The Nation

Vol. CXII, No. 2908 | Founded 1865 | Wednesday, March 30, 1921

MEXICO—1921

I. Introductory—The House in Order

Beginning a Series of Articles

by Paul Hanna

Mr. Lansing Lifts the Veil

by Oswald Garrison Villard

Recognize Russia!

Editorial

Fifteen Cents a Copy | Five Dollars a Year

Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1887, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Nation
FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1921 No. 2908

Contents

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor
Associate Editors
LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN
ERNEST H. GRUENING, Managing Editor
CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

UBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and lexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

VIVIANI will get a hearty welcome, the headlines tell us, and then add as if it were news: "Administration Will Have Open Mind on any Proposal He May Make." This is the day of the open mind and its inevitable companion, procrastination. We were to have had an immediate peace with Germany, but the recent events in Germany make it clear that we must not move now lest we upset our Allies in their latest action against our former enemy. At Omaha Mr. Harding promised that one of his first official acts would be to take the American troops out of Germany—but here, too, we plainly must not act now. Then those front-porch conferences were to have yielded an immediate program for our foreign relations—but the open mind is still open, and the program still lingers. The fact is that this Administration is not going to grapple with any foreign issue until it is compelled to. Domestic affairs have the right of way. The farmer is to be succored at the expense of Australian, Canadian, Danish, and South American producers; more temporary tariff barriers—a curse wherever they may be—are to be established by reenacting the Fordney bill Mr. Wilson vetoed. Then business is to be rescued from the excess profits and super-income taxes and by December we are to have a permanent tariff law based on the Payne-Aldrich law the American people once abolished. What if Sir Philip Gibbs declares that "the whole destiny of the world depends absolutely on President Harding's leadership"? Before America even, comes Big Business; Europe may go hang.

PREMIER LLOYD GEORGE is finding it no easy task to carry his country with him in the absurd German reparations policy to which he committed it at the behest of France. The retirement from the Cabinet of Mr. Bonar Law, like that of Sir Robert Cecil, is thought to be due to the Irish rather than to the German policy, but it weakens Mr. Lloyd George at a most unfortunate time. The band which is opposing the Prime Minister's German policy includes Mr. Asquith and Sir George Paish and such queer bedfellows as Horatio Bottomley, editor of *John Bull,* and J. L. Garvin, editor of the *Observer*. "Germany could only work up the enormous export surplus required to pay the Allies by driving British exports from every competitive market," argues Mr. Garvin. From the Rhineland there are still reports of the slowing down of industry, and British officials there are quoted as estimating the total amount collectible under the customs penalties as not more than $4,000,000 annually. In the French Chamber the other day Deputy Auriol, Socialist, declared that France's part of the duties would be less than the expenses of occupation. Here in America, too, there is less disposition than at first to identify the voice of the Allies as the voice of God.

MORE and more the news from Ireland takes on the character of real warfare. "Heavy casualties were inflicted on the First Royal Fusiliers in an attack upon a train today near Headford Junction, County Kerry. An official report states that one officer and six men of the ranks were killed and twelve wounded"—thus runs a Dublin war dispatch of March 21. The week of St. Patrick's Day was the bloodiest the rebellion has known not even excepting the historic Easter week of 1916. Yet bankrupt British statesmanship insists that it is getting on well in Ireland and accomplishing its purpose. Despite all sorts of false dispatches there is no real move toward peace in sight, and the Irish are so encouraged by the success of their anti-Belfast boycott that they are beginning one upon certain English goods. The folly and the needlessness of it all are overwhelming when one realizes how easily a man with the spirit of a John Bright, or a Cobden, could bring about peace.

ALMOST a year ago in the main street of the mining town of Matewan in Mingo County, West Virginia, ten men were killed in a gun fight. Among those slain was Albert C. Felts of the Baldwin-Felts detective agency, and among those involved in the killing was "Sid" Hatfield, Chief of Police of Matewan. Felts was in charge of a party of detectives who had been engaged by the mine operators to drive from their homes the families of the striking miners—without the bother of a legal warrant. Hatfield tried to prevent the forcible eviction of the families, and a fight started. Sixteen men were finally tried for the murder of Albert C. Felts—among them Hatfield. After a legal battle almost as bitter as the original affray, the sixteen defendants have finally been acquitted on the chief charge. The verdict establishes nothing but the innocence of the defendants; all strike questions were excluded from the trial. But the outcome may have important results.

BERLIN has had its first pogrom. A preconcerted raid was made on a Jewish quarter, several hundred of its residents attacked and beaten, and a number seriously hurt. While it has not appeared that any of the injuries have resulted fatally, the mere fact of this organized assault is ominous. It marks a tragic step backward toward barbarism. It adds another European country to those which have allowed the smoldering embers of ignorance and race antagonism to blaze into violence. Yet this outburst is not surprising. Since the war, which intensified every passion, which aggravated every dislike, which aroused new hates, anti-Semitism has been studiously nurtured in Germany. From a latent and localized prejudice deriving its inspiration from Junkertum, it has developed through reactionary propaganda and careful organization in a sadly disorganized community until it is today a rampant, widespread mental disease. The Viennese manifestations, while complicated by great numbers of Galician Jewish refugees whose presence adds to the economic distress, are essentially of the same origin. Could such a thing happen in the United States? Five years ago we should have laughed the idea to scorn. But it is not unthinkable today in a country as credulous as ours, by nature more prone to mob violence than its neighbors, which tolerates the lynching of another weak and helpless race within our borders.

BUT even this sinister possibility does not justify the suppression of the Dearborn *Independent*. The threatened arrest in St. Louis of persons engaged in selling it is wholly misguided. While under an interpretation of a Missouri law such people are held to be disturbers of the peace, the police power in almost any State is probably sufficient, if invoked by the authorities, to check the sale of any publication. It is the more necessary, in dealing with so utterly detestable a campaign of slander, that the issues be clearly distinguished. More important than anti-semitism is the fundamental question of freedom of expression so gravely imperiled today. The right of the individual to say what he pleases is the cornerstone of our American liberties.

THE natural response to the "Rhine horror" meeting in New York was the patriotic rally in Madison Square Garden on March 18, at which, according to the New York *World*, there was greater hatred of and bitterness toward Germany expressed than during the war. The fateful old German inability to understand other people's psychology, to be tactful, considerate, and wise, still persists over here. The Von Machs learn nothing. As for the patriotic rally, it was great fun for those who took part in it; they rejoiced in their opportunities to hiss Mayor Hylan and the originators of the "Rhine horror" affair, and they demanded that no one should break up the old friendships with the Allies. As to the latter *The Nation* is heartily with them. It only wishes that they could see that the real menace to our friendship with France is not the professional German-American, but the French imperialists, who, all unwitting, are pulling down the whole economic structure of Europe; and that the real menace to our peace with England is not the Sinn Feiner but those directly and indirectly responsible for the proposal to build a large navy to rival the British, who fail to realize that this will lead straight to war.

IT is no new thing to find the representatives of the Allies bad business men, but the recent note of the Reparations Commission asking Austria to deliver all livestock specified in the treaty of St. Germain seems bo unintelligent and heartless. This means the immediate su plying of 6,000 milch cows—1,000 to Jugoslavia, 1,000 Rumania (both cattle-exporting countries), and 4,000 to Italy at the very time when the American Relief is finding it necessary to ship milk regularly into Austria, the Vienna Children's Milk Relief asserts that there are thousands of children who have never tasted fresh cow's milk, and the Red Cross reports in Vienna alone 115,000 tubercular children whose chief need is milk. What makes this particular demand particularly immoral and idiotic is the fact that the Allied Governments, sitting in conference in London, after consulting their experts, have just announced that they are prepared to postpone their financial claims on Austria in order to avert her starvation.

