

hospitality of the Japanese? I have read, and even heard, that among the more ignorant classes there is a decided anti-foreign feeling, and it is not unnatural that those who refuse to reconcile themselves to Japan's new attitude should blame the foreigner for the change, but we did not encounter this sentiment anywhere. Never in our own country have we been the recipients of more constant kindness or more considerate attention. From Marquis Ito down through all the ranks of official life we found everyone friendly to America, and to us as representatives of America. At the dinner given by Minister Griscom there were present, besides Marquis Ito, the leader of the liberal party, Count Okuma, the leader of the progressive party (the opposition party), and a number of other prominent Japanese politicians.

At the dinner given by Consul General Miller at Yokohama, Governor Sufu and Mayor Ichihara were present. The state and city officials wherever we have been have done everything possible to make our stay pleasant. The college and school authorities have opened their institutions to us and many without official position have in unmistakable ways shown themselves friendly. We will carry away with us a number of handsome presents bestowed by municipalities, colleges, societies and individuals.

We were entertained by Count Okuma soon after our arrival and met there, among others, Mr. Kato, of the state department, and President Hatoyama, of the Waseda University, and their wives. The count's house is half European and half Japanese, and his garden is celebrated for its beauty. At Viscount Kano's we saw a delightful bit of home life. He is one of the few daimios, or feudal lords, who has become conspicuous in the politics of Japan, and we soon discovered the secret of his success. He has devoted himself to the interests of agriculture and spent his time in an earnest and intelligent effort to improve the condition of the rural population. He is known as "The Farmer's Friend." His house is at the top of a beautifully terraced hill, which was once a part of his feudal estate. He and his wife and six children met us at the bottom of the hill on our arrival and escorted us to the bottom on our departure. The children assisted in serving the dinner and afterward sang for us the American national air as well as their own national hymn. The hospitality was so genuine and so heartily entered into by all the family that we could hardly realize that we were in a foreign land and entertained by hosts to whom we had to speak through an interpreter.

In the country, fifteen miles from Kogoshima, I was a guest at the home of Mr. Yamashita, the father of the young man, who, when a student in America, made his home with us for more than five years. Mr. Yamashita was of the Samuiri class and since the abolition of feudalism has been engaged in farming. He had invited his relatives and also the postmaster and the principal of the district school to the noon meal. He could not have been more thoughtful of my comfort or more kindly in his manner. The little country school which stood near by turned out to bid us welcome. The children were massed at a bridge over which large flags of the two nations floated from bamboo poles. Each child also held a flag, the Japanese and American flags alternating. As young Yamashita and I rode between the lines they waved their flags and shouted "Banzai." And so it was at other schools. Older people may be diplomatic and feign good will, but children speak from their hearts. There is no mistaking their meaning, and in my memory the echo of the voices of the children mingling with the assurances of the men and women convinces me that Japan entertains nothing but good will toward our nation. Steam has narrowed the Pacific and made us neighbors; let Justice keep us friends.

Copyright.

WHAT ABOUT JOHN D.?

Is it significant that with all the noise concerning the efforts of Missouri's attorney general to obtain the truth concerning Standard Oil methods, service has not been obtained upon John D. Rockefeller? It is true that Mr. Hadley has rendered service to the people in his catechism of Henry H. Rogers and in some of the facts already produced. But the things so far learned during this investigation are mere hints compared with what John D. Rockefeller could tell and what he might be forced to tell if pursued by a relentless examiner.

We are told that Mr. Rockefeller is in hiding and that representatives of Missouri authorities are unable to reach the fastnesses where he is concealed. Our police officials pride themselves on their ability to invade the hiding places of the

burglar in the metropolis and of the highwaymen in the mountainous sections; yet in such instances as these the officers are resisted by armed force and they take their lives in their hands when they undertake the hunt. Is it possible that in this land the representatives of the law are not able to serve a subpoena upon the richest man in all the world? Is it possible that with all of our legal machinery we are unable to reach with a simple writ a man whose boast it is that within recent years he has given \$16,399,922 for a university in the city of Chicago, and yet who at the very time that boast is given its widest publicity is fleeing from the officers of the law?

John D. Rockefeller knows more about Standard Oil methods than any other man, and perhaps more than all of the other men associated with his great trust. He should be required to take the witness stand. Let us see whether as a witness, sworn to tell the truth, he will follow the rule laid down by his more or less distinguished son who recently said: "I believe that it is better for the doctor to sacrifice a human life than to tell a lie which would save it."

A NAUSEOUS MESS

The trial of Norman Hapgood, editor of Collier's Weekly, on a charge of criminal libel preferred by Justice Deuel, has developed into an investigation that reveals a very nasty mess. Justice Deuel, a member of the New York bench is a stockholder in "Town Topics," an alleged society paper in New York, of which Colonel Mann is editor. The testimony so far brought out, while it may prove the bravery of Justice Deuel in instituting the case, certainly does no credit to his discretion, for the revelations are sufficient to show clearly the long and systematic course of blackmail pursued by the publishers and editors of that publication. So strong was the evidence that Editor Hapgood was promptly acquitted.

