

a department store could not have its advertisement placed on a Congressman's speeches. To this he assented, but on my expressing incredulity he offered to communicate with the Postmaster General's department and secure a ruling thereon. Some ten days later he informed me that the Post Office Department sustained his view.

Now, as to your criticism: "What right has he (Baker) to allow the special privileges given to him personally to be used by the Radical Democracy, a political, partisan organization, for the dissemination of what is palpably campaign literature?"

Your critic presumably is unaware that the Congressional committees of both parties send out in Congressional elections, particularly in Presidential campaigns, millions of these speeches, many, however, like that of Congressman (now Senator) Dick, of January 5, sixty pages long, and that of Congressman McCleary, of April 22, fifty-six pages in length, being documents of which not one sentence was uttered on the floor of Congress.

Like most other abuses, it operates in favor of the rich and powerful, and against the poor and weak. No matter whether it be a political party which raises a \$16,000,000 campaign fund to save the "honor" of the country; whether it be a millionaire candidate like Roswell P. Flower or William Waldorf Astor or Henry Cabot Lodge; whether it be one like Chauncey M. Depew, who can command the Vanderbilt millions—it operates against the party or the candidate who is not rich or who is not backed by the plutocratic interests.

Your critic grows indignant over the poor, weak Radical Democracy of Brooklyn sending out a few thousands of my speeches, but seemingly has no eyes for the millions of speeches which the Republican Congressional Committee is sending out, much of the matter for which was prepared by department clerks at Washington, paid out of the public funds. Republican Congressmen and Senators have at their command and freely call upon bureau chiefs and clerks to make up literature which is inserted in "The Congressional Record" and then circulated under some one's frank. How unfair the whole business is is shown in the fact that the Prohibitionists, Populists, Single Taxers and Socialists have no Representatives in Congress, and consequently have no means of getting their matter made into public documents; and, even if they could, cannot raise one-thousandth part of the money the G. O. P. can and does raise for such a (for it) comparatively innocent purpose.

Your critic says: "If he is able to pay his own railroad fare, as he loudly proclaims, surely the Radical Democracy should be able to pay postage on its own campaign literature." First, as to the Radical Democracy. That organization is made up in the main of a band of enthusiasts who insist that things are "radically" wrong in a body politic which produces the billionaire and his corollary, the tramp, and out of the scanty earnings of its members pay for meetings and literature to enlighten the people as to whence monopoly derives the power to rob and oppress the people. If it were not so engaged, but were content to serve the plutocratic forces in either party, it could not obtain the funds to send out millions of documents to fool and mislead the people, where it now sends out thousands in its efforts to educate them, but there would no doubt be placed at its disposal a handsome clubhouse and all the other accessories of respectability, inertia and contentment, so long as it did not challenge the existing order of things.

I have never said, let alone "loudly proclaimed," that I was able to pay my railroad fare. But that is not the question. In common with all other members of Congress, I signed a receipt for the mileage which the law allows. I could scarcely have maintained my self-respect if I had had a railroad pass in my pocket. That aspect of the matter is, however, trivial compared with the well-known fact that not only are the railroads constantly demanding new legislation in their interest, modifications of or relief from provisions of laws enacted, often as a consideration for their exclusive privileges, but they openly, flagrantly and notoriously violate existing laws. None are more vociferous in demanding that "law and order" shall be maintained, particularly against their employes, while all the time they nullify, trample upon and set at naught laws affecting them. So commonplace has this become that whoever, like the Governor of Wisconsin, would attempt to curb or check them, or even require that they also shall be law-abiding, is denounced as a "fanatic," a "Populist," or laughed at as a fool or a "visionary."

It is not in human nature that he who is the recipient of favors from a railroad, telegraph or telephone company—I care not whether he be alderman, assessor, District Attorney, Corporation Counsel, Mayor or judge, whether he be Assemblyman, Senator, Congressman, United States Senator, Cabinet officer or even the President himself—can bring the same impartiality to the consideration

of legislation affecting these interests, as if he had not used or were not using their passes and franks.

ROBERT BAKER.

Brooklyn, June 28, 1904.

THE RUSSIAN-JAPANESE WAR.

From an interview given by George F. Seward, formerly United States minister to China, to the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of March 1. See editorial paragraph on page 260 of this Public.

