

## TREATMENT OF KOREA BY JAPAN

In "The New Far East," by Thomas F. Millard, and recently published by the Scribners, Japan, according to a reviewer on the New York Times, receives rather harsh judgment. We quote the portion dealing with the treatment of the Hermit nation by Japan:

The author makes a very definite effort to show changes in the attitude of Japan toward Korea within a few years, especially that her performances have not harmonized with her professions. He inserts in his text the entire protocol between Japan and Korea of Feb. 23, 1904, but omits another illuminating one, that between Baron Hiyashi, representing Japan, and Lord Lansdowne, representing Great Britain, of Jan. 30, 1902, which recites, inter alia, that the two Governments are "specially interested in maintaining the independent territorial integrity of the Empire of China and the Empire of Korea, and in securing equal opportunities in those countries for the commerce and industry of all nations." He cites Japan's note to Russia opening negotiations for the proffered purpose of adjusting issues between the two Governments, and avoiding a resort to hostilities, that note declaring that "Korea is an important outpost in Japan's line of defense, and Japan consequently considers her (Korea's) independence absolutely indispensable to her repose and safety." In the protocol of Feb. 23, 1904, the author detects a serious inconsistency; the words, in Article III., "The Imperial Government of Japan firmly guarantees the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean Empire," being completely out of harmony with another stipulation that the government of Korea shall adopt the advice of the Government of Japan regarding improvements in administration, as well as being at variance with the provisions of a later protocol, dated Aug. 22, 1904, obligating the Korean Government to employ a Japanese recommended by the Japanese Government as adviser in the Finance Department, and another, similarly recommended, as adviser in the Foreign Affairs Department, these stipulations in effect constituting a surrender by Korea of her independence and Governmental autonomy. As indicating that Korea resisted and Japan insisted on these concessions, and the former in her weakness yielded, Mr. Millard asserts that while negotiations were pending over that of Aug. 22, 1904, the Korean Emperor sought to induce some of the foreign Ministers at Seoul to protest against the imposing of those objectionable conditions, that they declined to interfere, and thereupon the Emperor made a virtue of necessity, and caused the requisite signature to be affixed. He also recites another protocol of February, 1905, turning over full control of the Post Office and the telegraph, making legally effective what he says was already practically so.

Referring to the part of the document of Aug. 22, 1904, requiring that the Korean Government, in conducting any diplomatic intercourse, making any treaty, or negotiating any franchise with a foreigner, must consult the Japanese Government in advance, he states as a fact that diplomatic representatives of Korea in foreign countries are being recalled, and her diplomatic interests turned over to the Japanese Legations in these places; and appends a letter from our State Department, saying that as a result of an agreement between Japan and Korea, (evidently the one quoted,) the interests of Korea in foreign countries are intrusted to Japan's representatives, and all correspondence concerning the relations of the United States and Korea will be carried on between our Government and that of Japan. It will be remembered that in Article II. of the Treaty of Portsmouth, Russia acknowledges that "Japan possesses paramount political, military, and economical interests in Korea," and en-

gages "neither to obstruct nor interfere with measures for guidance, protection, and control," which Japan may deem necessary there. He thus traces the steps by which he claims Japan has become the suzerain power in the Hermit Kingdom—characterizing her professions as out of harmony with her actual proceedings. He also energetically criticizes Japan's disclaimer of a desire to make conquest of foreign territory, through her victories; claiming that while she had encouraged emigration so that an unhampered opportunity for industrial expansion might be enjoyed by her people, she had manifested a hesitancy in relinquishing control of them, and a desire to extend her sovereignty over the lands to which they had gone. This obviously harmonizes with his belief that she has no intention of ever relinquishing her hold on Korea, whither many Japanese have gone, and he is not surprised that in the treaty she should have obtained recognition from Russia of her paramountcy there.

He is unable to comprehend that she should be content with acquiring no new territory as the result of her victories; thinks that, failing to do this, she must have fought her battles to no practical purpose. It is not conceivable that many who watched Eastern history in the last two years of its making will concur with him in this. The story is so trite that it should need no repetition—that Japan saw her very existence in peril as she observed the relentless advance of the Muscovite from point to point; promises, conventions, understandings thrown to the wind; Korea invaded, the prospect imminent that within a few years, if that advance were not checked, only the narrow stretch of water between Fusan and Kiusiu, or the lower point of Hon-do, would separate her from the power that had annexed such immense areas and was still influenced by an insatiable hunger for new territory, and that in vindicating her right to exist, and to exercise sway over the lands she had previously ruled, she achieved what, considering the peril that seemed imminent, was quite commensurate with her sacrifices, not to speak of other results of the war. In failing to appreciate this the author seems not to have comprehended the situation that confronted Japan when she began active hostilities.

