

his *Grashdanin* (St. Petersburg), referring to the delight with which Vannovsky's appointment has been received in all circles, says:

"It might seem as if the selection of a purely military man must excite in some quarters the fear of a drastic reaction; yet the effect has been the reverse. Everybody tells us that the students are pleased and convinced of the new minister's sympathy with their aspirations and demands. We, too, are grateful for this phenomenon, for it shows that, in spite of the efforts of our intellectuals to breed confusion and revolt among the students, we are still very far from that mental state in which only Robespierres and Marats would be looked upon as the proper guides of our educational world."

The *Nedelia* (weekly, St. Petersburg) makes a furious assault on the present system and hopes that the Government contemplates radical reorganization, both as to curriculum and discipline. It says:

"What has it [the system] given us in the last twenty-five years? It has given us incapables, victims of the unhealthy 'classical' studies, hate-inspired revolutionists who had sworn to avenge their wasted years, and nameless, impotent nobodies having no interest in real life and trained to dull obedience and official routine."

"In our university courses all live sciences were rigidly excluded or kept down to the least possible proportion. The spirit of brotherly association, of free and spontaneous intercourse; the influence of university life, the influence of cordial treatment of students by professors—all this was banished. Everything which binds men together, creates sympathy and mutuality, was prohibited. What can such universities do for science, for society? Science in our universities has fallen to the lowest estate."

Even the *Novoye Vremya*, which the students have regarded as hostile and which was at one time boycotted by them, expresses the same opinion. "Whatever," it says, "Russia still has of mental vigor and freshness is due to influences wholly independent of the schools. The universities have graduated little Hamlets, mediocre pedants. The literature of the university-trained writers is a literature of and for the dead, and the science of the same people is a colorless, trivial, empty ceremony." It hopes that all this will soon be a thing of the past, the memory of a nightmare, and that the ministry of education will put routine aside and call to its aid strong, free, original spirits who do not fear intellect and modern science. Society, the fathers and mothers of the rising generation, expect and sigh for such a change, says the St. Petersburg *Viedomosti*, another severe critic of the present system, which, it asserts, has driven the best men out of the faculties and has poisoned the life of thousands of young men.

The French papers generally comment approvingly on the new appointment; but the *Temps* (Paris) fears that General Vannovsky is too old a man to accomplish much in the way of a progressive policy. The three root causes of the discontent among Russian students, says *The St. James's Gazette* (London), are "spiritual tyranny, the suppression of thought, and the supremacy of the police administration." These, it thinks, are as yet beyond the power of a minister of education to remedy. The Russian review *Pravo* is quoted by *The Anglo-Russian* (London) as follows:

"Not only statutes but rights—this should be the watchword of all true friends of a legal order of things. In converse proportion to the growth of civilization and the developments of national life, the present lifeless system of laws becomes more inadequate than ever, and the need for extended personal and public rights, guaranteed by statutes, more and more pressing. Whoever believes himself capable of satisfying the national aspirations by technical improvements in industry, and the embodiment of law in a perfectly organized bureaucracy, who believes that personal rights simply are a hobby of the obnoxious West, with which Russian society might well dispense—he nourishes a misconception which, compelling men to turn their backs upon Europe and their faces toward Siberia, would be dangerous

were it not so conspicuously fallacious. No technical advancements, nor any objective system of laws, will meet the demands of the fast developing, grandly proportioned Russian culture becoming more and more intricate every day."—*Translations made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

### CHINESE OPINION OF THE MANCHURIAN TREATY.

NATIVE public opinion in China, as represented in the Chinese press, is thoroughly aroused over the secret treaty with Russia concerning Manchuria. The native papers are full of indignant protests, and high officials such as the Viceroys Liu Kun Yi and Chang Chih Tung have repeatedly memorialized the throne to reject the treaty. Many protests have also been sent to the Emperor, the Empress-Dowager, the peace plenipotentiaries in Peking, and even the Chinese minister in St. Petersburg. Two indignation meetings, unique in Chinese history, were recently held in Shanghai and were largely attended by Chinese of rank and influence. The meetings, as reported in the Chinese daily papers, show a copying of Western ways that is new for China. There is a regularly chosen presiding officer; a set of resolutions is brought forward; earnest speeches are made which show remarkable familiarity with the subject, each good point being accorded applause; and telegraphic resolutions are sent to influential persons all over the country, and to the Emperor. Among the speakers at the second meeting was a Chinese girl of sixteen, who, it is reported, made a very effective speech. *The North China Daily News* (Shanghai) translates from a native paper the following remarks made by her:

