

tanking, with branches in all the leading commercial centers, so as to promote our efforts "to seek and occupy the markets of the world"! The idea of occupying the markets of the world by forcing our goods upon them and taking none of theirs in return, has jocular possibilities of considerable merit, but Mr. Moore was serious.

Among the statistical reasons that have been advanced to prove that the country is flooded with prosperity whether the ordinary man can see it or enjoy it or not, are the railroad reports of earnings. How, it is asked, can the railroads make these increased earnings unless times really are magnificently prosperous? But it now turns out that the continued increase in railroad earnings "is not altogether due," to quote from a railroad report in the Chicago Tribune of the 10th, "to a corresponding increase in business, as in many of the roads the business has not been nearly as large this winter as it was for the corresponding months last year," but to the fact "that the roads get much higher rates now"!

President Hadley, of Yale, strikes a blow at imperialism, the echoes of which reverberate over the country from ocean to ocean. This effect is not wholly due to his personality. Greater men have given warning of imperialism without making the country hold its breath. Nor is it due to any peculiar force in his way of putting the thing. Its whole setting is peculiarly weak. But he is important enough personally, and what he says is said with enough vigor, to give voice to a widespread sentiment that has been silently but rapidly growing since the imperialists in politics and the magnates of trust organization have openly accepted the verdict of the presidential election as a license to them. Of the fact that the public are appalled at the consequences of the indorsement they gave to imperialism and trusts by reelecting the great promoter of both, Mr. McKinley, better evidence could not be de-

sired than the disturbed interest which has followed and been apparently caused by Mr. Hadley's Boston speech.

We have nowhere seen so compact yet accurate a summing up of the meaning of the new steel trust as in the American Banker of the 23d. There is a good deal more in "this solidification of the scattered iron interests," says that important financial journal, "than the stupendous power of brains, money and trade which it exhibits; it is not one, but many interests that are here converging; it is steel, oil, coal, transportation and banking credit which form its various and far-reaching elements." Those sentences are like flashes of light. And in the picture they reveal one can see that privilege has almost reached the climax which portends a desperate struggle, on one hand for the extension of governmental functions, and on the other for their contraction. With the establishment of this gigantic industrial conspiracy, based upon a solidification of special privileges, popular respect for vested interests in privilege must die out. It is becoming too plain for question that those interests are the means whereby the rights of the masses are destroyed. When that is fairly realized there will be no dispute as to whether vested interests shall go. The question will be, How? Running in one direction, public opinion will demand the confiscation of all great accumulations of property, regardless of its character, and the transformation of the trusts into a vast governmental system. Running in another, public opinion will demand the abrogation of the privileges which make these unwholesome accumulations possible. These two currents of opinion will be the forces, and their divergency the issue, when the Gargantuan steel trust shall have sufficiently exemplified the pernicious character of the doctrine of vested interests.

From Washington it is reported that McKinley's political and corpo-

rate managers are preparing to run him in 1904 for a third term as president. This report sounds absurd now; but the idea of a third term is not nearly so absurd as many things Mr. McKinley has done would have seemed if predicted four years ago. A crown colony policy would have been jeered at then. But it is in full swing now, with more power over our crown colonies vested in Mr. McKinley than is possessed by any monarch over anybody. In comparison with this departure from national ideals and traditions, a third presidential term would be but a trifling sign of retrogression.

THE BARBARIAN IN CHINA.

When the problem of the Chinese Boxers thrust itself upon the outer world, in sensational stories of bloodshed and mystery, we ventured the explanation (page 149) that this terrible anti-Christian uprising was probably no different from the anti-pagan outbreak that would occur in the United States if the Asiatics were obtruding oriental civilization upon us as our race is obtruding occidental civilization upon them. We drew our inferences from the conviction that human nature is much the same in all quarters of the globe as well as in all periods of time; that differences of language and of habits of life, and even in the color of the skin and the angle of the eye, do not radically alter the affectional tendencies, but that emotions of love and hate are everywhere and always similarly excited by similar causes. Subsequent revelations have confirmed our inferential explanation. The Boxer uprising is now known to have been a violent expression of those emotions in the Chinese which correspond to what in Americans are called patriotism.

A little band of Chinese reformers unwittingly touched the match to the powder magazine. Their effort and failure was reported in this country (see The Public, No. 25, page 9, and No. 26, page 7) at the time, nearly three years ago. It now transpires that their aspiration was "China for the Chinese."

But their method contemplated a wide departure from Chinese traditions and included the adoption of European models in education, government, etc. What the Japanese have about accomplished by this policy for Japan is what these reformers aimed to accomplish for China—absolute national independence and equality.

