and brothers, would tap the well-springs of local enthusiasm in his behalf, and this would materially assist in reducing the formidable Republican majority, if not in wiping it out entirely.

HARRITY for Senator to succeed QUAY; a living Chairman of a national committee in place of an ex-Chairman of a national committee as Senator in Washington.

A saying that is good and great, wise and true, that is often applicable in public affairs, and that is worthy of the political sage who has recently repeated it, runs thus: "Principles are greater than candidates."

The remonstrance of the distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, Archbishop CORRIGAN, as reported in the *Tribune*, against the sacrilegious project of travestying the Crucifixion in a Chicago theatre during the Exposition, ought to put an end to that project. After characterizing the shocking and mercenary project in language of becoming severity, the Archbishop closed his remarks by expressing a "hope that the Christian sentiment of the people of the United States will oppose it." Bishop MCDONNELL of Brooklyn has also spoken of the blasphemous and abominable project in a condemnable way, and so have many priests of the Catholic Church here and elsewhere. Many members of the Protestant clergy have likewise taken occasion to express their abhorrence of the profane and fraudulent project.

It can hardly be believed that, under these circumstances, the Vienna theatrical managers who got up the project of performing the "Passion Play" at the Chicago Exposition will persist in their determination to outrage the religious sentiment of the American people.

Under the title, "The New York Clergy," the *Tribune* prints an article in which we notice this dialogue:

"'What do you think of our New York clergy?' I asked a dear old country parson visiting the city, who has not changed the least of his views for the last forty years. 'Well,' he said, sadly, 'I found a few believers among them; but, dear me, how friendly they are with the heretics. They visit and joke with them just as though they were sound in the faith. I don't understand it.'"

It is no wonder that this old country parson was sad, and he would perhaps have been yet sadder if he had heard a remark that was recently made by another parson here. "I am an Episcopalian clergyman," he said, speaking slowly, "an Episcopalian, with leanings toward Christianity!"

When the steamer H. F. Dimock crashed into Mr. VANDERBILT'S yacht Alva in the fog, last Sunday morning, it is not disputed that the Alva's bell was ringing. But passengers who were on the Dimock's deck at the time assert that they did not hear the bell until just a moment before the collision took place; and the Captain of the Dimock says he heard only a "tinkling" sound. Evidently, under ordinary conditions the Alva's bell should have given warning soon enough and loudly enough for the Dimock to have steered clear of her, and its failure to do this calls to mind other instances of the same nature which have happened abroad and which not long ago led to an investigation of the subject by the celebrated Professor TYNDALL. Professor TYNDALL made numerous experiments on the south coast of England, the result of which was to convince him that there are states of the atmosphere in which it is, as it were, opaque to sound, as a fog is opaque to light, that is, it cuts off the spread of sound as effectually as if it were cotton wool. Possibly some such atmospheric conditions may have existed at the time and place of the accident to the Alva.

A Western writer says that "while New York is boastful, she does not shine in the world's literary horizon like Paris, where there are a thousand brilliant authors." We can assure this critic that there is a literary galaxy in New York, and that new stars are constantly appearing. We could not, without seeming to be invidious, give a list of the remarkable authors who have their abode here; but we are sure that by looking over the city directory, which is an excellent aid to the memory, we could name a full thousand of them, a thousand men and women who deserve celebrity as authors of works in prose and verse. Let our Western critic examine any good literary catalogue containing the titles of all the American books published during the present generation, and he will get some idea of the number of authors belonging to New York. He will not deny that there are writers of quality among them.

Then let him send in a complete list of the first-class *littérateurs* in Chicago, for example, which is a big settlement, or in any other place in his own region of our glorious Union. We shall look in his list for the names that have a world-wide fame. After he has scanned the records of the cities of the East as well as of the West, we shall be ready to ask him whether the census of Philadelphia's authors or of Boston's authors is one-half as big as that of New York's authors.

We admit that Paris has more men of literary ability than New York; but we assert that New York is forging to the front, and that she will yet get there.

