

tained, not only that the Sonnets were sent to Elizabeth, but, what was much more startling, that they were actually addressed to her. Later on, Boswell suggested that Chalmers did not mean this theory to be taken seriously. But the vehemence with which he maintained it precludes this charitable hypothesis. Yet, however fantastic Chalmers's theory may have seemed, it had the effect of starting an entirely fresh hare, which has been running with considerable vitality ever since. Hitherto the critics had assumed that when the publisher called Mr. W. H. 'the onlie begetter' of the Sonnets, he meant 'inspirer,' and that therefore Mr. W. H. was the friend to whom many of them were addressed. Now, whatever terms of respect or endearment might be applied to Queen Elizabeth, she could not well be called 'Mr. W. H.' So Chalmers had to get over the difficulty by explaining that 'begetter' meant the 'getter of the manuscript,' the person who procured it for the

publisher, and that this person had nothing to do with the contents of the Sonnets. This is the only part of his contribution which had any lasting value; for, needless to say, no one accepted his piece of mild scandal about Queen Elizabeth, or believed that, when she was turned sixty, Shakespeare was urging her to marry and warning her of what would happen when she came to be forty.

With this theory the tale of eighteenth-century mare's-nests reaches its climax. The belief that the Sonnets shrouded a mystery, and that that mystery may have had something to do with high life, was now fairly started on its career. The Earls of Pembroke and Southampton were waiting at the wings. Their actual appearance as candidates for the position of Mr. W. H. falls outside the eighteenth century, and respect for the high authorities who have supported their claims forbids the inclusion of those claims in an article on mares'-nests.

JOHN HAY AND THE OPEN DOOR

BY W. S. A. POTT

From The Weekly Review of the Far East, October 1
(SHANGHAI POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC JOURNAL)

THE doctrine known as the Open Door is certain to figure more or less prominently at the forthcoming conference on Pacific and Far Eastern questions. Notwithstanding the acceptance of the Open Door in China by the several Powers, there have resulted amongst them different and conflicting practices. This has led to charges of evasion and violation of the Open Door. Assuming

that there have been infractions of the policy, it yet remains true that the divergent practices are in part due to divergent theories or interpretations.

The origin of the Open Door as applying to China is more or less a matter of common knowledge. After the defeat of China by Japan in 1894 China lay like a stranded whale whose blubber was coveted by the chief Powers of Europe.

They not only seized territory, but secured from the Chinese themselves concessions for mines, railways, commercial privileges and spheres of influence or interest. Writing to a friend in March 1899, John Hay, then Secretary of State, said: 'We are, of course, opposed to the dismemberment of that Empire, and we do not think that the public opinion of the United States would justify the government in taking part in the great game of spoliation now going on.' In September 1899, Mr. Hay addressed to London, Berlin and St. Petersburg his famous note on the Open Door. The Powers addressed did not reply promptly. England was the first to accede; the others stated their sympathy with the principle, but refrained at the time from any formal endorsement. Mr. Hay, after a sufficient delay, sent word to each that in view of the favorable replies from all the others, he regarded that Power's acceptance as 'final and definitive.' Two months later he addressed a similar circular on the Open Door to France, Italy, and Japan all of which gave assurances to respect the principle.

There was nothing new in the phrase, 'Open Door.' In so far as it stood for the fact of free commercial intercourse with all nations, it had existed here and there in Europe for a long time. Great Britain in particular had always advocated this sort of open door. She now holds more colonies by far than all the other Powers together. Until two years ago she maintained for generations, so far as her control extended, an open door for the trade of other nations and set up no special imperialistic preferences for herself. In its application to China, however, the phrase 'Open Door' has taken on a political as well as a commercial meaning, and there is little doubt but that John Hay intended that such should be the case.

In order to appreciate the possibility

of varying interpretations of the Open Door, it is necessary to mention a portion of the text of Mr. Hay's circular on the subject. He asked of the Powers that 'each within its sphere of whatever influence —

'First. Will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China.

'Second. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within such said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

'Third. That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.'

