

marized in an answer he gave to some American newspaper. "When the war with Japan broke out a New York paper sent me a prepaid cable for 30 words in which message I was asked to say with which side I sympathized. I replied that my sympathies were with both the Russians and Japanese peoples, who would be the sufferers, and not with either of the governments responsible for the war."

HENRY GEORGE.

For The Public.

We saw the clouds, and Fate upbraided
With lamentations loud;
He saw, ere yet the night had faded,
The stars behind the cloud.

Oh, blessed vision, unrevealing
To hearts that pause and doubt;
He questioned not, and, unconcealing,
To him the stars came out.

These are the seers whose divination
Permits them thus to look
On Nature, as a revelation,
On God, as in a book.

And if sometimes we doubt God liveth
We know Him by His own;
And through a type of man He giveth,
Reach out and touch His Throne.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

LOOK ON THIS PICTURE AND THEN ON THAT.

The recent remarkable reversal of opinion in regard to Mr. Bryan's relation to the St. Louis convention is vividly presented in the two following contrasting editorials which appeared in the Philadelphia North American only four days apart. We reprint them from the columns of that excellent paper, the World-Herald, of Omaha, which presented them side by side in its issue of July 14.

"DOWN AND OUT."

The Philadelphia North American, in its issue of Thursday, July 7, printed the following editorial:

William J. Bryan has been repeatedly written of as a political corpse. Both Republicans and Democrats have chanted more or less joyful dirges over him at odd intervals. Yet, in every instance, the funeral services have been premature. The Nebraskan has persisted in galvanizing himself into a life that was always sufficiently virile to make it necessary to begin the work of burying him all over.

But the job has been done again at St. Louis, and this time the undertakers appear to know their business. They went about the matter systematically, and the result is unmistakable. The man who, for eight years, has done with the Democratic party as he saw fit, to-day stands alone, deserted by those who called themselves his friends, and the object of the contemptuous scorn of those who encompassed his overthrow.

There is more of pathos than anything

else in the central figure of this picture. Mr. Bryan has played a remarkable part in the making of recent political history. Few men have seemed to possess more fully the devotion of a large, if not very thoughtful, section of the American people. He seized hold of his party at the psychological moment when it realized that the course upon which it was then bent was toward inevitable defeat, and when it was ready to grasp at any straw pointing to victory. And he has held that party to his own path by the sheer force of a strong personality and an equally strong will.

We need not here discuss the wisdom of his doctrines. The North American's condemnation of them has been expressed frequently and forcibly. But we, in common with the great majority of his critics, gave Mr. Bryan credit for absolute sincerity. That is why he has been able to sway the Democratic masses as has no other man since the days of Andrew Jackson, and that is why his complete eclipse at St. Louis is pathetic. For he has maintained that reputation for sincerity to the end and has gone down fighting desperately for his mistaken notions of political economy and statesmanship.

But just as his power over his party was testimony to American admiration for honesty, so his downfall is testimony to American common sense. It shows that wrong-headed ideas, no matter how right-headed, cannot long prevail with any large number of our citizens. Mr. Bryan's political end comes because the party that twice made him its presidential candidate has realized that he is a visionary and dangerous leader.

For its own sake, it is a pity that its whole time appears to have been taken up with achieving this realization. Otherwise there might have been a more inspiring demonstration of what Democracy means at this year's national convention.

"A GALLANT FIGHT."

The Philadelphia North American, in its issue of Monday, July 11, printed the following editorial:

Shorn though he be of the plumes of leadership, and overwhelmed by a hostile faction within his own party, William J. Bryan emerges from the political chaos at St. Louis the biggest man and the best fighter in the Democracy. He went into the convention seemingly certain of ignominious defeat; achieved a temporary victory, and, while eventually defeated because his foes were reinforced from an unexpected quarter, no ignominy attaches to the result so far as he is concerned.

It was a foregone conclusion that he could not hope for indorsement of the

ideas of which he is the chief exponent. Such a possibility was hardly considered, even by Mr. Bryan. The question seemed to be, how absolute should be the repudiation of those ideas, and, as a consequence, of himself? Confronting this question, he fought a battle which must excite admiration, irrespective of political bias.

The mere physical endurance of the man was almost superhuman. He was grit to the core. And, beset on all sides by men who count themselves shrewd politicians, and oppressed with the knowledge that the drift of party sentiment was strongly away from him, he displayed a quickness of intellect, a depth of resource and a power of oratory that were simply amazing.

Single-handed he fought his opponents to a standstill in the committee on resolutions. It was solely due to his efforts that the platform failed to incorse the gold standard, and left him in a position to preserve both his consistency and his regularity. And the convention ratified this negative but—to him—very material triumph.

It is true that Judge Parker's eleventh hour interference took from Mr. Bryan the fruit of his labor. But it could not take from him the credit for a splendid display of courage, nor make larger the antagonists who appeared beside him as pygmies.

MR. BAKER'S USE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

A letter from Congressman Robert Baker to the editor of the New York Tribune, published in the Tribune of Sunday, July 3.

Sir: My attention has just been called to the article in Sunday's Tribune, headed "Criticism of 'Anti-Pass' Baker's Use of Franking Privilege." So much space having been given to the article, and as many of your readers may deduce therefrom the conclusion that the circulation of my speeches in this manner is an abuse of the franking privilege, it would seem only fair that an opportunity should be accorded me to state how and why this speech is thus sent out.

Some fifteen months ago I received through the mails, under the frank of Congressman Littlefield, what purported to be a list of "trusts," on which, stamped with a rubber stamp, appeared an advertisement of the "Congressional Information Bureau," a private concern located in Washington.

I at once sought Postmaster Roberts, calling his attention to what I then regarded as a violation of the franking privilege. I pointed out that if such a document could be mailed under a frank, there would seem to be no reason why

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 employees, 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