Mr. LOUIS WINDMÜLLER, one of the most distinguished of our German Mugwumps, has an article on the silver question in the *Forum* for August, whereof this is the concluding paragraph:

"To repeal the SHERMAN act would leave us with an unsalable stock of silver larger than that held by any other nation, which would remain, a monument to our folly, for many years. To continue it, must lead eventually to national bankruptcy, an end to which free coinage can bring us more speedily."

This reminds us of that famous creature that can't live on land and dies in the water.

We suppose there is no better beer anywhere than some of that brewed in this country, or here in New York. It is reported that a few dealers are now selling beer at three cents a glass, instead of the old price of five cents; but experts of large experience say that this cheap stuff is of poor quality, and that it is served in mugs which hold less than those of the approved size. We are in favor of selling all articles of food and drink as cheaply as they can be afforded; but, after giving heed to the arguments of brewers and beer dealers, we must doubt that the very best quality of beer can be profitably sold by retail for less than five cents a glass, a properly filled glass, we mean. We consider it really very cheap at that price, which is a price not beyond the means of even people of small income who consume it in moderation. We shall not be surprised to hear of the three-cent dealers failing to attain prosperity, or of their having trouble with critical customers.

THE ANARCHISTS AT HOMESTEAD.

Are They Greater Than the Law, or Less?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* "The "Advisory Committee" is the name adopted by the revolutionary body which set up a government of its own awhile since at the town of Homestead, and for more than a week held armed possession of that town, defying the authority of the State of Pennsylvania, within whose domain it lies. The banditti under its orders attacked and murdered private citizens acting altogether within their legal rights. They even sought to burn these men alive, a mode of warfare never heard of before since Cromwell devastated Ireland. After the citizens surrendered they treated their prisoners in a manner worthy only of Congo savages. Nor will any one who knows them believe that they received the militia peaceably because they were militia and not "Pinkertons." They had as much right to fire into the one as into the other, and they knew it. The idea, indeed, of banditti respecting law! They attacked the watchmen and did not attack the militia for one reason and one only—that the watchmen were 300 and the militia 4,000 strong. Cowards who fight behind women and children will not fight except at odds of ten to one.

Now the revolutionists issue their manifesto and frankly avow their position, as they would have it considered, while the Gatling guns are trained on them. It is, they say, that a man once hired thereby acquires a right to be hired for his life—and, of course, to have his hirer continue his business, whether at a loss or a profit, for the same period, for his benefit. Preposterous as this is, it does not begin to cover the ground defended just now with dynamite and boiling oil by the revolutionists. They not only asserted this principle of compulsory hiring, but asserted that the hired man had a right to fix the price. It was not that the employer should be compelled to choose an old employe over a substitute proffering himself at the same wages, but that the existing employes must be retained at any wages he might demand, irrespective of competition. But, again, wild as is this absurdity on which they acted, though they dared not formulate it, even this does not exhaust their criminal folly. Granting that an employee can only be hired for life, and that he is the sole judge of the amount of wages to be paid him, the question still remains, How are his rights to be enforced? It would by no means follow that he is justified in taking possession of his employer's property, and refusing admission to officers of the law or other employees.

Let us illustrate: If a merchant contracts with a clerk for a year and discharges him without good cause within that time he breaks a contract and may be sued for damages. If he does not pay them the law steps in, takes possession of the merchant's property, and publicly sells enough of it to reimburse the clerk. But it does not permit the clerk to arm himself and his friends with Winchester rifles, to take possession of the merchant's store, and to kill the watchmen whom the owner sends to guard it. These are simple elements of American law. But the simplest elements of American law are unknown to or ignored by the foreign Socialists and their newspaper lickspittles of this day.

The manual laborer in his arrogance assumes that he alone labors, whereas this whole American people is a laboring people. He is the spoilt child of American civilization. He is better off to-day than any other class of workers in the land; better off than kings were two centuries ago. It is time that he should understand that if he chooses to set his hand against every man, then every man's hand shall be set against him, and that he will be destroyed to any necessary extent before he will be permitted to destroy the reign of law in the republic. Truly yours,

J. T. R.

BALTIMORE, July 23.