IN the passion for discrediting the Soviet Government, its enemies have manufactured not merely propaganda in wholesale quantities for export, but they have produced the raw material out of which history is largely made. *The Nation* called attention last summer to an Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw, purporting to quote the *Isvestia* of June 11 in regard to Russian policy, and noted that the copy of the newspaper of that date in the New York Public Library contained no such article. Possibly the *Isvestia* in question came into existence in the same way by which the London *Daily Herald* says bogus copies of the Russian *Pravda* have been circulated in the Baltic states and eve smuggled into Soviet Russia itself. These spurious issu containing anti-Soviet propaganda, have been printed London and circulated, the *Daily Herald* declares, with the aid of Scotland Yard. They may naturally be assumed to have been the basis for some of those ingenuous dispatches from the Baltic region, beginning, "Copies of the Russian *Pravda* received here say——." And yet the same Government that did not scruple to assist in circulating a fictitious newspaper was most solicitous in its recently concluded trade agreement with Russia to obtain the promise of the Soviet Government not to spread anti-British propaganda abroad. It is permissible to pull the Bear's ear but not to twist the Lion's tail.

A RECENT announcement that employees of the Post Office were to be allowed to treat with the Government through their organizations—collective bargaining—is a welcome sign that the new Postmaster General, Will Hays, intends to follow a more enlightened policy than that which prevailed during the Burleson regime. No other Cabinet officer has so great an opportunity to raise the morale and increase the efficiency of his Department by the installation of even a modicum of justice in the treatment of employees as has Mr. Hays. The demoralization of the service worked by the Burleson era of autocracy and incompetence cannot be counteracted in a day, but the comments of Mr. Hays indicate an appreciation of how to go at it. "My purposes are to take the postal service out politics," he said at Chicago lately, "to make such rectifi tions as in all decency and fairness must be made to assure a square deal, and to strengthen and broaden the civil service." We hope Mr. Hays acts as he talks, and we wish him success in cleaning the Augean stable of his predecessor.

THE report of the committee of the American Association of University Professors on the dismissal of Professor J. E. Kirkpatrick from Washburn College reveals flagrant and insolent autocracy on the part of President omer and the trustees. "It is established," says the committee in its summary, "that Professor Kirkpatrick was dismissed without prior notice, hearing, or stated charges, and without his knowledge of certain allegations against him made to the trustees." The specific acts cited as grounds of his dismissal turn out to consist: "(a) in his having, some years earlier, angered certain potential contributors by calling the attention of the State's Attorney to a violation of law; (b) in his having talked with a neighbor and personal friend, who was also a trustee, about the movement for increasing the salaries of college teachers; (c) in his having, as a delegate to the Congregational Conference, expressed to one other delegate views about the nomination of a member of the Board of Trustees which did not coincide with the wishes of President Womer." These are the acts cited; "one of the principal actual causes," the committee finds, "consisted in his having, during the preceding college year, urged changes in the constitution of the college which would limit the president's powers and give the faculty a greater part in the determination of the educational policies of the institution." These facts require no comment. Nor is it surprising, under the circumstances, to learn that the committee reports of President Womer that, though "highly successful in collecting money for the institution and in carrying out a program of material improvements," he has been "at once autocratic and vacillating" in his official relations with the faculty. He is found have been guilty of bad faith, to have been "lacking in dor and trustworthiness" in his administrative methods, and to have made, in connection with this committee's investigations, "statements which are not in accord with the facts." The trustees, of course, back up the president, and share his responsibility. It is all a disgraceful affair.

THE comparative literary sterility of the Southern States has been vigorously described by Mr. H. L. Mencken. A really searching explanation of it is yet to come. Every now and then, during very many years, a consciousness of the fact itself has suddenly obtruded itself in the minds of cultivated and thoughtful Southerners. At such moments they would found a periodical—the *Southern Review* in 1828, the *Southern Quarterly Review* in 1842, *Simm's Magazine* in 1845, *Russell's Magazine* in 1857, and the *Nineteenth Century* in 1869, to name a few only. All these magazines were more or less identified with small literary groups in Charleston. Today another such moment has come and Richmond announces the foundation of *The Reviewer*, a bi-monthly. A commendatory testimonial accompanies the first issue in which "the undersigned, realizing the need of a literary review in Richmond, and the growing demand for such a publication throughout the State, wish to express their cordial approval and indorsement." How familiar that sounds to anyone who has gone through the files of the old Southern magazines, how quaint and innocent! Yet among the undersigned are mes Branch Cabell and Mary Johnston and Ellen Glasgow nd others who know the ways of literature in this busy world. We wish *The Reviewer* the best luck provided it avoids the old Southern fault of over-anxious refinement and intellectual timidity.

England Ready for a Navy Talk

FROM England has again come so plain an offer to discuss the limitation of armaments that it is hard to see how the President can delay for a moment. In the course of the debate on the new British estimates it appeared that England has deliberately abandoned her historic two-Power standard for her navy; has reduced the number of capital ships in full commission from twenty to sixteen as compared with thirty-eight in 1914; has given up one destroyer-flotilla and the entire South American squadron and decreased the personnel by 6,000 men. True, four new battleships are to be begun while eight are transferred to the list to be disposed of; but Baron Lee, First Lord of the Admiralty, has specifically declared that in "making this long delayed beginning with the replacement of obsolete ships, the Government neither commits itself to, nor contemplates, any building program in answer to those of any other Power." Indeed, he went out of his way to say that his Government "trusts it may be possible as a result of frank and friendly discussion with the principal naval Powers to avoid anything approaching competitive building, either now or in the future." More than that, Lord Lee has stated that "if America invites Great Britain to a conference to come to an agreement on the naval question" he is prepared to put aside all other business to help that matter forward. What more can anyone ask?

Well, we ask that on this side of the ocean there be immediate response not only in official Washington but by all those who bespeak a "hands across the seas," "blood is thicker than water" policy. Instead, we have the President, according to Washington dispatches, accepting one of Mr. Wilson's foolish beliefs that "the possession of the world's most modern navy will insure the country a respectful hearing when it is ready to propose new international relationships." "It is understood," one correspondent telegraphs, "that he [Mr. Harding] regards the possession of the most powerful navy in the world as a guaranty not only to the world but to American citizens of the sincerity of the Administration, when it proposes changed international relations and reduction of armaments." All of which is the same nonsense which Mr. Daniels used to talk. It is as if a drunkard would not sign a pledge to do away with drink until he had convinced everybody by one last grand debauch that he was not afraid of good hard liquor.

How can any American be so credulous as to believe that it is necessary for the United States to arm further in order to obtain a "respectful hearing"? Why, there is not a country on earth that speaks with such authority as the United States today, and no foreign chancellery stops to ask the chance number of our battleships when we do. So childish a bluff as that will fool nobody, nor any attempt to so juggle a proportional disarmament as to give us a dominating position because we have the greatest number of post-Jutland battleships afloat or under way. England will not accept any such arrangement, and as for the world, it seeks not "proportionate" disarmament, but *disarmament* complete and absolute. Mr. Harding ought to bestir himself; he may be compelled to by the tremendous decrease in this year's income tax returns. But he ought not to wait for them. He must move or this golden opportunity to encompass naval disarmament will pass unused.

Recognize Russia!

