

abandoned. But public opinion so strongly demands such a canal that the railroad companies are forced, as matter of tactics, to join in the demand. Naturally, therefore, they demand the route that is least likely to disturb their transportation monopoly. Hence these monopoly interests are a unit for the Panama route.

How far they are disposed to go to prevent interference with their designs is indicated by the Washington correspondence of Walter Wellman, of the 16th, in the Chicago Record-Herald of the 17th. Mr. Wellman's correspondence is as a rule exceptionally trustworthy. When the Colombian senate had rejected the treaty, on the ground that it would involve a cession to a foreign power of Colombian sovereignty, which the Colombian constitution forbids, Mr. Wellman made this report of official Washington sentiment:

It is a great mistake to assume that the Panama project can be killed by the Colombian congress. None of the officials of the American government have any idea of turning to the Nicaragua route.

As was some time ago announced in these dispatches, President Roosevelt has no sympathy with the Nicaragua idea. He has no intention at this time of having recourse to that route. If the pending treaty fails he will look about for other means of acquiring the necessary rights in Panama. Not a few of the President's advisers urge him bluntly to "take what we need." Probably there is not another first-class nation in the world that would hesitate for a moment to seize the Isthmus for the purpose of conferring upon it and the world the boon of a great ship canal connecting the two principal oceans of the world. Only mawkish sentiment and fine-spun moral considerations stand in the way of the United States, and these obstacles are likely to be swept away if the little band of boodlers at Bogota continue to block the path of progress.

But it seems that this new development of imperialism is to wait upon other possibilities, for Mr. Wellman continues:

Before the time comes when President Roosevelt will be called upon to demonstrate whether or not he has enough nerve to solve the problem with a man-o'-war and a battalion of marines, there are various possibilities in the situation which must be permitted to work out:

1. The Colombian congress may ratify the treaty without amendment in order

to avert the danger of the threatened secession of the states of Panama and Cauca.

2. If the Colombian legislators are not sufficiently impressed by that hazard, a million or two of French money, contributed by the stockholders of the new Panama Canal company, may open their eyes.

3. If the treaty is amended and then ratified there is a possibility that the United States Senate may accept the amendments. It will all depend upon what the amendments are. The State Department continues to assert unofficially that any amendment of the treaty would be fatal. It is the duty of state department officials to say this for effect at Bogota, but it may or may not be true.

And finally, if everything else fails, Panama and Cauca are very likely to revolt and set up as an independent state. If they do, it will not take the United States government very long to recognize their independence, and not much time will be lost in concluding a treaty with the new government.

If these possibilities fail, however, the unselfish policy of "benevolent assimilation" which has devastated the Philippines is to be resorted to, sentiment or no sentiment. Protests are expected, but, continues Mr. Wellman—

a number of senators and other public men have already told President Roosevelt that, in their opinion, public sentiment will uphold him. If the United States were to seize the Isthmus through lust for territory or to escape paying a proper price for the canal concession, or through any other improper motive, the censure of the moralists would be well deserved. But everyone knows that if circumstances push the United States into such an enterprise the step will be taken unselfishly.

Exactly so.

It seems, then, that trans-continental railway interests are likely to involve this country deeper in imperialism, with more world-power fighting and bluster and loot. What could better serve their purpose than to turn the Isthmian canal sentiment of the United States into another colonial craze, with incidental fighting, if thereby they might clinch the demand for a canal route that would interfere least with their monopoly?

"What is the difference between hens and poultry, pop?"

"Why, hens, my son, are things that belong to our neighbors; poultry is something a man owns himself."—Yonkers Statesman.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Aug. 20.

Another hitch in the Isthmian canal project (vol. v, p. 792) has occurred. The senate of the Republic of Colombia has unanimously rejected the treaty for cutting the canal through the Isthmus of Panama, which was ratified by the senate of the United States in March last.

