

is highly significant of the extent to which we have drifted away from democratic moorings. The snobbery of Washington social life has fixed itself like a parasitic growth upon Washington official life. Mr. Day's salary was large enough to support him in comfort and decency; why, then, should he resign his office for lack of means to keep up a toploftical social establishment? Simply because undemocratic social customs which he does not care to brave, demand that as secretary of state he live like a lord and entertain like a prince. That is what is meant by "supporting the dignity of the office." Dignity of the office! Mr. Day seems to have supported the dignity of his office very well, in the office, where it should be supported. It is not the American people, but the swell mob, who would require him also to support it with a continuous free lunch at his house. President Hayes was the subject of many sneers because he saved part of his presidential salary. But Hayes deserved especial respect for that. He acted upon the sound democratic idea that official salaries are simply wages for work, carrying with them no obligation whatever, except to honestly earn them. When that idea prevails throughout Washington official life, though Washington social life may suffer, the real work for which official salaries are paid will be better done.

It is not altogether easy to repress some feeling of impatience, either for the good faith or the good sense of the Universal Peace Union, which has just been holding its annual meeting in Connecticut. It denounces war with all its might; yet it does nothing, advocates nothing, is friendly to nothing that would really make for peace. Its panacea for war is international arbitration. No doubt arbitration would be a vast improvement in ridding us of the horrors of war, but it could not put an end to what is worst about war. So long as the causes of war are fostered, its worst evils will persist. The Peace Union seems to think that the hor-

rors of war are the worst of it. That is not true. The death of soldiers and the destruction of property are small matters in comparison with the passions that war generates; and those same passions would flourish under systems of arbitration. They might even intensify in bitterness from the very suppression of war; while some of the blackest evils might flourish under arbitration as they could not if war were still regarded as the court of last resort. Many things are worse than death in battle. Slavery is one—worse alike for master and slave. Many things are worse than destruction of property in battle, among which systematic interference with the production of property and systematic divergence from its producers of the results of production, are not the least. These things figure among the great indirect causes of war. Their reform would put an end not only to killing and destruction, but also to the passions which war expresses and engenders and which arbitration could not allay. Yet as to them the Peace Union is silent. Even that moderate though far-reaching and deep-touching of the reforms which make for peace, the abolition of tariffs, finds only individual support here and there in the Peace Union. The Peace Union as a body is given over almost as completely to the great war god Protection as is the warlike manufacturers' union. As to more radical reforms—the abolition, for example, of that most prolific cause of war, landlordism—the Peace Union has vested interests to conserve which stand as a forbidding specter in its path. Some of its members plead for this reform, but the union itself is dumb. It is easy to cry, Peace! and to propose patent devices for enforcing peace; but it is hard to stand out against the vested wrongs that make real peace impossible. The Peace Union seems to bear much the same relation to peace that a sabbatarian society might bear to religion.

What a humiliating commentary upon our good faith is the refusal of

the Haitian government to permit the United States to establish a weather bureau station at Mole St. Nicholas. The refusal is based upon a suspicion of ulterior bad motives on our part, the Haitians fearing that our establishment of a weather bureau station within their jurisdiction would be only the first step toward our ultimate acquisition of the Haitian country. Their suspicion would have been laughable six months ago. But today we are obliged to confess that it is at least excusable. For behold the record we have recently made in this respect. Conspiring with a little knot of Hawaiians, mostly of American origin, we have gobbled up the Hawaiian islands. Taking advantage of the fortunes of war with a European power, we have grabbed Puerto Rico without the least reference to the wishes of its inhabitants. Under cover of adjusting the same war, we are proposing to appropriate the Philippines in utter disregard of the natives, whom our expansionist newspapers are viciously denouncing because they claim the simple right of self-government. And as to Cuba, we not only propose to grab that island, but in doing so to ignore our pledged faith. When the Haitians note the conscienceless land hunger we are thus developing, and observe how European nations use slight territorial concessions in China to slice up that empire, is it remarkable that they should suspect our good faith in soliciting permission to establish a weather bureau station upon their island? The action of Haiti in this matter is an indication of the kind of reputation which, thanks to our imperialists, we are gaining among our neighbors. No doubt all the republics to the south of us, which once trusted the United States as an older and stronger brother in republicanism, entertain similar suspicions to those of Haiti. If they do, it is nobody's fault but our own.

At the bankers' convention in Denver last week, some leather-faced Shylock compared the patriotism of sol-