The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1907.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosques 14 and 77, Boulevard des Capucines, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Great Question Between the United States and Japan.

Very opportunely the second number of the *International Law Quarterly* presents for its leading article an address delivered by Secretary ROOT at the meeting of the American Society of International Law in which was discussed the real question raised by the conflict between the Japanese treaty of 1894 and the San Francisco school board resolution. It was made clear in this address that the treaty rights of the Japanese had been violated by the resolution of the San Francisco school board, which discriminated against Japanese pupils as compared with the children of certain other resident aliens. Mr. ROOT, however, did not stop with that demonstration, but went on to show that the question of paramount importance is one not of international law but of international sentiment. Against popular sentiment treaties are waste paper and diplomacy is empty routine. The real question which underlies all the recent discussion of the purport and effect of the treaty of 1894 is this: Are the people of the United States about to break friendship with the people of Japan?

In this address, of which the authoritative text is now published for the first time, Mr. ROOT proves that the President and Senate when making the treaty of 1894 were constitutionally empowered to declare that if the State of California chose to provide a system of education which should include alien children it must not exclude the particular alien children of Japanese descent. Now, the State of California did choose to provide a system of education which was to include alien children, but it did direct the establishment of separate schools for Indian, Chinese or Mongolian children, and declared that these children must not be admitted to any other school building. It was in pursuance of this statute that the San Francisco school board passed the discriminatory resolution against which Japan protested.

Mr. ROOT cites a number of pertinent and conclusive decisions by the United States Supreme Court to show the adoption of the unvarying rule that when a State statute conflicts with a treaty the former must fall before the latter, even when the provisions of a treaty relate to matters concerning which our Federal Congress itself has no power to legislate, but upon which in the distribution of legislative powers under the Constitution the power to legislate was reserved to the States alone. It follows from these decisions that the treaty making power alone, which is lodged in the President and Senate, has authority to determine what rights, privileges and immunities shall be accorded to foreigners visiting or residing in our country. No State can set up its laws as against the grant of any particular right, privilege or immunity any more than against the grant of any other right, privilege or immunity. No State, for example, can say that a treaty may grant to alien residents equality of treatment as to property but not as to education; or as to the exercise of religion and as to burial but not as to education; or as to education but not as to property or religion. That would be substituting the mere will of a given State for the judgment of the Federal President and Federal Senate in exercising a power committed to them and prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

There was therefore no real question of power arising under the Japanese treaty of 1894 and no real question of State rights. Neither was there a practical question of war with Japan. Mr. ROOT testifies that all the talk about war was sensational and imaginative, because there never was even the semblance of any friction between the two Governments. There was, however, a profound and serious question which had been raised by the foolish attempt of the State of California and the San Francisco school board to nullify a treaty right of the Japanese. That question was: What state of feeling would be created between the great body of the people of the United States and the great body of the people of Japan as a result of the treatment which had been given to the Japanese in this country? What was to be the effect upon the proud, sensitive, highly civilized people across the Pacific of the discourtesy, insult, imputations of inferiority and abuse aimed at them in the columns of American newspapers? What would be the inevitable effect upon our own people of the high spirited responses that natural resentment for such treatment would elicit from the Japanese? Were the two nations which in the first article of their first treaty proclaimed a perfect, permanent and universal peace and a sincere and cordial amity between each other to face each other henceforward with angry and vindictive feelings?

Well timed and much needed is Secretary ROOT's admonition that in our day it is not Governments but peoples that make friendship or dislike, sympathy or discord, peace or war. In our day, through the myriad columns of the press and through messages flashed over countless wires, multitude calls to multitude across boundaries and oceans, in courtesy or insult, in amity or in defiance. It is no longer foreign offices, no longer Ambassadors and Ministers, that keep or break international peace. It is the people of a given country who permit themselves to treat the people of other countries with discourtesy and insult that are sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind, for a world of sullen and revengeful hatred will never be a world of peace. Let us hope, then, as Mr. ROOT believes, that the question whether the people of the United States are about to sunder their age long friendship with the people of Japan has been happily answered in the negative.

Opportunity Arrives at the City Hall.

The Mayor will be face to face with the Prentice bill in a few hours. The Senate passed it yesterday by a non-partisan vote of 38 to 8, and sent it hurrying down the river. The following statement is from the Springfield *Republican*, an intelligent and detached observer:

"Mayor MCCLELLAN is said to be hesitating whether to veto or approve the recount bill, affecting his own title to the office he holds, when that measure reaches him from the Legislature. But it cannot be that utter foolishness so far besets him as to bring forth a veto. Still, there is the fact that he resisted at every turn the Hearst effort to gain a recount of the Mayoralty vote through the courts."

