

resources has been and still is almost more than we can stand. But, as we can tell from our correspondence, as well as from the increased demand for other literature it has created, the book is doing its work.

We shall pull through somehow. This optimism seems to me warranted by impartial and philosophic inquiry. Though in times of depression one is inclined to think that it is our desires and inclinations, rather than the evidence of existing facts, that impel us to accept it as true, yet all past history teaches us that in the eternal struggle between the social and the predatory instincts of man, the former must eventually gain the victory. To promote this end, however, is the highest duty, as well as the most satisfactory and elevating work to which any of us can devote our lives.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 14.

Between Russia and Japan (p. 630) the issue of peace or war still hangs in the balance. Diplomatic notes appear to be passing between the two governments, and ominous naval movements are in progress; but nothing at once definite and authentic is as yet reported.

In British politics another landmark has been made, by the disruption of the Liberal-Unionist party. This party was formed in 1886 under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain, who had been a leader in the Liberal party under Gladstone. In his last administration save one, Mr. Gladstone introduced in parliament a measure of home rule for Ireland, whereupon the anti-Irish, or imperial Liberals, followed Chamberlain's lead in the formation of the Liberal-Unionist party, which entered into a coalition with the Conservative party. At the ensuing elections, those of the Summer of 1886, this coalition drove Gladstone from power and formed a coalition ministry, with Salisbury as premier. The coalition held office until 1892, when the Liberals, under Gladstone, were returned to power for a brief season. They were again defeated, however, in 1895, and the coalition secured possession of the government to hold it ever since, their latest triumph at a general parliamentary election having occurred in 1900 (vol. iii, p. 441). Mr.

Chamberlain himself did not become a member of the coalition cabinet until 1895, notwithstanding the earlier temporary victory of the coalition of which he was the master spirit. In the Summer of 1902 Salisbury withdrew from the ministry (vol. v, p. 295), Balfour taking his place as premier; and in September, 1903, Chamberlain resigned from the ministry (vol. vi, p. 391) for the purpose of relieving the premier of embarrassment in connection with the Chamberlain protection policy. Since then Chamberlain has actively promoted this policy in a political campaign made with reference especially to the next general elections. At the by-elections (pp. 598, 629) thus far this policy has not been endorsed by the voters. The latest of these by-elections was in the middle division of Devonshire on the 8th, when the Liberal candidate was elected over the coalitionist by an increased majority of 100 per cent. Immediately afterward a correspondence disclosing the disruption of the Liberal-Unionist party, noted above, was given out for publication.

The letters had been written from October 23 last to January 4, and were between the Duke of Devonshire, president of the party organization, and Mr. Chamberlain. As reported by cable—

the Duke states that Chamberlain, in forcing his protection policy as a paramount issue in the next general election, places the Liberal-Unionist organization in a position of great embarrassment, since the organization disburses funds to local associations and assists candidates in their campaigns. The Duke points out that the party is irreconcilably divided on the protection issue and that he does not see how the Central Liberal-Unionist organization can usefully continue its existence or equitably distribute the funds among candidates who are antagonistic on the present question before the country.

Mr. Chamberlain, replying—advocates a conference with representatives of the Liberal-Unionist associations of London to vote on how to continue the central body, the minority to retire, and, if they wish, to start a separate organization.

To this the Duke responds:

The Liberal-Unionist association, which has done its work in averting home rule, and which has maintained the Unionist party in power for the greater part of seventeen years, should

recognize that under present conditions its existence is no longer necessary and should be dissolved with as little bitterness as possible.

Mr. Chamberlain thereupon declares that in his judgment a continuation of the association is possible, and announces his purpose—

on his own responsibility, to call a general meeting at as early a date as possible to decide upon the course to be taken. If the meeting resolves to continue as an association he does not feel that the resignations of some of its members would deprive it of its representative character.

Elections were held December 16, for the Commonwealth parliament of Australia; but only meager reports have as yet been published in this country. The best information thus far available shows a Labor party land-slide. The Labor party gains 9 seats in the Senate and 13 in the House, while the party in power in the last parliament (vol. v, p. 503) loses 6 seats in the Senate and 5 in the House. The result reported by Reuter to the London papers, December 18, is as follows:

Senate: Ministerialists (protection), 6; Opposition (free trade), 13; Labor party, 17.

House of Representatives: Ministerialists, 27; Opposition, 26; Labor party, 29.

On this result the Melbourne representative of Reuter comments:

As regards the fiscal question, the Laborites are, speaking generally, strongly protectionist, but parliamentary history in Australia shows that they have been willing to reinforce either side provided they have been able to secure their own legislative ends. There is no likelihood of the fiscal issue being raised, inasmuch as, in addition to staunch protectionists, who form the working majority in the house of representatives, a good many theoretical free traders declare for fiscal peace. The attitude of the Labor party towards preferential trade will still be to increase the tariff wall against the foreigner without making any reduction in favor of England.

