

tinctly withheld recognition. These are Great Britain, the Netherlands, France and Germany. An authoritative announcement to that effect was made by Lord Lansdowne, the British foreign minister, in the House of Lords on the 19th. Lord Lansdowne stated that while no proposal had been received for concerted action towards Serbia by the Powers, the British ministry had no intention of maintaining ordinary relations with the persons concerned in the massacres. He added that France, Germany and Italy are taking a similar attitude, and at the same time explained that the British minister to Serbia had been instructed to withdraw from Belgrade on the arrival there of King Peter, and in the meanwhile to do nothing which could be construed as a recognition of the new government. The Dutch representative at Belgrade has been instructed to like effect; and it is understood that the United States will hold aloof, which can easily be done because the American minister to Serbia had not yet presented his credentials to the former government when the revolution occurred.

A Servian parliamentary deputation of eight members appointed to meet King Peter and conduct him to the Servian capital, left Belgrade on the 19th and arrived in Geneva, Switzerland, on the 21st. On the 22d the new King, accompanied by this deputation, took a special train from Geneva for Belgrade, where they arrived on the 24th. To avoid meeting King Peter upon his arrival in Belgrade, the ministers from Great Britain, Germany, France, Turkey and the Netherlands had withdrawn from that city on the 23d; and only the Russian and the Austrian ministers greeted him at the railroad station where the ceremonies of his reception were performed. From the station he was conducted to the cathedral for the religious ceremonies of the Greek Church, and thence to the new palace, near the old palace in which the late King was killed. He held a conference with his ministers later in the day.

While the press has been full of reports reflecting anti-revolutionary sentiment concerning the situation in Servia, and especially expressing abhorrence of regicide, but little of

an authentic character has been cabled to exhibit the state of mind of the revolutionists. This lack of information has now been well supplied by a correspondent of the Chicago Evening News, whose cabled report of an interview at Geneva with Dr. Danitsch, an ex-minister of Servia and one of the new King's escort from Geneva to Belgrade, appeared in that paper on the 23d. The Danitsch interview is as follows:

All alleged interviews with King Peter of Servia ascribing to his majesty a determination to punish the Servian revolutionists, are not only canards, but canards embodying nonsense; and as to the demands of Russia [quoted above in full] we have nothing to fear on that score. Russia is playing a part. This was a case where assassinations were indispensable for the un-fettering of a spirited and freedom-loving people. The execution of King Alexander was meant as an object lesson to Russia as much as to Servia itself. Our nation is independent by virtue of great sacrifices and it intends to remain independent. That means, of course, that it purposes to manage its internal affairs in accordance with the dictates of the best intelligence and the best morality of the country. In the abstract, the Servians deplore the assassination as much as anybody, but the late King was himself an assassin in heart as well as a mangler of the Constitution. Alexander's last plans provided for the assassination of more than a score of his ablest subjects. He could have escaped death had he yielded to the demand for abdication, but he refused. The Servian nation is much more satisfied with the destruction of the Obrenovitch dynasty than it would have been with his abdication, because the King as an exile would always have been a source of unrest and peril to the state. Comment in the European press on the so-called "barbarism of Servia" produces in us sentiments of contempt, and is based wholly on ignorance coupled with perverse blindness as to the national aspect of the Belgrade tragedy. To ask King Peter to punish the murderers would be to ask him to reverse the revolution he has so long and intelligently fostered. Now that he is seated on the throne, martyrdom for the men who delivered Servia is impossible. The rule of Alexander would have caused the very stones of Belgrade to rise and mutiny.

A decree abolishing the Servian constitution of 1901, granted by the late King Alexander (p. 167), was officially published at Belgrade on the 20th, and a new constitution promulgated in its place. The decree also

abolished all laws contravening the new constitution.

The island of Malta is this week the source of a bit of revolutionary news for which the British government is responsible. This news refers to an arbitrary abrogation of the Maltese constitution for the purpose of coercing the people. Malta is an historic rock of the Mediterranean sea, lying between Sicily in Europe and Tripoli in Africa. It is about 117 miles long by 9 wide, having an area of 115 square miles. Both as a commercial distributing point and a naval post its favorable situation has caused it to be held in high esteem. Coming under the control of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in 1530, through a grant from the Emperor Charles V, it remained in their control until 1798, when they surrendered it to the French, from whom it was wrested by Great Britain in 1801. The treaty of Amiens provided that the island should be restored to the Knights of St. John; but protests against this were made by the Maltese. Listening to these protests, and, as a British writer naively puts it, "appreciating also, doubtless, the vast value of their new possession," the British government refused to make the restoration. Napoleon utilized this refusal as one of his grounds for resuming hostilities. At the close of the Napoleonic war, the Congress of Vienna recognized the island as a British dependency, and it has ever since been a crown colony of the British empire. In 1849 the British government granted the Maltese a constitution, providing for a council or legislature of 18 members—10 to be appointed by the British government and 8 to be elected by the people. Slight as was this recognition of popular rights, there was strong opposition to it in England. The Duke of Wellington thought it as unreasonable to give a constitution to Malta as to give a constitution to a man of war. His allusion was to the character of Malta as a military post and naval station. But the population of Malta in 1901 was 188,141; and, besides a university, there were in the island 146 public and 127 private schools, with an aggregate of 19,695 pupils. Recognizing that a community approximating this size might be different in some governmental respects from a man-of-war, Great Britain granted, in 1887, a more popular constitution,

under which the legislative body was to be composed of 13 elected members and only 6 appointees. Thus the majority was shifted from British office holders to the people of the island. This is the constitution which has now been abrogated.

