

The Outlook

A Family Paper

Volume 53

Saturday, 22 February, 1896

Number 8

THE Queen's Speech last week was, as usual, a kind of formal and non-communicative prelude to the opening of the new session of the English Parliament. The principal interest in it centered in the expressions with regard to Armenia, Venezuela, and South Africa, but on all these matters the tone of the message, while distinctly pacific, was vague and noncommittal. The Queen conveyed the rather stale information that the Sultan had sanctioned reforms proposed for the Armenian provinces, and expressed her regret that the fanatical outbreak among the Turkish population had resulted in a series of massacres. She also regretted the sudden excursion into the South African Republic of an armed force, and declared that the matter would be made the subject of a searching inquiry. The Government of the United States having expressed a wish to co-operate in the termination of the differences between England and Venezuela, the Queen expressed her sympathy with the desire to come to an equitable arrangement. In a word, the Speech, as usual, was purely a formal matter, but the debate which followed was significant as showing the attitude of the parties. Lord Rosebery severely criticised the Government's policy toward Armenia, which he declared was most mysterious and led to the conclusion that the Ministry had decided to abandon the cause of Armenia. Touching on the Venezuelan question, Lord Rosebery said that he welcomed the intervention of the United States because it introduced the important element of a substantial Government offering to guarantee the permanence of any settlement that might be arrived at. The whole speech was distinctly friendly in character, and Lord Salisbury, who followed, declared that the chief obstacle to settlement had been the extravagant claims of Venezuela, but that the difficulty would, in his judgment, be solved before long by the mutual development of a desire for arbitration. On Monday of this week an amendment to the reply to the Queen's Speech was moved in the House of Commons urging that the whole question should be submitted to arbitration. A most interesting debate followed, which was closed by the assurance of Mr. Balfour that the amendment would only hinder the object in view. Sir William Harcourt declared that both inside and outside the House the consensus of opinion was in favor of arbitration. The feeling seems to be very general in London that an early adjustment of the affair is now assured. Pressure has been brought to bear by our own Government on Venezuela to resume diplomatic relations with Great Britain, and when a Minister from Venezuela arrives in London, it is believed that the way will be open for a prompt adjustment of the differences between the two countries. The immense advantage of treating international affairs with calmness and deliberation instead of bluster and buncombe is plainly seen in the contrast suggested by the speeches of Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords, and of Mr. Frye in the United States Senate. Lord Rosebery's attitude was that of a trained statesman dealing with affairs of world-

wide moment with dignity and a deep sense of responsibility. Mr. Frye's attitude was that of an angry boy who shakes his fists and declaims.

The legal opinion of Professor Bernay, of the University of Lausanne, which we publish on another page, is a very important document. It was obtained, as will be seen, by the British Peace Association, and has been forwarded to The Outlook by a special English correspondent. It is distinctly a judicial opinion, wholly free from political and national bias. It has the authority of an impartial opinion, and settles, as far as any opinion from a single unprejudiced and disinterested expert can settle, some of the disputed questions involved in the Venezuela controversy. According to this opinion, the Monroe Doctrine does not justify our intervention in the Venezuelan dispute; the claims of Secretary Olney in this respect are unfounded, and, moreover, were not presented in proper forms of diplomatic courtesy. On the other hand, our declaration that England's refusal to submit the Venezuelan question to arbitration would be regarded as unfriendly, though "ill conceived from some points of view," is not a menace of war; nor is the appointment of the Commission an infraction of international law. Finally, while intervention by one State in a controversy between two other States is sometimes legitimate, notably when a stronger State is committing an unlawful act to the injury of a weaker State, it appears impossible to discover in the issues between Venezuela and England any conditions which justify such intervention by the United States. Such, in brief, is the substance of this opinion, which we commend to the studious consideration of our candid readers. This valuable paper gives us the gift to "see ourselves as others see us"—always a valuable though not always a welcome gift.

The chief figure of the week in England has been Mr. Chamberlain, whose very able management of the difficulties in South Africa has elicited praise even from his political enemies. The notable quality which has characterized Mr. Chamberlain's treatment of South African matters has been directness. He seemed to grasp the situation the very moment the startling news was conveyed to him, and before the newspapers had published the reports the Secretary for the Colonies had taken every step necessary to disavow Dr. Jameson's enterprise in every form. There was none of the usual diplomatic evasion and procrastination. In the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain has shown the same qualities. He has apparently taken the whole English public into his confidence, and told them the entire story without any of the usual diplomatic reservations and concealments. He has substituted complete publicity for the traditional diplomatic policy of secrecy, and it is not surprising that this new method has secured popular approval on the instant. From the very beginning Mr. Chamberlain has made the newspapers free of all the information which he possessed. Twenty-four hours before

the debate on the Transvaal affair in the House of Commons he had published the dispatches, and when he stood on his feet to meet his critics he practically disarmed them by telling the whole story simply, frankly, and apparently without any evasions. His critics had expected to make a point of his unwise haste in printing the dispatch to the British High Commissioner in South Africa, in which he had set forth the grievances of the foreign residents of the Transvaal and suggested a scheme of reforms which included the practical autonomy of the residents of the Rand. To this suggestion President Kruger took serious offense, and has refused to carry out his intention of visiting England for the purpose of conference with the Government.

