

statement that: "There was open competition and a very moderate price when the railroads bought their 1899 rails, and they bought with the greatest liberality; there was no competition and a very high price when the time came for buying their 1900 rails, and they bought most sparingly." That is to say: Industry thrives under competition and languishes under monopoly.

And what are we going to do about it? The position of the monopolist with regard to the question is fairly expressed in the characteristic imprecation: "The public be damned!" How would it answer for the public to see to it that the monopolists be taxed?

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 6.—Perhaps there is no subject so interesting in connection with the composition of the Democratic membership of the House as that of determining what has influenced their identification with the party. Of course, it is a truism to say that there are Democrats and Democrats, but this is not sufficiently descriptive. One of the most striking illustrations of the difficulty of apportioning some members as belonging to the plutocratic-Democrats or the democratic-Democrats is that of a gentleman now serving his fourth term and who has been mayor of a large Western city. Monday being District of Columbia day, there were a number of minor bills up for consideration, among them one to regulate Turkish bath establishments, with a provision for an annual license fee of \$25. Another made the docking of horses tails a crime and prohibited docked horses being brought into the District of Columbia. I asked this gentleman how he stood on the bill to license Turkish bath establishments. He said:

"Oh! I am in favor of that. They ought to pay a license just the same as any other business."

I replied: "True, just the same as any other business, but why any business? Have not people an inherent right to sell groceries and dry goods and to sell Turkish bath service?"

Later, I asked him his attitude towards the "docking bill." He said:

"Oh! I am against that! I don't think the government has a right to interfere with such things."

To this I replied: "Your attitude is to my mind most extraordinary! Here you are advocating interference with those things which are entirely proper and which every man has an inherent right to do, but when a measure is

proposed which says that people shall not be cruel, that they shall be prohibited from engaging in a cruel practice, you say it is an "invasion of their rights."

He confessed to not having regarded the matter from that standpoint before. Yet he is forceful, and I am convinced he is aggressively honest, and justly has the respect of every man in the House.

One of the curious episodes of the Fifty-eighth Congress happened on the 4th. A Democratic member desired to incorporate into the Record a letter addressed to him together with speeches delivered by another member some years previous. Not desiring to take up the time of the House by having them read from the clerk's desk he had arranged with the gentlemen controlling the time on both sides that he should have time to ask permission to insert these documents in the Record as an extension of remarks on the floor. Being recognized, he asked, without any preliminary remarks, for unanimous consent to so insert. A member at once said: "Mr. Chairman, that can't be done; the gentleman hasn't made any remarks."

"Oh! yes he has," replied the chairman; "he said: 'Mr. Chairman.'"

Thereupon the member who had said "Mr. Chairman," and nothing more, got the permission to "extend his remarks."

The only thing that prevented the reporters from making fun of the incident was the fact that a week before this member had made an extemporaneous speech of about 20 minutes' duration on the same subject. Otherwise they would undoubtedly have "guyed" him as the man whose speech consisted of the two words—"Mr. Chairman."

Perhaps no more ridiculous plea was ever advanced by a party leader than that of Congressman Dalzell, when, on behalf of the committee on rules, he brought in a resolution empowering the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, F. S. Degetau, to sit in the House with all the rights of a Delegate from a Territory. Upon Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, insisting that legislation should be enacted providing for the election of a delegate from Porto Rico, and conferring a Territorial government upon that island, Mr. Dalzell said that while such a measure would probably have the unanimous approval of the House, its defeat in the Senate was a foregone conclusion; that the Senate would almost certainly amend it out of all shape and substance as they had done in the last Congress.

To this Mr. Williams very properly replied: "You can't scare us with your bogey of an intractable Senate! The Senate is Republican, and the party is as much responsible for the

Senate as for the majority in this House."

Nevertheless the will of the people, as evidenced in the previous unanimous vote of the House is nullified. Yet we call the system that produces such a condition "popular" government.

ROBERT BAKER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Feb. 11.

The war cloud which has for several months been hanging over Russia and Japan (p. 646) has burst at last, and deadly hostilities have begun.

