

only where it comes into competition with Russia in the eastern market.

But in a still more intimate way the purpose and methods of imperialism connect themselves with social problems at home. Readers of *The Public* may, perhaps, remember a book on Poverty reviewed some time since in these columns. It was a minute study of the English city of York, in which place the author found that over 40 per cent. of the population were virtually paupers. Now suppose England, instead of overwhelming the Boers, had given her thought and effort to enabling these people to become purchasers of her goods! Well does Mr. Hobson speak of the "absurdity of spending half our financial resources in fighting to secure foreign markets at a time when hungry mouths, ill-clad backs, ill-furnished houses, indicate countless unsatisfied material wants among our own population." Imperialism turns its back on these conditions in the home market. It does not seek to increase this market by a better distribution of wealth at home. It goes about, at the cost of the nation's revenue and lives, seeking foreign markets and foreign investments.

Imperialism talks much about the spread of civilization. When we shall have attended better to social conditions at home, then and then only shall we have a civilization worthy to spread. But imperialists do not think so; the present civilization is good enough for them, and they want more of the same kind. So the great financial forces that in both England and America, through the Tory and Republican parties, are whistling patriotism and prosperity to the neglect of the conditions of ill-distributed wealth at home, are the same forces that are backing the policy of Imperialism.

Let us recognize the fact that there are many good men in these parties who have not considered the full purport of this policy. There are others who have been carried along by the impulse of a mistaken patriotism, or by the force of cleverly manipulated public opinion. To all these we must appeal to pause and think how

false the policy of Imperialism is both in spirit and in method. Its spirit is driving us to acts of cruelty and to the sacrifice of the optimistic principles of democratic government. Its method is to divert attention and to turn away from the betterment of social conditions at home, while it seeks new fields to exploit abroad.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 7.

The long expected clash of war between Russia and Japan over the Korean question (p. 213), a clash in which Great Britain, France, Germany and even the United States may possibly become involved, seems now most imminent. In the news dispatches it is freely predicted. Yet the authentic disclosures are thus far insufficient for a rational judgment either as to the probability of early hostilities or as to the immediate or nominal causes therefor.

In the western hemisphere the burning question of the week is the Panama complication (p. 612). President Roosevelt has devoted to it a long special message to Congress, which was read before both Houses on the 4th, upon their re-assembling after the holiday recess. In this message he reviews the subject vigorously from the Administration point of view, concluding with a declaration that the recognition of Panama as an independent republic is "already an accomplished fact," and therefore that the only open question is "whether or not we shall build an Isthmian canal."

Along with his special message the President transmitted a letter received by Secretary Hay from Gen. Reyes, the Colombian special envoy, and Mr. Hay's reply, which indicates the policy of the Administration with reference to Colombia's right to resist the secession of Panama. Gen. Reyes wrote (under date of Dec. 8):

I have the honor to address your excellency for the purpose of stating respectfully that I have received from my government instructions to inquire what

attitude would be assumed by the government of the United States in the event which may take place of Colombian troops or forces under the Colombian flag making their appearance on the Isthmus, or attempting a landing on the territory for the defense of the sovereignty and integrity of Colombia, and respecting the railroad line and the terminal points, in accordance with the stipulation of the treaty of 1846, which my country is ever ready to observe.

Secretary Hay's reply (dated Dec. 11) was as follows:

I have quoted your question textually, and in reference to it am instructed by the President to bring to the attention of your excellency the following facts: That the Republic of Panama proclaimed its independence on the 3d of last month; that, in consequence of this movement, the independence of Panama has been recognized by this government and by many others; that a treaty has been signed between the United States and Panama, which has been ratified by the latter state, and is now waiting ratification by the American Senate; that by the provisions of the said treaty the United States agrees to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama; that although the treaty has not yet become law by the action of the Senate, there are already inchoate rights and duties created by it which place the responsibility of preserving peace and order on the Isthmus in the hands of the government of the United States and of Panama, even if such responsibility were not imposed by the historical events of the last fifty years. In view of these facts I am instructed to say to your excellency that the government of the United States would regard with the gravest concern any invasion of the territory of Panama by Colombian troops, for the reason that bloodshed and disorder would inevitably result throughout the whole extent of the Isthmus, and for the broader reason that in the opinion of the President the time has come, in the interest of universal commerce and civilization, to close the chapter of sanguinary and ruinous civil war in Panama.

A general debate upon the subject was precipitated by the message in the Senate on the 4th, led by Senator Morgan in opposition to the President's policy with reference to the recognition of Panama. Senator Morgan is reported to have declared that President Roosevelt's interference in Colombia's affairs on the Isthmus was not warranted by the Constitution and to have asserted that if there is to be a general policy on the part of the United States of upholding civilization that policy must be undertaken

by Congress. He is quoted as saying, also, that "neither the President nor the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power of the United States, has the lawful power to wage or declare war against any foreign power without the consent of Congress, when such country is at peace with the United States." In this connection he is reported as declaring that he might yield in his judgment that no ship should ever pass through the Isthmus of Panama, but he could not assent to the breaking down of our fixed policy of neutrality between belligerents, or to enlarging the diplomatic powers of the President by construction until they reach the whole height of usurpation. He urged his colleagues from the South to note that the President's attitude is intended to force them to vote for the Panama route; and for himself he insisted that he was not opposing the President on slight ground, but because he believed the course of the President to be such as to threaten the honor and integrity of the United States.

