

Trouble Makers in Far East.

The following is a free translation of an editorial in Japanese which recently was published in the Japanese American News:

WE WOULD like to know what is the general reaction of the American public toward the refusal of the Chinese government to open direct negotiations for the return of the Shantung Peninsula to China, proposed by the government of Japan. According to Peking, London and Tokyo dispatches, the Chinese government does not recognize such a necessity and is reported to have said that the Shantung Railroad was the private property of Germany and that this question has nothing to do with the Kiaocho Bay settlement.

The Shantung Railroad was conceded to Germany when Germany captured from China the Kiaocho Bay region. At the same time Germany was conceded the right to explore for minerals. The railroad was built by joint capital of Germany and China. So, strictly speaking, there can be no doubt that this territory was the property of the German government.

At the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and Germany the Japanese troops captured this railroad. This fact was recognized by the Chinese government. Concerning the military protection of this railroad, Baron Goto, the foreign minister in the Terauchi cabinet, as the representative of the Japanese government, interviewed the Chinese minister to Japan. The result of this interview was published to the world.

Disregarding these facts, the Chinese government today flatly refuses to recognize these negotiations and other acts relating to the Shantung Railroad and says China herself will take up the burden of guarding this property. This statement, easily made, is most irresponsible, disregarding as it does international negotiations and the spirit of good faith.

By the Versailles treaty the Kiaocho Bay settlement, together with its economic rights, is given entirely to Japan. Japan proposes now to return those rights to China. Japan asked China to open direct negotiations. If the Chinese government refuses to enter into direct negotiations Japan has no alternative but to hold these concessions for some time.

It would seem that certain American papers suspect that this move on the part of the Japanese government is some sort of a trick. Such a suspicion is nothing more or less than the result of lack of understanding of the attitude of the Japanese government. As a matter of fact, this proposal by the government of Japan is simply to return to China the political sovereignty and other rights of the Kiaocho settlement lawfully bestowed upon Japan.

As far as the Chinese are concerned, there are sufficient reasons why they should be grateful to Japan, for Japan sacrificed large sums of money and precious human lives in capturing this territory from the Germans.

We hardly find any word suitable to a criticism of the attitude of the Chinese government in flatly refusing to open negotiations for this territory. Japan thoroughly understands the meaning of the mutual benefit of standing with China and believed it was in a fair way to educate and enlighten China and thus promote peace in the Far East; and to this end Japan has in the past done whatever she could to assist China in every way possible.

If the attitude of the Chinese has been correctly stated, Japan's endeavors, sacrifices and efforts have come to nothing.

It is possible, of course, that some of Japan's policies were not entirely in accord with China's desires. Also, Japan's demand may have been interpreted by China as insufferable and unnatural.

Some Chinese remember past events well. Japan generally assisted China and tried to lead the Chinese toward a better condition, because the Japanese firmly believed that ultimately this course would operate for the welfare of China, of Japan and the peace of all the Far East.

The proposal that direct negotiations be opened for a return of Shantung to China is a most illuminating example of this attitude. Many Americans regard the Shantung situation as one in which Japan was in every way reprehensible. But this attitude is based on false information and misapprehension of the true situation. The American attitude today might be different if Americans had been afforded ample opportunity to understand the real situation.

On account of the attitude of China in refusing to open direct negotiations with the Japanese government, we hope that responsibility for the internal troubles of the Far East will be placed where it belongs.

Japanese-American Gatherings.

THE QUESTION of assimilation of Americans and Japanese, frequently discussed in these columns, led recently to a discussion of social gatherings in country districts in which Americans and Japanese freely commingle. In this regard we said in part, in Japanese:

These social gatherings not infrequently develop into religious meetings. While we have no objection to churchmen and ministers participating in Japanese gatherings, we feel that where that element outnumbers others the original plan of the Japanese—an exchange of opinions and heart-to-heart talks—would be weakened. In the country districts the general aim of such meetings should be an exchange of opinions between land owners and tillers of the soil.

In such meetings we do not advise formal speechmaking. On the contrary, we advise an elimination of formality. Heart-to-heart talks, not diplomatic speechmaking, we believe, makes for an entente cordiale between Americans and Japanese.

If social gatherings of this sort could be held everywhere and frequently, anti-Japanese agitation and the charge that Japanese are unassimilable would soon cease to be heard and a real co-operation between the two races would surely result.

Investigating the Japanese.

MEMBERS of the House Immigration Committee purpose to investigate the question of Japanese immigration on this coast this summer, according to dispatches from Washington. At least five members of the committee, says Representative Johnson of Washington, chairman of the committee, will conduct the inquiry, covering all Pacific Coast states and concentrating in California.