Berkman Not a Jew.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The overlying *World*, and ever-prevaricating, makes it appear in this morning's issue that Berkman was connected with the Anarchists who, a few years ago, got up a ball in Brooklyn on the Day of Atonement. Every inquiry has been instituted, and not a single individual can be found among all the Russian emigrants who has ever known a Jew of that name, nor is there any Jewish community either here or in any part of the United States that are able to corroborate that Berkman ever belonged to the Jewish race or belief. He is a foolish and chosen instrument in the hands of the Anarchists and anti-Semites; and, in order to give the matter a coloring, he was selected and Judaism singled out to be injured by connecting him and his crime therewith. Respectfully,

JULIUS HORWITZ.

NEW YORK, July 25.

A Socialist Repudiates the Depraved and Vicious World.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your editorial on the *World's* inciting to riot and anarchy, in to-day's paper, is well timed and in order. Before even you mentioned it in your journal, business men had discussed in my hearing the tendency of the *World* toward disorder, and to pandering to the lowest dregs of society for the mere sake of sensation, of selling more newspapers. I am a Socialist and a patriotic citizen, and that does not imply any belief in mob law, riot, or anarchy. The rights of labor, of humanity, do not necessarily imply disregard of law and order. Burgess McLuckie is reported to have said he was glad Mr. Frick was shot—Mr. Gompers declined to pass an opinion. These men are against us and hurt us by such utterances and non-utterance. Stand up for labor, but not murder or anything allied to it.

I am glad one newspaper in New York has some strength and moral courage. Yours,

JULY 24. REMINGTON.

A Citizen of Ohio Agrees with The Sun.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I enclose New York draft for the daily SUN for a year.

I am unwilling to be without a paper that has taken such a magnificent and fearless stand as your paper has for law and order in connection with the Homestead riot.

Although a Republican, and respectfully but decidedly differing with you on some questions, I wish to add my testimony to that of thousands and hundreds of thousands throughout the United States, that whenever the honor of our common country is attacked, either at home or abroad, or the fundamental principles on which our government is based are to be depleted, THE SUN leads as in the right.

I remain yours very truly,

ELIOT HOYT.

CLEVELAND, July 21.

The Columbus Celebration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The Legislature of this State at its last session passed a bill making Oct. 12 next (the accepted authentic date of the discovery of America by Columbus) a legal holiday. President Harrison's proclamation of this morning fixes Oct. 21 as the date of the discovery, and declares it to be a legal holiday in 1892. Is there not an error somewhere? And will not there be considerable inconvenience in business circles owing both to the difference in the dates and the making of two special legal holidays in one month?

BENJ. CLARKSON.

THE WEST POINT CADETS.

It is Proposed to Make a Considerable Increase in Their Numbers.

WASHINGTON, July 26.—This year's Board of Visitors to the Military Academy has renewed the recommendation of its predecessor that the corps of cadets should be enlarged by the legislation of Congress.

It is questionable, however, whether this is necessary or expedient. There have been many diverse expressions of opinion on this subject. Gen. Grant once said, during a visit to the Academy, that there ought to be a thousand cadets there; but this was probably a hasty expression, intended to show his appreciation of the good work of the school. If proper means were taken to secure as many cadets for the Academy as the existing laws allow, there would not only be a large increase upon the number now there, but many more than are needed for the vacancies in the army.

The number of cadets at the date of last year's report was 284; the number according to the present report is 250. But under the existing law there might be 347. The strength of the corps is fixed at one from each Congress district, one from each Territory, one from the District of Columbia, and ten from the United States at large, these last being appointed by the President. The trouble is, in the first place, that some Congressmen fail to select candidates for appointment from their districts, but, above all, that they often select candidates who cannot pass the examination. Last year, for example, there were seventeen districts from which no appointments were made. Nine who were appointed did not appear; and out of 129 who appeared for examination 39 did not pass. Instead of an alternate in each district, only 64 in all were appointed, and only 30 out of these thought it worth while to appear, and but seven of these were admitted. This is a simple explanation of why only 97 cadets were secured last year to fill 155 vacancies.