In this connection, however, it must be remembered that the Ministerialists were defeated in the House last September by the adoption of a railway employes' amendment to the Ministerial labor arbitration bill. Having opposed this amendment the Ministry dropped the whole bill when the amendment carried, thereby incensing the Labor members

and evoking from them charges of bad faith. Two months afterwards parliament was dissolved, and it is probable that the bitterness among workingmen, engendered by the attitude of the Ministry described above, accounts for the Labor party's victory.

Apart from the issues raised by the Labor party, the questions at issue were chiefly between protectionists and free traders, the latter advocating a revenue tariff, and the former urging "fiscal peace,"—or, as we should say in this country, a "stand pat" policy. The elections were very much confused, as there were several factions. In some places it was Labor candidate versus anti-Labor. Then there was a good deal of sectarianism, an organization called the Australian Protestant Defense Association having sought to stir up strife against Roman Catholics. Women voted at this election, for the first time in most of the States. The women candidates, however, were all defeated, though more women voted than men.

The principal event of the week in American politics was the return from his European observation tour (pp. 613, 632) of William J. Bryan and his delivery of two important speeches on the political situation. The first was delivered at a reception at the Victoria hotel, New York, immediately after he had landed, which was on the 9th. Among those who participated in this reception to Mr. Bryan were Dr. Girdner, John S. Crosby, Senator McCarren, Bourke Cockran, Charles A. Towne, General James B. Weaver, and Edward M. Shepard, all of whom delivered appreciative speeches of welcome. As reported, Mr. Bryan said he intended to keep away from any personal identification with the campaign of 1904, and dwelt upon the idea that a high moral principle of equality and justice must hereafter form the basis of all party contests in this country. His second speech was made at a banquet at New Haven on the 11th, at which the other principal guests were Congressman De Armond of Missouri and Governor Garvin of Rhode Island. It was in this speech that he defined the great

political issue of the time as being—

the issue between man and mammon, between plutocracy and democracy. All surface questions of policy, of taxation, and of regulation of finance are but phases of that century-long, that world-wide struggle between the common people and organized wealth. To say that it does not pay for a nation to violate the rights of the people of another nation involves so much of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division that many get lost in a maze of mathematics. But to say that "the wages of sin is death" is to give an epitome of history that accords with each person's experience. In dealing with the trusts, with finance, with labor problems, and with all the other questions at issue, we must view them from a moral standpoint and arraign every evil at the bar of the public conscience. Will it win? Nothing else will give permanent success. As the martyrs who, eighteen hundred years ago, kneeling in prayer while hungry beasts devoured them, invoked a power mightier than the legions of Rome, so to-day it is not only possible, but necessary to appeal to that moral sentiment which when aroused will prove more potent than the purse.

St. Louis has been decided upon as the place and July 6 as the time for holding the Democratic national convention. This decision was made by the national committee of the party at Washington on the 12th. Both New York and Chicago were in the contest, and the selection of St. Louis is reported to have been effected partly in the interest of Mr. Gorman, as the Southern candidate, and partly in fear of Mr. Hearst, in whose favor it was supposed the galleries in either New York or Chicago might be packed, and whose claims have developed into a serious problem for the party.

An arbitration conference, also held at Washington on the 12th, adopted resolutions urging the government of the United States to endeavor at once to arrange arbitration treaties. These resolutions were submitted to a mass meeting in Lafayette theater in the evening of the same day and were accepted with enthusiasm. The resolutions are as follows:

Resolved, That it is recommended to our government to endeavor to enter into a treaty with Great Britain to submit to arbitration by the permanent court at The Hague, or, in default of such submission, by some tribunal specially constituted for the case, all differences

which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiations.

Resolved, That the two governments should agree not to resort in any case to hostile measures of any description till an effort has been made to settle any matter in dispute by submitting the same either to the permanent court at The Hague or to a commission composed of an equal number of persons from each country of recognized competence in questions of international law.

It is further resolved that our government should enter into treaties to the same effect, as soon as possible, with other Powers.

Among the notable speakers were Gen. Miles, Cardinal Gibbons, Andrew Carnegie, Edward Everett Hale and Rabbi Silverman. John W. Foster, former secretary of state of the United States, was president of the conference, and Thomas Nelson Page was secretary.

News from the San Miguel mining strike in Colorado (p. 631) must be read with caution, since this strike region is subject to press, telegraph and telephone censorship; but such as has been allowed to go out is to the effect that since the declaration of martial law and down to the 7th, 56 men had been expelled from San Miguel county by the military authorities, and that the search for firearms had resulted in the confiscation of between 600 and 700 weapons.

Similar efforts to drive men out of the Cripple Creek region have been met—whether successfully or not, does not appear—by an injunction. This was issued on the 7th by Judge Seeds of the District Court on the application of the Western Federation of Miners against the State militia, the Mine Owners' Association and the Citizens' Alliance. It enjoins them from driving union miners from the district. Adjutant General Sherman M. Bell was reported on the 7th to have said that he had given instructions to Colonel Verdeckberg, commanding the State troops in the Cripple Creek district, to permit no service upon himself and other officers of the guard in the injunction suit, and he declared that no attention would be paid the writ.

Regarding the Cleveland, Ohio, traction question, Mayor Johnson appears to have scored a pro-