

tury: Printers of Italy," just published by the Grolier Club of this city, will be noticed next week.

## Correspondence.

### THE DRIFT IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: President Taft's recent speech at Pittsburgh, in praise of Mr. Knox's foreign policy, ought to stir every one to careful thought. Does it not threaten, doubtless with fair intentions, to be an arrogant and meddlesome policy?

In the first place, observe what we are undertaking in Central and South America. The President thinks it a matter of pride to use the vast power and influence of the national government to help get ship-building contracts for the men in the steel business. Is it not possible that this may be a cause of shame? We send a fleet around the world on exhibition for the weaker nations, and then follow it by persuading Argentina to set up a little fleet, quite possibly on borrowed money. Will the money be loaned by New York bankers? I submit that it is immensely perilous business, when the United States uses governmental influence to saddle other and poorer peoples with the burden of building battleships. Is it not somewhat like the old-fashioned business of selling muskets and gunpowder to the Indians?

Moreover, we seem to be fairly launched upon the enterprise of using the government for the collection of debts in the countries south of us. Naturally the big interests which seek to exploit new countries are pleased to look to Uncle Sam benevolently to guarantee their ventures. Are we not doing enough for these interests at home with high tariffs and other favors, without going into business for them abroad? We ought to be able to see where the precedent already established in Santo Domingo, of running other nations' custom houses, inevitably leads. It means a kind of protectorate, with a responsibility over the conduct of another people, leading the easy way toward some kind of annexation, at our convenience. All this is for the money power, and not because we love the people whose taxes we benevolently collect.

I heard a high official of the United States, when asked whether our present policy, for instance, in the Philippines, did not logically carry us to the control of South and Central America, reply: "I should not mind it a bit." No wonder, when such ideas are in the air, that South American states think it necessary to order Dreadnoughts!

I am aware how patriotic it sounds to promise to protect American citizens and guard their property wherever they go on the planet. It would not be difficult to raise a war cry over some injustice in the treatment of Americans abroad, while we quietly tolerate exactly such injustices when perpetrated at home. Where have Americans abroad suffered greater indignity than Italians and Chinese have borne in our own country, often without redress? If any Latin-American State had treated a citizen of ours with as cruel wrong as

our authorities meted out to the *bona fide* American citizen, Mr. Ju Toy, I fear where our resentment might have carried us.

No nation is as yet civilized enough, and free of blood on its own skirts, to venture to set itself over other states, as the lordly elder brother to keep the others in order. But this is just the trend of our foreign policy in South and Central America. Why should not people who go into half-civilized parts of the world, or embark their business ventures under feeble governments, take their own risks? They are sure to behave better so, than when they put on the arrogant airs of men who can summon ships to their defence. Are we sorry that Livingstone and Stanley had to make their own way in the heart of Africa? Has it ever been well for missionaries to the most degraded peoples to be followed up by bombarding gunboats? The fact is, among the more civilized nations, the American traveller or merchant is as safe to-day as he is at home, and, if honorable himself, needs no police protection from Washington. Whereas, everywhere on the fringes of civilization, including plenty of places in the territory of the United States, it is impossible completely to guard heedless, hot-tempered, venturesome, and especially greedy and unscrupulous individuals. Our present policy threatens the rise of serious and embarrassing complications over some drunken brawl in Callao, or the failure of a Latin-American court to satisfy one of our exploiting syndicates.

Mr. Taft is warm in praise of Secretary Knox's attitude on the question of the "open door" in the East. We all like the open door—for ourselves. Does President Taft really mean to hint, as his words imply, that this nation stands ready to impose its doctrine of an "open door" in Manchuria or China, and even to go to the length of breaking the peace of the world, over a matter of a few petty millions of dollars of trade? Is there any conceivable difference, that could arise between our government and that of Japan, or Russia, or Germany, touching privileges of commerce, to warrant the intervention or even the threat of war? Will the United States remain the greatest dog-in-the-manger in the world at keeping its trade to itself, and have no bowels of mercy for the other animals who like their little manglers?