ONCE more communist Russia arises to confound her enemies. The Kronstadt rebellion, the unrest in Moscow and Petrograd, the anarchist disturbances in the Ukraine, all led optimistic imperialists to assert for the hundredth time that the Soviet Government was tottering to its fall. Then gradually out of the mist of press misrepresentations and mistakes and half-truths the facts again began to emerge; and the Russian Government was suddenly revealed as a power still firmly intrenched and more necessary to placate and to deal with than ever. Within three days events took place that entirely changed Russia's position and assured the continued control of the Soviet Government. On March 16 a trade agreement was signed at London between the "Government of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic" and the British Government, together with a declaration of recognition of claims signed by M. Krassin and Sir Robert Horne, President of the British Board of Trade. By these instruments the world's most powerful trading nation has welcomed the Russian Government—which it had referred to in earlier days as a government of "murderers," "cutthroats," and "tyrants"—back into the commercial family of nations. On the same day a Russian-Turkish treaty was signed at Moscow "establishing fraternal relations between the two countries." On March 17 the Kronstadt garrison surrendered to the Red Army and the Government forces took the town. On March 18 the terms of a trade agreement between Russia and Germany were settled, and the final peace treaty with Poland and the Ukraine was signed. On March 19 the Italian Foreign Minister announced that Italy would soon sign a trade treaty with Russia. So, after years of trial and persecution, Russia again becomes the friend of the great.

One great nation still holds aloof—and even she is beginning to show signs of anxiety. While England and Germany sign up pacts of commercial friendship with Russia and begin to turn the pages of her catalogue of concessions; while Canadian concessionnaires pick up vast tracts of lumber, and fifty of the largest firms in Holland combine for trade with the Baltic states and Russia; while British factories begin to turn out goods for Russian people to buy—the Government of the United States decides to find out "through diplomatic and other channels" what is going on in that part of the world. Russia is again on the map—not only on the geographic map where she has sprawled all along in mocking immensity—but on the diplomatic map made up of "good" governments which respect the rights of private property and do not say their prayers to the prophet Marx. And the United States wants to see what Russia is doing there with the other fellows. Does Russia really mean it when she says she will be good? The new Administration has decided, so the newspapers tell us, that the time has almost come when we must begin to think about finding out what has been occurring and when we must determine what position, if any, we wish eventually to stand upon. This, as anyone who has followed our Russian policy must realize, is going a long way.

It is evident, however, without waiting for the State Department to announce details, that the return of the Russian prodigal to the family of nations has not meant a complete victory for communism. Lenin has secured for his country peace, commerce, and a chance to rebuild. He has forfeited, however, some important items of his program laid down some powerful weapons. When, as the correspondent of the New York *Herald* reported, he "screwed up his eyes in a comical manner and said: 'I fear I have become respectable,'" he summed up the extent of his concessions. He has forfeited his belief in an imminent world revolution as well as his power of helping to bring it about by propaganda or force. He has yielded up the riches of Russia to foreign concessionnaires—an act which he admits carries with it the danger of foreign interference in defense of such holdings. He has, if he is quoted correctly, modified, for the time being, his plan of communistic enterprise in agriculture and industry, by acknowledging the rights of private agricultural holdings, of free commerce in agricultural products, and of private production by "artisans." He has given the bitter non-communist press an opportunity, which they have avidly seized upon, of proclaiming the downfall of communism at the very moment when they are forced to admit the virtually universal success of the Soviet Government. But their joy may be partly unwarranted. For years Lenin has been living according to two philosophies—the philosophy of communism and that of *realpolitik*. He is doubtless dominated by the hope that he can make the second serve the first. By clearing Russia of invaders, by opening trade, by getting industries going, and by placating the peasants, he hopes to save Russia for communism. And he is unique among statesmen in his readiness to admit a deviation from principle. "The Brest-Litovsk peace is bad, but what would you have me do? I cannot defeat the Germans. We must have a breathing spell." So he said in 1918. "Concessions are dangerous," he has said lately, "but are they more dangerous than hunger and cold and underproduction and industrial chaos?" "Private enterprise is not communism," he is doubtless saying now, "but there can be no communism till things are running again—in five or ten years perhaps." Lenin *has* compromised beyond question for the sake of expediency. He has surrendered a position here and one there, but by admitting his necessity he has softened the pain of defeat and may in the end stave it off entirely.

Meanwhile he says to the nations of the world—though he addressed his words to Great Britain: "Agreement useless unless the British Government ceases the mistrust shown us for three years. Our best and only propaganda will be the example given the world by our economic reconstruction of Russia." The United States should listen to those words. Will we continue to stand with one foot in the past and one in a wholly imaginary future, while the other nations of the world recognize the power and promise of the existing Russian Government? During Mr. Wilson's regime we insulted the Soviet Government by every means in our power; we refused its overtures and drove out its representative. We learned nothing from Britain's willingness to face and accept the facts. We threw away a chance to be Russia's best friend among the nations. Small signs now begin to indicate an unwilling gradual change of heart. Relief can now be sent into Soviet Russia. Will trade follow? The dogmatic statement of Secretary Hoover gives us little hope, but if the new Administration is wise it will ask Russia to send an envoy back to us and follow after England as fast as we may.

The Railroad Wreck

THIS is a sad world. Only one short year ago a complaisant Congress passed the Esch-Cummins law. It gave our railroad financiers everything they asked. Railroad credit was permanently insured by a provision that rates were to yield 6 per cent on the aggregate value of railroad property. The monstrous Plumb Plan for service at cost was buried hell-deep under a mountain of anathemas with a stake through its heart. With a sigh of relief a harassed country saw the roads slip back into the competent hands of "the Christian men to whom God in his wisdom had intrusted them"—to apply in a different connection the well-remembered words of a late railroad president.

A year has passed. Today the Esch-Cummins law is a complete and admitted failure. Even Senator Cummins asserts that something is wrong; he demands an inquiry by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce to find out what it is. The self-same financiers of a year agone mournfully announce that they can't make their roads pay, and so must be allowed to smash the unions and slash wages. They declare with apparent truth that many of the roads are on the verge of bankruptcy. Freight won't move, and passengers won't travel. The roads don't come within gunshot of 6 per cent, and the loathsome Plumb Plan is once more raising its hideous head. It is all very discouraging to men whose business it is to pick financial plums off the railroad tree. Already they talk of selling the good-for-nothing plum tree to an ungrateful Government—always provided, of course, that the price can be made right. In fact, one uncommonly intelligent banker warns his colleagues that they are going altogether wrong in their present fight on the unions. He urges them instead to kiss and make up with the men's organizations, and then go hand in hand to Uncle Sam, pointing out to the old gentleman that after all it is a lovely plum tree and that he couldn't do better than add it to his charming fruit garden.

What is the matter? Why do all the rosy promises of private-ownership-propaganda days fade as a leaf? Let Senator La Follette answer:

> The financiers of Wall Street are running the railroads today. Beginning about 1900 a change came, and the railroad management of the country passed out of the hands of men who had come up from the ranks, who were capable of running the railroads, and believed in balancing service against transportation charges. The management of the railroads passed into the hands of the representatives of Wall Street, and from that hour on the railroads of the United States have not been run by men capable of managing the transportation of the country. They have been run, sir, by the representatives of the great financial houses, by the promoters, by the banks.
>
> Of the twelve men responsible for the new union-smashing policy of the railroad executives, nine, we are reliably informed, are opposed to that policy. They are the active operating officials; but the other three, representing the dominant banking interests, dictate the action of the group. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

More specifically, dealing with the Esch-Cummins law, a Wisconsin Senator goes on: "This infamous law has destroyed the very purpose which its authors professed to believe it would achieve, for by passing that law you imposed transportation charges upon traffic that the traffic of the country cannot bear." The financiers, under the beneficent operation of this law, have managed to transform a shortage of freight cars into a surplus of 300,000 idle cars, and their passenger trains are running half empty where they are not being consolidated. On a recent journey a certain passenger spent nine nights in a Pullman. In no case did he make a reservation in advance, and in no case was the berth above him occupied. Despite the hullabaloo over wages and the propaganda for cutting them, the fundamental trouble with the railroads today is bad management and excessive rates. The executives are busy trying to produce profits instead of transportation. In this effort they have overreached themselves, and have killed the traffic goose that lays the golden egg.