It is largely a personal question with Mr. MCCLELLAN. He is more or less in the tangle of previous policy. It will require some vigor of purpose to cut loose and grasp the opportunity that has come to him—probably for the last time—to prove to everybody

1. That he does not fear the result of any sort of investigation, under judicial direction, of his title to the office;

2. That he had rather lose his office than hold it by a title not legally and morally sound.

We rejoice to learn from the Hon. WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN, for whose political judgment we have always had the highest respect, that he is not responsible for the policy that has encouraged so unfortunate and so widespread an impression that the Mayor's case was the converse of that indicated in the two foregoing propositions.

Julia Ward Howe.

Boston must share with New York the privilege of claiming that remarkable woman, JULIA WARD HOWE, who has just celebrated her eighty-eighth birthday in extraordinary vigor of mind and body. She was born in the old city of New York in Marketfield street, which runs from Broad, just south of Beaver, to the Produce Exchange court; on Marketfield street are still to be seen ancient brick houses of the time of Mrs. HOWE's birth in 1819. Her father, SAMUEL WARD, was the first president of the Bank of Commerce and a founder of the University of the City of New York. In the fine mansion which he built at the corner of Broadway and Bond street and filled with objects of art JULIA WARD spent her girlhood, and there she met the social lions, literary and professional, of that day. The Ward mansion is gone, and in its stead towers a building whose gilded signs proclaim the commercial instinct of another race.

Boston adopted JULIA WARD when she married Dr. SAMUEL G. HOWE, who had served as surgeon with the Greeks in their war for independence in 1824-27. A touching reminder of that unselfish devotion was the bowl of roses which the Greeks of Boston sent Mrs. HOWE on her eighty-eighth birthday: her distinguished husband had been dead thirty-three years.

Long after JULIA WARD HOWE's labors for abolition and woman suffrage are forgotten her fame will endure as the author of that inspired hymn which stirs the blood yet like a trumpet peal. She has described how it came to be written and to be named "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." During the civil war she went out from Washington with the Rev. Dr. MCCLARK to witness a review of Union troops. It was a red letter day for her, and the story of her inspiration has a dramatic quality which forms a fitting prelude to the patriotic lines:

"The road was so filled with soldiers that our return from the parade grounds to the city was very tedious, and to pass the time away we sang 'John Brown's Body.' Some of the marching regiments took it up, and it was passed along the road until the echoes reverberated for miles. My pastor asked me why I did not put the spirit of 'John Brown's Body Lies a-Mouldering in the Grave' into some graceful and expressive words. I told him I had tried. One morning soon after that I awoke suddenly about daylight, and the lines I wanted were vaguely running through my mind. I arose and wrote them down. They were published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and the editor named them 'The Battle Hymn of the Republic.'"

This was in 1861; at the time JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*. So Mrs. HOWE's glorious hymn fired the soldiers of the Union armies and was sung at thousands of patriotic gatherings with tremendous effect during almost the whole period of the struggle. The naming of the song was also an inspiration, and it seems to belong to LOWELL.

JULIA WARD HOWE's birthdays have been celebrated by distinguished men as well as by troops of her friends in all walks of life for a great many years. It was in 1889, when she attained the age of seventy, that OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES paid her the merited compliment of saying, for she has always been remarkably young in her looks and movements as well as in her views of life: "To be seventy years young is far more cheerful and hopeful than to be forty years old."

To the woman suffrage movement Mrs. HOWE has lent the dignity of a brave and gracious presence, never faltering in the cause and contributing many impressive sayings to it, as when in January, 1904, addressing the Massachusetts Legislature at the age of eighty-four, she said:

"Through untold labors and privations we bring the men to men's estate. Who shall say that our duty to the body politic ends there?"

JULIA WARD HOWE has always been on duty herself, lecturing, writing, and laboring without losing the refining and moulding influence of her sex; and she is still on the active list, for no longer ago than May 19 she preached a sermon from the pulpit of the late JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. Truly she is wonderful in her youth and optimism and a glory to American womanhood!

Horsemanship in the Army.

President ROOSEVELT's latest order, requiring proficiency in horsemanship on the part of all field officers of the army, has in a general way met with the approval of the service. It may operate a certain hardship in isolated cases here and there, but upon the whole it will leave things pretty much as they are. Ever since Mr. ROOT's army reorganization bill was enacted into a law seven years ago the Captains and Lieutenants of the infantry have been receiving more or less training, for they have constantly been subject to detail for staff duty, which involves equestrian performances. It is a reasonable assumption, therefore, that most of them have by this time become familiar with the saddle, those not actually assigned having prepared themselves in anticipation of assignment.

Cavalry and field artillery officers are of course good horsemen already and will have nothing to fear from any ordinary test. They have been on horseback from the beginning and it must be an exceptional case in which any one of them falls short of a really practical standard. Such hardship as there may be will fall upon the few infantry officers who, attaining to middle age before 1900, have not since had the opportunity to acquire a strange habit. The worst that can happen to them, however, will be the Retiring Board and a precocious relegation to the limbo of the inactives. It may mean the elimination from the active list of a few men otherwise capable of admirable service and the consequent reduction of their pay; but it will not necessarily involve injustice or oppression to any serious extent. Competent observers do not believe that the Roosevelt order will cause widespread injury. Thoughtful observers hesitate to say that it will lead to any particular results of good. All agree that no great harm will come of it, and that is something to be thankful for in these very piping times. Strenuous experience has taught us to hail with honest reverence any outcome of a White House order which amounts to anything less than a calamity.