In speaking of our foreign policy, I used the word "drift" advisedly. No mere private citizen should be inhospitable to any light which may alter his views upon the colossal subjects with which modern statecraft has to deal. Grant that those of us, who now look upon our present foreign policy with grave apprehension, may be mistaken; grant that we do wisely to let our national government arrange loans at Peking for syndicates of bankers, and go touting in Montevideo for battleships in behalf of the ship-building industry; grant that we might well take over the custom houses of half a dozen states, and meet the further consequences of responsibility for millions more of people; grant that we ought to set up Gibraltar in the Pacific and be ready to fight for the entrance of oil and sundries into Manchuria; grant even that we might need to dispatch battleships to Constantinople, or march an army to Damascus to rescue a missionary, or one of our newly naturalized Syrian citizens; grant all you please in favor of an

active and aggressive foreign policy, my point is, that we are at present merely drifting into it, without due and deliberate consideration. Under the forms of a democratic government, we have the extraordinary spectacle of two or three men in the executive department, quietly, and, perhaps, unconsciously, shaping the foreign policy of a great nation, without apparently having taken pains to think out the real significance of their course, much less to weigh the possibility of a wiser and more patriotic, and, perhaps, more "Christian" alternative. Meanwhile, the deliberative body in our government merely looks on and is silent. Hardly any warning or questioning views are raised. The Senate, notoriously sensitive to its treaty-making rights, allows, without protest, the establishing of precedents in international matters even more vital than most treaties deal with. The nation, which can scarcely let a draw-bridge be interfered with without action by Congress, throws into the lap of a single man the power to send a costly fleet around the world, to let words go out from the State Department which might kindle irremediable war, or to moor ships with a menace in the port of a friendly state. Is it not time for the American people to wake up, and at least take notice where we are moving? If the motion is right, ought it not to be deliberate, so that we may know that we are right?

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Jamaica Plain, Mass., May 9.

### PENSIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Thank you for your editorial on pensions in your issue of May 5. Remembering well and having somewhat participated in that fine enthusiasm which, in the earlier calls of 1861, brought volunteers in excess of the requisition; recalling the ardent love of country and unreserved devotion to it then expressed, I can think of no contrast meaner and more degrading than the perpetual whine and holding out of the hat, especially during the past thirty years, ostensibly in behalf of such soldiers and patriots. I am fain to believe that the chief backers to the pension agents and other middlemen in such applications come from "volunteers" of 1864, not to speak of the "bounty-jumpers," men who enlisted upon receiving a sum of money with the intention of deserting at the earliest opportunity and of repeating the process—I have known of cases when they were in the ranks less than six hours, and then, under another name, became candidates for another "bounty." Such men then made a trade of patriotism, and possibly have resumed it in more peaceful times. In those early days true men did not stand upon their "rights," but threw themselves to the fore unreservedly, with all their hearts. Yet they knew what we have apparently forgotten, that their country had a right to call them to arms—as clear and as full a right as to take their property by taxation—and that they had no greater right to claim largess from their country because they had served her under arms than had those who paid war taxes, because they thus impoverished themselves in contributing to the same desired result. Not one of us begrudges a pension bestowed upon any crippled by wounds or by a disease certainly ascribable

to the service. This, indeed, might be considered as implicitly a part of the contract for their support made at the time of enlistment; further than this they have no right or claim. Neither has Congress or a majority party a moral right to be generous with the nation's funds. They stand as trustees; and a trustee for a minor or a widow has as clear a right to use his ward's money in doles to beggars as has Congress to bestow largess from money wrung from poor and rich through taxation. Our countrymen are not niggardly or ungenerous, and had voluntary subscriptions been asked for exceptional cases beyond the legitimate powers of the nation's trustee, undoubtedly such call would have been liberally responded to by others and by the millionaires who survive among the veterans.

T. E. C.

Baltimore, Md., May 7.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems to me that military pensions and other allowances after retirement to civil life should be based upon the public benefit reasonably to be expected therefrom. Grateful recognition of past service is not properly transmuted into coin unless there is a fair chance of profit to the whole community in the transaction. As bearing upon my theory of the matter, I quote from Sir Henry Maine's "Popular Government" (Essay ii) a few sentences expressing what looks to me like truth, and what will be conceded to be at least the honest judgment of a careful and able investigator. He says:

The first necessity of a State is that it should be durable. . . . Next perhaps to the paramount duty of maintaining national existence comes the obligation incumbent on democracies, as on all governments, of securing the national greatness and dignity. . . . and the government which fails to provide a sufficient supply of generals and statesmen, of soldiers and administrators . . . is a government which has miscarried. . . . If the choice has to be made, and if there is any real connection between democracy and liberty, it is better to remain a nation capable of displaying the virtues of a nation than even to be free.