The transportation committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, after discussing the financial plight of the New England roads and the proposals for their relief by yet further rate increases, points out that poor service and high rates have driven shippers to the extensive use of motor trucks. It demands an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine "whether the New England roads are now being operated efficiently and economically."

Yet more pointed is the report of the New England Traffic League, representing the important shippers of that section. It says: "Instead of proceeding in an orderly way to bring this [the wage] question before the Labor Board, they [the carriers] have attempted a short cut through a campaign of publicity, and have utterly failed to accomplish any results commensurate with the efforts expended." "In view of this inexcusable failure" the League "feels that it is time the directors of these [the New England] roads take action that will not only make unnecessary further increase but which may give some assurance that charges that are now so high as to divert business from the roads may be so adjusted as to increase the amount of traffic handled by these lines." The sacrifices made by shippers during the war, says the League, "are misconstrued into meaning that the Executives can tax them to the limit without fear of opposition." The following passage even suggests a degree of impatience:

> If the time has arrived when no confidence can be placed in the word of a railroad executive, the sooner the shipper understands this the better it will be; for if those in charge of these properties cannot command the respect of their patrons, the directors can do no better service to their stockholders than to replace those in control by men who will have some respect for an agreement. In none of these proposals have the carriers indicated any intention of cleaning house, but apparently propose to continue the present inefficient methods of operation which shippers generally believe to exist, particularly on the New Haven road, and possibly on other lines.
>
> It is clear to the business interests of New England that if the increasing of rates is carried much further the carriers will, like Samson, ruin themselves by pulling down the industrial structure upon which they are solely dependent and upon which the prosperity of New England depends.

Other than New England roads may well take these stinging words to heart. If the gentlemen who at present own and mismanage these rich properties wish to keep them in their own hands, it is high time for them to bestir themselves to give cheap transportation and cut rates to a point that will let traffic move.

The Outcome in Upper Silesia

IN his book on the Peace Conference, Mr. E. J. Dillon records how in an interview with an American journalist Mr. Lloyd George interrupted his visitor to ask of his entourage, "Is it Upper or Lower Silesia *that we are giving away?*" Well, the Upper Silesian plebiscite is over and no part of Silesia is given away by the fiat of Paris; it remains German by a very heavy majority vote. The result is satisfactory in that it will increase the Allied prospects of German indemnities; it keeps within Germany a territory that should be inside her boundaries, and will put heart and courage into the German people for the tasks before them. As for Poland, there the blow is a severe one. A correspondent of the New York *Tribune* cabled the other day that if the Germans won, Poland would collapse. As to that we shall see what we shall see. It is but just to both sides to record that the voting passed off without disturbances, and this is the more remarkable as we have no doubt from reliable documents that lie before us that the Poles were guilty of coercion and violent oppression during the months before the plebiscite. Doubtless there was wrongdoing on both sides. All the more gratifying is it to record the faultless behavior of the British troops on duty in Silesia. In a most trying position they won the respect of both Germans and Poles.

This Silesian plebiscite must not become of the things of the past without dwelling upon the clear illustration it affords of the mischief done to the world by protective tariffs. Strictly speaking, aside from sentiment, it would make no difference to German industry or to the world at large which flag flew over Silesia if only there were free trade. If German industrialists could have purchased Silesian coal and iron without let or hindrance if these materials were under Polish control, then they would have stood the loss of Silesia—with much outward alligator grief for the German Kultur to be subordinated to Polish "barbarism"—but with great inward resignation. But, of course, what the Poles planned to do was to slap on tariffs right off, and perhaps export bounties as well. The tariffs were to be for revenue and the bounties and other tricks to keep Germany from obtaining the Silesian coal and iron which have been so necessary to her development. That the Poles, had they thus hampered or cut off the German market, would not have been in a position to absorb the greater part of the Upper Silesian output themselves, did not weigh with them. They wanted to grab for themselves raw materials the control of which they counted upon to save their new State from bankruptcy while weakening Germany correspondingly—a New York *Times* correspondent admitted on the day after the voting that if Upper Silesia were lost to Germany the latter would probably be quite unable to pay the indemnities demanded by the Allies.

All of which merely goes to prove how nationalist and tariff lines cripple trade, barter, and exchange, and make for hate, bloodshed, and war. The German Empire grew great when its states combined and abolished their tariffs against each other. Europe will and must yet abolish all its tariffs and customs houses and supplant its narrow nationalism with an internationalism under which the iron and coal of Briey, of Lorraine, the Ruhr, Upper Silesia, and Poland will be held in trust for the peoples of the Continent, with special regard for those who are without them.

Oh, Boston!

TIME was when we loved to visit Boston. We regarded it as one of half a dozen of our large cities with a pronounced individuality. We used to love to tread—when not trying to catch a train—the parabolas and hyperbolas of its streets; we liked to sniff the fishy smells of the T-Wharf and the skinny odors of the leather district; we reveled in baked beans, saturated with molasses and fragrant with the bouquet of roast pork, which we stowed in our bunkers between layers of steaming brown bread; we sat down two or three times a day with reverence before a section of squash pie, moist and rich with milk, and graced with a cuticle baked nut-brown but tender as moonrise in spring. So superior, that squash pie of New England, to the coarse-grained insipid pumpkin that is foisted upon one by the vulgarian restaurateurs of New York! In those days Bostonians prided themselves—and rightly—upon their Bunker Hill Monument and their accent; upon their literary clubs and their creamed codfish; upon their Public Library and their Museum of Fine Arts; upon their Puritanism and their pie. In that geological age—we were there last in the autumn of 1920—the city by the Charles was not merely big; it was Boston. It was worth all it cost to get there from any place, even under the Esch-Cummins law.

Ah, Boston!

But recent news is depressing. Boston is elated because while in 1880 there was one bathtub to every 40.2 persons, there is now one to every 4.4 persons. If the ratio of increase is maintained, it is said, there will be a tub per person inside of five years. Well, what of it? What sort of thing is that for Boston—our Boston—to brag of? Boston and Bunker Hill, or Boston and beans—such associations are historic and ennobling! But Boston and bathtubs! Bah! The bathtub is the great symbol of our materialism and hypocrisy. It is the proof of our belief in inward grace through outward cleansing; of absolution by ablution; of sanctification by soap. Bathing has become our modern religion and the bathtub the family altar. It will soon be the fashion to advertise not "four rooms and a bath" but "four baths and a room." We shall carry our tubs with us, like Diogenes, and excuse ourselves between courses at dinner to withdraw and take a bath.

But we had not imagined that Boston—our Boston—would succumb to this craze, would abandon her fine individual virtues for so conventional and superficial a cult. We might have believed it of Salt Lake City, where we noted recently that they had forbidden smoking on the public streets, or of some thriving towns of the Middle West where the visitor in search of the soul of the community hears only of the number of automobiles and the miles of asphalt pavement laid since 1910. We shudder to think that when next we go to Boston we may be stopped at the city line by an inspector of the Bureau of Bathtub Boosting, who will inquire when last we were wet-cleaned and if we have brought an individual swimming pool with us. A speck of dirt will be worse in the new era than a slip of grammar in the old. Browning will give way to blue[ ] and the Boston Latin School to a soap factory.

What the Hub of the Universe needs is not more s[ ] bubbles but more axle grease. Her future, like her past, should be built on Bunker, not on Buncombe Hill.

Oh, Boston!

Mexico—1921

I. Introductory—The House Set in Order

By PAUL HANNA

MEXICO has put her house in order. Fifteen million people in that country have achieved a Government satisfactory to most of them. Now they are waiting to see if it will prove satisfactory to the people and Government of the United States. That is the truth and the issue respecting Mexico. Mexico's present leaders are realists. They know that a government fully approved by its own people may be attacked and destroyed from without because it does not suit the taste of foreign Powers. They recall that under Porfirio Diaz Mexico had a government wholly pleasing to the foreign world and wholly disastrous to the Mexican masses. They dare not and will not pawn the wealth and happiness of their country, as Diaz did, to purchase the praise and recognition of foreigners.