The real Eastern question (to be more definite, let us call it the Oriental question) is not an obscure one. Russia owns all the territory in the northern part of Asia from the Ural mountains to the Pacific. She has not had until lately an outlet to the Pacific by an ice-free port. Down between Japan and the littoral of eastern Siberia there pours an arctic current making the climate rigorous for the latitude. For this reason, after the China-Japan war of 1898, Russia, in return for services to China in preventing Japan from making permanent lodgment on the northern shore of the gulf of Pechili, secured from China by a secret treaty the right to build a railway from her trans-Siberian line south through Manchuria, the undisputed territory of China, to Port Arthur on the promontory of Liautung, which promontory extends from the mainland of Manchuria south into the gulf of Pechili, and the right to lease an ice-free harbor on the promontory for permanent occupation. In pursuance of this concession, Russia has built the Manchurian railway to Dalny and Port Arthur at the southern end of the promontory of Liautung and has created commercial and military stations at Dalny and Port Arthur.

It was not wise on the part of China to grant to Russia these concessions. She herself should have fortified the terminal port, giving reasonable transportation privileges to all comers, including Russians. But she could not avoid making the grant. It was in the nature of an enforced "quid pro quo." It is now "un fait accompli." The whole matter was worked out by diplomatic means. Russia got privileges that she needed, and as respects which the world at large may properly feel sympathetic with her. She needed such access to the Pacific. It was on the line of natural development.

There is a general impression that Russian diplomacy is not always scrupulous. It is certain in this case that the occupation of Port Arthur, ostensibly for commercial purposes, has been followed by large expenditures intended to make it a strongly fortified naval station. It is certain also that her military occupation

of parts of Manchuria, made at the time of the Boxer outbreak, has been continued and extended. It is certain that the protests in China against this action have gone unheeded. It is certain that those of Japan have gone unheeded. It is certain that Russia has not only disregarded these protests, but has advanced in a positive way the proposition that Manchuria and even northern Korea must be considered within her "sphere of influence."

The term "sphere of influence" is a euphemism that everybody understands. It means that the nation asserting it intends, whenever it so desires, to take full control. It means that no other nation must interfere with its purpose, and it means that the purpose of full control may be worked up to by tentative steps.

If we grant to Russia at once a reasonable degree of sympathy in her desire to get a commercial outlet on the Pacific, ought we to extend sympathy to her in her effort to seize and control territory belonging to China? This is a question of morality. If it is moral for a man to take property belonging to some one else by force and because it may be useful to him, it is moral for a nation to do the same thing. As a matter of common sense, and in view of the best conceptions of that very indeterminate thing, international law, it is not allowable for a nation to do an act the like of which would not be allowed to an individual.

But for China or Japan there may be a broader ground of objection to the seizure of Manchuria. Possession of that territory may be held by them to create danger to their respective states. Our own nation practically demanded that France, under Napoleon III., should abandon effort to control Mexico. We should have fought for our view if France had not complied with our demand. With nations, as with individuals, self-preservation is the first law of nature.

That Japan feels strongly on this point was shown when she went to war with China. Her object was to throw herself across the path of Russia on the way to the gulf of Pechili. The southern littoral of Manchuria was the scene of all her operations, and when she had conquered the territory her right to it was confirmed by treaty. Russia, uniting with France and Germany, forced her to give up the conquered territory and to rest satisfied with other indemnity. This action of Russia must have seemed to Japan proof enough that she had not been wrong in her conception of Russian purposes. And now the fact that she makes war on Russia is evidence of the

most complete sort that the Japanese consider the Russian occupation of Manchuria a menace to their country that cannot be disregarded.

In China, beyond a doubt, the same fears exist. It is Chinese territory, and territory that is held more dear because the ancestral seats of the Chinese dynasty are there. Any foreign occupation of Manchuria would be obnoxious to a degree. A permanent occupation would be regarded as the first step threatening the integrity of the body of the empire.

Americans should stop to think of this. One-half of all Asia has passed under foreign rule. It is Russian in the north, French in the southeast, and English in the southwest. There is a constant forward movement of the European populations against the Asiatic. This movement is one not altogether indicative of national purposes. It results from the control already acquired. It is due to the same impulse that has pushed our own boundaries forward at the expense of Indian tribes or of other control, and that has pushed the English forward in South Africa. This movement occasions alarm, of course. What more natural than for the Chinese or Japanese to believe that what has happened in the districts to the north, to the southeast and to the southwest may happen in their territories.

