

march to their rescue. President Kruger was not without warning of the revolt, and determined to defeat it. His resolve was a real triumph for the Uitlanders, for, ten days ago, he had promised them to support the demand to remove the tariff on food-stuffs, to grant equal subsidies to all schools, no matter what language was taught, and to extend the franchise, if on their part they would defend law and order at Johannesburg. An agreement being made, the city was placarded with these conditions, and the President seized the telegraph. The revolutionists were thus checkmated at home and could not communicate with their friends abroad. When the invading force arrived thirty miles from Johannesburg, the Boers met them and, with their marvelous marksmanship, repeated the history of Majuba Hill fourteen years ago. Of 110 Englishmen who were struck, 80 were killed. Five hundred were taken prisoners.

⊛

The news from South Africa quickly produced a storm in European international relations. The Emperor William, with the journalistic tendencies which have been characteristic of him, and which do not very well accord with his view of government, promptly rushed into print on receipt of the news of Dr. Jameson's foray. He telegraphed to President Kruger, of the South African Republic, his sincere congratulations that, without appealing for help to friendly powers, the Boers had succeeded by their own energetic action in putting down the disturbers of their peace, thus protecting the independence of the country against foreign attacks. Under the circumstances, and especially in view of England's treaty right to control the foreign relations of the South African Republic, this message is unquestionably a menace to England and an expression of the unfriendly feeling toward that country which has become very marked throughout Germany. The English people, while somewhat stirred up and angered by the President's Venezuelan message, were profoundly moved by this evidence of the Emperor William's hostility, and have responded with a unanimity which makes it clear that England will insist upon a free hand in South Africa at any cost. "British passion," says the "Globe," "is steadily rising, and the solicitude of the Ministers is to prevent a premature outbreak." The press generally interprets the Emperor's message as a deliberate insult and urges the Government to make every preparation for war. What is known as the German party is strong at the English court, but if English feeling is as intense as the newspapers seem to indicate, Lord Salisbury will be powerless to withstand the popular pressure which will be brought to bear upon him. The Emperor has stirred up a tempest which he has not allayed by his noticeably cordial reception of the South African Republic's Secretary of State, and his assurances of German aid to the Boers if they need it. The situation is full of peril to the peace of Europe.

⊛

The composition of the Venezuelan Commission commands the confidence of the country, although it cannot be said that in all respects it fulfills the highest expectations of those who hoped for the best possible combination of dispassionateness and ability. Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, and Justice Alvey, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, bring to the discharge of their delicate duties judicial training and habits of mind. President Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, and ex-President White, of Cornell College, represent the highest character, in attainment, equipment, and spirit. They are capable of looking at the ques-

tions submitted to them in the broadest light, without fear or favor. Mr. Frederick R. Coudert, of this city, is an accomplished and successful lawyer, brilliant, facile, and able, whose strong anti-British statements, reported to have been made shortly after the publication of the President's message, have irritated the English public, and are unfortunately suggestive of opinions already formed on matters which demand absolute openness of mind. The political complexion of the Commission is a very subordinate matter. Of the five appointees three are Republicans, but the party affiliations of such a man as Dr. Gilman are never of a tyrannical kind. At the first meeting of the Commissioners on Saturday, Justice Brewer was unanimously chosen to act as presiding officer. In his instructions to the Commission, the President declares that it is expected that the Commission will avail itself of all possible sources of information, will apply to the matter all pertinent rules of municipal and international law, and will report their conclusions, with evidence and documents, with as little delay as possible to the President. These instructions are sufficiently comprehensive to permit the Commission to investigate all matters relating to the boundary dispute between England and Venezuela. They may find that there is a boundary, and that evidence exists which will permit them to agree upon an actual line; or they may find, as we suspect they will, that no such boundary line exists. They are charged with duties of the very highest character. It will be possible for them, acting within the limits of their very indefinite and general power, not only to state their conclusions with regard to the matters in dispute, but to recommend some form of settlement between this country and Great Britain. The speech of Mr. Carl Schurz before the Chamber of Commerce in this city last week indicates one of the lines along which such action might be taken. He suggested that the moral weight of the Commission would be greatly increased if England were invited to name an equal number of appointees, and this joint Commission were to select a distinguished outsider to preside, the Commission not to act as a Board of Arbitration, but as an Advisory Council to report to the two Governments. The findings of such a Commission would carry an authority so great that, in all probability, neither Government could disregard its conclusions.

⊛

One of the consolatory features of the Venezuelan incident has been the disclosure of the growing community in sentiment between the two great English-speaking nations. It is clear that here is a new and distinct element in the relations of the two countries—an element which does not exist, for instance, between France and Germany, or between England and Germany, or between any other two great powers. It is a sentiment which the Governments of both countries will have to reckon with. The religious public on both sides of the Atlantic is making this sentiment felt. On Thursday of last week Dr. Abbott received by cable the following message: "London Nonconformist Council send greetings to churches of America and assurances that the two nations are one and indivisible." This Council represents, we believe, the entire body of Nonconformist Churches in London. The Presbyterian Church in Scotland has also spoken in unmistakable terms, the Edinburgh Presbytery of the Free Church having telegraphed to the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in this country the hope that "everything consistent with the will of Christ will be done on both sides to secure a worthy and peaceful settlement of questions under debate," to which Dr. Robert Russell Booth has responded in kindred spirit.