If Congressmen would invariably make their appointments in season, and if, as the present Board suggests, they would appoint not one alternate, as hitherto customary, but two, we should see, even with no greater care in selections than now, a large increase in the number that pass and in the size of the classes. This suggestion of two alternates is, in fact, one of the best contributions of the present Board to the discussion.

There is another point to remember. With the coming fall elections the increase in the number of Congressmen will raise the legal strength of the corps to 371. Here is an increase of twenty-four cadets annually made certain. Now, under the present system, with all its deficiencies, there are actually enough graduates every year to fill the vacancies among the Second Lieutenants of the army. In the late assignments it was even necessary to appoint additionals in some branches of the service, as the actual vacancies had been filled. Each year, also, there is a certain number of enlisted men to be commissioned after examination for promotion. It is, therefore, safe to say that, with the increase of twenty-four to be made under the next Congress apportionment, more cadets will be graduated each year than can find places in the army, unless there shall be a cutting down of the promotions among enlisted men, which would not be wise, or a permanent increase in the number of officers, for which no legislation has yet been provided.

Another cause that is likely to operate for the increase in the number of cadets is the new system of examinations at many different places through the country. It has been seen that last year nine principals and thirty-four alternates failed to report for examination at West Point. It must be evident that by holding examinations in distant parts of the country, as well as at West Point, the number of candidates who present themselves will be increased, especially among the alternates. With the chance of the failure of a principal, the only one presented to an alternate, it is natural for him not to lay out much time and money in preparation and in travel, but the new system of local examinations, combined with the selection of two alternates, where this latter suggestion is adopted, must make a difference in the successful candidates.

Still another means of bringing up the number of cadets to what is now contemplated by law would be that of fixing an earlier date for the appointment of candidates, and, on the failure of Congressmen to exercise that privilege, to give it to the President or the War Department. This would insure ample time for preparation, which would mean greater chances of passing the examinations.

It should be said that of late years opinion has tolerably well settled upon the plan of increasing the number of cadets simply by giving the President the appointment of ten cadets annually, instead of ten in four years, as now. This would create an increase of only thirty cadets in the maximum. But the coming increase of twenty-four on account of the new Congress apportionment, really seems large enough in itself at present, since there has been no increase in the authorized force of officers for the line of the army. After a year or two of this increased number it will be time enough to consider whether a further enlargement in the corps of cadets is advisable.

Home Rule for Ireland.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The aspect of things consequent upon the result of the late elections in Great Britain and Ireland is most favorable for home rule for Ireland from the Irish point of view. The reason is that the Irish Nationalists, on Mr. Gladstone's accession to power, will hold a mastery "of the situation" for the compelling of an honest measure of Irish local government. It is mortifying, of course, to the English to appear to be forced to do justice to Ireland, but history shows that the latter will never receive proper treatment from her big "sister" unless by compulsion. The Irish members have only to act together wisely, and with the single aim of their country's advantage, and, even usually a reasonable home rule bill will be passed. The present Tory bluster is for political effect, and betrays the uneasiness of the "Unionists" in view of approaching events. The "Lords" will succumb, as that body has done before, to the determination of the "Commons." So home rule is still another boon to remain, until achieved, the chief and most momentous business of British legislation. Let the Irish hold on to their present grip!

WILLIAM J. MCCLURE.

BARRYTOWN, N. Y., July 25.

Reversible Snakes in India.

From the Hartford Times.

A snake not often heard of, at least in America, is the liver-colored snake with two heads, or perhaps they should be called mouths, though it does not have two mouths at the same time. They are reversible mouths, occupying the opposite end every six months. It lies with the two ends crossed on each other, as with folded hands. Every six months the change of the seasons reverses the functions of the two ends, the head becoming the tail and the tail becoming the head. The mouth at one end heals, or closes up all but a small opening, while the opposite end becomes the mouth for the next six months.

A friend of mine in India who told me about this remarkable snake said he refused for a long time to believe that the functions of the two ends were reversed every six months, but one day he found one of these snakes in the jungle and carried it home, where he had a physician examine it. The result was the physician confirmed the stories of the creature and my friend was skeptical no longer. I learned no other name for this singular reptile than that of "the liver-colored snake."