Mr. Hay, it should be noted, did not ask that the several Powers give up their spheres of influence. Nor did he ask that they should not seek any further spheres of influence. The Hay Note was, in fact, a recognition of spheres of influence — as necessary evils no doubt, but still as hard facts, the abolition of which he could not go so far as to request. In other words, he asked for all he could reasonably expect to get at the time. Furthermore, it will be seen that the three propositions in Mr. Hay's note do not by any means cover all commercial activities and situations in which discrimination can be

practised. Finally, in the various notes and treaties between the different Powers subsequent to the formulation of the Hay Doctrine there is always some sort of mention of the preservation of China's territorial integrity or to the maintenance of the Open Door and the territorial integrity of China. Of course the phrase, territorial integrity, has itself come to be ambiguous; but it is only necessary to observe here that the two terms, 'Open Door' and 'territorial integrity' do not necessarily imply each other, and as a matter of fact, have not done so. The constant coupling of the two terms might lead one to construe then as meaning one and the same thing. But in the policy of nations other than the United States, they have not usually been treated as such.

Accordingly, it would seem that there are at least three sorts of Open Door now being applied in China. They can be graded in a scale of liberality.

The narrowest and least liberal is what we may call the Japanese Open Door. This may be characterized as an adherence to the mere letter of the Hay Note. Accordingly, territorial integrity has nothing to do with the Open Door, and anything can be done to China without prejudice to her 'territorial integrity' short of absolute deprivation of political sovereignty. Article IV of the notorious Twenty-One Demands can thus contain a preliminary statement about 'effectively preserving the territorial integrity of China.' Consequently, some of the methods of Japan have earned the undesirable epithet of 'economic imperialism.'

The second sort of Open Door is a strictly commercial policy. But, as such, it goes beyond the observation of the barest requirements as to equality of commercial opportunity outlined in the Hay Note. It is also opposed to any further acquisitions of spheres of influence or other virtual monopolies. It

however, believes in the consolidation by open and legitimate means of any gains obtained prior to the Hay circular. It is in the nature of a self-limiting policy for the purpose of providing a *modus vivendi* between competing nations in China. It looks upon any further encroachments upon China as violations of the Open Door, and is desirous of preserving the *status quo*. This view may be called the European view of the Open Door.

The third view gives to the Open Door a comprehensive political, as well as a strictly commercial, significance. It regards any infringement of the principle of equality of commercial opportunity as *ipso facto* an infringement of China's territorial integrity. Conversely, it considers any impairment of her territorial integrity as a violation of the Open Door. It believes in an Open Door not merely in China between competing foreign powers, but also an Open Door primarily for China in order that China may have the fullest possible opportunities for self-development. That is the American Open Door, although it is also upheld by more liberal British opinion.

We owe this third and most liberal theory of the Open Door to Mr. Hay more than to any other one man. It goes very far beyond the letter of the famous circular letter of 1899, but it is well at the present time to remind ourselves of what was Mr. Hay's attitude toward China. Some of his published statements reveal unmistakably what this attitude was.¹ In an address on 'American Diplomacy,' which was delivered at the New York Chamber of Commerce Dinner in 1901, Mr. Hay said:—

'If we are not permitted to say what we have done, we can at least say a word about what we have tried to do,

¹ See Thayer's Life of John Hay

and the principles which have guided our action. The briefest expression of our rule of conduct is perhaps, the *Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule*. With this simple chart we can hardly go far wrong.'

In March 1899, before the dispatch of the circular note, he wrote confidentially to Paul Dana the letter from which we have quoted in the beginning of this article.

What John Hay did in China's behalf after the Boxer Rebellion and at the time of the Russo-Japanese war should also be borne in mind. After the Boxer troubles, when China was again in danger of being vivisected by the Powers and Germany was particularly aggressive and vindictive, Hay did more than any other statesman to save the Empire.

In a letter to a friend he wrote:—

'About China, it is the devil's own mess. We cannot publish all the facts without breaking off relations with several Powers. We shall have to do the best we can, and take the consequences, which will be pretty serious, I do not doubt. "Give and take"—the axiom of diplomacy to the rest of the world—is positively forbidden to us, by both the Senate and public opinion.'

By 'give and take' Hay meant bargain-counter methods. In another portion of the same letter Hay said:—

'I take it you agree with us that we are to limit as far as possible our military operations in China, to withdraw our troops at the earliest day consistent with our obligations, and in the final adjustment to do everything we can for the integrity and reform of China, and to hold on like grim death to the Open Door. . . .