Perhaps we ought to add that all these roseate forecasts are based upon the hypothesis that President ROOSEVELT will not require army officers to exhibit the equestrian skill and reproduce those astonishing equestrian achievements the lifelike photographs whereof adorn the showcases of nearly every shop in Washington. To expect so much of mere commonplace mortals would be at once cruel and wantonly capricious. As we understand it army officers presenting themselves for promotion to field rank will be expected only to show that they can sit a horse with credit and ride that horse a given number of miles without calamitous results to man or steed. In other words, we shall have had the familiar outburst with the usual upshot.

System, Not Personnel.

The disclosures made by the Commissioners of Accounts in their present investigation of the conduct of the President of Manhattan and his subordinates have shown at once the carelessness and inefficiency, to put it mildly, of Mr. AHEARN and his appointees, and the entire inadequacy of the system under which the taxpayers' money is spent. Undoubtedly the Ahearns, Daltons and Walkers would be able to prove their incompetency and slackness under any conditions, but it may be questioned whether the most gifted and upright administrator could give an entirely satisfactory account of himself were he called on to work through the bureau organizations as they exist now.

It has been shown once more that the bureaus duplicate each other's work in many cases, and that in other instances they fail entirely to cooperate. The bookkeeping is faulty and leads to endless complications and misunderstandings. Extravagance and waste are inevitable when the checks intended to prevent them admittedly fail of their purpose, nor is it to be expected that unscrupulous place holders, contractors and tradesmen will neglect the opportunities for graft thus provided. When it is borne in mind that practically every department of the municipal establishment is run in the same slipshod way that is characteristic of the Manhattan borough organization it becomes plain that an unnecessarily heavy burden is put on the taxpayers of New York city by the unbusinesslike manner in which their affairs are conducted.

Not less important than getting honest and able men in office is putting sensible methods into effect.

The Rev. Dr. WILLIAM J. LONG in his challenge to President ROOSEVELT to prove his charge that the doctor is a "nature faker" is unnecessarily chivalrous, for he says:

"If I have spoken falsely, if in any book or word of mine I have intentionally deceived any child or man regarding animal life, I promise publicly to retract every such word and never to write another animal book. On the other hand, if I show to any disinterested person that you have accused me falsely you must publicly withdraw your accusation and apologize. As a man and as President no other honorable course is open to you."

If the President takes up the gage he cannot, as a man and author, refuse to place himself on a par with the incensed naturalist and make equal sacrifices should he fail in the proof. Would it be sufficient to apologize? By no means. If the President is wrong about the wolf that killed the deer by biting it in the breastbone, about the woodcock that set its broken leg in a clay cast, and about the characteristics of the Canada lynx so well known to Dr. LONG and so picturesquely described by him, how could Mr. ROOSEVELT keep on his pedestal as a great authority on mammals and familiar birds, and how could he escape the pledge not to write another animal book?

When Baron ROTHSCHILD was interviewed to-day as to the drop in consols he said that with President ROOSEVELT attacking the railways in one part of the world, the income tax question and other problems in France and the socialistic movement in England, the public was killing the goose that laid the golden egg and could expect nothing more than the conditions of the money market revealed.—*Cable despatch from London.*

Conspirator!

THE SOUTH AND THE PRESIDENCY.

A Leading Journal of Tennessee Brings Out the Name of Luke E. Wright.

From the Memphis Commercial-Appeal.

The civil war ended forty-two years ago. It settled several issues for once and all. The South accepted the result cheerfully and has been going about its business philosophically ever since. During the last forty years this section has developed itself. It has built cities and railroads. The Southern white population has increased at a greater rate than that of any other section of the country. All along the line the South is coming into her own, and Southern writers, immensely handicapped as they are, have written in recent years the most popular and successful books. Yet the South has been modest. She has year after year stepped aside, though furnishing the bulk of the Democratic vote.

When she made an alliance with the East she did secure some recognition. Mr. Cleveland appointed a number of Southerners to some of the most important places at his disposal. No other President has recognized the South except to give negroes important offices to which they were not entitled.

In 1896 the South made what seemed a logical alliance with the West. What was the result? The West went Republican all along the line, binding herself to the felonious doctrine of protection and betraying her chivalric ally, the South, as the latter had never been betrayed before.

The people of the East are much more akin to the people of the South than are those of the West. An alliance between the Eastern and Southern Democracy could be made to mean something. If the professions of Eastern Democrats are sincere why not take the East at its word and nominate a Southerner for President?