Details regarding the action of the Colombian senate are thus far but meagerly reported. It appears, however, that the vote against ratification was taken on the 12th, that it was unanimous (25 out of the 27 members of the senate being present and voting), and that the unfavorable action was based upon the supposed unconstitutionality of the treaty. The constitutional point seems to relate to provisions of the Colombian constitution forbidding the alienation of Colombian sovereignty over Colombian territory without authority from the people. Such alienation was apparently regarded by the Colombian senate as being involved in the treaty; for while the treaty reserves to Colombia all general sovereignty over the territory ceded for the purposes of the canal, it nevertheless empowers the United States to exercise a degree of military authority within this territory which might conflict with the general Colombian sovereignty nominally reserved.

There are indications also that the Colombian senate was offended by a diplomatic note from the United States which was read before it by the Colombian minister of foreign affairs, wherein the Colombian government was notified that the American government would look unfavorably upon any substantial amendment to the treaty. This note appears to have been regarded by the Colombian senators as revealing a purpose on the part of the United States to deprive them by intimidation of their right to propose amendments.

The most important European news relates to the Macedonian insurrection (p. 296) in Turkey. At our last report, August 12, a

battle at Krushevo was hourly expected (p. 298), the town being occupied by insurgents and invested by 4,000 Turkish troops. On the 14th the Turkish troops had gained possession of the town, but the battle was still raging in the outskirts. According to reports by way of Belgrade, Servia, subsequently confirmed by dispatches by way of Sofia, Bulgaria, the Turks massacred the entire Christian population of Krushevo upon capturing it. A later dispatch, appearing on the 17th in the Frankfort Zeitung, Berlin, described the river near Monastir as full of the mutilated bodies of women and children who had been massacred by Bashi-Bazouks. Still another dispatch of the 17th, from Uskub, by way of Sofia, Bulgaria, reported that 600 Bashi-Bazouks, under the command of Albanian chiefs, had pillaged and destroyed several Christian villages in the districts of Debre and Okrida. On the other hand it was reported from Constantinople that 800 Mussulmans had been massacred by insurgents in the Monastir district. Fighting in the neighborhood of Krushevo was still in progress on the 17th; and on the 18th three Turkish battalions which had attacked a body of insurgents near Monastir, 23 miles from Krushevo, were reported by way of Sofia as having been routed, after a battle of six hours, with a loss in killed and wounded of 210.

The magnitude of this insurrection may be inferred from the fact, of which there is no doubt, that the Turkish government has issued a proclamation ordering out 52 additional battalions (about 52,000 troops) from the European provinces of Turkey, for service in Macedonia.

Supplementing its appeal of last week (p. 298) the Bulgarian government has now presented a memorandum to the Powers setting out at great length the condition of affairs during the last three months in Macedonia, since the Turkish government undertook to inaugurate the promised reforms. The most precise details, dates, places and names of persons are given in this memorandum, which is reported by the dis-

patches to constitute a terrible category of murder, torture, incendiarism, pillage and general oppression committed by the Turkish soldiers and officials. The particulars are credited entirely to official sources, such as the reports of Bulgarian consuls and agents of the Bulgarian government, and, in many instances to reports made by Turkish authorities. The Bulgarian government guarantees the absolute truth of every statement and challenges the Turkish government to disprove a single charge made in the memorandum. The memorandum asserts that—

during the last three months the Turkish government has taken a series of measures with the alleged intention of inaugurating the era of promised reform and of assuring peace and tranquillity to the Bulgarian population of European Turkey, but with the effect of further exasperating this population and reviving the revolutionary movement. Instead of proceeding solely against persons guilty of breaches of the public order, the military and civil authorities have sought every possible pretext to persecute, terrorize, and ruin the Bulgarian inhabitants, alike in the large cities and in the small villages. Wholesale massacres, individual murders, the destruction of villages, the pillaging and setting fire to houses, the arrests, ill treatment, tortures, arbitrary imprisonment, and banishment, the closing and disorganizing of churches and schools, the ruining of merchants, the collection of taxes for many years in advance—such, proceeds the memorandum, are among the acts of the Turkish administration of the vilayets of Salonica, Monastir, Uskub, and Adrianople. The memorandum then relates in detail a number of such cases in each vilayet.