"People of all ranks and classes seem hopelessly to lack union and patriotism. The officials seem to care only for their posts and their families, and the people regard themselves as helpless babies and leave everything in the hands of the officials. This is why China is so weak. In foreign countries, such as England, America, Japan, every one, in office or not, feels an interest in the government, and treats everything in connection with it as his own business. Hence, these countries are strong and no one dares insult them. The Russo-Chinese agreement shakes the very foundation of China, and yet many Chinese seem indifferent. The people should be solidly united against this dangerous and dishonorable compact. The only persons who seem to be in favor of this agreement are Prince Ching and Li Hung Chang."

*The Chung Wai Jih Pao* (Universal Gazette, Peking), in discussing Russian methods, observes:

"We Chinese find it hard to understand the ways of Westerners in the matter of politics, which are both clever and obscure. There is in both East and West a use of funds in the conduct of the government of which the people are in ignorance. The public funds to be used each year are always made through appropriations."

"In accomplishing her [Russia's] objects, money is a small consideration. The year before last, China sent an ambassador to the court of Russia, and he received attention such as was given to the ambassador of no other country. He was accorded many audiences with the Czar. Because of the many presents and the marked attention, he became a captive of Russia. At another time, a governor of one of the provinces, on his way to Peking, had business with a Russian bank, and the manager of the bank told him that, any time he was in need of funds, he might draw on the bank freely. There was another instance of a Russian minister's having given money to one of the underlings of a Chinese minister who went to pay his respects to him. Altho a small matter, it showed the disposition of the Russians to buy the favor of the Chinese. A man who recently went to Tien-Tsin to establish a newspaper received from a Russian consul an offer to sell 20,000 copies of the paper. The editor, however, instead of showing favor to the Russians, exposed their methods, and the consul had nothing more to do with the paper. Russian agents came to Shanghai in 1899 to investigate the na-

tive newspapers, and offered bribes to those who would favor the Russian cause; but none of the newspapers would agree. Now that the secret treaty has come to light and is being publicly discussed, the Russians deny it, and put false representations in the mouth of the American minister [referring to a reputed denial of the treaty on the part of Minister Conger]. They say it is invented by Japan, tho the facts are as clear as day. Even a Chinese newspaper has helped the Russians by denying the existence of the treaty, most certainly because of some bribe. . . . The indignation meetings in Shanghai do not manifest hatred of Russia or friendship for England and Japan more than others, but they are a recognition that now help is to be looked for only from England and Japan. If the secret treaty is agreed to at this time, it will mean nothing less than the division and destruction of the empire."

The Shanghai *Mercury* translates from the native daily, *Su Pao*, the following comment on the treaty:

"These Eastern encroachments of Russia are all in accordance with the will of Peter the Great. But China herself must stiffen her opposition to Russia before she can hope to get help from any one else. True, Russia does not fear China, but she fears the other kingdoms. . . ."

"If we sign it [the treaty], the other nations will not keep their hands off, and if we do not, Russia will be displeased. Like a man on a tiger's back he naturally does not know whether it is better to keep his seat or get down. The Boxers had the audacity to attack all the world, but it is not likely that Russia with all her ferocity will have the courage of Tuan Wang and Kangyi [Boxer leaders]."

**British Approval of Our Policy in China.**—The press of Great Britain is almost unanimous in commending our Chinese policy. *The Times* and *The Daily News* (London), usually at opposite political poles, seldom lose an opportunity to praise our moderation and good sense. The American suggestions in the far East are always sensible, says *The Guardian* (Radical, Manchester). Commenting on Mr. Rockhill's plan for basing the Chinese indemnity on the sum China can afford to pay without becoming bankrupt, *The Guardian* says:

"Compensation there must be; but the assumption throughout the negotiations that it is the lower limit that is fixed by the actual expenditure of the victors in the war is wholly novel. Besides, technically we have never been at war with China; what, then, is the legal justification of an indemnity? Again, what compensation do the powers mean to pay to China for the indiscriminate pillage in which their troops have indulged? Surely the losses incurred by China through the shameless violation of the laws of war by some of the international troops should be told off against the expenditure incurred by the powers in protecting their legations?"