That the wealthy society men and the financiers of New York should for years tamely submit to being "held up" very clearly shows a sad state of morals in the exclusive circles of Gotham. It seems that "Town Topics" did not profit from what it printed, but from what it suppressed, and the payment of round sums by prominent financiers and society leaders to escape being pilloried in that scandal-mongering sheet must be taken as evidence that they were unwilling to have a great many of their doings made the subject of public discussion.

The public will readily recall the stinging commentaries made by Colonel Henry Watterson on "The 400," but in the light of the revelations made since the Hapgood libel suit began it must be admitted that Colonel Watterson, despite the fact that he wields a trenchant pen, fell far short of the real facts. The whole is a shocking commentary on the social conditions existing in the American metropolis. That such a publication as "Town Topics" could have pursued its blackmailing tactics through a long series of years without being brought to book by some one of its many victims, seems almost impossible.

But the revelations in this particular case are in line with the revelations in the great insurance cases. It is added evidence of the fact that something radical must be done to clear the social and financial atmosphere if the country is not to be polluted beyond redemption. Collier's Weekly has performed a distinct favor to the public and to reputable newspapers by exposing the disreputable methods of "Town Topics" and calling public attention to another phase of the social and financial conditions now existing in Gotham.

MR. ROOSEVELT AND DEMOCRATS

A democratic publication printed in Illinois warns democrats and democratic editors against "the habit of giving utterance to fulsome commendation of the policies and acts of President Roosevelt and his administration." That publication says "Mr. Roosevelt was elected as a republican and if he ever shows a leaning toward democratic policies it is because he finds it convenient to adopt them temporarily for republican purposes." It adds:

"As president of the United States Mr. Roosevelt is entitled to fair treatment, but every democrat should remember that in giving way to sentimental utterances of the president's policies he is laying the snare that will compel an inglorious backdown or taking back of utterances and he is violating his duty to his own party."

"Fulsome commendation" should not be indulged in with respect to Mr. Roosevelt's policies or those of any other man. But so far as we have observed democrats have followed Mr. Roose-

velt only as Mr. Roosevelt has followed democracy. Whatever Mr. Roosevelt may do democrats generally will have nothing to retract unless it be the expression of confidence in Mr. Roosevelt, which expression was given under the impression that he meant what he said.

Even though there may be "an inglorious backdown" on Mr. Roosevelt's part, there will be none on the part of democrats who have rushed to his support when he has declared in favor of some reform along democratic lines.

Democrats who have given Mr. Roosevelt encouragement when he has declared himself in favor of reforms for which democrats have all along contended have not violated their duty to their own party. They have discharged their duty as citizens and as democrats, and they have shown that they are more interested in obtaining "the greatest good to the greatest number" than they are in the triumph of any particular party or individual.

The day has gone by when a party may be strengthened by the refusal of its members to support their principles simply because those principles are advocated by men of an opposition party. Democrats have had the right to take the president of the United States at his word, and in all of his proposed reforms Mr. Roosevelt has had the consistent and patriotic support of democrats generally. Nothing will arise, nothing can arise—but the demonstration of the claim that democratic reforms are unwise—which need cause any democrat who has encouraged Mr. Roosevelt to regret the position he has taken.

Even though Mr. Roosevelt does not justify the confidence which democrats and men generally have placed in him, there will be no "inglorious backdown" on the part of those good citizens of all political parties who have encouraged the president in every instance when he has proclaimed the good democratic doctrine that the corporations are the servants rather than the masters of the people.

A NEBRASKAN'S "DISCOVERY"

A republican member of congress, Representative Norris of Nebraska, has, we are told by the Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, discovered "an effective way of inducing the senate to take cognizance of the proposition of amending the constitution to secure direct election of senators." The Globe-Democrat correspondent explains:

"Mr. Norris has advanced the proposition in a new form, and has sugarcoated it in a fashion that, it is thought, may commend it to senatorial consideration. Judge Norris provides for election of the president for eight years and forbids a second term. This is likely to be amended in the house to six years. The measure also provides a four year term for congressmen, which is expected to help it in the house, while the six year presidential term will make it popular with the public at large, and when it gets to the senate, its friends calculate, it will look so good that that body will find embarrassment in amending it to strike out the reorganization of methods of electing senators."

If Mr. Norris really believes that he has "sugarcoated" this proposition in a way to commend it to senatorial consideration he is a very guiltable gentleman. He ought to know that the United States senate, as at present constituted, never "finds embarrassment" in amending any measure, or destroying any measure, which is not acceptable to the interests which the senate faithfully serves.

Does any man imagine for a moment that a measure increasing the term of the members of the lower house to four years, increasing the presidential term to six years, and providing a plan for the selection of senators which would make impossible the election of a considerable number of the incumbents, will "look so good" that senators will "find embarrassment" in amending it to strike out the reorganization of methods of electing senators?

There isn't a well informed school boy in the United States who couldn't tell this republican congressman from Nebraska that he is either the victim of a woefully misplaced confidence or else has permitted a friendly newspaper to offer in his name an insult to the intelligence of the people.

A "VICTIM"

Lincoln Steffens recently said that he regards Henry H. Rogers as "a victim of the existing system of political corruption, just as clearly a victim as some ward healer." Mr. Steffens is usually clear in his statements, but it must be confessed that he should have provided a diagram for this one.