

The Japan Mail,

Jan. 4, 1907.

Mail "WHO IS IT?" Jan. 4

"Eli Perkins," in a letter published elsewhere, asks "who is it in Japan who is trying to make war between the United States and Japan?" An astounding question, surely, yet we must assume that our correspondent has obtained the idea from some source which he deems trustworthy. We can only say that if there be such a person he is absolutely unknown in Japan and we must concede to America the credit of discovering him. With entire confidence we venture to affirm that if the heart of the Japanese nation could be laid bare to-day, there could not be found among all the impressions it bears the faintest outline of a desire for war with America. Such a conception is intolerable to the average Japanese; we may even say, inconceivable by him. And what makes it particularly distressing that any query like that of "Eli Perkins" should be propounded is the fact that the "yellow journals" of which he speaks do not exist at all in Japan, so far as this particular problem is concerned, and that Japanese newspapers, one and all, have exhibited the greatest moderation and good temper in dealing with the question of educational exclusiveness in one corner of the big Republic. They deserve the fullest credit and, on the contrary, we find them now asked why they are seeking to produce a result which in truth they have done everything in their power to avert. Yet there is a "who," though not in Japan. He is the San Francisco hoodlum and the San Francisco editor. It is well known what kind of incendiary stuff certain San Francisco journals have published and are publishing, and it is known that one of them recently went to the extreme of inventing an interview with the United States Consul General for Yokohama, and putting into his mouth words which he never uttered. These are the unscrupulous players to the unwashed gallery who are seeking to stir up a maelstrom, and they have their assistants in the coterie of Far-Eastern journals which, ever since the Russo-Japanese war, have sought with unanimity which is highly suggestive and with rancour which is worse than extravagant, to bring Japan into odium and Russia into esteem. The part acted by these Far-Eastern echoes is to attribute to Japan bellicose sentiments and aggressive aims which invest her with the character of the civilized world's enemy, in pursuit of which programme they have not hesitated to depict her as secretly hostile to the United States and as longing to swallow up the Philippines. We direct the attention of our correspondent to these quarters, and we can assure him that there and there only can he find the "who" of his inquiry.

Jan. 5, 1907.

AMERICAN OPINION AND CALIFORNIA.

Mail Jan. 5
The *New York Herald* of December 3rd, prints a number of statements elicited by its representatives from leading American publicists with regard to the San Francisco question. There are 17 of these opinions, and on reading them through we find that 10 are opposed to Japan, 3 are in her favour and 4 are neutral. Virtually without exception the ten supporters of San Francisco's action take the ground that every State of the Union has unquestionable competence to regulate its own educational enterprises according to its own convictions and convenience, and that the Federal Government can not interfere in such matters, or arrogate any title to give international pledges in contravention of that competence. Some dwell upon the age pretext, being ignorant apparently of the fact that out of the 93 children affected only 24 are over 16 years of age, and being further strangely blind to the other palpable fact that any difficulty as to age may be at once overcome by regulations enacted to that end. It is indeed quite singular that any reasoning publicist should attach value to this question of age, or should imagine the Japanese so foolish as to base an international protest on such a foundation. Others among the *Herald's* informants find an analogy in the freedom that each State enjoys to educate the negro element of its population separately, a point of view which loses sight completely of the cardinal feature that the negroes are not protected by any treaty. Not one of the whole 17 seems to have any appreciation of the real issue, namely, that what the Japanese object to is invidious discrimination. It is distinctly laid down in the Treaty that the Japanese shall enjoy in the United States the same "rights of residence" as those enjoyed by "native citizens or subjects, or by citizens or subjects of the most favoured nation." No one is likely to deny that education for one's children is a right of residence, but even if that be denied, even if it be admitted that the San Francisco Authorities are competent to close the doors of their schools to all nationals who are not American, there would still remain the fact that in admitting all except the Japanese, they are running counter to the principle of most-favoured-nation treatment. Doubtless this aspect of the case will be fully brought to the attention of the courts which are to pass judgment, but in no event do we see cause for any of the uneasiness which obviously pervades some circles in America. If the courts decide against San Francisco, then it will devolve on the Federal Government to give effect to that decision, in the extremely improbable event of San Francisco refusing to comply. If the courts decide in San Francisco's favour, then the Federal Government will stand partially shorn of its treaty-making competence, and Congress will doubtless proceed to remedy that defect.