Senator Phelan, according to the press dispatches, asked Representative Johnson that the investigation be made with a view to renewing efforts to pass pending legislation which would bar all Japanese immigrants from the Pacific Coast and would prohibit Japanese children born in the United States from acquiring citizenship. Commenting on this the Japanese American News said, in Japanese:

This move is doubtless the result of anti-Japanese agitation in Washington. Perhaps the House committee felt it necessary to investigate to get first-hand information. We do not believe that the House Immigration Committee plans an anti-Japanese movement, as reported by some anti-Japanese newspapers, for the Japanese question is not such a great problem with Americans in general. The "problem" is merely an anti-Japanese agitation in the three Pacific Coast states.

We cannot believe that Congress will be easily moved by agitators or that it will carry out legislation that does not dispense justice impartially.

Senator Phelan is reported to have made the statement that since the practice of sending picture brides has been abolished the Japanese are trying to evade the immigration law by the adoption of children. He said this was reported by the Seattle Immigration Bureau.

The adoption of children and the abolition of the picture bride practice are different problems. It is an ancient Japanese family custom, when there is no child to inherit the family name, to adopt one.

The "gentlemen's agreement" of 1907 clearly provided that the Japanese in the United States might summon any child from Japan in following this custom of adoption. The Seattle case might have been misunderstood as breaking the "gentlemen's agreement." But it has nothing whatever to do with picture brides.

In making this argument Senator Phelan only exposed his ignorance. It is beside the question to speculate on how much heed Chairman Johnson will give to anti-Japanese agitators.

So far the "gentlemen's agreement" has been kept by the Japanese government and there is no occasion to enact any law which would run counter to that agreement. Anyone, of course, may ask whatever he wishes, but Congress is Congress and must maintain its dignity, must hold an impartial attitude and must not allow itself to be swayed by prejudiced demands.

We firmly believe the House Immigration Committee will carry out a just and impartial investigation of the Japanese situation in Washington. And we are sure the committee will discover the anti-Japanese movement is confined to small numbers.

As a matter of fact, it is a question unworthy of discussion.

PROPOSED ANTI-ORIENTAL LEGISLATION.

THE Standing Committee of American Workers attempted by those who would abrogate the rights and curb the activities of all Orientals in the United States, particularly in California.

A little leaflet entitled "Proposed Anti-Oriental Legislation" questions whether this agitation is fair, American or Christian. The answer of the committee is self-explanatory. It follows:

WE, the Standing Committee of American Workers, American Legion, and the United States, representing the various Protestant Boards and Agencies, note with deep regret the present hysterical anti-Japanese agitation, which appears to us to be without sufficient foundation.

We recognize that the program proposed by the Anti-Japanese League and others is far-reaching, and must ultimately include not only Japanese but all other Orientals in this country, and will vitally affect our future relations with them and with the countries from which they come.

As this question concerns not only the Pacific Coast but a large portion of the world, it demands the earnest consideration of all Americans.

The proposed measures to which we take exception are as follows:

Cancellation of the Gentlemen's Agreement.

Rigorous exclusion of Japanese as immigrants.

Confidential and legalization of the policy that Asiatics shall be forever barred from American citizenship.

Amendment to Section 1 of Article 14 of the Federal Constitution providing that no child born in the United States of foreign parents shall be considered an American citizen unless both parents are of a race that is eligible to citizenship.

To provide such labor as may be necessary for the development and prosperity of the country and which cannot be had here or secured from desirable immigration, it has also been proposed to bring in Chinese laborers for a fixed term of years, confirming their right to certain localities and certain industries so that they can not offer an economic menace to American labor, and to send them back to China when their term of service has ended.

In the light of the proposed program we maintain that the chief critics of the Gentlemen's Agreement between Japan and the United States is without foundation, as official reports of the United States Government will show.

There has been no substantial increase in adult Japanese population in continental United States since the Gentlemen's Agreement was entered into in 1907. The figures usually published show arrivals only and neither take account of departures nor of the decrease due to deaths.

We are not in favor of a wide-open door immigration policy, believing strongly in the principle of the right of self-government and elevation of the standard of admission, which policy should be universal in its application. We recognize that there are serious economic reasons for regulating immigration on the part of our government, but such laws should be made in all fairness and without racial discrimination.

The question of so-called picture brides needs no discussion, as the Japanese Government has already abolished the practice upon the recommendation of the Japanese on the Pacific Coast.

The proposition of confining and legalizing the policy of barring Japanese citizenship will be too denied to Asiatics, and especially providing that no child born in the United States of foreign parents shall be entitled to American citizenship unless both parents are of a race eligible to citizenship, is open to the severest criticism, being undemocratic, un-American, and unconstitutional.

Our long experience in connection with the Orientals in the United States convinces us that their children born in America are intelligent, moral and liberty-loving, and are every sense worthy of the privilege of citizenship.

The proposition that Chinese coolies be imported for a term of years and then sent back implies contract labor and a species of slavery abhorrent to American ideals which should not even be considered.