The cause of the abrogation originates in a language controversy. Of the native language it is said that if its German and Italian elements were eliminated it would remain almost pure Punic—the ancient speech of the Carthaginians. In fact, however, it is a patois compounded of the many languages of the many peoples who have in the course of many centuries successively possessed the island. But the educated classes use Italian. This was also the language of the law courts until 1899; but in March of that year the British government decreed that the English language should thenceforth be allowable in the Maltese courts, and that after 1914 its use there should be exclusive. That change was opposed by the legislative body, and the local Italian press continued to protest bitterly against it. Popular feeling became so strong that the legislature refused in 1901 to vote taxes, in which it was encouraged by a mass meeting of 10,000 people held on the 5th of May, 1901, at Valetta, the capital, a city of 50,000 inhabitants. Ignoring the constitutional right of the legislature, the government then levied taxes arbitrarily by an order in council; and against that revolutionary proceeding a mass meeting of 12,000 or 15,000 people at Valetta protested on the 11th of August, 1901. In consequence of all this popular opposition, the British ministry modified the language decree to the extent of withdrawing the exclusive or compulsory clause which was to have come into effect in 1914; and on the 8th of February, 1903, the modification was proclaimed in Malta. But at the same time the ministry refused to suppress either the optional use of English in the courts, or the right accorded to parents of choosing between the study of English and Italian, in addition to Maltese, in the public schools. Upon proclaiming that decision, the British governor of the island warned the legislature that if it repeated the obstructive tactics of the previous year, by refusing to vote taxes, the constitution would be modified. Irritated by this threat, the 13 elected mem-

bers of the legislative body resigned and returned to their constituents, who promptly reelected them. Thus assured of popular approval in the language question contest, the legislature has now defeated the education appropriation bill for the current year. Consequently, and pursuant to the threat of the governor, the governor in council decreed on the 22d the abrogation of the constitution of 1887 and the revival of that of 1849. He has thus changed the legislature from a body of 6 appointees and 13 elected members, to one of 10 appointees and only 8 elected members.

In American politics the event of the week is the meeting of the Democratic convention of Iowa. Its sessions began on the 24th at Des Moines, with John H. Quick, former mayor of Sioux City, presiding as temporary chairman. D. W. Hamilton was permanent chairman, and the nomination for governor went to Jeremiah H. Sullivan.

Two questions of general interest arose in the controversy. One of these related to the Kansas City platform. The committee on resolutions having refused by a majority vote to recognize that platform in the slightest, a minority member brought the controversy into the convention by moving on the floor that the preamble of the proposed State platform read as follows:

We, the chosen representatives of the Democratic party in Iowa, in convention assembled, hereby declare anew our faith in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party as expressed in the last national platform. The motion was defeated and the committee's preamble, namely—

We, the chosen representatives of the Democratic party of Iowa, in delegate convention assembled, hereby declare anew our faith in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party and renew our allegiance thereto—

was adopted by a vote in convention of 463 to 354. The other question arose over a proposition in favor of government ownership of railroads. This proposition also was defeated in committee, and also came before the convention on a minority report proposing to insert it in the committee's platform. It was defeated 628½ to 129½.

With reference to exclusively

State matters the platform as adopted demands economical government; equitable taxation of corporate and private property; purchase of supplies from lowest bidders; substitution of a local option liquor law for the present mulct law; and State aid in the building of permanent highways. As to other than State matters exclusively it indorses the Louisiana Purchase exposition, and then proceeding to the tariff question declares:

The tariff policy originally adopted for the avowed purpose of raising revenue to meet the enormous burdens of the civil war has been turned to the use of individual and class interests until it has become the creator of countless unearned fortunes and the shelter of huge combinations of capital, organized in the form of trusts, which are strangling competition in many of our industries, destroying individual effort, crushing ambition largely in every line of industry and already acquiring a power which enables them to dictate in their own interest the prices of labor and raw material and the cost of transportation and finished products.

The platform thereupon denounces government by injunction; favors the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; opposes imperialism, insisting upon immediate measures giving self government to the Philippines and Porto Rico; and condemns the Republican party "for its financial policies which would foist upon the country an unstable currency based upon uncertain private securities," protesting especially against the Aldrich bill under which the money of the nation would "be loaned to capitalists upon the bonds and securities of private corporations," and declaring it to be "an effort to give value and stability to watered bonds and securities of corporations and trusts, many of which are maintaining monopolies in defiance of law and public sentiment." Further on the money question the platform insists that—

the integrity of the money of the nation be guarded with jealous care and demand that it shall be sufficient in volume to meet the needs of the business interests of the country, and that it shall be safeguarded by careful legislation, so as to prevent the gamblers of Wall street from cornering the money market, thus inflicting untold injury upon the smaller business men, the farmers and the laborers of the land.