⊗

Mr. Chamberlain described this whole transaction, went over the whole question with the greatest apparent candor, said frankly that he had irritated President Kruger by his unwise action, and had possibly prevented his proposed visit; that he had made a mistake in making public a scheme of reform in the government of the Rand without previously submitting it to President Kruger; that his action had been met by an angry protest; that he withdrew it as a mere tentative suggestion; and closed a very able speech by the declaration that the English Government intended, under all circumstances, to stand by its rights in South Africa. The speech, by reason of its lucidity, intelligent arrangement of detail, and general air of candor, disarmed criticism and has made the most favorable impression in England. While Mr. Chamberlain was speaking in the House of Commons, Baron von Vieberstein, the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, was also speaking in the German Reichstag. He said that Germany had never attempted to obtain any kind of a protectorate over the Transvaal, but that the German Government will uphold the *status quo* at Delagoa Bay, the rights involved in the ownership of the German railways, and the maintenance of the independence of the South African Republic. In other words, Germany apparently conveys to England the decision that she will not stand by and allow English intervention in the affairs of South Africa. The situation undoubtedly contains elements of danger. It may be doubted whether the English Government proposes to send an army corps of twenty thousand men to South Africa, as is reported in the newspapers, and whether the German Government is also making preparations looking to the same end; but the English cannot leave the difficulty with the Boers where it is, and, if German declarations are to be believed, England cannot interfere to change the conditions for the better without antagonizing Germany.

⊗

The prophecy has been freely made of late that the Bourgeois Ministry would go out of power in France, as its predecessor went out, on the question of the Southern Railway scandals, and the large attendance of visitors in the galleries of the Chamber of Deputies on Thursday of last week was an indication of the popular interest in the subject and in a possible Cabinet crisis. The trial of the first group of speculators involved in the Southern Railway scandal resulted in the defeat of the Ribot Ministry. An examination of all the matters involved has been in progress for several months, and the question upon which the Bourgeois Ministry was to stand or fall last week related to the appointment of what is called in France a Judge of Instruction to conduct the inquiry. Judge Poitevin was selected for the work, and the charge has been freely made that this official was too much under Ministerial influence. On that ground the Ministry had been beaten in the

Senate, and its opponents expected to beat it in the popular body. How much sincerity there is in the charge against Judge Poitevin it is impossible to say, but the opinion seems to be that the charge was simply a pretext under cover of which the opponents of the Ministry hoped to overthrow it. Out of 581 members of the Chamber, 326 voted for the Ministry and 43 against it, leaving a large group of Deputies, 212, who seem to have preferred to leave the present Ministry in office, but who were not willing to indorse it. The affirmative vote came largely from the Moderate Republicans. In the Senate the Ministry is accused of being too radical; among the Radicals it is charged with being too conservative. But it is probably having as comfortable a time as any French Ministry can under the existing conditions in the Chamber of Deputies. All parties and groups are now looking more to the municipal elections, which will take place throughout France in May, than to the carrying out of any distinct policy.

⊗

In the United States Senate last week five free-coinage Republicans voted with the Democrats and Populists against the consideration of the House tariff bill. The Republicans who thus broke away from party lines upon a question involving what has been the cardinal principle of the party were: Senators Jones, of Nevada, Teller, of Colorado, Dubois, of Idaho, and Carter and Mantle, of Montana. With their aid the Democrats and Populists buried the tariff bill by a vote of 29 to 21. Some Republican papers express confidence that this action will be reconsidered, but the general belief is that the tariff bill is killed and that the bolting Republicans have formally served notice that they care as little for the protection of Eastern manufacturers as the latter for the protection of Western silver-miners. Whatever the outcome, the vote furnishes another sign that Republican unity is increasingly difficult to maintain. When so many Western Republicans will vote with Southern Democrats against a tariff bill, the union of the free-trade and free-coinage sections of the country in one political party certainly seems less remote. In the House of Representatives the important event of the week was the defeat of the Senate's free-coinage amendment to the Bond Bill by a majority of 125 votes. This majority against free coinage was without precedent in recent years. Even in the fall of 1893, the free-coinage amendment to the bill repealing the Sherman Act received 125 votes, as against 226 in opposition. This year the free-coinage proposition received but 90 votes, as against 215 in opposition. An analysis of the two votes shows that the increased strength of the opposition was due to the increased strength of the Republican party. In 1893 the Democrats voted 114 to 101 against free coinage; this year they voted 58 to 31 in its favor. In 1893 the Republicans voted 112 to 13 against free coinage; this year they voted 184 to 25 against it. In 1893 the free-coinage proposition had the support of 11 Populists; this year of only 7. It was, therefore, to the displacement of Democrats and Populists by Republicans in the elections of 1894 that the extent of last week's anti-silver victory was due. Only seven Republicans from east of the Missouri River supported the free-coinage proposition. This vote is admitted by silver men to be a decided setback to free coinage.

⊗

In interpreting the significance of this action the reader must recall the classification of parties on the financial question which The Outlook has heretofore given. These parties are not two, but three: the first is in favor of gold monometallism; the second is in favor of a double or alter-