of many in this country and abroad "that in our dealings with the state of Colombia we have violated and are about to violate the rules of international law, and that we are adopting a line of conduct toward that country which we would not have taken against a stronger power." The petition further says that the fact of Colombia's comparative weakness should make us the more careful to avoid the suspicion that we are making an unjust use of our great power and that the mere existence of such a suspicion is injurious to our honor and self-respect. It concludes by saying: "We therefore respectfully ask that before final ratification of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty our action in Panama be carefully and deliberately investigated, to the end not only that the Republic may do no wrong, but that its good reputation in the world, which is dearer than any gain of lands or trade, should suffer no loss."

One report on the Iroquois theater fire in Chicago (p. 632) was made on the 12th. It is the report of a committee of experts—builders and architects—appointed by Mayor Harrison to answer the following quesions: (1) What was the primary cause of the fire? (2) Why did the fire extend? (3) Why did it spread to the auditorium? (4) What caused the loss of life? The inquiry by this committee has been made with evident skill and care, and the report appears to be conscientious and candid. Yet there is a plain minimization of the fact, which can be proved by abundant evidence, that the fire was attended by an explosion so tremendous that it rose in a pillar of fire-flash through the stage skylight to a distance of 70 or 80 feet above the stage roof. The experts' report does, indeed, account for the spread of the fire to the auditorium in part by "air pressure producing friction against brick wall, due to expansion of air or gases resulting from burning of scenery"; but it does not appear to have considered whether this "expansion of air or gases"—of sufficient force to break through the skylight and rise high in the outer air explosively—may not also have flashed into the auditorium explosively. Again, in assigning causes for the deaths, no account appears to have been taken in this report of the apparently reasonable suspicion that the expanding gases may possibly have been of such a character as to suggest the advisability of organizing a supplementary expert committee composed of chemists. The causes of death suggested by this report are panic, asphyxiation, and burning; and it is implied that these resulted from flame, smoke, and gas produced by the natural progress of quick combustion in a confined place. Yet there is reason for grave suspicion, at least, that many of the deaths were caused by the fumes of an explosion produced by other causes. This is a view of the catastrophe that ought not to be neglected by the coroner's jury. The facts that give rise to the suspicion may not lead to important results, when considered by experts; but they are facts, highly significant facts to the non-technical mind, and their significance or lack of it ought to be clearly disclosed by competent expert witnesses.

Great disasters to civilization are predicted by the London Spectator as the possible outcome of the possible discovery that experiments with radium may lead to the transmutation of metals. As quoted by a Canadian paper, it ruminates in this wise:

> If it became possible simply and expeditiously to transmute lead and iron into gold or silver, the basis of our civilization would disappear. Wealth in kind would become the only form of riches. The stores of bullion at the banks would become simply heaps of scrap-iron. The great financial centers of the world, which owe their importance to their gold reserves, would lose the basis of their preeminence. A sovereign would become no more than a dishonored bank note, representing, it is true, a certain amount of labor or produce, but incapable of realization in any known value, because the basis of values had fallen. Banking would come to an end; reserves of capital would cease to have any practical meaning; all forms of investment would cease; the gold-producing countries, like the Transvaal and West Australia, would be bankrupted; and the elaborate system of commerce which mankind has built up during a thousand years would crumble about our ears, for there would be no standard, no little rod, by which to measure prices.

One must hestitate to deal seriously with that paragraph, it has so suggestively the flavor of a satire upon the "gold bug" fanatics. Yet it may be well, even at the risk of falling a victim to a subtle joke, to observe that so long as there are men to do the work that they themselves want done, and no legal obstructions are interposed between them and the natural sources of supply nor between them in their mutual trading, they will manage to get along very comfortably though gold becomes as cheap as dirt.

New York's genial and eccentric district attorney, William Travers Jerome, a man-about-town-turned-reformer-of-other-folks, who is so suggestive of a paper-bound and slightly reedited edition of Roosevelt, has blown through Chicago with the mild cyclonic force of a Manhattan gale, and like a wandering comet has left behind him a dizzy dazzle in the civic atmosphere. If this rhetoric is flamboyant and mixed and perhaps incoherent, it is for that reason all the better adapted for its descriptive purposes. For a public character more flamboyant and mixed and incoherent than Mr. Jerome, it would be difficult to find anywhere within the generous covers of "Who's Who in America."

Mr. Jerome is a stickler for enforcement of the law as it is, regardless of whether it is right or not. Indeed, he is rather contemptuous of the idea of rights, as being youthfully academic. But he holds that laws must be enforced, wherefore he devotes his energies to the suppression of illegal gambling, illegal prostitution, illegal beer-drinking, etc., which is all very proper and commendable for an administrative officer as such. Not district attorneys, but legislatures, are responsible for the wisdom of laws. Yet Mr. Jerome, an administrative officer, confesses to encouraging the police in brutal crimes against persons charged with crime; and this is at least as illegal as dealing faro to men who want it dealt

or serving beer to men who want to drink it. Here, for example, is his declaration, as reported in the Chicago papers, of the way in which policemen in New York treat their prisoners, with the evident knowledge and encouragement of this rattle-de-bang district attorney:

> One thing I will say for our police. They are brave, efficient men; they are not afraid of anything. Should any thug be so unfortunate as to stab, or shoot, or in any way injure a police officer, that thug is brought into headquarters in fragments. He gets badly hurt, if not killed, while resisting arrest. He resists arrest whether he wants to or not.