In summarizing the specific details of the outrages described, the memorandum declares that—wholesale massacres were perpetrated by regulars and Bashi-Bazouks in the town of Salonica and the villages of Baldevo, Banitz, Echouriloyo, Karbinza, Moghila, Smerdesch, and Enidje, while the scenes of carnage, pillage, and incendiarism were everywhere terrible. The estimates obtainable of Bulgarians imprisoned mostly on flimsy pretexts, give for the vilayet of Salonica 900 prisoners; for Uskub, 500; for Monastir, 850, and for Adrianople, 550, a grand total of 2,800. As information is lacking from many districts in these vilayets it is thought that without exaggeration the number of prisoners may be placed at even three times this total. The Bulgarian merchants and artisans living in Constantinople and Salonica were ordered to return to their native village and did not have any time or opportunity

to dispose of their business or property. Some of these Bulgarians, who with their families had been settled there for twenty years or more, were utterly ruined. As the order applied equally to professors and school masters, the Bulgarian schools were closed before the end of the school year. The authorities rigorously enforced the same order against the Bulgarian priests, making every effort to paralyze the development of religious and educational work and deprive the Bulgarian Exarch of all his privileges and force the people to come under the authority of the Greek Patriarch. Encouraged by the Turkish authorities the Greek bishops and archimandrites forced their way into the Bulgarian church, burned the prayer books and employed menaces to compel the people to acknowledge the Patriarch. The provincial administration employed every possible means to install Mussulmans in the Bulgarian villages. On the slightest pretext the Bulgarians were forced to sell their lands to the Turks at any price the latter chose to pay. Burdened with taxes, liable to perform statute labor for the Turkish land owners, the population is reduced to a state of serfdom. This is one of the principal causes of discontent, and when to this is added the exactions of the tax gatherers, the wretched people are ready to revolt against such a despotic government.

Responding to the demand of the Russian government (p. 298) for the punishment of all concerned in the murder of the Russian consul at Monastir, a Turkish court martial, on the 14th, condemned to death the policeman who shot the consul, and the sentence was immediately carried out. Another policeman was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. In addition, the Turkish government has offered the widow of the Russian consul an indemnity of \$80,000, the Sultan has expressed his regret, his son has visited the Russian ambassador at Constantinople, and the Grand Vizier and other high dignitaries of Turkey have expressed sympathy.

Russia evidently does not regard this as sufficient, for on the 15th she dispatched a squadron to Turkish waters to exact, say the dispatches, a complete obedience to her demands for satisfaction for the murder of her consul at Monastir. On the 19th her ambassador at Constantinople presented an additional note to the Sultan demanding that severe official censure be passed upon Hilmi Pasha, the inspector gen-

eral of Macedonia, for his negligence in permitting excesses by Turkish soldiers. The Austrian ambassador is reported to have supported the Russian demand. The Russian squadron, consisting of 14 warships, sailed from Sevastopol on the 17th, under command of Rear Admiral Krieger; and on the 19th it had appeared at Jeni Ada, only 60 miles from the Bosphorus. Reports of the 20th from London were to the effect that Great Britain had ordered her Mediterranean fleet to Salonica at once, and that France and Austria were expected to join in the movement. Germany alone was said to be holding aloof.

Chief among the minor European events of the week is the prorogation of the British parliament until Nov. 2d. This session of parliament, which began in February (vol. v, p. 729), has been made notable by the enactment of the education bill (vol. v, p. 485), the development of Chamberlain's protection tariff policy (vol. vi, p. 169), the defeat of a labor union protective measure (vol. vi, p. 89), the defeat by the bare majority of 13 votes of a single tax bill (vol. v, pp. 819, 821, vol. vi, pp. 44, 72), and the enactment of the Irish land purchase bill.