Who shall the Southerner be? Among those mentioned are John Sharp Williams of Mississippi, Joseph W. Folk of Missouri, Senator Daniel of Virginia and Senator Culberson of Texas. These are all good men, and we do not desire to disparage any of them.

But there is one man in the South who could come nearer winning than any of these. This is Gen. Luke E. Wright, the first acting Governor of the Philippines and now Ambassador to Japan. He is the only Democrat who has by sheer ability and force of character compelled recognition from a stalwart Republican Administration.

If Southern men are to be considered why not consider General Wright, a great lawyer, a fine executive officer, a good, practical soldier and an accomplished diplomat? No man in the country has had better training for the Presidency than he, and he would make a great President.

Calling to the South.

From the Richmond News Leader.

We do not know how much substance there is in the Daniel boom. We do believe from many signs that the North is anxious for Southern leadership and for Southern statesmanship of the old time high, broad and honest kind to assert itself.

THE AGASSIZ CENTENNIAL.

The Great Naturalist's Friendship for the Poet Longfellow.

From the Boston Transcript.

Agassiz was no closet student. He was a naturalist of the pioneer type, and anything but a hermit. He never isolated himself, but welcomed and drew around him friends and associates in his most engrossing scientific investigations. Recreation was an essential to a man of his intense nature. The social life of Cambridge was entered into with great relish. He was a member of all the fashionable clubs of the time. Society claimed his presence in Cambridge and in Boston, and he accepted all invitations. He was a lively raconteur and a charming companion.

Longfellow at his first meeting with Agassiz at Felton's on January 9, 1847, well describes the newcomer as "a pleasant, voluble man with bright, beaming face." "Very pleasant, affable and simple" he found him. A month later Longfellow notes in his journal that he heard Agassiz at a dinner party extolling his (Longfellow's) description of the Rhône in "Hyperion," which, he remarks naively, "was pleasant in the mouth of a Swiss who has a glacial theory of his own."

Between the poet and the naturalist a very warm friendship sprang up, and frequent mention is made of Agassiz and his sayings in Longfellow's scintillating diary. On one occasion, Longfellow records: "Agassiz said that whenever a road or railway is opened up in this country there European weeds spring up. The weed called by the Indians 'the white man's foot' is so named because it advanced into the wilderness with the settlers." Again he notes that Agassiz thought there were "several Adams and Eves." On one occasion Longfellow called on Agassiz and found him dissecting "a huge skate." "There was an intolerable fishy odor in his room," comments the poet; and the inference is that Longfellow did not remain as long as he otherwise would.

Longfellow gives us some idea of Agassiz's sufferings from stage fright, but adds "he warms and glows as he advances." In one address it appears that Agassiz exhorted his hearers "to strive to take the same pleasure in the scientific discoveries of others as their own," a fact which Longfellow found quite worthy of record! Agassiz once tried, it seems, to get Longfellow to write a poem on the great revelations of science concerning the earth, and eloquently depicted the successive periods of primeval rock, vast forests of fern, strange huge creatures, &c. Longfellow listened graciously and thoughtfully to his friend's vivid recital, but he was quite averse to the proposition, feeling that he was not the man to write such an epic. It was Longfellow who presided at the fiftieth anniversary of Agassiz, when both Longfellow and Lowell wrote their famous poems of appreciation.

Ten years later Longfellow notes in his journal that it is "sad to see Agassiz at sixty so weakened." "'I cannot work,' he said, and wept." Longfellow comforted and cheered him, and records a little later Agassiz's departure on his last (the Hassler) expedition:

"His deepest sea soundings shall not be deeper than our love and admiration for him."

Trials of a Purist.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Why "self-confessed"? "The self-confessed murderer will be hanged next Tuesday." Is not self-confessed obvious? Who other than self would or could do the confessing?

Why "sooner or later"? "The President will get his sooner or later." He could not get it sooner, but he may get it soon. Why not "soon or later"? Does colloquial use create an idiom at variance with sense?

These two phrases stick in my craw, and I'm not a darned bit particular either. Can't you open a campaign against them?

PURIST PEST.

BALTIMORE, May 27.

A Weatherwise Quaker.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It always rains in Philadelphia during the week of quarterly or yearly meetings of the Society of Friends.

Thee need not therefore in New York look for pleasanter weather until our gathering of Friends at the Old Meeting House on Stuyvesant Square has finished its 212th annual session. Thou art eclipsed for the time being.

LUCRETIA MOTT WEATHERPENNY.

PHILADELPHIA, May 27.

Philadelphia On Boston.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A Boston newspaper is running a series of prize puzzles entitled "Do You Know Boston?" Is or is not this an infringement on the time honored inquiry: "Do you know beans?"

C. S. P.

PHILADELPHIA, May 27.

PRESIDENT CABRERA OF GUATEMALA.