Eleven years of civil war is the price these Mexicans have paid to escape their old bondage to native and foreign masters. Those years were marked by the terror, violence, disappointment, and betrayals which are common to organized bloodshed, for whatever cause. The agony of rebirth looked at times like the throes of national death. But if the symptoms were confusing, the outcome is clear enough. Mexico is reborn, entirely at peace, and busy from end to end with the development of her new domestic freedom. To make sure this freedom exists, to understand how it applies itself and how much its undisturbed development may contribute to human progress, is surely the duty of every American. For there is no menace to Mexican liberty except the misunderstanding or indifference of the American people. For every worthy class of Americans there is a strong appeal in what Mexico has done and is planning to do.

The revolution which began in 1910 and culminated in May of last year had four fundamental objects in view: (1) To give the peons land; (2) to restore political democracy; (3) to establish the wage earners' right to organize; (4) to promote education. Today the land is being distributed among the peons, and to all other citizens of the Republic who wish to make agriculture their calling. Peasants who followed their fathers into slavery for the payment of their grandfathers' debts have, in thousands of instances, received acres of their own. Regiment after regiment of the revolutionary army is dissolving from a parasitic garrison existence to the status of individual productive owners and tillers of their own ground. They do not wish to soldier because they have something else to do. They do not need to fight because their fight has been won.

Political democracy? I saw more of it in Mexico than exists, I believe, anywhere else in the world today. The Minister of Finance is the ex-Provisional President whom Obregon succeeded after a free election by the people. The Governor of the Federal District is an ex-cobbler who insists upon talking personally with the hundreds of poor persons who visit his office daily. "We must destroy the servile illusion about public officials," he explains. Public buildings are placed at the disposal of any sect or faction, however small in number, whose orators wish to denounce or praise the administration, demand new methods of taxation, or impugn the personal honor of cabinet members. As you read the different daily newspapers in Mexico City you will learn that the ministry contains here a "Bolshevik" and there a "Diaz Cientifico." Workmen parade the principal streets with red flags whenever the spirit moves them and are not disturbed by the authorities. The Catholic Church and the Federation of Labor conduct a series of joint debates in a crowded theater to determine whether proletarian rule would be just or desirable.

Perhaps the wit and good humor of this intellectual ferment is best illustrated by what befell a Socialist Deputy who acted as chairman at one of these debates. He had taken the floor to quell some immoderate hecklers. "Remember," he said to the crowd, "this audience is composed entirely of workers and intellectuals. Bad manners would dishonor such a gathering." Instantly a garage hand leaped to his feet. "Señor Fulano [the chairman] is neither a workman nor an intellectual. He is—a Deputy!" The house roared, but the heckling ceased.

Labor's freedom to organize, agitate, and strike is unrestricted. Many of its activities are housed in buildings donated by the Government. Its independent educational efforts enjoy semi-official subsidies. Its veteran leaders occupy such posts as director of government factories and director of public printing. Books on economic subjects which are desired and indicated by the workers are being translated into Spanish and printed at government expense, just as other works of general cultural or scientific interest are being produced for other classes of the population.

Public education is largely in charge of the National University, whose distinguished director, Dr. José Vasconcelos, will shortly enter the cabinet as chief of the new Department of Public Education, with an initial appropriation of some 25,000,000 pesos. The program calls for a free school and library within reach of every child in the Republic. Hundreds of these schools have been opened during the past six months.

These things Mexico has done and is planning to do for herself. Within her own borders no serious obstacles are apparent. There remains only the great peril of her vast natural wealth and the lust of alien exploiters to possess it. Within the limits of a Constitution which gives the state title to all subsoil treasures, but which provides for leasing to private exploiters, I am convinced the administration of President Obregon intends to deal generously with foreign capitalists. Several projects are under way in the Ministry of Finance for the repayment of interest and principal on the external debt which has been defaulted since 1914. Under this regime the foreign world is invited to share the bounty of Mexico's wealth, but alien capitalists will not be permitted to set all four feet in the trough and trample the weaklings to economic death.

If that limitation is intolerable to foreign capital there will be war against Mexico, preceded, I imagine, by a violent effort of plotters in Mexico City to seize the Government and mold it nearer to the desire of business hearts. There are plenty of eminent Mexicans willing and anxious

to function in the "Cubanization" of their native land. And they are active in persuading others that such an evolution from independence to a place within the "Empire of North America" represents Mexico's very desirable destiny. But the Mexico of President Obregon and the liberated masses is not afraid of its domestic foes. On the battlefield and in the voting booth it has taken their measure and vanquished them successively. In the matter of both materials and morale it is today better able than ever to crush its internal enemies. But what about its foreign foes? What about invasion? Mexicans know they would be crushed. Most Mexicans, however, are in what may be termed the Patrick Henry stage of patriotic development. They do not believe that life is so dear nor peace so sw that they should be bought at the price of liberty. Th will run to their mountain shelters and fight for years against any invasion. Let this suggest what the conquest of Mexico must mean in terms of blood and treasure.

Mr. Lansing Lifts the Veil

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

FROM Robert Lansing has come the most interesting contribution to the history of the Versailles Treaty, of the League of Nations, and of Woodrow Wilson which has yet appeared.[1] Only the intimate memoirs of Mr. Wilson himself, Lloyd George, or Clemenceau could surpass it in world-wide interest, and it is doubtful if anything that they may write will be sufficiently detached to surpass Mr. Lansing's statement as purely historical material. We cannot recall a similar case where an actor in a great dramatic event has in so short a time thereafter not only lifted the veil as to what happened behind closed doors, but has so elaborately dissected the chief personality of the drama. Naturally Mr. Lansing is not without deep personal feeling. Out of consideration for the President he put off for thirteen months a statement of the facts which led to his resignation's being accepted by President Wilson in such a shabby manner. He has now set forth, with obvious effort to be just and to confine himself to a lawyer's presentation of the facts, the exact story of what took place in Paris and why his mind could not "run along" with the President's. He makes no studied personal plea for himself; he does not stress various aspects of the mortifying position in which Mr. Wilson placed him in Paris; and he frequently goes out of his way to give his former superior the benefit of any doubt, to suggest explanatory reasons for the attitude Mr. Wilson assumed, and to analyze situations as much as possible from the President's point of view. Moreover, he frequently pays tribute to the altruism and idealism of the ex-President. But he would be more than human if in so doing he could eradicate all trace of the sense of injury and wrong which any honorable man must feel who has been through such an experience and been publicly charged by his superior with something akin to disloyalty.

For generations to come historians and moralists will, we presume, wrangle as to the exact responsibility of Mr. Wilson for the Paris catastrophe. Already the lines are clearly drawn. His admirers, those, for instance, who are now raising a fund of $500,000 to commemorate the ex-President's services to the cause of peace, believe that, if only for his enunciation of the Fourteen Points and his insistence on the League of Nations, he deserves the highest pedestal in history. They portray the President as having fallen among thieves in Paris and as meriting the greatest credit for having achieved as much as he did in his single-handed battling against the subtle trickeries of cynical, Old-World diplomats. They ask what would have happened to the beaten enemy and to Russia if Mr. Wilson had not been there, and, sincerely believing that the League of Nations has come to stay and is in fact the beginning of a new world-order, they feel, as General Smuts has just put it, that Mr. Wilson accomplished more than enough to entitle him to the thanks of mankind.