To understand the cause of this war we must go back to the war between Japan and China (vol. i, No. 1, p. 10; vol. iv, p. 711) in 1894-95. Coming out of that conflict triumphant, Japan demanded as one of the fruits of victory the cession by China to her of portions of the Liaotung peninsula (on the southern extremity whereof Port Arthur is situated), of which she had come into possession through the fortunes of war. China was helpless to object, but Russia interfered, and with the support of France and Germany forced Japan to relinquish possession. Japan accordingly withdrew in 1896. In 1898 she joined Russia in an agreement acknowledging Corea (which occupies a larger peninsula between Japan and the Liaotung peninsula, and which had been under Chinese suzerainty), as an independent power. But Japan has never abandoned her ambition to secure a foothold upon the Asiatic mainland, nor has Russia receded from her manifest policy of extensive dominion in northeastern China.

Pursuant to her policy Russia promptly sent a fleet to Port Arthur, and in accordance with concessions from the Chinese government a Russian military force took formal possession (vol. i, No. 1, p. 10) on the 28th of March, 1898. When the "Boxer" troubles broke out in China (vol. iv, p. 441), all the powers, including Russia and Japan, united for the ostensible purpose of restoring order. But Russia, on pretense of protecting her frontiers bordering upon Manchuria (of which the Liaotung

peninsula, with Port Arthur at the southern extremity, is part), carried on a supplementary movement by herself in that province; and at the close of the "Boxer" troubles, and while restoration negotiations were under way between China and all the Powers, the Russians established (vol. iii, p. 617) a Manchurian protectorate,—an exercise of authority over the Chinese province which she has ever since asserted.

Objections made by Great Britain and the United States, as well as by Japan, evoked from Russia, early in 1901, the following assurance (vol. iii, p. 775):

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 neighboring empire, provided the action of other Powers does not place any obstacle in the way of such a measure.

Notwithstanding this assurance, Russia immediately sought by diplomacy to secure further concessions from China relative to the Manchurian territory. This was disclosed by China (vol. iii, p. 823) in an appeal to the Powers to support her in her refusal to accede to Russia's pressing solicitations. Russia subsequently explained (vol. iv, p. 9) that her intention to restore Manchuria to China could manifestly—

only be carried out when the normal situation is completely restored to the empire, and the central government established at the capital independent and strong enough to guarantee Russia against a recurrence of the events of last year.

Russia was therefore understood to be formally pledged to withdraw from Manchuria when the Chinese government should have been restored to power and become capable of maintaining order throughout China. But Japan was still not satisfied. She was reported to have demanded of China (vol. ix, p. 25) either that Russia be ejected from Manchuria or that the temporary occupation of that province be made international. Japan's objection evidently grew out of her fear that if Russia were once firmly established in

Manchuria the Russians would extend their encroachments into Corea and finally withdraw that country from the sphere of Japanese influence.

Japan's uneasiness was subsequently justified by the continuance of the Russians in the occupation of Manchuria long after the complete restoration "to the empire of China" of "the normal situation," and the complete reestablishment of the Chinese government, had been effected. Regarding Russia's attitude in this respect as a menace, Japan began preparations for the conflict that has now come. Her first important precaution was to secure in January, 1902, a treaty of alliance with Great Britain (vol. iv, p. 712), under which the latter Power is now bound to use its efforts to prevent other Powers from joining with Russia in hostilities against Japan; and if any other Power or Powers should so join, to come to Japan's assistance and "conduct war in common and make peace in mutual agreement." The publication of this treaty was followed (vol. iv, p. 823) by the announcement of an arrangement in March, 1902, between the Russian minister to China and the president of the Chinese foreign office for the evacuation of Manchuria by Russia. A treaty to that effect, signed at Peking on the 8th of April, 1902, (vol. v, pp. 10, 40), provided as follows:

Russia agrees to restore the civil administration of Manchuria, without reserve, to the Chinese Empire; to evacuate Manchuria completely, so far as military or civil control is concerned, within one year from the date of the treaty; to remove her army, except a small force for the guarding of the Russian railway, within one year, withdrawing a part of the troops in four months, another part in eight months and the final quota in twelve months; and to surrender all claim to exclusive railway and mining privileges in Manchuria, pledging herself and China to the "open door" principle in that province.

