

is possible to conclude a treaty of peace. My personal views are of secondary importance, but my ideas are in entire accord with those of my friend, Count Lamsdorf. In serving my Emperor, I have received precise instructions from his majesty and shall follow them. The ultimate decision remains in the hands of the Emperor, and it is for him to decide the destinies of Russia. The Emperor is the friend of peace and desires peace, but I fear that the Japanese terms will be such that we will be unable to reach an accord.

A similar lack of confidence in a favorable result at the peace conference is expressed by the Japanese. An example is furnished by the Japanese minister at London, Baron Hayashi, who is reported in an interview on the 18th as saying:

We do not know what powers have been delegated to the Russian plenipotentiaries, and after the events of the last eighteen months Japan puts faith only in accomplished facts. The terms will be communicated only at the conference. Then we shall discover what powers the Russian plenipotentiaries possess. I cannot see where people get the idea that the Japanese terms would be moderate. The public evidently mistakes the Japanese for angels.

#### Russian domestic conditions.

An order having been issued by Gen. Trepoff positively prohibiting the publication of news relating to labor strikes or other revolutionary events, no trustworthy reports of the domestic situation in Russia (p. 231) are obtainable. But that disorders continue is evident from the rumors that break through the censorship.

A regiment stationed in a small village in the mountains near Tiflis, in the Caucasus, was reported on the 14th as having "murdered all its officers and joined the revolutionists." Rioting in Lodz, Warsaw, Odessa and the Caucasian provinces, together with bomb-throwing at Baku, Batoum and Moscow, were reported on the 16th. On this day, also, an Associated Press dispatch described a proclamation at Moscow, issued by revolutionists, which announced that Count Shouvaloff, the chief of police at Moscow, who was assassinated on the 11th (p. 234), had been executed pursuant to a revolutionary death sentence on account of "the black and cruel activity of this satrap at Odessa [where Count Shouvaloff formerly was prefect], and his subsequent re-

turn to the active service of reaction at the call of Trepoff, the pan-Russian dictator, to stamp out the revolution in Moscow." The proclamation concludes:

Let this execution serve as a joyful signal to the Russian millions in revolt and as the death knell of the dying autocracy. Let it remind all dogs of the autocracy of national justice.

It is expected that Gen. Trepoff will be the next victim. An Associated Press dispatch of the 13th from St. Petersburg reported that—

he is constantly in receipt of letters signed by the executive committee of the fighting organization informing him that his hour has come. A remarkable feature of all the communications is that the writers take pains to say that no safeguards will avail to avert his impending doom. At the same time they tell him he need not be afraid to go abroad in the streets. They add: "Your sentence will be executed in your own room. You will die in your bed." The terrorists seem to take pride in issuing a challenge involving a demonstration of their power and resources to penetrate the armor of the police. Moreover, General Trepoff knows enough of the resources and desperateness of the organization to believe firmly that the terrorists are able to execute their threat. He makes no concealment of the fact that he expects to be killed, but his nerve is unshaken. "I will at least die at the post of duty," he says. Privately General Trepoff takes a gloomy view of the future of the autocracy, in which he believes. The General is confident that if given untrammelled power he could restore the old status quo in a year, but the present vacillating policy he thinks will end only in ruin.

Thirty of the crew of the Potemkin, who had surrendered (pp. 231, 232), were shot for mutiny, according to a Kustenji (Roumania) report of the 14th; and a Berlin report of the 15th declared that the leaders of the Odessa outbreak (p. 199) were "tied to the muzzle of a shotted cannon and blown to fragments by General Trepoff's orders, according to reports received here from that city." Dispatches of the 13th purporting to be directly from Odessa, indicated that the civil and the military authorities there are out of harmony. "Of 202 persons arrested," says this report, "74 were acquitted to-day, owing to a lack of evidence, while 28 who were found guilty were sentenced to six weeks' imprison-

ment, the two weeks which they were in jail awaiting trial to be credited to their sentences;" and in contrast with that leniency by the civil magistrates the report states that "24 of the leaders of the uprising, held as prisoners of the military government, were hanged in the various prisons to-day."

A session of the Zemstvo congress (p. 183) was called to assemble at Moscow on the 19th, but the Moscow police, under advice from Gen. Trepoff, forbade the meeting. Nevertheless the executive committee met on the 16th at the house of the president of the district Zemstvo of Moscow, to prepare a programme for the congress. The police appeared and demanded that this committee disperse; but the members of the committee refused to comply. It was positively declared that the congress would be held at the appointed time, and these declarations were verified. At the palace of Prince Dolgorouki, one of the leaders of the Liberal party of Russia, on the 19th, 225 delegates met. Mr. Golovine, president of the organizing committee, called the congress to order and was stating that promises had been secured that no extreme measures would be taken by the authorities, when the presence of the police was announced. Invited to enter, five police officers came into the room. They demanded that the congress disperse, in accordance with the Prefect's order forbidding such meetings as calculated to produce disorder. The congress refused to obey the command, explaining that the congress was in session with the Czar's authority, as personally expressed on the 19th of June. The names of the delegates were taken by the police, who thereupon withdrew, and the congress proceeded with its work, of which the following news report is cabled by the Associated Press:

