

personified, had entered into our consciousness.

Isn't this the experience of us all? And doesn't it repeat itself, in ever varying form, again and again through life?

One prized superstition after another—religious, political, social—fades away, leaving for a time a blank and possibly stimulating hypocritical instincts. But when it has served its uses (and all good superstitions serve good uses), we find upon fully relinquishing it, that the truth which it has only symbolized becomes more real to us than the symbol ever was.

Just as fatherly and motherly affection—a mere abstraction, if you please—looms up now above the accumulated memories of half a century, as infinitely more real and concrete than the Santa Claus myth by which that affection was expressed at Christmas time, so do even greater truths become the more real as with intelligence and good motive we abandon the superstitions that have supported them in the progressive stages of character building.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 19.—The speech delivered by Congressman Robert Baker in the House on December 14th fully justifies the efforts put forth by The Radical Democracy of Brooklyn for his election in the campaign of 1902 in the Sixth Congressional District of New York. Our speakers then promised the voters of that district that if he were elected, unlike so many who had been sent to Congress in the past from our city, he would be heard from upon the trust and other economic questions in a way that would command attention from Congress and the country. He has already redeemed that promise in the speech referred to, which is a notably vigorous arraignment of the protectionist superstition, of the Republican claim that universal prosperity exists in this country and that every man who so desires can obtain employment—in the language of Representative Hepburn, of Iowa—"at a compensating wage." The falsity of this claim is vividly shown by Mr. Baker in the many instances he cites of the miserable wages paid to the coal miners, the farm laborers, the factory operative and the shop-girl; while convincing evidence is also presented in the list of lock-outs and shut-downs and wage reductions, culled

from the recent newspaper press, that even the limited prosperity of the past few years is rapidly disappearing.

We are gratified to learn from the New York Times' report that "the speaker had the undivided attention of the House and evoked frequent applause from the Democratic side;" and still more pleased at the sustained interest in the speech shown by requests for a large number of copies for distribution in their own districts received from two leading Congressmen of the West. These requests clearly indicate that the speech is as well adapted for circulation in rural communities as in the crowded labor centers, and The Radical Democracy strongly urges democratic Democrats everywhere to write at once to their Congressmen for as many copies as they can profitably distribute. In this connection we recommend the plan The Radical Democracy itself has adopted, of sending the speech to registered voters.

Requests for copies should be addressed to one's own Congressman, as it would be impossible for Mr. Baker, who is a poor man, to respond to more than requests for individual copies, while the Congressional committee can and no doubt gladly will fill orders given by any Congressman for as many copies as can be profitably used in his district.

Real Democrats will be particularly pleased at Mr. Baker's review of the principles for which Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, and Gov. L. F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island, are making such sturdy fights in their native States.

PETER AITKEN.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 24.

The Panama question (p. 554) has become a subject of most serious controversy at the American capital.

Since our last report on this matter the Republic of Panama has been recognized by Russia, Germany, Austria, France and China; but no recognition has yet been made by any country on the American continents, except the United States.

Reports of military movements by Colombia against Panama have frequently appeared in the news dispatches. None have been confirmed, however, except a recent one, to the effect that a small body of Colombian troops have taken possession of Pinos island, off the

Atlantic coast of Panama, about 50 miles west of Cape Tiburon. Even this is now denied.

Meanwhile the United States have been strengthening their naval and military forces at Panama. They have also sent William I. Buchanan, of New York, as American minister to Panama. Mr. Buchanan's appointment was confirmed by the Senate and he left at once for Panama. But on the 19th Senator Gorman moved a reconsideration on the ground that confirmation had been allowed inadvertently; in consequence of which, under the rules of the Senate, Mr. Buchanan's appointment now stands unconfirmed.

But the event of principal interest and importance regarding the Panama question is the carefully prepared speech delivered on the 17th by Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, in conditional criticism of the Administration. Mr. Hoar's speech is printed in full at page 291 of the Congressional Record for December 17th. The point he emphasized was not whether the Republic of Panama had been recognized prematurely by the Administration, but—

whether our Administration, knowing or expecting beforehand that a revolution was coming, so arranged matters that the revolution, whether peaceable or forcible, should be permitted to go on without interruption, and only took measures to stop the Republic of Colombia from preventing it. Did the President, or the Secretary of State, or any other department of our government, purposely prevent Colombia from anticipating and preventing a breach of the peace and a disturbance of the transit across the Isthmus by sending her troops there before it happened, and so virtually let the revolution take place, and say to Colombia, "You shall take no precautions to stop it?" Did we, in substance, say to Colombia, "We will not allow you to prevent a revolution in your province of Panama by moving your forces there" before it broke out?

After reviewing all the documents which the Administration had sent to the Senate, Mr. Hoar concluded that—

all our government, by its own statement, seems to have done in its anxiety that transit should not be disturbed was not to take measures that violence should not occur, but to take measures that violence should not be prevented. It performed its duty of keeping uninterrupted the transit across the Isthmus