WASHINGTON, May 28.—It is usually difficult and often impossible to measure with accuracy the political conditions existing at any given time in any of the Latin American republics or to estimate correctly the personal qualities and special qualifications of Latin American rulers. A moment of thought will at least suggest that the same statement might be made regarding this country, its individual States and its political leaders. There is no clearly marked unanimity of view regarding political conditions in Ohio or Wisconsin, and there is no absolute harmony of opinion concerning such men as Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan, or Mr. Taft and Mr. Foraker.

It is much to be regretted that there is in this country a strong tendency to believe the worst that can be said about our Latin American neighbors and their rulers. This disposition is not at all to our credit. It has long stood and it still stands as a barrier in our relations with the sixty-odd millions of people occupying the Western Hemisphere south of our boundary lines. A short time ago Castro of Venezuela was an object of special attack. To-day it is Cabrera of Guatemala. The general sentiment of this country toward all the countries of that region is at all times lamentably uncharitable.

There is little room for doubt that an anti-Cabrera cabal is actively at work. It would probably be very difficult to locate definitely its leading spirits, but it may safely be assumed that some are among his opponents in his own country, some in Mexico, some in Salvador and some in Nicaragua. Mexico, for various reasons, is unfriendly toward Cabrera; Salvador is Guatemala's enemy, and so is Honduras; and there are many who believe that Zelaya of Nicaragua would be pleased for reasons of his own to repeat in Guatemala his recent experience in Honduras. The unfortunate gentleman is thus menaced by those of his own household and practically surrounded by opponents and enemies.

In the clamor made against him by these various groups the defence made by Cabrera's friends sounds only as a faint and feeble note. His Minister in Washington and his Consul-General in New York assert his popularity among his people and deny the charges preferred against him. It is seldom that any other voice is heard in his defence. The forces arrayed are too unequal for the fair play to which he is surely entitled.

Manuel Estrada Cabrera is not one of the master minds of the age. He is a product of Central American conditions and in many ways stands well above the average of the Central American Presidents of the last thirty or forty years. He was Secretary of Government and Justice in 1898, when President Barrios was killed, and became acting President under the law until a new election could be held. At that election he was chosen as President by a practically unanimous vote. He was reelected in 1904. He has effected a number of important reforms and his administration has been on the whole one of achievement.

Under his rule the financial condition of the country has been improved, important public works have been carried out and others have been started, the laws have been reformed and liberalized, agriculture has been fostered and new systems of sanitation have been introduced. His greatest achievement has been along the line of a new public school system. In a special report on the subject of technical education in Guatemala Consul-General Winslow has said: "There are few villages in the country where there are no schools. There are in the city of Guatemala (population 100,000) twenty-five public schools, eight institutes and three colleges. It is his [Cabrera's] ambition to establish firmly an educational system modelled after that in use in the United States, where the watchword shall be industry, promptness and honesty." This is the testimony of an American official.

Regarded with strict impartiality, there is much that is highly commendable in Cabrera's administration. Unfortunately there is also much that is open to some criticism and even to denunciation. He has doubtless overplayed the game of "Off with his head," figuratively and literally, when dealing with political opponents. He has exiled some and has caused others to be "removed." In some respects his political methods have been those of the Spanish Governors-General of two or three centuries ago. While his experience and his methods are far from unique, even in the present day and generation, they do undoubtedly furnish his opponents both within and without the Guatemalan boundaries with a powerful and effective weapon against him. With those who wish to get rid of him his sins and his errors of judgment overwhelm the good that he has done.

The immediate and the ultimate political future of Guatemala are alike beyond prediction. There may come revolution, acting from within and excited and supported from without, and there may come Mexican intervention. In the latter event the United States could not well deny to Mexico the right to say to Guatemala very much what Mr. McKinley said in 1898 about the Cuban trouble. There are disturbances at Mexico's "very door" and because of her "endangered interests" she may say that it must stop.

Paraffin Here and in England.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The clipping from the *Garden*, reprinted in THE SUN, telling how to protect seeds contains an Anglicism possibly unfamiliar to most Americans. Paraffin, as used, is undoubtedly an abbreviation of paraffin oil, that is, ordinary kerosene, petroleum or lamp oil, and is so used by English writers. "Three Men in a Boat" had all their provisions tainted with "paraffin" from an oil stove upon a time, certainly not the inert, waxlike, solid paraffin as we see it in candles.

Any one attempting to carry out the directions understanding "paraffine" as used by us would be in much the same predicament as the experimenter who had been advised by his paper that isinglass dissolved in vinegar would make a desirable cement, and wrote to the editor that he had been keeping stove mica and vinegar on the back of the stove for hours and no sign of solution.

TOURIST.

NEW YORK, May 27.

Fulton Street and Fulton Avenue.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I read in THE SUN of May 12 the letter describing "The Mystification of 'Finn Hoop'" in locating Fulton street and Fulton avenue, Brooklyn. Let me tell him that the street commencing at the Fulton ferry and thence running southerly to the east side of the City Hall, ending at the Municipal Building, is Fulton street. The street commencing at the east side of City Hall, near Municipal Building, and running easterly to East New York is Fulton avenue. They have always been two distinct streets, although meeting at City Hall.