With the disclosure of this treaty all just complaint on the part of Japan was regarded as having been removed. But the prescribed year went by, and still Russia remained in full occupation of Manchuria. Japan and England were reported last July as having

protested to China (p. 213), and from that time on Japan and Russia have been engaged in the diplomatic negotiations that have culminated in the present war.

The exact character of those negotiations was not made known until war had been virtually declared, although press correspondents ventured many guesses. Each nation has now formally stated its case.

Japan's statement came first. It was issued from Tokio on the 8th. From this statement it would appear that Japan's object is to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of Corea and her own interests therein; that upon this consideration it is impossible for her to view with indifference any activity by Russia, contrary to her solemn treaty with China and her repeated assurances to the Powers, in not only continuing her occupation of Manchuria but in also taking aggressive measures in Korean territory. Should Manchuria be annexed to Russia, the independence of Corea would, as Japan believes, naturally be impossible. Accordingly on August 12, 1903, the Japanese government proposed to Russia through its representative at St. Petersburg, the basis of an agreement which was substantially as follows:

1. A mutual engagement to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Chinese and Korean empires.
2. A mutual engagement to maintain the principle of an equal opportunity for the commercial industry of all nations with the natives of those countries.
3. A reciprocal recognition of Japan's preponderating interests in Corea and that Russia has special interests in railway enterprises in Manchuria, and a mutual recognition of the respective rights of Japan and Russia therein.

Not until October 3, according to the Japanese statement, did Russia present counter proposals; and these were of such a character that Japan absolutely rejected them. The Russian government is charged with refusing to join in guaranteeing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Corea; it is complained of for asking the Japanese to concede that Manchuria and its coasts are outside

of their sphere of interest; it is accused of proposing restrictions upon Japan's freedom of action in Corea,—as, for instance, refusing to allow her to occupy any portion of Corean territory for strategic purposes. The Japanese statement goes on to express surprise that the Russians, who profess no intention of absorbing Manchuria, should be disinclined to insert a clause in complete harmony with their own repeatedly declared principle respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. Furthermore, this refusal impressed the Japanese government all the more with the necessity for the insertion of a clause to the effect that Japan has important commercial interests in Manchuria and entertains no small hopes of their further development, and that politically Japan has interests there by reason of her relations to Corea which preclude all possibility of her recognizing Manchuria as being entirely outside of her sphere of interests.

Russia's statement, issued from St. Petersburg on the 9th, asserts that although the negotiations began in a friendly manner, Japanese social circles and the local and foreign press attempted in every way to produce a warlike ferment among the Japanese and to drive the government into an armed conflict with Russia, under the influence of which the Japanese government began to formulate greater and greater demands, at the same time taking most extensive measures to make the country ready for war. These circumstances induced Russia also to take military and naval measures. Nevertheless she declared herself ready to recognize Japan's privileged and commercial and economic position in the Corean peninsula, with the concession of the right to protect it by military force in the event of disturbances in that country. At the same time Russia insisted on three points:

1. A mutual and conditional guarantee of the principle of the independence and sovereignty of Corea.
2. An undertaking to use no part of Corea for strategic purposes, as the authorization of such action on the part of any foreign power was directly opposed to the principle of the independence of Corea.
3. The preservation of the full free-

dom of navigation of the Straits of Corea.

Continuing, the Russian statement asserts that this did not satisfy the Japanese government, which in its last proposals not only declined to accept the conditions which appeared as the guarantee of the independence of Corea, but also began at the same time to insist on provisions to be incorporated in a project regarding the status of Manchuria. Such demands on the part of Japan were regarded as inadmissible, since the question of Russia's position in Manchuria concerns China and all the powers having commercial interests in China. This is given as the reason for Russia's refusal to include, in a special treaty with Japan regarding Corean affairs, any provision concerning territory occupied by Russian troops. But Russia insists that she did not refuse to recognize (so long as her occupation of Manchuria shall last) both the sovereignty of the Emperor of China in Manchuria and also the rights acquired there by other Powers through treaties with China; and she protests that Japan was precipitate in breaking off negotiations without first taking into account these considerations and continuing the negotiations with a view to arriving at a peaceful understanding.