"He resists arrest whether he wants to or not"! What does that mean? It can mean nothing less than that the policeman criminally treats an unresisting prisoner as if he were resisting, and then falsely reports that the unresisting victim did resist. Of which District Attorney Jerome approves.

—

Severe but just were the comments which Edward F. Dunne, one of the circuit court judges of Chicago, made upon Jerome's view of police criminality, when a case of the same character came before him upon an application for the protection of two men under arrest from police violence. The police officer had beaten a fellow prisoner with the butt end of a revolver; and though the beating had not reduced the prisoners "to fragments," as appears to be customary within Mr. Jerome's jurisdiction, Judge Dunne took occasion to say:

> I would like to say in connection with the abuse of prisoners that the statements attributed to District Attorney Jerome are law-defying, crime-inciting utterances from a public officer charged with the preservation of the peace. They simply incite officers to commit crime. Men in his position should not be guilty of uttering such incendiary and illegal statements. It is most outrageous, unworthy of the man and a disgrace to his office. I have made these statements concerning Mr. Jerome on the assumption that he was correctly quoted as follows: "Most of the men charged with crime, with us, when brought into court, bear evidence of resisting an officer. We see to it that these men do resist an officer or we force them to and then bring them into court in fragments." I am astounded at Mr. Jerome, as I had always believed him to be a vigorous prosecutor and an honest man.

Judge Dunne was not mistaken in his original estimate of Mr. Jerome's personal character and official vigor; but he had evidently known nothing of that agile public servant's intellectual and ethical eccentricities.

—

The following extract from Mr. Jerome's speech before the Chicago Merchants' Club makes him seem an entirely different man from the inciter of police to crime which his incendiary interview revealed to Judge Dunne:

> I was puzzled for a long time to think why it was that good men were not found in public life, and I said to myself: "This seems a strange thing that among 80,000,000 of people corruption should be found only in public life. What is this mysterious virus that a man becomes inoculated with when he goes into public life that makes him a 'crook?'" It dawned on me on reflection that the corruption of public life was perfectly rational, because it was nothing but the reflection of commercial life. Now, you know the business world better than I do, but I know it well enough to know that there is hardly a concern that manufactures that does not have to bribe the purchasing agents of the people that they sell to; and it is not right, and it is not honest, and it is no defense to the man that does it, to simply say that they are all doing it. Nor is it any defense for a man to say: "I shall be ruined in business if I don't." Isn't there something in this world higher than not being ruined in business?

It is hard to realize that those sane sentiments could spring from the same brain that so ignobly encourages brutal crime by the police, or that could immediately emit this incoherent mixture of false democracy and brummagem aristocracy:

> We have got to get the men, and we will get the men when we get away from this farcical doctrine that there are no classes. I tell you there are classes and there will be to the end of time. There are brave men and cowards; there are true fellows and liars; there are honest men and thieves. God Almighty did not make all trees to grow to the same height, nor all mountains of the same altitude. And, it is class that has got to save the classes if this democracy or any other democracy is going to be saved.

It is evident from this that eccentricity is not Mr. Jerome's only fault, for eccentricity is not necessarily incompatible with at least enough clarity of thought to see that the question of classes in a democracy is not a question of "brave men and cowards," "true fellows and liars," or "honest men and thieves," but of equality of legal rights.

—

In commenting approvingly upon Mr. Jerome's speech, Mr. Walter L. Fisher, of the Municipal Voters' League, judiciously selected its best part and gave it more concise expression in these emphatic words:

> There can be no doubt that, in the broad view, political conditions are but a reflex of commercial and social conditions. Dishonesty and corruption are no more universal in commercial life than they are universal in political life, but it is only too true that political corruption exists because commercial corruption exists and to the extent that it exists.

We heartily commend that true indictment to the prayerful consideration of "business classes" everywhere. The distinguished and courageous Howard Crosby, writing many years ago in the North American Review, was almost prophetic in his characterization of what we should now call the wealthy business classes. He plumply called them distinctively "the dangerous classes." Even then the moral putridity which permeates these classes—making their codes of ethics even more offensive than their boasts of virtue—which Mr. Jerome deplored and Mr. Fisher describes, was perceptible to men like Crosby. Such social phenomena are inevitable, however, where the law makes privilege and the privileged rule the law.

It may be proved, with much certainty, that God intends no man to live in this world without working; but it seems no less evident that he intends every man to be happy in his work. It was written: "In the sweat of thy brow," but it was never written: "In the breaking of thy heart."—John Ruskin.