The scheme of a national assembly on the basis outlined by the committee presided over by M. Boulligin, minister of the interior, was minutely and critically discussed and denounced as totally inadequate to remove Russia's internal grievances, because, including a property qualification and an electoral system by classes, it prevented the assembly from truly interpreting the will of the nation, while the exclusion of

numerous categories of citizens from the franchise was a contradiction of the principles of equity and reasonable state policy. At the same time it was recognized that the proposed assembly would comprise a considerable portion of the social forces of the Empire and serve as the center of a social movement, which would tend to secure political liberty and regular national representation. Therefore it was considered desirable that in the event of the carrying out of the Boulogne or a similar project the delegates of the zemstvos and municipalities should participate in the assembly to the greatest possible extent, with the object of forming a compact group and to obtain a guarantee of individual and public liberties. Numerous resolutions embodying the foregoing criticisms were adopted unanimously, as were also resolutions complaining of excessive administrative and police control of elections and insisting that publicity be given to the proceedings of the proposed assembly which should be in direct relations with the Emperor without interference from the council of the Empire.

Although the newspapers of the Empire had been strictly forbidden even to mention the congress, the *Slovo* of St. Petersburg, printed a long dispatch on the 20th giving a detailed report of the proceedings.

#### British Politics.

Preparatory to the general parliamentary elections, which cannot be much longer deferred, Mr. Balfour, the British prime minister of Great Britain and leader of the Conservative party, has introduced a new element into British politics (p. 121) by proposing a redistribution of parliamentary seats, or, as we should say in this country, a new apportionment. But the redistribution is not proposed upon any general basis of population as would be necessary in this country. The Opposition charge that its purpose is to lessen the representation of Ireland, which sends Opposition members, and to increase the aggregate Conservative representation in England. In this manner it is suspected that the Conservatives hope to save themselves from the defeat which it is believed they must encounter at the general elections on the present parliamentary distribution. Under the plan proposed by Mr. Balfour, Irish representation would be reduced by 21 members, on the ground that Ireland's population has fallen off;

whereas plural voting, University representation, and other historic inequalities would be preserved in England. The Irish view of the scheme as stated by T. P. O'Connor is reported as follows:

It is founded on no principle whatever, except to diminish Irish representation. A limit is arbitrarily fixed for counties, so as not to interfere with English counties, and for boroughs so that about twenty-five English boroughs, noted as hotbeds for corruption and represented mainly by Unionists, just escape extinction. For this trick, the meanest and shabbiest ever attempted to be perpetrated by England against Ireland, to be essayed by a moribund ministry and an utterly discredited leader like Balfour, makes its audacity almost inconceivable. The bitterest part of it is that Ireland's decline in population, of which Balfour is taking advantage, is the direct result of the Union and the British parliament's atrocious dealings with Ireland. Under the Act of Union the Parliament of England guaranteed Ireland 103 members in the British Parliament "forever," and if Ireland now got representation according to her population in 1800 she would have 103 members, while, when the reform bill of 1858 was introduced, she would, if the same basis had been taken, have 261 members. When in the 1858 debates the Irish members demanded an increase of Irish representatives the British ministry refused on the plea that the Act of Union guaranteeing Ireland 103 was really a treaty which could not be abrogated without the consent of both parties. Yet now, when owing to England's infamous rule, the opportunity presents itself of reducing Irish representation by adopting a population basis, it is jumped at by the British ministry despite the emphatic protests of the other party to the treaty.

The ministerial scheme evoked an adverse ruling from the Speaker on the 18th. John Redmond had asserted the right of the House to act upon the redistribution resolutions in detail, whereas Mr. Balfour insisted that they be voted upon as a whole. The Speaker sustained Mr. Redmond. Under this ruling the Irish members would have been able, so the dispatches have it, to prolong the session into the winter, and Mr. Balfour withdrew the resolutions.

The result of an important bye-election which came off on the 29th of June, being in harmony with the results of most of these elections recently, further indicates the direction of the political trend in Great Britain. It was for the constituency of East Finsbury,

which is a part of London and has been strongly Conservative. At the preceding election the Conservative majority was 347. This is now turned into a Liberal majority of 768. The circumstances are significant. J. Allen Baker, the Liberal candidate, who had been defeated by 347 at the general elections, which occurred during the Boer war (vol. viii, p. 441), was again the Liberal candidate; the Conservative candidate, Mr. Cohen, was widely respected for his philanthropy and derived no little strength no doubt from his family relationship with the Rothschilds. The lines were sharply drawn between the progressive and the reactionary policies which in Great Britain as in this country are in conflict, and the municipal issues of London were evidently uppermost in the public mind. Regarding this fact the *Manchester Guardian* of the 30th said: "Mr. Baker's connection with the London County Council supplies some explanation of the new tendency of opinion. Mr. Cohen found it necessary to remind the electors on his placards that they were not voting in a municipal election. Londoners seem to be realizing at last that social reform requires a sympathetic Parliament behind a progressive County Council." Mr. Baker is a pronounced supporter of the progressive policy advocated by the leader of the Liberal party, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who described it in a recent speech in these terms: "Let the value of land be assessed independently of the buildings upon it, and upon such valuation let such contribution be made to those public services which create the value. What is our rating system? It is a tax upon industry and labor, upon enterprise, upon improvement; it is a tax which is the direct cause of much of the suffering and overcrowding in the towns. And remember that overcrowding is not a symptom only, but a cause of poverty, because it demoralizes its victims and forces them to find relief in excesses. By throwing the rates on site values, communities which created these values will be set free—free in the sense that they can expand, free to direct their own destinies." In other words, Mr. Baker is what would be known in this country as a single taxer.