The Evangelical Alliances of both countries have united in the request that English-speaking Christians should make common prayer on Wednesday of this week that "Christ-like counsels may prevail in the present crisis." The British authors, to the number, it is said, of thirteen hundred, have printed an address to American writers in which they declare that if war were to occur between the two countries English literature would be dishonored and disfigured for a century to come:

"There is no anti-American feeling among Englishmen. It is impossible there can be any anti-English feeling among Americans. For two such nations to take up arms would be civil war, not differing from your calamitous struggle of thirty years ago, except that the cause would be immeasurably less humane, less tragic, and less inevitable."

The Peace Association, at a special meeting, has passed a resolution urging the submission of matters in dispute to arbitration; Boards of Trade have sent messages of peace, and labor organizations in both countries have protested against the war talk as injurious in the last degree to the prosperity of the working classes. These expressions may be taken as voicing the feeling of the vast majority of thoughtful Christian people in this country and in Great Britain.

Public curiosity has been excited by the disclosure that private interests may have something to do with the Venezuelan dispute. On the English side is a corporation, concerning which we know little except that it exists and is endeavoring to get possession of certain mines and lands in the disputed territory. On our side are two other corporations, one organized in New York, the other controlled if not organized in Minnesota, both of which have obtained concessions from the Venezuelan Government in the same disputed territory. There is more in this drama than appears publicly upon the stage. There have been Venezuelan agents active in the lobby, laboring with individual members and appearing before House committees for the purpose of promoting these pecuniary interests. In some cases these agents have been ex-Ministers of the United States to Venezuela, who, when their terms of office expired, have come to Washington to promote Venezuelan-American interests. In one notable case the Minister of the United States, appointed to press our claims against Venezuela, when his term expired returned to Washington as an agent of Venezuela to urge on Congress the supervision and modification of these very claims. The public will be glad to know the facts in this matter; it will not tolerate private influence and interest in an international dispute.

While we are in a great state of excitement over the remote, not to say unthinkable, peril to the United States from imagined British aggression on a Spanish republic in Venezuela, we bear with very unexemplary patience the destruction of American property, the hazarding of American lives, the interference with American rights and liberties on Turkish soil. Thousands of dollars' worth of property has been destroyed there by mobs, abetted by the Government. Americans pursuing a legitimate business are in terror for their lives, and are practically prisoners in their own houses, not daring to venture out, and we have thus far contented ourselves with insisting that they shall not be massacred along with their friends, and with pressing on the Turkish Government a claim for money reparation for the buildings which have actually been burned. If our Americanism is genuine; if it is not a mere pseudo-Americanism stirred up for political purposes by political organs; if it is something more than an Americanism for an elec-

tion, it ought to express itself in a demand that our Government should display, in the protection of American citizens in Turkey, something of that vigor which it pretends to display in the protection of Spanish-American interests in Venezuela. If the United States Government should propose an alliance with Russia and England for the purpose of compelling the Turk to fulfill the functions of government, to put an end to wholesale massacres, at least to furnish adequate protection to American citizens within its territory, the three Governments together could at once bring some peace out of that horrible disorder, and, if necessary (as we believe it is), could dethrone the present Sultan and establish a competent government where now there is nothing but anarchy. Whether this is feasible or not, one thing is certain: either our Government ought to notify American citizens on Turkish soil that it will not protect them and they must remain there at their own risk, or else it ought to furnish them protection, not merely from the saber of the Kurd, but from the fear and horror in which they are now continuously living.

Last week, for the fourth time during the present Administration, different kinds of money were not at par with each other at the money exchanges. The first occasion was during the panic of 1893, when Government notes and silver certificates rose to a premium of one per cent. over gold. This premium (which came at the time the Administration was insisting that the business world feared the depreciation of silver and paper) was due to the exceptional demand for money of small denominations. This demand could not be met by gold coin, as gold coin was chiefly in large denominations, and could be met by silver and paper. Therefore silver and paper rose to a premium over gold. On each later occasion, when different kinds of currency have not been at a "parity" on the exchanges, the premium has been upon gold. The cause has in each instance been the issue of bonds by the Administration to strengthen the gold reserve. The sale of these bonds to buy gold has of course created for gold money a demand which could not be met by silver and paper money. Therefore gold has been raised to a premium by the very attempts of the Administration to prevent a premium. Gold has never been at a premium except in the presence of these attempts of the present Administration to prevent such an outcome. Last week's premium upon gold extended also to the legal-tender notes which the Treasury redeems in gold at the option of the holder. The premium upon gold was from 1 to $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., and dealers in money would not furnish legal-tender notes except at about the same advance. These premiums were of course limited to the money exchanges. In all ordinary commercial payments silver certificates and bank notes were at par with gold and Government notes. In this way the country has had another concrete illustration of the error of the monometallist contention that a small premium upon one kind of money on the money exchanges is incompatible with the parity of different kinds of money in the general business of the Nation. The only argument ever advanced to indicate that the French bimetallic law (1803-1873) did not keep gold and silver at par is thus proved to be worthless. The Nation is being educated in the principles of bimetalism by the efforts of the Administration to establish monometallism.

The premium upon gold, greenbacks, and Sherman Act notes last week was of course due to the anxiety of investors to participate in the expected bond issue. The formal announcement of this issue was not made until midnight on