The last note in the diplomatic negotiations was delivered by Russia on the 4th. Japan's response, delivered on the 5th, was reported from St. Petersburg as being regarded by the Russian government as a declaration of war. It is as follows:

The independence and territorial integrity of the Corean empire being regarded by the Japanese government as absolutely essential to their own country's security and repose, they cannot view with indifference any action tending to render the position of Corea insecure. The Russian government has, by means of inadmissible amendment, successively rejected Japan's proposals respecting Corea, the adoption of which the Japanese government regarded as indispensable to assuring the independence and territorial integrity of the Corean empire and to safeguarding Japan's preponderating interests in the peninsula. This attitude on the part of the Russian government, coupled with their successive refusals to enter into an engagement to respect China's ter-

ritorial integrity in Manchuria, which is seriously menaced by Russia's continued occupation of that province, notwithstanding her treaty engagements with China, and her repeated assurances to the other Powers having interests in the same region, has rendered it necessary for the Japanese government to seriously consider what measures of self-defense they are called upon to take in the presence of the delay on the part of the Russian government in connection with the pending negotiations, which has remained largely unexplained, and of their naval and military activity, which it is difficult to reconcile with an entirely pacific aim. In the pending negotiation the Japanese government has exercised a degree of forbearance which it believes affords abundant proof of its loyal desire to remove from the relations between Japan and Russia every cause for future misunderstanding; but, finding in its efforts no prospect of securing from the Russian government any adhesion either to Japan's moderate and unselfish proposals or to any other proposals likely to establish a firm and lasting peace in the far East, the Japanese government has now no other alternative than to terminate the present futile negotiation. In adopting that course the Japanese government reserves to itself the right to take such independent action as it may deem best to consolidate and defend Japan's menaced position, as well as to protect its established rights and legitimate interests. The Japanese government, having exhausted in vain every means of conciliation with the view to removing from the relations of the two countries every cause for future complication, and finding that their just representations and moderate and unselfish proposals, made in the interest of permanent peace in the far East, were not receiving from the Russian government the consideration which is their due, have resolved to sever their diplomatic relation with the Russian government, which, for the reason named, has ceased to possess value.

Pursuant to the foregoing note of the 5th Japan dismissed the Russian minister on the 7th and on the same day recalled her own minister from St. Petersburg. Following this severance of diplomatic relations she sent warships to sea on the 8th with instructions to attack the Russian flag wherever found, and began to throw troops in large numbers into Corea for service on the Asiatic mainland.

Actual war began at midnight on the 8th, when Japanese torpedo boats attacked the Russian fleet at Port Arthur under cover

of darkness. On the morning of the 9th an open attack was made by a Japanese squadron. Reports from the battle are not yet sufficiently full or trustworthy to warrant any extended description or statement of results. Some Russian warships seem to have been disabled, and two Russian transports with 2,000 Russian troops appear to have been captured. The Japanese were reported on the 11th to have taken possession of Seoul, the capital of Corea.

Formal declaration of war was made by the Czar of Russia on the 9th, immediately after the attack by torpedo boats upon the Russian fleet. It is in these terms:

By the grace of God, we, Nicholas II., Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias, etc., make known to all our loyal subjects:

In our solicitude for the maintenance of peace, which is dear to our heart, we made every exertion to consolidate tranquillity in the far East. In these peaceful aims we signified assent to the proposals of the Japanese government to revise agreements regarding Corean affairs existing between the two governments. However, the negotiations begun upon this subject were not brought to a conclusion; and Japan, without awaiting the receipt of the last responsive proposals of our government, declared the negotiations broken off and diplomatic relations with Russia dissolved. Without advising us of the fact that the breach of such relations would in itself mean an opening of warlike operations, the Japanese government gave orders to its torpedo boats to attack suddenly our squadron standing in the outer harbor of the fortress of Port Arthur. Upon receiving reports from the viceroy in the far East about this, we immediately commanded him to answer the Japanese challenge with armed force. Making known this our decision, we, with unshaken faith in the Almighty and with a firm expectation of and reliance upon the unanimous willingness of all our loyal subjects to stand with us in defense of the fatherland, ask God's blessing upon our stalwart land and naval forces. Given at St. Petersburg, Jan. 27, 1904, A. D. (new calendar, Feb. 9, 1904), and in the tenth year of our reign. Written in full by the hand of His Imperial Majesty
NICHOLAS.