The Irish land purchase bill had, at our last report (p. 300), passed the House of Lords with several amendments added to the bill as passed by the Commons. All but two of these amendments, unimportant ones, were in due course accepted by the Commons; and on the 13th, the Lords agreed to the elimination of these two, and the bill became a law.

News of American politics comprises the Republican convention of Nebraska, held at Lincoln on the 18th. The nominations were for a justice of the Supreme Court and regents of the State University. The platform reaffirms the protective tariff policy of the party, opposes combinations of capital for the purpose of stifling competition, and declares for President Roosevelt as the next Republican candidate for president.

More complete reports regard-

ing the Democratic county convention of last week at Cincinnati (p. 299), make it appear that the convention was prevented from expressing itself. It seems that at the primaries the local managers, whose leader is Lewis G. Bernard, were defeated. But on the day of the assembling of the convention they rushed through a resolution authorizing a committee to appoint delegates to the State convention, doing so before a large number of the members of the convention had arrived and before the convention had organized. When the convention had properly assembled, and this action and its purpose became known to the delegates, a motion to reconsider was made and seconded. The chairman—a Bernard man—refused to put the motion, declaring it out of order. An appeal from this decision of the chairman was then moved and seconded. That also he refused to entertain. In this manner a minority of the convention governed its action, and delegates to the State convention were named at variance with the expressed wishes of the primaries. The matter becomes important because a contest at the State convention is to be made.

The contesting delegation was chosen at a convention of the primary delegates held on the 14th, which was attended by a majority of the delegates elected to the original convention by the primaries. Upon organizing, this convention adopted resolutions in which it explained the action of its members by declaring that they were delegates duly elected at the Democratic primary for the purpose of choosing delegates to the State convention, who had convened on the 11th in county convention; that resolutions of vital importance were passed at said meeting before a large number of the delegates had assembled, and before the permanent organization was effected; that after inquiry into the nature of these resolutions a motion duly made and seconded to reconsider them was declared out of order by the Chair; that a motion duly made and seconded appealing from the decision of the Chair was declared out of order; that a motion duly made and seconded to amend the resolutions was de-

clared out of order by the Chair; that in numerous other instances the Chair acted as sole judge of what the convention should or should not consider, and by "gag-rule" trampled upon the rights of the delegates and robbed the voters of a well-earned victory which they had won at the polls over "bossism" and in behalf of good government. In consequence, this second convention denied the legality of the proceedings of the meeting of the 11th, and declaring them to be null and void proceeded to choose delegates to the State convention. The State delegates chosen by the second convention differ from those named at the first, only in those respects in which the officers of the first convention are charged with having "gagged" the majority. A careful analysis of the two sets of delegates shows that upon the question of nominating Johnson or Zimmerman for governor, the first set stands 22 for Zimmerman, 16 for Johnson and 4 doubtful, while the second set stands 23 for Johnson, 15 for Zimmerman and 4 doubtful.

Continuing his plan of campaigning Ohio for anti-monopoly legislature (p. 293), Mayor Johnson opened a large meeting at Chippewa Lake in Medina county on the 12th. He spoke on the same day at smaller meetings at Medina, Abbyville and Liverpool. On the 13th he opened the day in the Medina county speaking with a speech at Brunswick, following it with two at Hinckley, one at Renson Corners, one at Granger, one at Sharon, and one at Wadsworth. Some of these meetings were small and some were large. Some had been arranged for and some were spontaneous gatherings. Mayor Johnson travels in an automobile, and speaks wherever an audience gathers. Medina county is overwhelmingly Republican, and some of Johnson's most responsive audiences are reported to have been composed in the main of Republicans.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Grand Army of the Republic is in session at San Francisco.

—Wall street reports (p. 293) are to the effect that the crisis is past.