As an old Brooklynite I can remember back nearly fifty-five years, and there has been no change in all that time—there have always been Fulton street and Fulton avenue.

S. M. MEGIR.

GIG HARBOR, Wash., May 21.

Opportunity for the National Alumnæ.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* With reference to the fighting girl sought by the Cornell alumnæ, what about working up a little fighting spirit among the national alumnæ? After twenty-five years of existence they number only 3,000 and what do they accomplish?

Why don't they take pattern by the work of the National Association of Women Professors of Germany and try to introduce into the women's colleges education for economic independence instead of the present pleasant pastime before marriage?

NEW YORK, May 28. PRIMARY TEACHER.

APPREHENSIONS.

The Third Term by Proxy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* When in an article on our form of government the writer some three years ago made this forecast: "It is within the bounds of possibility that our grandchildren may tell their children of the election of the last President," the suggestion was received with polite contempt. It seemed too absurd and far fetched to deserve serious discussion. Does it seem so remote a possibility now? Have we not taken a great step toward the "man on horseback" when we tolerate the idea of a President dictating to us who shall be his successor, telling us it must be some one who shall carry on "my policy," and at the same time trying every manœuvre known to the practised politician to make himself the apparently indispensable candidate?

If Roosevelt stands for a third term, in heaven's name let us be under no illusions about the matter. Let it be put plainly to the people that they are voting not for a four year President but for a dictator who has already shown his utter disregard for all their constitutional rights and who would have no scruples in securing for himself a power more absolute than that enjoyed by any modern monarch.

A. B. H.

NEW YORK, May 28.

The Barrator.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The question of the place of Mr. Roosevelt in the affairs of the nation after the expiration of his second term in the Presidency has not appeared so grave to me as you fear in your editorial "Should He Be Reelected." I have been thinking for quite a time that the common law will soon get him for barratry—unless he reforms.

Then, too, if it is true that there is a feeling among Mr. Harriman's business associates that he should be dropped from the management of the Union Pacific Railroad, it is possible that we can have him for the Chief Magistracy of the nation. He surely knows enough about the law of nations—the *jus gentium*—to remind Congress, before foreign nations attempt to do so, that it is the major part of the law of this country; and he knows enough about the dignity of a high office not to concern himself with the price of chickens and ducks, as well as to put Congress on the right track in its proper political sphere and deny to it the interference with things civil and common. I am not sure that he is familiar with international law—*jus feciale*—or law of heralds; but if we can persuade Mr. Hughes to take the Vice-Presidency we may be sure of the whole matter.

Their first object in office would probably be the revision of the preamble of the Constitution, which now stands warped, to the following:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more domestic union, force justice, insure common tranquillity (sedition), provide for the general defence, promote the perfect welfare, and secure the blessings of license to ourselves and debt to our posterity, do ordain and establish that there shall be a Congress who shall have full power and authority to make all laws which to their wisdom will seem meet and proper.

Of course Harriman is a reactionary; which reminds me of Franklin's joke upon signing the Constitution. An old Quaker lady once reminded her sister that, "All the people except me and thee are queer, and sometimes me thinks thee a little queer." Likely Roosevelt is *sui generis*, as you say; but will you not urge the candidacy of Harriman—especially that he has been shot in the back on account of campaign contributions?

GALLIO.

SCRANTON, Pa., May 27.

What the Mohonk Conference Did.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In your news columns of May 25 was published the outline of what purports to be a treaty prepared by the Mohonk Conference, to be submitted to the peace conference at The Hague.

As chairman of the business committee of the Conference I am able to say that no such treaty was prepared or even discussed. The paragraph you published undoubtedly emanated from a person of unsound mind. It is calculated to convey the impression that the conference was held at a lunatic asylum instead of at Lake Mohonk. What the Mohonk Conference really did adopt was the following platform:

The thirteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on international arbitration recognizes with profound gratitude the development of those forces which are making for international peace through international justice. The promotion of intercourse, friendship and amity among the nations, the organization of international bodies in commerce, science and philanthropy, the demand for higher standards of international morality are but preludes to greater harmony and unity among the peoples of the world.

We mention with satisfaction among the events of the last twelve months the holding of the Pan-American Congress, the visit of Secretary Root to the South American republics, the organization in the United States of a branch society for international conciliation; the international conference for the revision of the Geneva Convention of 1864, the holding at Washington of the first annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, organized in 1905 at the Mohonk Conference and the publication of its organ, the *American Journal of International Law;* the formation of the Japan Society for the cultivation of friendly relations between Japan and the United States; the increasing disposition of nations to assist each other in time of famine and disaster, and the holding in New York of a national arbitration and peace congress of far reaching influence.