Perhaps this country may never again need to call upon the most vigorous of its citizens to become soldiers in its service. It does not appear unwise, however, to take such obvious measures as will be likely to facilitate the making of armies, in the case of armies being some time needed. Men do not (as a general rule) get themselves "stormed at with shot and shell" or exposed to the vicissitudes of heat, frost, and fatigue because they like it. Patriotism is often a sufficient inducement, but pecuniary inducements have always been offered, in addition, to the persons chosen by the government as the most desirable for such bounties (usually commanders rather than actual fighters), *pour encourager les autres*.

In America such prizes have been given to the rank and file for the apparent reason that the award would tend to insure the existence of a rank and file in time of need. The details of the distribution may not commend themselves to many of us, but the intention is good. Some think that a modification of the present methods so as to make them tend to induce enlisted men to remain in the service more than ninety days, and to comport themselves in such

wise as to obtain commissions as officers, might also be worth while. Out of this feeling, as I understand, has grown the bill to create a volunteer officers' retired list, similar to that enacted for revolutionary officers eighty years ago.

Perhaps I am biased in its favor. I was a civil war soldier who, after serving a year and a half as an enlisted man, was commissioned lieutenant as a mark of approval of my conduct in battle. I continued in the regiment (Twenty-fourth New York) until the expiration of its term, having meantime been advanced one grade. If the bill just mentioned should become a law, I should be a beneficiary, if surviving, to the extent of about \$50 a month. Like all participants in the war now living, I have entered the domain of old age, and it did not occur to me that the bill was a "scandalous raid upon the treasury by the pension grabbers" until I noted the characterization at the head of your editorial comments last week, along with the observation that its passage would call loudly for a Presidential veto.

If I believed that characterization to be deserved, I would not apply for a place on the lists, although the allowance would mean a substantial addition to my comfort. I have not asked any member of Congress to support the bill, because such a request might savor of solicitation of charity, and I think I could get on without it. But even after carefully reading your editorial of this week, I am unable to view the matter in the light there indicated. I may be wrong, and if so, or if the Congress concludes it best not to act favorably on the bill, I shall try to content myself with the outcome.

THERON WILBER HAIGHT.

Waukesha, Wis., May 6.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In holding up in its true light the measure now before Congress, for placing the volunteer officers who went out of the national service forty-five or more years ago, upon virtually an equal footing with the professional military men, you do an important service not only to the country but to those survivors of the volunteers who beg for protection against the evil ways of their associates.

The project is the latest, but it is to be feared not the last, development of the startling principle which has been emphasized at soldiers' meetings, especially at those of the Grand Army, for many years. The substance of this doctrine is that the soldier, not only of the civil war but of all national wars, has placed the government under a permanent money obligation, even though he has returned unharmed to the activities of the plain citizen; and that, in its delay to meet this debt promptly and generously, the government has shamelessly shirked its moral obligation.

One of the earliest expressions of this view, against which at the time of its publication I had occasion to make a public protest, was the insistence of a national encampment of the Grand Army that Congress should at once pass a service pension law, because "the Grand Army, in national encampment, had twice voted for it; because the Grand Army posts of every loyal State had petitioned the present Congress for it; because the payment of such pensions will awaken a

patriotism such as no other means can bring forth; because only by the passage of such a measure can justice be done the saviors of the republic." The most recent repetition of this claim appears in the pamphlet circulated by a committee for securing means to lobby in Congress for the present measure, in the form of a telegram from sympathizers in California: "The volunteer officers ask what is justly due them. Let us fight for our rights as from sixty-one to sixty-five!" Reduced to its legitimate meaning this is an assertion that, once a soldier under any national emergency, always a soldier, for the pay, but not for duty. Some of us of a simple mind have always assumed that a republic, like any other system of government, has in a critical time absolute command of the property and lives of its subjects; and that such a crisis occurred at the outbreak of secession, when the republic, instead of resorting to conscription as it might have done with entire justice and wisdom, trusted its needs to the spontaneous public spirit and devotion of the people and received such a response of self-forgetting enthusiasm as marks the high tide of American patriotism. Thus a volunteer soldier is simply a special policeman with the peculiar honors that attach in romance to military service. It is his own fireside, his own life that he is defending; and, while his neighbors for whom he acts as a substitute may be grateful to him, it is not for them alone but for himself that his service is performed. And when his special duty is done, he returns to the ranks of plain, civil life. Under this new teaching of political morality a republic, far from being the strongest, is the weakest possible scheme of government. It may beg its citizens piteously to save it from peril; but, if they are indifferent to its calls, whether because they are in a profitable occupation or because they are afraid, it has no recourse; like Dogberry, with his unwilling thief, it must let them go the way of their preference. This is individual liberty carried out to anarchy. It seems a strange doctrine to be labelled patriotism. Yet all the claimants for pensions resent any imputation against their disinterested love of country.