For such as these Mr. Lansing's story affords no comfort at all. The picture that he paints is one that no historian can afford to overlook who proposes to draw a truthful portrait of Mr. Wilson, and it is anything but a flattering one. To this those of Mr. Wilson's defenders whose minds are closed will reply that Mr. Lansing, being a dismissed official, writes as one with a grudge. Fortunately for the former Secretary of State, not only is he able to document his case in considerable degree, but time has been on his side and also the outcome of the Conference. His judgments and opinions and prophecies have been upheld by the march of events, just as those critics like *The Nation* who attacked the treaty as soon as it appeared, as both dishonorable a unworkable and one the American people could not acce have had their contentions upheld not only by the "solemn referendum" of the American electorate last fall, but by the daily events abroad. Mr. Lansing was perfectly clear at the time as to what an abortion the Paris Conference had given birth to, for on May 8, 1919, he wrote of it in his diary:

> The impression made by it [the treaty] is one of disappointment and of depression. The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance. . . . It must be admitted in honesty that the League is *an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations* among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. . . . This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. These conditions *have not been destroyed.* They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion.

To this he added his belief that the League was simply an alliance of the five great military Powers, that justice was secondary and might primary in the settlement, and that the treaty could not bring peace "because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest." "Mr. Wilson," Mr. Lansing now declares, "won a great personal triumph, but he did so by surrendering the fundamental principle of the equality of nations. In his eagerness to 'make the world safe for democracy' he abandoned international democra and became the advocate of international autocracy."

Nothing could be added today, after two fateful ye during which the world has not progressed further toward peace, to this characterization in 1919 of a treaty which was madness from the beginning, nor to this analysis of the

[1] *The Peace Negotiations.* Houghton Mifflin Company.

League, for it was precisely because the League, as now constituted, gives to the five dominant Powers control of the world that its defeat in the Senate was made possible. Mr. Lansing quickly saw, too, that instead of the League's being created as an agency to prevent war it was chiefly to be an agency to carry out the terms of peace. He was utterly opposed to the interweaving of the Covenant of the League, as Colonel House seems also to have been, since to this fact, according to common report, is to be attributed the break between Colonel House and Mr. Wilson. Indeed, Mr. Lansing directly charges the ex-President with misrepresenting facts to the American people on March 28, 1919, when he assured the public that it was not true that the drafting and interweaving of the Covenant was responsible for delaying the peace. "Why attempt," wrote Mr. Lansing in his diary (which in Paris had a lock upon it besides being always locked in a drawer), "to refute what is manifestly true?" He admits, however, that the ex-President's action may have been due to his having failed to appreciate the exact situation existing at Paris—an alternative not complimentary to the President's acumen.

Mr. Lansing was opposed to the League of Nations as now constituted from the beginning. As far back as May 25, 1916, a year before we went into the war, in a letter to Mr. Wilson he opposed the doctrines of the League to Enforce Peace, declaring with rarely prophetic vision that "popular opinion as well as the Senate would reject" any treaty which limited our independence of action to the will of other nations across the seas. He did not believe that America should bind itself to fight wars abroad at the behest of an international body and leaned to the opinion that the use of force in compelling acceptance of a decision could be avoided by a resort to economic compulsion. He wanted to obviate the necessity of forcing nations to abstain from invading other countries by asking the nations to give a mutual understanding not to impair the territory or the sovereignty of any state. Just as Senator Knox has argued that we should build on the Hague Tribunal, so Mr. Lansing wanted the basic principle for the new organization to be judicial settlement. From the beginning he had valuable constructive criticisms to make. He found, to his grief, on the way to France that political expediency and diplomatic adjustment "tinctured with morality" were to be the President's basis for the settlement of international controversy. In Paris he laid before the President a memorandum on the "Constitutional power to provide coercion in a treaty," in which he declared that any attempt to contract by treaty to create a state of war upon certain contingencies would be unconstitutional, "null and inoperative." But as was frequently the President's habit in dealing with Mr. Lansing, Mr. Wilson neither acknowledged receipt of the covering letter nor of the memorandum, and he did not consult with his Secretary about the matter.

Mr. Lansing thinks that Mr. Wilson's distrust of him came originally from the fact that he is a lawyer. At the conference of the American Peace Commissioners on January 10, 1919, Mr. Wilson bluntly told Mr. Lansing that he "did not intend to have lawyers drafting the treaty of peace." Thereafter, Mr. Lansing, and with him Mr. White and General Bliss, were left much in outer darkness. Mr. Lansing's book contains a picture of these three gentlemen sarcastically entitled "The Daily Conference of the American Peace Commission." This abbreviated Commission often knew very little of what was going on and sometimes ascertained that from members of foreign peace commissions or the press representatives. Yet when Mr. Wilson sailed for Paris Mr. Lansing was left in charge, or in a coregency with Colonel House, and, of course, when the League of Nations Covenant was finished it was largely the work of a lawyer, Mr. David Hunter Miller of New York. It would have been easy for Mr. Wilson to relieve Mr. Lansing if he had lost faith in him on the ground that he was needed in the State Department, but he kept him in Paris, and for patriotic reasons Mr. Lansing hung on although subjected to great humiliation. In his book he discusses the question whether Mr. Wilson can brook criticism or not. He hopes that the President's attitude toward him was due to a misunderstanding of his [Lansing's] motives, but he is compelled to record his belief that Mr. Wilson "was irritated by opposition to his views, however moderately urged, and that he did not like to have his judgment questioned even in a friendly way." Alas, there are dozens upon dozens of others who have come to this same conclusion after personal experience; it is, to date, the sole known reason for Mr. Wilson's throwing over Colonel House, than whom no man ever served his country or his chief more unselfishly or more devotedly. Again, says Mr. Lansing in the course of his portraiture, "He [Mr. Wilson] seemed to lack the ability to forgive one who had in any way offended him or opposed him." And it is also enlightening that "there is in the President's mentality a strange mixture of positiveness and indecision which is almost paradoxical"; "suddenness rather than promptness has always marked his decisions"; "to put off a decision to the last moment is a trait of Mr. Wilson's character." Mr. Lansing's revelations do anything but enhance the credit of Mr. Wilson's personality.

How wide the breach between the two men was appears from each successive chapter. The Secretary of State wanted a carefully thought-out American program to take to Paris; Mr. Wilson took none—he admitted he had not even read the secret treaties which were the key to the whole political side of the struggle. Then they disagreed on self-determination, Mr. Lansing believing that if applied to every case it would become a source of political instability and rebellion. Mr. Lansing was also absolutely opposed to the system of mandates, originated by General Smuts, and he charges that the Allies set afoot a deliberate propaganda to induce the United States to accept mandates over Constantinople and Armenia, both of which would be a heavy burden to the mandatory Power, while reserving for themselves rich and prosperous territories. Those who were engaged in this propaganda did so, Mr. Lansing says, for the purpose of taking "advantage of the unselfishness of the American people and of the altruism and idealism of President Wilson." Then Mr. Lansing, in this case rightly, opposed the President by favoring the speedy negotiation of a preliminary treaty which should contain a set of declarations as to the League of Nations and an agreement for a future international conference to draft the details. Had this policy been adopted and vexed territorial questions left to later negotiation the whole situation of the world would be vastly better today, a financial catastrophe would not be so imminent, and hundreds of thousands of people would have been saved from death by slow starvation.

To the proposed "triple alliance" treaty with France and England Mr. Lansing, General Bliss, and Mr. White were entirely opposed, and the fact that this treaty, which would have bound us to spring to France's rescue *in perpetuo*, has

never had a moment's serious consideration in Washington bears out the correctness of their position. Mr. Lansing declares that this proposed treaty was agreed to by Mr. Wilson solely in order to do away with the French demand for an international military staff and for the creation of an independent Rhenish Republic (with which we are still threatened in March, 1921).