## A SONG OF HARVEST.

Reap, oh reap! gather and reap,  
Where golden ripples laugh and run,  
For the husk of mounide, still and deep,  
Lies on the ripened ears like sleep,  
Where cornlands greet the sun.

Lift up your weary eyes, behold  
The golden fields, the golden air;  
The west wind flecks the swaying gold  
With light and shadows manifold,  
And gold gleams everywhere.

Reap, oh, reap! while the sickles sing  
The harvest song of the world at rest.  
Reap with rhythmic sweep and swing  
Till silence falls with evening,  
And peace is manifest.

Lift up your joyful eyes and see  
The silver night with gliding feet  
Move from the sunset glimmering,  
And, priestess of God's ministry,  
Hallow the garnered wheat.

—Pall Mall Gazette.

The English Bible is the best-selling book, and Shakespeare is the best-selling author. Who comes next in popularity? There can be little doubt, says the "Book Monthly," that it is Charles Dickens, with Sir Walter Scott a good third. It may be taken that half a million volumes of Dickens are sold every year in English editions, not to speak of those issued in America. Mr. Waugh, the managing director of Chapman & Hall, says that in the last six years they have sold close upon 2,000,000 volumes of Dickens.

## DR. HARPER AND CHURCH UNION.

Editor Dominion Presbyterian: The articles by Dr. Harper on the above subject will be read with great interest. It is very important that there should be full and open discussion from all sides, and the doctor's articles are written in admirable style and spirit. Apart from the general trend of the first article, with which some will and some will not agree, it seems to me that he is in error on two questions of fact: (1) He seems to take it as settled that the Presbyterian church has committed itself to the desirability of the organic union now being discussed. I do not so understand the situation. The Assembly responding to invitations from another church, appointed a committee to ascertain the desirability and feasibility of union. Whether we agree with it or not, Mr. McKay's amendment was quite in order since it is perfectly competent for the Assembly to say at any stage that union on certain proposed lines is not even desirable. Moreover, one Assembly cannot bind another. The Assembly, for instance, in several successive years voted in favor of severing the connection with Queen's University, but the Assembly at Vancouver went the other way and retained the university. No one thought the Assembly had exceeded its power.

(2) The Doctor seems to think that the basis if union as thus far arranged is to be sent down this year for "practical consideration." This is not the case. The union committee would not consent to this, and opposed an amendment which asked for it. The report is only sent down for "information" and not for "practical consideration." This is a very different and more bewildering situation.

R. G. MacBETH.

Paris, Ont., Aug. 20, 1906.

## A STARTLING STATEMENT.

A Bengali writer in The Statesman makes this startling statement regarding girl life in Bengal. He says: "Taking Bengal, I find that there are about 4,000 baby-girls in the province, under one year, who have already been 'married,' and over 600 baby-girls out of this number, under one year, who have become 'widows'!"

You will have some idea of the aggregate number of girl-widows, growing in proportion as the age limits rise, if you carry the age up to twelve. And when you consider that the custom prevails mostly among the higher classes, you will realize the enormous proportion, to total women population, of girl-wives and girl-widows. Multiply this figure by the number of provinces in India and you get a rough idea of this crying evil of the Kali-yuga, and the number of its victims. Imagine babes and sucklings in a state of what William Hunter describes as 'perpetual penitential widowhood.' How many of our girls of five and seven and upward, to say nothing of these babes of twelve months, must have been their fathers, and grandfathers, with the moral certainty of becoming widows long before reaching their teens. Nowhere are words 'marriage' and 'religion' so badly abused as in India."

On August 9th will be published No. 3,000 of the sermons of C. H. Spurgeon, truly a quite unique circumstance. No preacher ever produced and published 3,000 discourses which were, and are, widely read. Another peculiar circumstance is that 800 of these have been published since his death: "he being dead yet speaking." James Sheridan Knowles, who gave up all theatrical associations to become a successful preacher at Exeter Hall, and to combat Roman Catholicism through the press, while instructing students in elocution advised them to go and hear the Cambridgehire lad at New Park Street, adding, "He is absolutely perfect in his oratory, and, besides that, a master in the art of acting."