The Cheapest Drunk.

From the London Tid-Bits.

Besides the "drunk" grass—that is drunk grass—of the Dutch colonists in South Africa, there is in Mongolia another plant with a corresponding native name and similar properties. It is a new species of stipa, which was brought from the Alachan Mountains by a Roman Catholic missionary, where horses were disabled by its intoxicating qualities. In Kamtchatka an intoxicating plant is found of considerable strength. The most common method of using it is to roll it up like a bolus and swallow it whole.

A Lasting Excuse.

From Boston Life.

"I want to get off this afternoon," said Jacky Horner to his employer. "My grandmother's dead."

"Look here," said the employer severely, "didn't I give you an afternoon off a month ago because your grandmother was dead?"

"Yes, sir," replied the unabashed youth. "She is still dead, sir."

Opportunity for a Career.

From Truth.

"Huh!" sneered Willie. "You're nothin' but a girl. You can't never be President."

"No, but I can be the President's wife," retorted Sukey, proudly, "and tell people how to make apple dumplings."

The Fly in the Ointment.

"You ought to be very glad your corns are cured," said the pessimist's wife.

"I suppose so," replied the pessimist, "but now I can't tell when it's going to rain."

You can break up a bad cold by the timely use of Dr. Jayne's Expectorant, an old and popular medicine for sore lungs and throats, and the best of all cough remedies.—Adv.

REBUILDING TO GET RID OF RATS.

A St. Louis Club That Had to Put Up With the Pests or Tear Down the Club House.

From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

There are at present more disconsolate and discomfited rats in St. Louis than this town has, perhaps, ever known before. That there are thousands of the rodents without home and shelter one has only to go down to Seventh and Locust streets, where the demolition of the old Mercantile Club building is in progress, to be convinced. Visit that locality an hour after the workmen have ceased their work and you are liable to think that the number of rats bereft of home and friends runs up into the millions. There are rats to the right of you, rats to the left of you, rats in front, and rats in rear. The hegira begins just before dark, and continues through the long hours of the night and until the iconoclastic workmen begin operations in the morning. With the sound of the first hammer in the morning the rats hurry back to their stronghold in the basement, hunt their places in the nooks and crevices of the walls, and stay there until the coast is clear again in the evening.

The truism that pride cometh before a fall was never more practically and undeniably demonstrated than in the history of this large and always rapidly increasing family of Mercantile Club rats. Had they been content to remain in the basement of the building and there surfeited themselves upon the rich viands which fell naturally to their lot, they might have remained forever in undisputed sway of that cavernous domain. Even had they not been possessed of that vaulting ambition which overleaps itself after they moved up to the first floor and planted their banner upon the ramparts of the front entrance, claiming ownership of everything in sight by the questionable right of conquest, they might not have been disturbed. But like all other creatures inspired with the fatal gift of ambition, after gaining one point they arrogated to themselves too much of right and privilege. They at once began to roam over the building as their own tyrannical will directed, and nothing was sacred from their vandalism and greed. A party of clubmen dared not give a dinner in the banquet hall unless they first secured the services of an army of small boys with clubs to bruise the heads of the contumacious rats who insisted upon intruding themselves where they were not invited. If the banqueters failed to set apart sufficient of the choicest dishes to stuff the capacious and insatiable maw of the rodents to the point of apoplexy, then the entire club would suffer, for the rats would turn to and rend the upholstery in the still hours of the night when all but burglars and rats are asleep. The intrusions and the usurpations of the rats became so unreasonable and outrageous that the suffering club members could stand it no longer. They had rights as well as the rats. The issue was squarely made by the rats themselves. The members exhausted every means to postpone the final determination of the point.

There were only two ways out of the difficulty argued the sorely harassed club men. Either the rats must be disciplined or the building demolished and a rat-proof structure erected in its stead. Now, the only known way of disciplining a rat is to kill him. But to kill the rats meant a ruthless war of extermination extending, as they are, through years and involving a heavy outlay in the purchase of terriers and the employment of small boys by the hundred. The shrewd financiers of the club with prophetic vision foresaw that this would rapidly de