But the classic example of the way Mr. Wilson was betrayed by his expediency and sacrificed everything for the Covenant still remains—Shantung. Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, it appears, went before the Chinese delegation after the President's surrender and said to its members that: the President was very sorry that he had not been able to do more for China but that he had been compelled to accede to Japan's demand "in order *to save the League of Nations.*" Not unnaturally Mr. Lansing describes this in his diary as an "iniquitous bargain" and "a flagrant denial of undoubted right." Mr. Lansing points out that it was the result of secret diplomacy, because the "arguments which prevailed with the President were those to which he listened when in secret council with M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George." So murder will out. Mr. Lansing declares that the Japanese threats were "nothing but bluff," but the President yielded before them as he threw overboard, one after another, all of the Fourteen Points. Even members of the British peace staff bewailed the fact: "they had counted on him to stand firmly by his guns and face down the intriguers."

It is the President's secret diplomacy in Paris that Mr. Lansing most severely criticizes. When the writer of these lines left the Crillon after the indignation meeting of the American correspondents when it became known that Mr. Wilson had surrendered on the open covenants of peace, a distinguished Kansas editor prophetically remarked to him: "It's all up with Mr. Wilson. Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando will now take Mr. Wilson into a private chamber and rob him to their hearts' content, and the outside world will not even hear his cries for mercy." Mr. Lansing on January 29, 1919, remonstrated with the President, declaring that his private conferences were "making a bad impression everywhere." The President heard him in silence. On March 29, Mr. Lansing told his faithful diary that "Secret diplomacy is reaping a new harvest of execrations and condemnations. Will the practice ever cease?" The record of the Paris proceedings he later declared to be one of "the abandonment of principle, of the failure to follow precepts unconditionally proclaimed, of the repudiation by act, if not by word, of a new and better type of international intercourse."

It is no exaggeration to say that if Mr. Lansing, when he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his return from Paris, had blurted out the whole truth he has recorded here, the treaty fight would have ended at least six months earlier. If after its publication now there is any prospect left for an American acceptance of the Covenant we shall be very much surprised. For we believe the reasoning of Mr. Lansing as to the Covenant, the crimes of the treaty, and its fundamental errors to be so sound as to be unanswerable. Expediency may have ruled in Paris; there is no need for it now. Undoubtedly as the financial situation in Europe gets worse we shall be told again that it is all our fault for not accepting Mr. Wilson's handicraft and entering the League—which presupposes our ability to have dominated it had we entered it. Mr. Lansing favored our accepting the treaty. He admits that his position was "paradoxical. I was opposed to the Treaty but signed it and favored its ratification. . . . Even if the Treaty was bad in certain provisions; so long as the President remained inflexible and insistent, its ratification without change seemed a duty to humanity." I still thinks he was right in this position, but in so doi he is guilty of that very expediency of which he accuses t President. We were to swallow monstrous wrongs, to break our own plighted faith so as to get the miserable old treaty done and over with! For the sake of peace we were to become *particeps criminis*. Fortunately, it was not to be, and now we have Briand's word that the treaty is dead.

But this paradoxical position of Mr. Lansing's raises anew the whole question of his own position in Paris. Ought he not to have resigned, particularly after the Shantung outrage? There can be no question that had he done so it would have been to his profit. He himself says that he withheld his resignation because it "would have undoubtedly caused an unfortunate, if not a critical, situation." He bore unbearable slights in order to have the American delegation present an unbroken front in the face of the enemy. But after all he compromised with his conscience. Like so many others he subordinated that conscience to loyalty, and to the outside world sponsored what he knew to be monstrous wrongs; he was betrayed by the hidebound regularity of the place-holder. He is indignant at Mr. Bullitt for what he terms the betrayal of a confidence in telling the Senate Committee what Mr. Lansing's real views were. But at least Mr. Bullitt refused to be a party to the confidence game which was then being worked on the American people—when they were being told that the spurious coin offered them was the pure gold with whic the reconstitution of the world was to be achieved. Loyalt to one's superior and to one's crowd can go much too far. There are times when a man should place his insistence upon serving the right and his soul above all else, and as his decision goes so is his final place in history often fixed. It seems to us that the place for Mr. Lansing to have spoken out was Paris, and the time, March, 1919; not March, 1921. Now he is compelled to write a defense of his paradoxical position. Had he, like Wolsey, served his God as he served his country in Paris, had he refused to compromise, he would today be beyond the need of any defense, and, in his shining righteousness, would have been one of the great patriotic figures of the country.

Moreover, it is quite possible now to speculate as to what would have happened if Mr. Lansing, instead of persuading General Bliss to destroy the letter of resignation which that officer wrote, had joined with him and Mr. Henry White in throwing down the gauntlet to Mr. Wilson. If instead of Mr. Lansing's reasoning with the President those three gentlemen had demanded that they be treated as something else than dummies, under penalty of immediate resignation and a public statement, something would have happened. Similarly, a united front of these three gentlemen on the Shantung issue with the threat of truth telling would have probably stopped that outrage.

We need open diplomacy for a "new and better type of international intercourse," as Mr. Lansing affirms in this book, but even more we need statesmen who will speak o at any cost when statesmanship becomes a magnificent co spiracy against right and justice; we need statesmen and diplomatists who will serve the truth first and last. Those who begin to do so will be among the great men of history.

Exit Georgia

By PAXTON HIBBEN

THE most significant event in connection with the Russion situation that has occurred since the collapse of the Wrangel adventure took place on February 19. Georgia, the last hold of the anti-Bolshevists between India and the Mediterranean and between the White Sea and the Persian Gulf, turned soviet. At the crossroads of the world between East and West, Georgia is the last of the Transcaucasia states that separate Bolshevist Russia from Bolshevist Turkey to succumb to the soviet influence. The event is the culmination of a long campaign of quiet but effective propaganda emanating from the Kremlin, whose strength has been not so much in what Soviet Russia can or will do for the Transcaucasia states as in what the Western European Powers have failed to do for them. For precisely three years the Transcaucasia states have waited upon some action by Peace Conference, Supreme Council, Assembly of the League of Nations, or the individual European governments vitally concerned in maintaining the road to India and the Middle East open for the non-soviet world, to enable them to stand alone. They have waited in vain.

When it is recalled that from Batum, Georgia, on the Black Sea, the route runs which forms the most direct way to Tabriz, Teheran, and all Persia, and that from Batum, through Baku and across the Caspian to Krasnavodsk, is the shortest way from Western Europe to Bokhara, Khiva, Afghanistan, and all northern India, the importance of the conversion of Georgia to the soviet idea is apparent. The "all rail route to India" via the Syrian desert and southern Persia, for which Great Britain arranged with France on December 23, is a mere makeshift intended to discount the loss of the one natural route that has served mankind for countless centuries—that across the Transcaucasian isthmus. From a political standpoint it is not that Russia has gained so much—the road to Persia, Bokhara, Afghanistan, and India has been open to the Soviets since the annihilation of the Denikin army a year ago. What is significant is that the political influences which are opposing bolshevism have lost their last base of operations in the Middle East, anywhere.

There is not—or at least there should not be—anything surprising in the sovietization of the Georgian Republic. It has been coming for a long time, and those in Europe who have given the matter even superficial consideration must have been aware of it. On November 11, 1919, I filed a press dispatch to the Chicago *Tribune* describing the abortive attempt to effect a bolshevist revolution in Georgia which even then only failed by the narrowest margin. My message was stopped at Constantinople by Admiral Bristol, who sent Commander Haynes to Tiflis to ask me what I meant by trying to send such a dispatch. I tried to convince Commander Haynes that the message was true in every detail, that Georgia was even then ripe for revolution, and that if any serious attempt were made to bring about a change of government in Georgia it would probably succeed. I told him that the Georgian army was shot through with bolshevism and could not be counted upon to resist the soviet influence, and quite a number of other things which are plain to anyone, now. Commander Haynes got most of his information from Russian Czarist refugees, and would believe nothing else; so my message was never passed. Nevertheless, a serious attempt at a soviet revolution has been made in Georgia at last, and has succeeded. On March 10, even Batum, under the very guns of the Allied Black Sea fleet, went soviet with little struggle. So much for censorship.