The pending measure goes a step further than the claims of the Grand Army in proposing the creation of an aristocratic class of beneficiaries of pension; for creation it certainly is. No man of us for these forty odd years has ever dreamed that he was still in government service. We dropped our commissions and our uniforms with relief when we were discharged, and have been diligent ever since in earning our livelihood like other civilians, not setting ourselves above our old companions in arms, the former private soldiers, who incurred the same dangers as ourselves and are entitled to fully as great appreciation from their country.

If six hundred or twelve hundred dollars a year is the right amount to soothe our neglected honor, why shall not an equal sum be given to these, once of lower rank, but now our equals before the law and in the eyes of an affectionate country?

A VOLUNTEER CAPTAIN.

Cincinnati, O., May 7.



## CORRECTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Perhaps some of your readers who consulted your review of Professor Hart's "Slavery and Abolition" in the issue for September 13, 1906, may be interested in the following notes.

On page 184 we read of Whittier: "During the three years, 1835 to 1837, he was a member of the Massachusetts Legislature." Pickard's "Life of Whittier" makes it clear that Whittier, elected in 1835, served in the Legislature, but, though reelected, was unable, on account of poor health, to take his place, and that he was not again chosen. As pertinent to Professor Hart's purpose as the influence Whittier exercised over Cushing, p. 185, is the circumstance narrated by Pickard, *Life*, I, 285: Whittier allowed himself to be a Liberty candidate for Congress, so long as there was no danger of election, and in 1842-43 was successful in preventing the election of any other man, his opponents not being acceptable to the anti-slavery forces. But in December, 1843, Webster having recommended that the Whigs should nominate Whittier, Whittier, in alarm lest he should be elected, declined the candidacy.

Professor Hart, on page 186, says that Lowell's first anti-slavery utterance was called out in 1845 by the capture of some fugitive slaves. According to Scudder's list in his *Life*, Lowell had published, as early as August, 1843, his "Stanzas on Freedom," and between that time and his lines on the capture of fugitive slaves had appeared two anti-Texas poems.

On page 189 Professor Hart writes a sentence implying that Channing died in 1839. The correct date is 1842.

Professor Hart, probably, was less painstakingly accurate in those portions of his book that had to do with men of letters.

WM. H. POWERS.

South Dakota State College, May 4.

## UNIVERSITY ADVERTISING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the report of the recent meeting of the American Oriental Society, in your issue of April 14, mention was made of a paper by Prof. George A. Barton, "deprecating the sensational manner in which the discovery" of Dr. Hilprecht's "Deluge fragment" was exploited. The matter is of interest not only in connection with the quarrels of the Orientalists, but in its relation to the subject of university advertising, lately discussed in the annual report of President Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation. It is to be feared that the University of Pennsylvania, while by no means alone, is not least among the sinners in this direction; and Professor Hilprecht may be a victim more than a party to the fault. His University maintains a "Bureau of Publicity," which perhaps exercises many wholesome and legitimate functions—though one wonders that a society of scholars need court publicity in these well-reported days—but which incidentally does things calculated to make the judicious grieve. Its weekly organ heralded the "Deluge tablet" under the head-line "The Biblical Flood Story Confirmed," and followed up the "story" with an editorial in which it was affirmed that

