

he does on the ground that it is not a matter connected with municipal affairs. Consequently the lord mayor and the sheriff must themselves foot the cable bill of about \$38. That is a most excellent example, and it would be well if it were strictly followed everywhere. It is just as dishonest for public officials to spend public money for public purposes not within the functions of their government, as to spend it for private purposes. When Congress, for instance, appropriates money for a purpose which, though public in one sense is not so in the Congressional sense—ship subsidies for instance—it robs tax payers just as truly as the city of Cork was expecting to rob tax payers when at their expense it cabled a message to the United States on an international subject.

THE "KNOCKERS."

It was inevitable, of course, as soon as announcement was made that the government had in contemplation the farming out to the highest bidder of the monopoly of the opium traffic in the Philippines, with a proviso that the sale of the drug should be confined strictly to the Chinaman, that the "knockers" should be heard from.

Yet it did seem only fair and reasonable that the financial "knockers"—those who assail our colonial policy because of the increased taxation its execution imposes on the American citizen—should be silent. But they were not. It was in vain to tell them that the opium license would take from the imperialistic burden which was staggering our patriotism at least \$100,000 a year. They laughed scornfully, exclaiming with insolent precision that the amount saved was not even worthy to be spoken of as a bagatelle; that \$100,000 taken from \$200,000,000 would leave \$199,900,000, or 1,999 two thousandths of the present annual colonial expense. "But, even if it left us only one trillionth of the expense to pay," they asserted with unbearable candor, "we would still knock." Our demand is that the complete burden be removed—our demand," said these

poor creatures, in a tone teeming with disloyalty, "is that we give up the infernal, trouble-breeding islands."

Another class of "knockers," self-styled "patriotic," had, from a superficial point of view, better grounds for their complaints. Basing, as usual, their fault finding on the equality clause of the Declaration of Independence, they arraigned the Administration for discrimination. "Why," they cried in pitiful indignation, "should the Chinese be permitted to indulge in the tranquilizing drug while the Americans and the Filipinos are interdicted?" These narrow, short-sighted people seemed to find it impossible to grasp and appreciate the real purpose of the Administration's wise measure of exception. They did not consider that the opium fiend is, necessarily, on his way to the cemetery, that every Chinaman buried means one less possible live Boxer, which means one less possible factor of danger to the American missionary. They failed to recognize that the prohibition of the use of opium among the Americans tended to save that people. And they did not reason from experience that opium is forbidden to the Filipinos simply because we can arrange the disposition of their number without being obliged to tempt them to self-destruction.

But let us take heart. Let us hope that in time all "knockers" will become so broadened by culture that they will be ashamed of ever having tried to pick flaws in our glorious programme of expansion. In the meantime we will go onward, as we have been going, from success to success. Our flag of liberty will float over nation after nation as we proceed; and under its protecting folds will be sheltered the American and the alien, the live and the dead.

G. T. EVANS.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 25.

Regarding the Servian revolution (p. 166) the Czar of Russia has supplemented his note to Peter I of Servia (p. 168) with the following

message published officially at St. Petersburg on the 18th:

A week has now elapsed since the day of the bloody revolution at Belgrade, an intimation of which could not be given to the Imperial Government in the customary official form because legal authority was lacking in Servia. Strictly adhering to her standpoint of noninterference in the internal affairs of the Balkan states, and at the same time finding it impossible to hold any intercourse with the persons who have arbitrarily usurped power, Russia has awaited the conclusion of the troubles in order to define clearly her attitude toward the events in the kingdom of Servia. The Skuptschina and Senate assembled in extraordinary session June 15, the legal order of things was reestablished, and Prince Peter Karageorgevitch was unanimously elected king. The Prince, complying with the request of the national assembly, has consented to ascend the throne of Servia under the name of Peter I. Immediately after the proclamation the new King telegraphed to the Czar, asking his imperial majesty to recognize him as King, whereupon the reply of his majesty in confirmation of this was sent. The Imperial Government, while hailing the election of the new monarch, scion of a glorious dynasty, and wishing all success to the supreme head of the Servian people, which is allied to Russia by ties of religion, can nevertheless not refrain from expressing the confident hope that King Peter will be able to give evidence of his sense of justice and firmness of will by adopting measures at the outset to investigate the abominable misdeed which has been committed and to mete out rigorous punishment to those traitorous criminals who have stained themselves with the infamy attaching to regicides. Of course, the entire Servian nation or army cannot be held responsible for the crime which revolts public conscience, yet it would be dangerous to Servia's internal peace not to exact expiation for the revolution carried out with violence by the military. Such neglect would inevitably react in an unfavorable manner on the relations of all the states with Servia, and would create for Servia serious difficulties at the very commencement of the reign of King Peter I. Their Russian co-religionists offer to God supplications for the repose of the souls of King Alexander and his consort, who have met an untimely end, and they invoke the blessing of the Almighty on the rule of King Peter for the welfare and prosperity of the Servian people.

Recognition of the new Servian government by Italy, as announced last week (p. 169), has since been denied. Four other nations have dis-

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 Serbia, 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 Serbia 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 Serbia 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 Serbia 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 Serbia" 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 Serbia 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,