

THE U. P. TELEGRAPHERS.

It seems tolerably clear that the railway telegraphers on the Union Pacific system will either have to submit to the existing conditions against which they have entered complaint, or leave their keys. Their committee met General Manager Dickinson, to whom they submitted a modified schedule. He refused to agree to it. They purpose now to appeal to President Clark. This will likely be useless, because, as a matter of course, Mr. Dickinson doubtless consulted with that gentleman before reaching his decision in the matter.

If the telegraphers conclude to succumb, they will not be likely to do so with a good grace, as they will, from their standpoint work under the disadvantage of feeling that they are imposed upon. Labor performed under this condition of mind is done reluctantly and is much more exhausting than when executed in a cheerful spirit. Such a situation is against the interest of both employer and employed. A feeling of that nature could, in questions of this character, be modified; if not avoided, by a recourse to arbitration, which takes the power of decision out of the hands of the principals, thus excluding a serious cause of antagonism between them. It is a question whether or not the disputants in labor and capital controversies could be compelled by law to submit their difficulties to arbitration, as a statute of that nature might be declared antagonistic to American institutions on account of its tendency to abridge individual liberty. There is nothing in the way, however, of sensible people mutually agreeing to be governed by that civilized method of adjusting differences.

Should the telegraphers decide to strike, the situation will be another addition to the social turmoil that is keeping the country in continuous commotion. There will be the effort of the company to secure non-union telegraphers, consequent bitterness between the two classes of the profession as well as the strained feeling between employers and the previous employees, all of which ought to be avoided by any means available and consistent. The disturbance of business and public inconvenience that would necessarily ensue and which would affect an extensive area of country, is another part of the subject of much importance. Arbitration is the only feasible means of ameliorating the situation.

SPENCER ON VERACITY.

HERBERT SPENCER, the noted English philosopher, expresses in the *Popular Science Monthly* for August, some thoughts on veracity. Mr. Spencer is a remarkable writer. He deals largely in assertion, which he fails to support by elaborate reasoning. This is evidently because his statements are the result of matured mental analysis, which he does not appear to think need be given to the reader. He relies upon the self-evident correctness of his averments. On this basis he seems to anticipate their unquestioned acceptance. The present article is not

up to his usual standard, as he says but little, if anything, beyond what ordinarily observant and intelligent people are aware of. His opening sentence is a sweeper. Here it is: "Complete truthfulness is one of the rarest of virtues."

Such a statement as that is strikingly true if not specially comforting. If truthfulness is viewed from the standpoint of fine lines, many persons who pride themselves on their freedom from falsehood will have a little of their self-appreciation eliminated. It includes overstating a matter, for the purpose of giving it an intensity that does not belong to it, or understating in order to modify it below its real standard of importance. Then there are the cases innumerable in which people are influenced to deviate from precise truth, by personal considerations such as the desire to inflict injury; the desire to gain a material advantage, to escape punishment or other threatened evil; the desire to get favor by saying things that please. Re-asserting the idea embraced in the opening sentence, Mr. Spencer says: "In mankind at large the love of truth for truth's sake, irrespective of ends, is but little exemplified."

The writer of the article in question furnishes numerous examples of human races among whom untruthfulness was a conspicuous trait, and others—comparatively few in number—with whom telling the truth was a prominent virtue. The whole paper indicates that Mr. Spencer did not differ much from the Psalmist David when the latter said "All men are liars."

The philosopher's deduction is to the effect that untruthfulness prevails most among peoples who are subject to coercive governments. There is no system of rule that equals that of this country in its embodiment of the genius of freedom. In the face of this fact and of the inference of Mr. Spencer, the American people are credited with having ability to evade the more exact lines of truthfulness beyond most other inhabitants of our globe. Their reputation is to the effect that their ingenuity in this respect amounts to adroitness, which enables them to escape the odium which attaches to blunter departures from correctness. This tendency is so strong in the ordinary American mind that most of the humorous literature of the country is composed of pure hyperbolism. It will hardly be denied that the exaggeration in earnest keeps steady pace with the disposition to magnify for fun.

This object lesson hardly comports with Mr. Spencer's theory that freedom from coercive rule and truthfulness walk hand in hand.

To operate in unison with a high standard of personal truthfulness ought to be one of the chief objects of every man.

TWO WAYS OF LOOKING AT IT.

It is funny to see how partisan motives and feelings enter into the discussion of all public questions, whether they are in anyway related or not. A local sheet, which has never been conspicuous for consistency, has endeavored to make it appear that the Democrats were responsible for the defeat of the silver bill, and has made

that alleged action a reason why the Democratic party should be defeated in November. But another paper, which is strongly Republican, insists that it was the Republicans who defeated the measure, and claims this as a big feather in the cap of the Republican party and one reason why it should be successful in November. The following on this matter appeared in the *Omaha Bee*. (Rep.)

"Ex-Speaker Reed having claimed for the Republicans of the House of Representatives the credit of defeating free silver legislation, some papers have questioned their right to the claim, holding that the credit belongs rather to the sound money Democrats. Nobody will withhold from the latter the commendation they deserve for earnest and persistent work against free silver. They labored wisely and well, showing a every stage of the fight the course of their convictions. But the cause which they battled could not have won without the help of the Republicans.

"When the question of considering the free silver bill was last before the House the Democrats opposed to it mustered 94 votes, while those favoring the measure numbered 117. Had the Republicans refrained from voting the Stewart bill that passed the Senate would have been considered and without the votes of Republicans against it would have passed the House.

"It is well remembered that when the question of considering the Bland bill was up in March, there was a general feeling of anxiety regarding the action to be taken by the Republicans. Many members of the party in and out of congress believed that it would be good politics for the Republicans to allow the Democrats to make their record on silver and give the President an opportunity to veto a free coinage bill. They might have given valid reasons for such a course, but after due deliberation it was decided to be the duty of the party to vote its convictions. The view that prevailed was that expressed by ex-Speaker Reed when he said: "What we must do is that which is best for the country, and that we stand ready to do under all circumstances." Being opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver because that policy would be disastrous to all interests, the Republicans in the House of Representatives manfully stood by their convictions and defeated free silver.

"Without denying, therefore, whatever credit belongs to the anti-free coinage Democrats for their sturdy fight, fair-minded men must concede that the greater share of the credit for the defeat of free silver belongs to the Republicans of the House. Had they been governed solely by considerations of political expediency; had they been disposed to let the Democrats make a record on silver regardless of the possible effect upon the financial and business affairs of the country; had they, in short, subordinated every other consideration to that of making political capital, unquestionably a free silver bill would, before this time have been in the hands of the President. But the Republican party is a party of principles. It was established, as Mr. Reed well said, for the purpose of carrying out principles, and there has never been a time in its history when it failed to respond to the call of duty or to courageously maintain its convictions of right and its judgment of what is for the best interests of the people.

The proprietors of all theatres at Washington, D. C., have been notified by the commissioners of the District of Columbia that their houses must be fitted throughout with electric lights.