Upon the outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Japan Secretary Hay, of President Roosevelt's cabinet, addressed diplomatic notes to Great Britain,

France and Germany, inviting them to join in a notice to Russia and Japan that the war must be restricted to Manchuria and not involve any other part of the Chinese empire.

The greatest conflagration in an American city since that of 1871 which raged in Chicago, occurred at Baltimore on the 7th. It began with a series of explosions during the forenoon, while thousands of people were in the churches, and was not got under control until the next day. Firemen with their engines came from New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Trenton, Washington, Jersey City, Harrisburg and Newark. The plants of four newspapers—the Baltimore American, Herald, Sun and Evening News—were destroyed, as were the court house, the post office and many of the largest and most expensive business buildings. Steel structures seemed to melt before the great waves of flame. One remarkable thing in this connection is noted. The United States bonded warehouse, at Lombard and Gay streets, which is only three stories high, and was built in 1835 according to old time methods of construction, stands almost uninjured, while skyscrapers supposed to be fireproof which surrounded it are masses of ruins. The fatalities are so few that but little attention has been given to that result by the reports. It is even reported that there were none. But the loss of property is estimated as high as \$125,000,000. Notwithstanding the slight loss of life, however, the suffering of the homeless—a tenement district having come within the fire field along with the great business district—has been intense.

NEWS NOTES.

—A special grand jury to investigate the Iroquois theater disaster (p. 678) was organized at Chicago on the 8th.

—A national arbitration society, with Edmund J. James as president, was organized at the Northwestern University, Evanston, on the 6th.

—To obtain a sleeping berth on a trip from Springfield, O., to Mobile, Ala., on the 5th Bishop F. W. Arnett, of the African M. E. Church, was obliged to charter a sleeping car.

—A conference on the case of John Turner (p. 660) is to be held at Brick-

layers' Hall, Chicago, on the 14th at 2 p. m. under the auspices of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

—At Havana on the 4th the American flag was lowered from the Cabana barracks and the last American soldier left the island republic. This completes the American regime (p. 698) in Cuba.

—To protest against the military regime in Colorado (p. 631) in connection with the miners' eight-hour strike, a meeting is to be held at Clark and Erie streets, Chicago, on the 14th at eight o'clock.

—In the Federal court at Jacksonville, Fla., on the 10th Helen Wilmar's Post, of Sea Breeze, Fla., editor and publisher of Freedom (p. 362), was convicted of using the mails to defraud by means of mental science treatment of the sick.

—On the 9th the judiciary committee of the Chicago city council recommended the passage of the Dunn ordinance (p. 626) prohibiting the aldermen, the mayor and all city employes from accepting passes of any kind, including street car passes.

—Col. Edward Butler, the millionaire St. Louis politician, was acquitted on the 6th on the charge of having bribed 19 members of the house of delegates at St. Louis in 1899 to secure the passage of a lighting bill. This was one of the principal "graft" cases of St. Louis. It was tried at Fulton.

—A congress of industrial and commercial cooperative societies in the United States and Canada is called to be held at the World's Fair grounds, St. Louis, on the 16th and 17th of June for the purpose of organizing an American Cooperative Union. The chairman of the committee of arrangements is N. O. Nelson, of St. Louis.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 633) for January shows on hand January 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash	228,745,084.14
Total	\$378,745,084.15
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
Decrease	\$ 5,649,191.43

—In its issue of February 14 the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat will celebrate Lincoln's birthday with a special number, among the contributors to which are the following distinguished men: Ex-Secretary George S. Boutwell, William Lloyd Garrison, Gov. L. F. C. Garvin, William Randolph Hearst, Tom L. Johnson, William Sulzer, Robert Baker, Herbert S. Bigelow, William Jennings Bryan and Edward M. Shepard. The Johnstown Democrat is itself distinguished for the Lincolnian radicalism of its democracy.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 633) for the seven