the discovery "completely vindicates the Old Testament text and is a check to super-critical ideas and skepticism with regard to the accuracy of our sacred writings"; Dr. Hilprecht's "Temple Library" having become "a very bulwark and defence for all that is holy and sacred to us." Clearly it could not have occurred to the writer either that there might be doubt as to the date of the fragment, or, supposing that it paralleled the Biblical account of the flood, that there might be various explanations of the fact, or (finally) that, for such intelligent persons as university publications are supposed to represent, "all that is holy and sacred to us" has long ceased to depend upon the historical accuracy of the early chapters of Genesis. The effect of the article was therefore to awaken ridicule even among those totally unversed in the subject-matter involved. There should seem to be a query here for university authorities, namely, since one can hardly hope to find advertising agents of the requisite culture and judgment to represent matters of scholarship with due credit to those concerned, whether it may not be better to abandon the effort altogether. Whatever is of real public concern will surely be heralded quite as soon as scholars of good taste can possibly wish it to be.

I have only to add that the writer, far from being a willing critic of the University of Pennsylvania, is an alumnus thereof, and a loyal one, if he knows what loyalty means; one who believes that the university is too great to adopt or tolerate questionable methods through a yielding to the principle of competition, and who, like many others of its alumni, covets for it such a policy as shall give no occasion for either apology or defence.

X.

Philadelphia, April 25.

## Literature.

## ANCIENT AND MODERN CHINA.

*My Life in China and America.* By Yung Wing. New York: Holt & Co. \$2 net.

*Court Life in China.* By Isaac Taylor Headland. New York: The Revell Co. \$1.50 net.

*In the Land of the Blue Gown.* By Mrs. Archibald Little. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$2.50 net.

*The Chinese.* By John Stuart Thomson. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co. \$2.50 net.

*Changing China.* By the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$3 net.

*China: Its Marvel and Mystery.* By T. Hodgson Liddell. New York: The John Lane Co. \$6.50 net.

*The Great Wall of China.* By William Edgar Geill, F.R.G.S. New York: Sturgis & Walton. \$5 net.

*China and the Far East.* Edited by George H. Blakeslee. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. \$2 net.

For a venerable Chinese gentleman,

eighty-two years of age, to be able to write his autobiography in faultless English, is in itself a wonder. Dr. Yung Wing is a doctor of laws of Yale University, and writes, after a life of strenuous work, from his quiet home in Hartford, Conn. A perusal of this remarkable and scholarly publication fills one with a pleasant astonishment. It naturally suggests a question: What, if one poor lad taken from a country village in China is capable of such high intellectual and social attainments, will be the outcome when the whole nation has similar opportunities afforded under the great educational reform now going on throughout the empire? Dr. Yung Wing begins at the very opening of his career and tells in a simple and fascinating manner of the hardships of his child-life in southern China. The poor boy who hawked candy about the streets of his native village from daylight to dark to gain a mere pittance, who was greatly frightened at the first sight of a foreign missionary lady, and who ran away from her boarding-school to which he had been taken by his parents to learn English, can hardly be recognized in the person who in a few years was to become the first Chinese graduate of Yale, a successful merchant, an educational commissioner, a Chinese official, a doctor of laws, the son-in-law of his college president, and a retired gentleman. His history is to a large extent mixed up with that of China, especially with those educational reforms that are connected with Western studies. As an example of his style and subject we may quote what he says of his great patron the Duke Tsang Kwo-fan:

To crush and end a rebellion of such dimensions as that of the Taipings was no small task. Tsang-Kwo-fan was made the generalissimo of the Imperialists. To enable him to cope successfully with the Taipings, Tsang was invested with almost regal power. The revenue of seven or eight provinces was laid at his feet for disposal, also official ranks and territorial appointments were at his command. So Tsang Kwo-fan was literally and practically the supreme power of China at the time. But true to his innate greatness, he was never known to abuse the almost unlimited power that was placed in his hands, nor did he take advantage of the vast resources that were at his disposal to enrich himself or his family, relatives or friends. Unlike Li Hung-Chang, his protégé and successor, who bequeathed \$40,000,000 to his descendants after his death, Tsang died comparatively poor, kept the escutcheon of his official career untarnished, and left a name and character honored and revered for probity, patriotism, and purity. He had great talents, but he was modest. He had a liberal mind, but he was conservative. He was a perfect gentleman and nobleman of the highest type. It was such a man that I had the great fortune to come in contact with in the fall of 1863.

"Court Life in China" could not have