In a letter to Henry Adams written about the same time are these words:—

'What a business this has been in China. So far we have gotten on by being honest and fair. . . . At least, we are spared the infamy of an alliance with Germany. I would rather, I think,

be the dupe of China, than the chum of the Kaiser.'

In 1905 the Kaiser, feeling his isolation and wishing to humiliate France, started a rumor that a powerful coalition headed by France was under formation and directed against the integrity of China and the Open Door. The Kaiser asked the United States to send around a circular calling for a statement that none of the Powers had any latent designs directed against the Open Door or integrity of China. Mr. Hay did not know at the time the motive of the Kaiser but he thought it would do no harm to send a self-denying circular, which he promptly did. In his diary are these entries:—

'What the whole performance meant to the Kaiser it is difficult to see. But there is no possible doubt that we have scored for China.'

'Our policy is not to demand any territorial advantage and to do what we can to keep China entire.'

If the foregoing attempt to distinguish between the different kinds of Open Door is at all correct, then it is apparent that there is a need for clearer definition of the term and a common understanding of just what the term means in discussions where it figures. Otherwise there will always be problems of the Far East that may or may not be amicably settled.

Furthermore, if what we have shown to be John Hay's view of the Open Door is the fairest view of the Open Door so far as China is concerned, then it must follow, that what has been called 'altitudinous' diplomacy can no longer be practised. For this there must be substituted a diplomacy of the Hay type which is a diplomacy of and for human beings and is sensitive to the hopes and aspirations of four hundred million human beings in China. The Hay Open Door, we repeat, is an Open Door not only *in*, but also *for* China.

EAST AND WEST

BY RABINDRANATH TAGORE

From *The Modern Review*, September
(CALCUTTA LITERARY AND CURRENT-AFFAIRS MONTHLY)

It is not always a profound interest in man that carries travelers nowadays to distant lands. More often it is the facility for rapid movement. For lack of time and for the sake of convenience, we generalize, and crush human facts flat in the packages inside our steel trunks that hold our traveler's reports.

Our knowledge of our own countrymen, and our feelings about them have slowly and unconsciously grown out of innumerable facts, which are full of contradictions and subject to incessant change. They have the elusive mystery and fluidity of life. We cannot define to ourselves what we are as a whole, because we know too much; because our knowledge is more than knowledge. It is an immediate consciousness of personality, any evaluation of which carries some emotion, joy or sorrow, shame or exaltation. But in a foreign land, we try to find our compensation for the meagreness of our data by the compactness of the generalization which our imperfect sympathy itself helps us to form. When a stranger from the West travels in the Eastern world, he takes the facts that displease him and readily makes use of them for his rigid conclusions, fixed upon the unchallengeable authority of his personal experience. It is like a man who has his own boat for crossing his village stream, but, on being compelled to wade across some strange watercourse, draws angry comparisons, as he goes, from every patch of mud and every pebble that his feet encounter.

Our mind has faculties which are

universal, but its habits are insular. There are men who become impatient and angry at the least discomfort, when these habits are incommoded. In their idea of the next world, they probably conjure up the ghosts of their slippers and dressing-gowns, and expect the latch-key that opens their lodging-house door on earth to fit their door-lock in the other world. As travelers they are a failure; for they have grown too accustomed to their mental easy-chairs, and in their intellectual nature love home-comforts, which are of local make, more than the realities of life, which, like earth itself, are full of ups and downs, yet are one in their rounded completeness.

The modern age has brought the geography of the earth near to us, but made it difficult for us to come into touch with man. We go to strange lands and observe; we do not live there. We hardly meet men, but only specimens of knowledge. We are in haste to seek for general types, and overlook individuals.

When we fall into the habit of neglecting to use the understanding that comes of sympathy, in our travels, our knowledge of foreign people grows insensitive, and therefore easily becomes both unjust and cruel in its character, and also selfish and contemptuous in its application. Such has, too often been the case with regard to the meeting of Western people, in our days, with others to whom they do not recognize any obligation of kinship.

It has been admitted that the deal-