The principal debater in support of the Administration was Senator Lodge, who spoke on the 5th. He is reported to have quoted a number of authorities in support of his position that the President has not departed from beaten paths in recognizing the independent government of Panama, and to have laid down the general proposition that "a revolted state may be recognized as sovereign or independent by a neutral power without departing from its attitude of neutrality." Replying to the objection that the President had gone beyond his authority in nominating a minister to Panama, Mr. Lodge quoted a number of instances to show that the early Presidents made nominations to other countries without the authority of Congress.

In the course of his Panama speech in the Senate on the 6th Senator Lodge made some remarkable statements with reference to the administration of President Cleveland. The immediate occasion for these statements was a dinner at New York, on the 4th, in honor of the inauguration of

Mayor McClellan. Several prominent men who had been invited did not attend, among them being Judge Parker and ex-President Cleveland. The latter wrote a letter declining on the ground of "a vexatious indisposition." But Mr. Olney, of Boston, Mr. Cleveland's former cabinet officer, who did attend, made a speech in which he urged Mr. Cleveland's nomination by the Democratic party for the presidency. Alluding to these circumstances, Senator Lodge said:

This morning I had the pleasure of reading the account of a great banquet in New York. Among others present was a very distinguished citizen of my own State, whom I am very proud and happy to call my personal friend. I very rarely agree with him on any political question, but he made a single statement last night with which I think I am in more or less agreement. He referred in a picturesque way to the dreadful career that has been run by the Republican party since it came into power in 1896. He said they have passed from a needless war with Spain to a wanton war with Colombia. Needless war with Spain. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that adjective was well chosen. If, when the first stirrings for independence had come in that land, the administration of Mr. Cleveland had behaved with sense and courage; if they had told Spain that the time had come when the United States could no longer hold back and that Cuba must be free, I believed then and I believe now that Cuba would have obtained her independence, perhaps after some protracted negotiations, but without any war by us. I have always believed that if that administration, instead of taking counsel with the Minister of Spain, a great sugar planter in Cuba, had been guided by a sound, brave American spirit before Spain had squandered blood and treasure in the island, we might, indeed, have been saved from the war. And I look forward with great interest and great pleasure to the picture that was drawn at that dinner by the ex-Secretary of State when he eulogized the last Democratic President. Apparently, in twenty years he is the only candidate they can produce, and Mr. Olney seems to think he is the only one that can run. Whatever his strength or whatever his weakness, I cannot refrain from saying that his nomination would present me at least with one great source of pleasure. His administration has never been discussed. I do not regard the Democratic party—this, I suppose, is a partisan remark, but I shall make it—as always abounding in good sense, but they had too much sense to fight the campaign of 1896 on Mr. Cleveland's administration, and we were deprived of the opportunity of discussing it. We can say what we will about the silver issue, but it was a better issue for the Democratic party to

meet the country on than what had gone before; and when I saw the accounts of this delightful banquet in New York and read those inspiring speeches and observed the Democratic party once more through its chosen leaders there preparing to stand across the pathway of American progress and proposing to put at their head the man who held power last in their name, I confess my spirits rose higher than ever about Republican prospects. I thought of what a pleasure it would be to contrast the policy which tried to set up Liliuokalani in Hawaii with the policy of the Republican party which has made those islands a part of the United States; to contrast the tariff which they passed and which their own President called the tariff of perfidy and dishonor with the tariff we passed; to examine the history of the loans which they made in a time of profound peace to the bankers of New York with an interest rate far above what the United States could borrow at, even then, and contrast them with the loans which we made in time of war; to compare that era of panic and depression with the prosperity which followed. The whole field bristles with delightful contrasts. I think that nothing could be happier for us than to have our Democratic friends nominate the last Democratic reform President, with the agreeable record of his last administration as a theme for debate, on a policy of sustaining Colombia and opposing the United States in digging the canal at Panama.

Martial law with strict press censorship has been established in another of the strike regions (p. 567) of Colorado,—the more westerly region, namely, San Miguel county, of which Telluride is the county seat. But little has been heard from either region for nearly a month. The later reports have indicated the end of all trouble. A dispatch of the 19th from Denver to the Chicago Record-Herald, for example, declared that all—

indications are that the striking miners have lost their fight in Colorado, both in the gold and silver and in the coal mines. The strike atmosphere is clearing daily, and it is believed that the military campaign of the State authorities has resulted in a complete defeat for the unions. There are more men seeking work than there is employment for. Governor Peabody has ordered a general reduction of the militia forces at Telluride and Cripple Creek, owing to the fact that the nonunion men are in the majority in these districts, and are believed to be amply able to take care of themselves. Several mines and mills are running to their full capacity.

Notwithstanding the pacific purport of that dispatch, the Gov-