As Americans we protest against a leadership which is actuated by narrow and selfish motives. A question which is so complex and far-reaching must be settled only after the most careful consideration and in harmony with Christian principles.

At this time, when human liberty is at stake everywhere, and when the civilization of the Twentieth Century itself is threatened, it behoves America not to take a backward step in Democracy, nor permit a small minority of her people to jeopardize the highest interests of the Republic and the World.

Action of the Standing Committee of American Workers Among Orientals, representing the Protestant Mission Boards and other Christian Societies on the Pacific Coast.

Charles R. Shepherd, Superintendent of Oriental Missions of the British Church.

M. D. Chubb, Superintendent of Oriental Missions of the Christian Church.

George W. Hinman, Superintendent of Oriental Missions of the Congregational Church.

Levi Gregory, of the Friends Church.

H. B. Johnson, Superintendent of Japanese Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

George Pearson, Superintendent of Chinese Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. and Mrs. William Acton, Superintendents of Oriental Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

E. A. Sturge, Superintendent of Japanese Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

J. H. Laughlin, Superintendent of the Chinese Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

John R. Tittsworth, Secretary of Oriental Work of the Y. M. C. A.

Myrt B. Mills, Executive Chinese Center, International Institute Y. W. C. A.

Sarah Ellis, Immigration department, Pacific Coast Field Committee, Y. W. C. A.

S. Vail, President of the Anglo-Japanese School.

NEW YEAR'S EVE.

ALTHOUGH it did not rain the weather had not cleared up. What a gloomy New Year's eve it was! To welcome the new year, however, the door of my humble lodgings was decorated with branches of pine trees from a neighboring hill as were also the boats moored on the river flowing before my house, with pine trees and smilax hanging over them.

The world was at peace; my home, too, was at peace. I had neither guests nor debtors to disturb the tranquility of my home nor any superfluous money to spoil my simple life with. It was, indeed, in the most quiet and indifferent spirit that I sped the departing year.

—Tokutomi Roka.

Perhaps the members of the committee will realize the treatment accorded Japanese is not just. Certainly there is plenty of room for better treatment.

Holding to these views, we welcome this House Immigration Committee investigation. The point which we desire to make is that if the House appoints anyone in close relationship with the anti-Japanese party the committee will probably be influenced thereby and it would be useless to hope for a just and impartial investigation and report.

As everyone knows, in the Western coast states there are numbers who are prejudiced and the House committee should be very careful in making its selection and investigation.

After a just selection and investigation it was reported that the Japanese in the United States have been at fault, we would not hesitate in striving at a betterment of conditions that would seem desirable to all Americans.

BUSHIDO.

By DR. INAZO NITOBÉ.

CHAPTER IV.—(Continued)

CHA-NO-YU is more than a ceremony—it is a fine art; it is poetry, with articulate gestures for rhythm; it is a modus operandi of soul discipline.

Its greatest value lies in this last phase. Not infrequently the other phases preponderate in the mind of its votaries, but that does not prove that its essence was not of a spiritual nature.

Politeness will be a great acquisition if it does not stop here. For propriety, springing as it does from motives of benevolence and modesty, and actuated by tender feelings toward the sensibilities of others, is ever a great and expression of sympathy. Its requirement is that we should weep with those who weep and rejoice with those who rejoice. Such didactic requirement, when reduced into small everyday details of life, expresses itself in little acts scarcely noticeable, or, if noticed, as one missionary lady of twenty years' residence once said to me, "awfully funny." You are out in the hot glaring sun with no shade over you; a Japanese acquaintance passes by; you accost him and instantly his hat is off—well, that is perfectly natural, but the "awfully funny" performance is that all the while he talks with his parasol down and he stands in the glaring sun also.

How foolish! Yes, exactly so. The underlying idea is that you are in the sun, I sympathize with you; I would willingly take you under my parasol if it were large enough, or if we were familiarly acquainted; as I cannot shade you I shall share your discomforts."

Little acts of this kind, equally or more amusing, are not mere gestures or conventionalities. They are the "bodying forth" of thoughtful feelings for the comfort of others.

Another "bushido" is that the code is dictated by our canons of politeness, but many superficial writers on Japan have dismissed it by simply attributing it to the general topsy-turvyness of the nation.

Every foreigner who has observed it will confess the awkwardness he felt in making proper reply on the occasion. In America, when you make a gift you sing its praises to the recipient; Japan we deprecate or slander it. The underlying idea with you is: "This is a nice gift; if it were not nice I would not dare give it to you; for it would be an insult to give you anything but what is nice."

It is a perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

A Chinese sage answers: "If you take a case where the eating is all-important and the observances of propriety is of little importance, then you are wrong; if the eating is of more importance, then you are right."

It is perverse reasoning to conclude, because our sense of propriety shows itself in all the smallest ramifications of our deportment, to take the least important of them and uphold it as the type, and pass judgment upon the principle itself. Which is more important, to eat or to observe rules of propriety about eating?