The meeting of the second Hague Conference next month marks another epoch in the history of international development. We note with gratification that twenty-one American republics will participate therein. We urge as the most immediate and important action to be taken by this second Hague Conference the following measures:

1. A provision for stated meetings of the Hague Conference.

2. Such changes in the Hague court as may be necessary to establish a definite judicial tribunal always open for the adjudication of international questions.

3. A general arbitration treaty for the settlement of international disputes.

4. The establishment of the principle of the inviolability of innocent private property at sea in time of war.

5. A declaration to the effect that there should be no armed intervention for the collection of private claims when the debtor nation is willing to submit such claims to arbitration.

We commend, in accordance with our resolution of last year, the consideration by the Hague Conference of a plan for the neutralization of ocean trade routes.

SAMUEL J. BARROWS,
Chairman Business Committee.

NEW YORK, May 27.

In the news report referred to by Mr. Barrows the contents of a paper prepared for the Conference seem to have been misunderstood as matter actually deliberated and adopted by the Conference. This mistake, it is proper to say, appeared in only a comparatively few copies of THE SUN of that morning, having been withdrawn before the bulk of the edition was printed.

Service Pensions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In a letter on service pensions in THE SUN of May 27 Commissioner Warner is quoted as reporting 185,000 applications filed, and estimates that 300,000 in all will be received. The writer then predicts that $52,500,000 will be required additional each year instead of $15,000,000, as estimated when the law of February 6 was passed.

It is manifest that Mr. Sedgwick argues from wrong premises. Ninety-nine in 100 of those new applications are from those already pensioned at from $8 to $12 a month. Take the average at $10, and the average increase by the same rule will be about $5 a month, so we may be sure that the money required to pay the increase will be little, if anything, more than $15,000,000, instead of $52,500,000.

NEW YORK, May 28. W. B. GONSALVES.

The Sole Arbiter.

Could the whale have swallowed Jonah?
For the answer to the same
Turn ye to the learned Roosevelt,
Sole Authority on Game.

Could the beasts have all been carried
In the ark of ancient fame?
For their methods and their habits
See the Knowitall of Game.

Was the old O'Leary bovine
For Chicago's fire to blame?
For decision most judicial
See the Only Boss of Game.

MCLANDBURGH WILSON.

AMERICAN RABBIS FOR RUSSIA.

"Rabbinical Overproduction" Here, Need of Spiritual Doctors There.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In a couple of weeks the greater part of our 200 to 300 rabbis will leave the old God of Israel to the care of their respective sextons while they themselves will fill mountains and seashores to rest from the enervating task of the winter season, preaching before half empty benches on doctrines and traditions in which both pew and pulpit have long since lost belief, but which for various reasons neither of them is prepared to give up formally and officially just now, preferring the game of fooling one another to making a manly religious declaration of independence. May I then be permitted, after an interval of nearly one year, to preach from Park row's national pulpit a new little lay sermon for my dear friends the theologians, who while packing their trunks may find some relief from their own theoretical fatigue in listening for once to what other people have to say? The subject will, however, certainly interest also the tens of thousands of Jewish laymen who take a deep and sincere part in the woe and welfare of the 6,000,000 Jews courageously fighting and heroically suffering for their final political and social emancipation.

He who is studying Russian affairs at a close range has to admit that not only the dynasty of Romanoff as such—not to speak individually of its present imperial representative, Nicholas II., or of a handful of incorrigible Grand Dukes and Grand Duchesses—but also a considerable portion of the Russian aristocracy and bureaucracy have reached the conclusion that the institution of the Duma will have to stay, the 125,000,000 of moujiks, tradesmen, artisans and intellectuals having definitely made up their minds to shake off the intolerable yoke laid upon them by the 5,000,000 individuals constituting the so-called Shlachtia. It can, further, suffer no doubt that although the Constitutional Democrats and Socialists in the Russian Parliament and a diminutive part of their constituency are, as a question of principle, not opposed to the granting of full political freedom to their Jewish fellow slaves, the overwhelming majority of the Russian people are still, quasi-instinctively, filled with anti-Jewish prejudices.

The struggle for liberty will therefore be hard and protracted, and it is the duty of the west European, and in particular of the American Jew, to offer efficient help to his brother in stress.

The non-occurrence of pogroms of any serious nature during the last eighteen months or so proves that the Government has the power and the will to keep in check the Black Hundreds and their sanguinary rabble. Not even the most fanatic anti-Russian American rabbi will, further, dare pretend nowadays that the Jew in the Pale is persecuted merely on account of his religion or prevented from living up to the most rigid tenets of a rigid orthodoxy. Have we, then, not the duty, if we really have the desire and courage to reach the bottom of truth, to ask ourselves whether the ailment of the Russian Jew is not rather of a pathological than of a surgical kind, and whether, therefore, a thorough study of the physiology of the patient and the history of his case should not precede the final diagnosis? In other words, and to make it short, is the agelong social aloofness which was and is still imposed upon the inhabitants of the Russian Pale by the code of Jewish orthodoxy not mainly responsible for the deep seated anti-Semitic feelings and policy of the Russian mujik and Government?