The Boxer movement had its origin in this fear. Russia had occupied Port Arthur. Germany had seized Kiauchau. England, as an offset against these advances, had demanded and received Weihaiwei. All these were points upon the gulf of Pechili, excepting Kiauchau, and it was just off the gulf on the China sea. The Boxers, with the sympathy of a faction in Peking, undertook their wild work in resentment against these aggressions. It succeeded in part, for it brought the foreign states named, and others seeking territorial aggrandizement at the expense of China, to see that China would not be a passive victim of her own dismemberment.

Japan, then, is fighting in self-defense. In doing so she is fighting, not only for her own permanent security, she is fighting for the permanent security of China as well. And in doing so it may be said that she is fighting the cause of Asia at large, the cause of the people of the "habitat" against European domination. Am I wrong in saying to persons who believe in the ancient landmark idea, that Japan, not Russia, is entitled to their sympathy under such circumstances?

We hear much about the yellow peril. In view of what has been said, the yellow peril scare will appear very idle. It

is, indeed, so ridiculous, in view of the advance of Europe (must we add America?) in Asia, that we may readily believe that it is the talk of persons who are not well informed, or talk that is put out for a purpose. It comes from St. Petersburg and from Berlin. Why it comes from St. Petersburg is easily conceived. Why from Berlin will be seen later.

As a long-time resident in the East, I assert that the yellow peril is a thing to cause no anxiety. No great states in the world's history have been so consistently peaceful as China and Japan. Possessing overwhelming power, they have refrained from conquests, even over surrounding petty states. There is Korea and the Lew Chew islands to the east, and all the Cochinchinese states, Siam, Burmah, Malacca, Borneo, the Philippines and Java to the south. Who has ever heard of hostile movements against them on the part of either? Japan was content with her own territory until white men came. Since then she has developed an ardent military spirit, but she has not since made any war where it could be said that territorial aggrandizement was the purpose. The yellow peril is a matter of imagination; then, where it is not a matter of allegation for a purpose. It is not Europe that has cause to fear Asia; it is Asia that has cause to fear Europe.

The United States has had a distinct policy in the East until lately. It may be that it still has. Our policy was to maintain an attitude of respect and sympathy for China and Japan, and to seek to draw other nations into the same attitude; to the end that the territorial integrity of both nations might be sustained, to the end that just things only might be done to those states, to the end that those states might the better be led to do just things in all their relations with foreign nations, and to the end that the people of all nations might have in China and Japan a fair field for their commerce and enterprise. This was our traditional policy. It was broadly conceived, and under it, so long as it was well observed by foreign states, China and Japan progressed on peaceful lines, and intercourse that was beneficial on both sides continually broadened. As a policy it was altogether above and beyond the much-vaunted "open-door" policy. Under the latter we did no more than claim that our trade should not be interfered with in the "spheres of influence." Under the former we actively combated the first beginnings of the "spheres of influence" idea. The open

door catchword was invented in England. It was long ago dropped there. It was taken up at Washington. It is high time that it should be dropped here as meaningless, and for our government to rest once more upon the proposition that when we defend in all right ways the territorial integrity of China and Japan, we do the only thing that can secure an open door.

Germany is an ambitious nation, as respects foreign markets and territory. Her people are scattering themselves all over the face of the earth wherever trade is to be done and taking a share in all opportunities. Her government has not been idle. It has shown extreme interest in Asia Minor; it has acquired territory in Central Africa; it has seized a point of immense vantage on the coast of China.

The object of this seizure is not well understood. The bare facts are as follows: After the secret treaty between China and Russia, referred to above, was made, but before knowledge of it had become general, Germany seized Kiauchau. Two German missionaries had been killed, and, without waiting for reparation, she made her descent upon that place. It so happens that back of Kiauchau, in the province of Shansi, is the finest coal and iron field in the world. That field is Germany's objective point. With German scientific skill, commercial quality and capital, and Chinese cheap labor, what will happen in the iron markets of the world when Germany enters upon this promised land may be left to the imagination of the reader. Why talk is put out from Berlin about the "yellow peril" may be left to the judgment of the reader. What will that peril really be when Germany is in possession and has developed the mines of Shansi?