They were so far successful in their designs as to gain the ear of the young emperor and to secure from him a series of favorable decrees. But at this point the empress dowager interfered, causing the reform decrees to be revoked and several of the leading reformers to lose their heads. Several more saved their lives only by fleeing from the country.

To promote her reactionary policy, the empress proceeded to arouse the traditional religious prejudices of the Chinese, her ready and efficient instrument for this purpose being the Boxer organization—a reactionary religious body which is distinguished by the gymnastic forms of some of its rites. But in resorting to that organization to smother the revolution in the direction of European methods the empress lighted a devastating fire which she could not put out.

The pent-up hostility of the Chinese to foreigners burst forth in a great blaze. No fuel was lacking. Though the Chinese are less disposed than most peoples to hate foreigners merely because they are foreigners, the assumptions and aggressions of Europeans in China for more than half a century had intensely embittered all classes. Treaties forced upon the country had opened the way for missionaries to penetrate to the interior, where they inflamed local feeling by putting time-honored superstitions to scorn and frequently appealing, not only in their own behalf but in behalf also of native converts, to foreign authority. The missionary went ahead of the man behind the gun. By provisos establishing extra-territorial courts for the protection of foreigners from responsibility to Chinese laws and tribunals, these treaties had been exceedingly humiliating to intelligent Chinamen. They had, moreover, disturbed local commercial interests by opening the coasting trade to foreigners. These

and kindred irritations, keenly felt by the more intelligent classes, were transmitted to the less intelligent who in minor ways had themselves come into disagreeable contact with the pushing and grasping and domineering barbarian. They had especially been stirred by new and queer superstitions, as they regarded them, which the missionaries introduced. They had been outraged by desecrations of sacred places. And back of all they had been terrified by the introduction of labor saving machines and methods in a country where the labor market is glutted to a degree that dwarfs the wildest fears of workingmen in this country. It was all submitted to because the barbarian had, in a war to maintain in China the pernicious opium trade which the Chinese government prohibited, proved his military superiority. But this foreign intrusion never ceased to be galling. When, therefore, the Boxers were encouraged from the imperial court to revive the old religious spirit among the people, the "foreign devil" became naturally an object of popular attack.

As the goal of the reformers was "China for the Chinese," so was that of the Boxers. But the Boxers waited for no slow development, beginning with the acceptance of European forms and standards; their method was the more direct one of killing foreigners at sight. The massacres that followed were as inevitable, human nature being what it is, as the anti-Chinese riots of California. They were more excusable. For the Chinese in California had as a class been guilty of nothing more heinous than being Chinese; whereas the Europeans in China appear as a class to have left nothing undone which might tend to excite the enmity of the native people.

In broad outline, then, the explanation of the Chinese massacres of foreigners is what we inferred when first the news came. Chinese human nature is not unlike Yankee human nature. But in connection with the accounts of the uprising we now have admissions which indicate that in at least one respect Chinese morals are superior to Yankee morals. Among those who make these admissions is

Sir Robert Hart, than whom probably no European better understands China and the Chinese. In the light of his revelations of Chinese character it would appear that we of this country need an infusion of Chinese morals much more than the Chinese need our missionaries.

Sir Robert's contribution to this subject may be read in the *Cosmopolitan* for March. His most striking utterance is with reference to the Chinese ideal regarding human intercourse. While our race is setting up expediency and the supreme test of might as standards, the Chinese cling to the doctrine of right. "For 30 centuries or more," writes Sir Robert Hart, "this recognized and inherited worship of right has gone on strengthening, and so strong is the feeling that to hint to them that right must be supported by might excites something more than amazement." Is it strange that to such a people it should have seemed ludicrous "for barbarians, who so little understood the import of right here, to send missionaries to teach about preparation for the hereafter"?

Superstitions there are in abundance among the Chinese. But so are there superstitions among us. And if their superstitions appear to us to be worse than ours, may this not be because they are not ours, but theirs? If we look down with contempt upon the Chinese because they worship their ancestors, living the lives their fathers lived merely because their fathers lived them, may they not as reasonably hold us in contempt for that degrading superstition of ours which is most commonly expressed in the phrase: "Our country, right or wrong?" The Chinaman's standard of right may often be false, but a false standard of right is better than a denial of right.

Yet we, who would put expediency and might above right, or, worse still, who would displace ideals of right with ideals of might, assume an air of superiority over the Chinese as we force our civilization upon them. But it is not a true superiority. It is only the superiority of brute strength, made more brutal by Satanic genius. That we are superior in any other way remains to be proven. There is certainly no indication of it in the his-

tory of the recent disturbances in China. If some of the Chinese massacred foreigners, women and children as well as men, this much, at least, can be said in extenuation, that they had been outraged beyond endurance by foreign aggression. But what shall be said of our race, whose soldiers in China, without provocation or excitement, but in cold blood and out of the mere wantonness of might, slaughtered the innocent and the helpless, regardless of sex or age. There is no story of massacre of Europeans by enraged Chinese mobs which cannot be matched by authentic stories of massacres of Chinese by European soldiers. The truth about foreign outrages in China has not yet been told. It has been hardly more than hinted at. Writers who know must be discreet. But it cannot always remain a secret, and when it does come out it will reflect no credit upon the "civilizers" of China.