I know that at this passage some of my venerable friends of the Jewish pulpit will instinctively raise their arms and in silent devotion utter words of amazement and condemnation. But let us brush these platonic indignations quietly aside and come to the kernel of my proposition.

To give even the shortest survey of the present state of the American synagogue would be beyond the reach of this letter of mine. I wish, therefore, to point out only the fact that in spite of any official declaration to the contrary American Judaism is suffering from rabbinical overproduction, or, to lay the finger more directly upon the wound, that more than 50 per cent. of the Jewish population of the United States have outgrown the theological stage, not needing any longer for their moral and spiritual uplifting the staff of Aaron.

Messrs. Jacob H. Schiff, Daniel Guggenheim, Adolph Lewisohn, Louis Stern and Isidor Straus—to mention only these few of our communal leaders—as scientifically trained business men know in which way to obviate the evil consequences of the unequal provisioning of the world markets. How then, gentlemen, if we were at once to transfer as first cargo to the ghetti of the Pale those of our rabbis who were born and trained in Russia as American missionaries of that progressive school of Judaism which was mainly instrumental in the final, social and intellectual emancipation of the west European Jew and in the Americanization—without any Zionistic *reservatio mentalis*—of the Jewish immigrant of 1848-82?

To conclude, it is by no means my intention to disturb by my proposition the cemeterial stillness of the Hebrew mausoleum which has been erected in memory of German-Russian orthodoxy in the city of New York in the year 1901-02 and endowed by a trio of well intentioned philanthropists with a few costly chairs for veterans, old and young, of Jewish science to doze away their time and muse over the melancholy glories of a dead past. My appeal is directed to the present spiritual leader of American Judaism, Dr. Kaufman Kohler, president of the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, who no doubt will sympathize with the gist of my thesis, and perhaps grasp the opportunity to spread the doctrines of the heroes of Reform Judaism among the 6,000,000 benighted denizens of the Jewries of eastern Europe, thus making of his institution a new centre of light for the House of Israel and securing for the same the unanimous and unstinted support of the 100,000 progressive Jewish families of this great and free republic.

NEW YORK, May 28. ISIDOR SINGER.

Prohibited Plays.

From the London Evening Standard.

The prohibition of "The Mikado" by the Lord Chamberlain is far from being the only example where the censorship has been applied during the run of a dramatic performance in this country.

As a general rule, however, the authorities have been content with a little alteration of the dialogue and "business." This was the case where a certain musical comedy in which a member of the Turkish Embassy traced an unflattering likeness to himself was concerned a few years ago. As a result of this gentleman's representations the character was cut out, or else made to shine in more heroic light, and the piece resumed its career.

A much more celebrated instance was afforded by the production of "The Happy Land" at the Court Theatre in 1873. After the piece had been duly licensed it was pointed out that three prominent members of the Cabinet were depicted on the stage in a somewhat undignified fashion. The Lord Chamberlain himself went to see a performance, and as a result ordered the piece to be withdrawn. Thereupon the management agreed to make certain emendations and the license was restored.

In the old days the censorship was often exercised in a ridiculous and tyrannical fashion. For example, in the time of Charles II. "The Maid's Tragedy," by Beaumont and Fletcher, was prohibited on the ground that "the murder accomplished by the heroine, *Evadne*, might supply a dangerous example to the Evadnes then shining at the court in the same rank of royal distinction." It is a little surprising that the authors did not try to get out of the difficulty by changing the lady's name to Evangeline.

Jefferson's Interest in Vaccination.

From the Washington Star.

"I have heard my pa tell," said the oldest inhabitant, "that the first case of vaccination for the prevention of smallpox which occurred in the District of Columbia was in the year 1801, and the subject was a member of Thomas Jefferson's household. Mr. Jefferson was deeply interested in the theory of vaccination, and had so much confidence in it that he was willing to have it tried on one of his household. August 6, 1801, was the date, and there was a great deal of talk about it at the time."

To Paint the Town Green.

Brokaw correspondence Duluth Herald.

Wisconsin is going to have a real green town, and Brokaw is the place. A paper company, which owns practically the whole town, has awarded a contract to William Laatsch of this city to give every house, barn and other building in this place a coat of green paint. The new church will be the one building in town which will stand out in cream color of brick. Mr. Laatsch expects to begin work this week and finish before July 1. There are fifty two dwelling houses here.

Regaining Lost Confidence.

From the London Tribune.

Owing to the rattling of chains and other ghostly disturbances at Hitchin Workhouse tramps are said to be giving the place a wide berth. The authorities, however, are doing their best to lay the ghosts, and by up to date methods and strict attention to business hope once to more regain the confidence and kind patronage of their clients.

Weissnichtwo.

Knicker—Wouldn't he tell where he lived?

Bocker—No, he just said it was the same place as Watterson's dark horse.