Mr. Rockhill's plan is a common-sense and businesslike proposition, says *The Outlook* (London); but it fears that the plan is too simple for acceptance. *The Celestial Empire* (Shanghai), published under English auspices, sees evidences of an attempt on the part of Russia to gain American friendship and even alliance. This journal quotes the Russian statesman, Prince Ukhtomsky, as declaring that "Russian autocracy has nothing in common with Cæsarism, but is a national idea of unity which fits her for alliance with America against English imperialism." It scouts this idea and asserts that Russia and America can have nothing in common. Their policies in China are at complete variance. Russia opposes sending missionaries to China, as the enlightenment of the Chinese would mean the failure of Russian ambition. But the American missionary, "perhaps more than any other, stands for enlightenment."

**The Future of the Kongo Free State.**—The present Belgian parliament has the problem before it of providing for the future of the Kongo Free State. It is to decide, says *The Guardian* (Manchester), whether or not it will annex the Kongo State to Belgium and whether, if it postpones annexation, it will im-

pose any restrictions on "the despotic rule which has discredited the Kongo administration and so brought discredit on Belgium herself." The Kongo State, it will be remembered, was organized in 1884 as an absolutely free state, under the patronage of King Leopold of Belgium. *The Guardian* declares that almost all the provisions of the Berlin agreement, which brought the state into being, have been violated:

"Within a few years from its foundation, the Kongo State began to throw off the mask and to show that its real aims were very different from those set forth at Berlin. Nominally free trade was to prevail on the Kongo; as a matter of fact, by various decrees dating from 1889 onward, the Kongo State assumed to itself a monopoly of all trade within three-fourths of its territories. In theory slavery was to be abolished, and by the destruction of the great Arab slave-traders of the South in successive campaigns the Kongo State seemed to have accomplished its purpose. In reality, as Consul Pickersgill reported in 1898, 'the outcome of this lofty enterprise' has been a 'mere modification of the evil that was so righteously attacked,' and the slave released by Kongo-state troops has, in our consul's words, 'to pay for his freedom by serving a new master during a fixed term of years for wages merely nominal'—that is to say, there is one public slave-owner, the Kongo State, in place of many private owners. As for the obligation to care for the moral and material well-being of the population, the Kongo State has simply ignored it. Every native has to work for the state, either as a porter or in collecting rubber, and defaulters are massacred by the armed savages who constitute the Kongo-state militia and police. The Kongo State, founded on a basis of free trade and philanthropy, has become a great commercial monopoly, utterly regardless of justice or humanity in its pursuit of gain. Uncontrolled by public opinion, it has permitted or connived at some of the worst excesses recorded in the history of European rule in Africa."

It is now generally admitted, concludes this Manchester journal, that the creation of the Kongo State was a mistake, and it should be annexed to Belgium.

**London and Paris: A Contrast.**—The contrasts presented by Paris and London are rather amusingly put by Felix Pejat, in the *Matin*, of the former city. He says:

"Paris does most things with the right hand or at the right side; London follows the left.

"Parisian coachmen keep to the right, those of London to the left.

"Paris grows by absorption, London by expansion.

"Paris is built of stone, London of brick.

"Paris has high houses and narrow streets, London's buildings are low and its streets wide.

"The windows of Paris open like doors, those of London à la guillotine.

"Paris is collectivistic, it dwells in houses which are really caravansaries; London is individualistic, each family having its own house.

"Paris has its *portier*, London its night-key.

"Paris gets up early from its bed which is against the wall; London arises late from its bed which is in the center of the room.

"Paris dines, London eats.

"London, said Voltaire, has one hundred religions and but one sauce; Paris has one hundred sauces and no religion at all.

"Paris is gay, London sad.

"London has too few soldiers, Paris too many. The soldiers in Paris wears a blue tunic and red pantaloons, while the London man-of-war is clad in a red coat and blue trousers.

"In Paris priests perform the marriage rites; in London they marry themselves.

"In Paris the married women are free; in London when a woman marries she ceases to be.

"Paris has more suicides, London more homicides.

"Paris works, London traffics.

"In Paris the street crowds fight by kicks, in London by blows of the fist.

"The proletariat of Paris refers to the pawn-shop as 'My aunt,' while in London they say 'My uncle.'"—*Translation made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*