Even now, with Sir Robert Hart's magazine article before us, the Chinese character stands out in marked contrast with that of their foreign guardians. They are not warlike, either by inclination or training, the arts of peace holding first place in their esteem. That alone ranks them high as a civilized people. But back of that lies the quality which Sir Robert emphasizes. They bring all questions to the test of right. If this characterization is true, then our race has little to justify its claim to superior rank in civilization. Not only do we not bring all questions to the test of right; we are denying that there is any right. By university, press and pulpit we are assiduously taught, not infrequently by definite assertion, that right depends upon time, place and circumstance; and from the presidential chair we are admonished that it is determined by destiny.

NEWS

In point of relative importance this week's news from China has first place. While the foreign ministers are formulating the principle of indemnification to be imposed by the allied powers upon the Chinese government for injuries to foreigners caused by the Boxer uprising, a diplomatic controversy of portentous pos-

sibilities has begun among the allies themselves. According to the gossips it may not improbably culminate in an international quarrel, with Great Britain and the United States on one side and Russia and France on the other. Japan is regarded as likely to line up with the former two, and Germany's attitude is accounted doubtful.

The bone of contention is Manchuria. Russia has for five years been gradually appropriating that province, and during the past two has extended her authority over it rapidly. While the allies were marching to the relief of Peking, Russia was also carrying on a campaign in Manchuria, her pretense being an alleged attack upon her Siberian frontier by Chinese (see pages 232, 249); and upon the completion of this campaign she assumed a protectorate over Manchuria (page 617) without consulting the allies. She did this upon the theory that her Manchurian operations were not involved in the allied movement. To this assumption of jurisdiction over a part of the Chinese empire, Great Britain and the United States object upon the general ground that it is a step in the direction of partition. Japan objects on the ground that as a step toward the absorption of Korea, it is a menace to the Japanese islands. Secret negotiations on the subject appear to be under way between Great Britain and the United States, and the latter has taken the open initiative of diplomatically protesting against Russia's pretenses. It did so in the form of a note of instructions of February 16 to the American minister at Peking, the nature of which it subsequently communicated to the European powers. In that note the American government expressed its desire to know the views of the Chinese government regarding the right of China to extend concessions or to make other agreements with any power without the consent of all the powers, and coupled this request for information with an admonition that the United States would hold it inadvisable for China to enter into any such agreements at this time. When interpreted into the nondiplomatic vernacular this note is understood to be a direction to China to recede from private negotiations with Russia and a warning to Russia to play fair. All the powers have expressed approval of the American note, inclusive of Russia herself. She, in re-

sponse, declares with reference to her Manchurian protectorate that—

As soon as lasting order shall have been established in Manchuria and indispensable measures taken for the protection of railway construction, which, according to formal agreement, China assured, Russia will not fail to recall her troops from these territories of the neighbor empire, provided the action of other powers does not place any obstacle in the way of such a measure.

But China advises the powers that Russia is nevertheless pressing upon her peremptory demands for Manchurian concessions. What lends historical importance to these events is the supposed probability that they may lead on to the long expected European war over the partition of China.

Hostilities against the Chinese are kept alive by Count Walderssee. On the 6th he reported a fight south of Man-Sheng with "400 Chinese regulars who had apparently been separated from the main body." He scattered them, killing 50 men and taking two banners. Four days later he told of storming a gate of the great wall on the 8th, capturing four guns and killing 250 Chinese.

It seems now, from an official dispatch from Mr. Conger, the American minister in Peking, in which he announces his departure on the 11th for home, that he has left the legation in charge, not of Mr. Rockhill, as was reported at page 746 that he expected to do, but of H. G. Squiers, the secretary of legation.

Great Britain's cordial relations with the United States in connection with the encroachments of Russia upon China have not disposed her to acquiesce in the American senate's amendments to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty for the construction and management of the Nicaragua canal. This subject was last presented in these columns at page 601, where the substance of the amended treaty appears. Three objections are raised by the British government to acquiescing in the amendments. One relates to the amendment striking out of the proposed treaty a clause (see No. 97, pages 9, 10) inviting other powers to agree to adhere to the treaty for the purpose of making the waterway neutral at all times and for all nations. Great Britain interposes to this amendment the objection that in her belief no agreement of neutrality will be ef-