For China, for Japan, for England, and for the United States. German purposes in Shansi are a matter of consequence. If Russia succeeds in Manchuria, China proper might not be affected greatly. Manchuria is outlying territory, and the loss of it might not affect China more than the loss of the state of Maine would affect the body of our nation. But Shansi lies between Peking, the seat of government, and the great body of population of the empire. With Germany in control, the capital would have to be abandoned and a new seat found for the government. With Russia in Manchuria and Germany in Shansi, the partition of the empire would have been begun, and the old empire, helpless, would fall an easy victim of further aggressions, in which France, Italy and possibly England and

the United States, might be involved. The map of eastern Asia would be changed and once more the Asiatic would go down before the Caucasian. And these same Caucasians, stirred by the delirium of conquest and separated by boundaries of indeterminate character, might be expected to fall into disagreements and wars, the like of which the world has never seen, because involving nations and populations on two sides of the globe. It is possible to conceive that Russia and Germany might emerge from these collisions with greater opportunities. Possibly England and France might. But not so with the United States. We could never bring the national conscience to support Asiatic enterprises to the bitter end.

Having been for 20 years while in China an ardent supporter of the policy of just dealing with China; having never since my return from China felt any occasion to revise my judgment in this respect; having been reared to believe that the off-colored stocks have rights that white men should respect; having appreciation of both the Chinese and Japanese as men altogether like ourselves in mental and moral endowments; it is natural for me to stand true to the conviction that foreign aggressions in that region ought to be reprobated, and, so far as possible, prevented. And having seen the policy of just dealing initiated by Burlingame successful for a long time, I am persuaded that it is within the range of possibility to-day for our country to advocate that policy by moral force, with good hope that it will help greatly to relieve the tension of the situation. It may be that I am wrong in the hope. It may be that my countrymen will lean to the idea that the domination of Asia by Europe will make for the best interests of the world. I am not of that opinion; and, having had opportunities to judge possessed by few, it may be that my opinion, even if held alone, is the right one.

An intelligent Korean was asked what side his nation would take in the war between Japan and Russia.

"You have seen two dogs fight over a bone?" asked the Korean.

The interrogator assented.

"Well," continued the Korean, "did you ever see the bone do any fighting?"
—Izwi Labantu, of East London, So. Africa.

We're gamblers all for wealth unearned.
Both those who win and fail.
Jerome should raid the wide, wide world,
And land us all in jail.
—The Whim.

"AT EVEN TIME."

From verses written by the late Bishop F. D. Huntington, only a few months before his death.

Far on, from hill to hill, my road runs, O my friendliest Friend!
Less free my plodding feet, less sure my step, less keen my sight,
Yet in the fading west keep me to the end
Thy morning pledge—"At evening time it shall be light."

"Has th' candydates accepted th' nommynation f'r prisidint?" asked Mr. Hennessy.

"No," said Mr. Dooley, "th' comities haven't med up their mincs whether they will give th' dimmycrat nommynation to Rosenfelt an' th' raypublican nommynation to Parker, or vicy varcy. It don't make much diff'rence, annyway."—The Chicago Daily News.

"Well, Parker is a safe man, annyhow," said Mr. Hennessy.

"He is," said Mr. Dooley, "but I wisht some wan else had th' combination besides Hill."—The Chicago Daily News.

When is a warship not a warship? When Russia is sending it through the Bosphorus with its guns covered with canvas.—The Boston Herald.

Statistics show that the average height of the American woman is two inches taller than it was 25 years ago. Yes, they come higher, but we must have them.—N. Y. Sun.

BOOKS

A DELIGHTFUL AND INSPIRING PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE—NOTES ON BOOKS.

Sir John Lubbock's little book, entitled the "Pleasures of Life," published by the Macmillan company, came out first in 1887, and has been republished in new editions almost every year since. It was this book which initiated the popularity of the idea of naming the one hundred best books, and Lubbock gives his list, which has been the basis of many subsequent attempts. Surely many readers of the "Pleasures of Life" would be inclined to place this itself among the best hundred. It is delightful in style, and is full of incitement to noble thinking and high living.

One reason for its perennial charm is that it deals clearly and interestingly with the primal concerns of life—happiness, friendship, time, travel, reading, home, education, wealth, health, trouble, love, nature, art, poetry, music, religion. Most books that treat of such general or abstract