Since November 11, 1919, a great many things have happened in Transcaucasia; but none of them has strengthened the position of the Bolshevists' opponents. Denikin was defeated. Wrangel made his attempt and failed miserably. Mr. Colby wrote his celebrated note of August 11, 1920, in which he refused to recognize "the independence of the so-called republics of Georgia and Azerbaijan." The Armenian and Georgian Republics were refused admission to the League of Nations. Mustapha Kemal swept into Armenia and conquered the country in contempt of President Wilson's "arbitration" of the Armenian boundary with Turkey. Most significant of all, the Moslem Republic of Azerbaijan on April 28, 1920, by a comparatively bloodless revolution within the country, and not through any invasion by the Red army of Russia, turned bolshevist—and liked it.

The defection of Azerbaijan was the most serious blow to the anti-bolshevists not only in Transcaucasia and the Near East generally, but also in Western Europe. Not only did it furnish the partisans of communism a base of operations from which India, Persia, and Turkey could readily be reached, but it provided a local Red army, recruited among the Tartars of Azerbaijan, with which whatever military operations might seem advisable could be carried out with no drain on the armed forces of Soviet Russia, proper. There has been a concerted effort in press dispatches to show that a large Russian Red army has been maintained in Transcaucasia. On January 12, for example, the New York *Times* published a Constantinople dispatch stating that "the Eleventh Soviet Russian Army had been withdrawn from Armenia and that the bolshevist troops in Georgia had likewise been ordered out." Of course there were no "bolshevist troops in Georgia" and eye-witnesses who have just arrived from Tiflis inform me that the bolshevist troops in Armenia were not from Russia at all, but from Baku. It was the radical Russian and Armenian workmen in the oil fields of Azerbaijan who effected the revolution in that country and who were at once formed into a soviet army for Transcaucasian use.

The most serious blow to the anti-Bolshevists in the defection of Azerbaijan was, however, the fact that comparative prosperity followed the sovietization of Azerbaijan. Where the British during their occupation of Transcaucasia, between November, 1918, and July 15, 1920, had kept the oil wells of Baku closed in an effort to break the oil land owners and thus force them to sell their holdings to British capitalists for a song, Soviet Russia opened up the oil fields again and 60,000 idle and discontented workmen were once more able to earn enough to live on. Of course, Soviet Russia profited by the oil; but the concrete example of material prosperity following the adoption of a soviet system was worth far more to the communists than fuel oil. It was the oil of successful propaganda, and the Russian

agents scattered throughout Transcaucasia lost nothing of the talking advantage that this fact gave them. In an Armenia without other food than that furnished through American charity; without adequate means of defense against their secular enemies, the Turks; with no agricultural implements, beasts of burden, or other means of material rehabilitation; overrun with almost half a million pathetic and helpless refugees from Turkish Armenia, whose presence further impoverished an already destitute land, propaganda of this nature was bound to be irresistible. Independent since 1918, recognized by the United States *de facto* on April 23, 1920, the Armenians, with amazing patience and faith in the promises of America and Western Europe, had resisted every communist influence. Mr. Colby's categorical pronouncement, on August 11, 1920, in respect of "Finland proper, ethnic Poland, and such territory as may by agreement form a part of the Armenian state," that "the aspirations of these nations for independence are legitimate," seemed to hold forth a definite prospect of urgently needed material aid.

At that very hour, however, the Turkish Nationalists were preparing an offensive against the Armenian Republic. Pleas and appeals for assistance launched broadcast by the Armenian Government brought only fine phrases. Late in October the attack began. On November 4 Kars fell and the victorious Turkish army swept through Armenia virtually unresisted. The lesson was unmistakable: Azerbaijan had prospered by adopting communism. By fighting communism, Armenia had been destroyed. On December 6, therefore, the proletariat of Armenia rose in revolt against a government whose best men spent most of their time in Paris or Geneva or San Remo or London, following the Supreme Council about begging for help which never came. The Socialist Soviet Republic of Armenia was proclaimed.

Only Georgia remained. With Georgia, the pressure of poverty and economic anarchy had never been so great as with Azerbaijan and Armenia. There were, it is true, several hundred thousand refugees in Georgia also—mostly anti-bolshevist Russians who had fled to Tiflis with what wealth they could carry, non-producers, useless alike for work or war. But Georgia has two outlets on the sea, at Batum and Poti, and a certain amount of foodstuffs and necessary supplies could be obtained from the Western world. The Georgians were pinched, certainly, and their paper money being valueless outside Transcaucasia they had difficulty in paying for what they required from abroad.

But Georgia produces the best manganese in the world and manganese is greatly in demand; manganese was therefore bartered for food and materials of first necessity. Georgia had not formed the very frontier and fighting ground of war from 1914 to 1920, as had Armenia and Azerbaijan. The returning troops of the disintegrated Russian Caucasus army, who swept northward after the bolshevist revolution of 1918, destroying as they went, passed Georgia by while they laid waste what war had left standing in Armenia and Azerbaijan. Georgia, too, had a railroad which connected the interior with the Black Sea and, through Azerbaijan (when there happened to be peace between the two countries), with the Caspian. What industries the Russians had established in Transcaucasia were in Georgia. Tiflis, a city of a quarter of a million before the war, grown almost to a million from the influx of refugees, boasts electric lights, electric street cars, factories, mills, a grand opera, a Russian ballet, and excellently paved, well-laid-out streets. What prosperity had escaped the blight of war in Transcaucasia was centered in Georgia.

The Government, albeit a socialist republic, was far from bolshevist. Some of the best educated and cleverest political figures of Imperial Russia were in the Georgian Government, and they were intelligent enough to see that socialism was the order of the day and to accept the socialistic trend. Large estates were confiscated. The manganese mines and the silk cocoon crop, constituting together the principal sources of revenue from exports, were nationalized and the proceeds of their sale applied to the purchase of supplies by the Georgian Government. The great private clubs with their ornate gardens were thrown open to all comers for a few cents' admission. A seat at the opera cost eight cents, and everybody went. On the whole, a distinct effort was made in Georgia to meet the demands of the more radical element while at the same time retaining a form of government with which the Western European nations would be willing to deal.

President Jordania, with his long record of service to the doctrines of Karl Marx, inspired confidence in the radicals, while Eugene Gueguechekori, a young man of marked culture and cosmopolitanism, who acted as President during the almost permanent illness of Jordania, treated with the various European missions according to the best traditions of Western diplomacy. David Ghambashidze, plenipotentiary of Georgia in London and Paris, was a man of the world who inspired the fullest confidence in the stability of his Government and the good sense of his compatriots. Even the reactionary French could scarcely shy at a government in which Prince Napoleon Murat, a great-great grandson of Napoleon's marshal and first cousin of Prince Joachim Murat, Senator of France, held a high place in the ministry for foreign affairs.

There was therefore every reason why the European Powers should, from their point of view, do all in their power to aid the menshevist government of Georgia to maintain itself, and none why Georgia should have been left to be overwhelmed by the rising tide of communism. Yet they did not. Every policy, every act of Britain, France, and Italy in Georgia from the beginning of the British occupation, immediately after the armistice in 1918, and following the departure of the German mission to Transcaucasia on October 12, 1918, until the final reluctant withdrawal of the British troops last July, was calculated to exploit the country to the maximum, to reduce both Government and people to a degree of poverty and want so desperate that this wholesale exploitation might be the more cheaply and more readily compassed.

The crudity with which the Georgian Republic and the Georgian people were held up and looted is scarcely believable. There were three Allied "missions" in Tiflis when we arrived in the late summer of 1919, going full swing—British, French, and Italian. They were there in a blaze of war-like uniforms—bankers, promoters, engineers, who had never seen a gun or heard a shot fired, and whose general's stars were shiny new—to impress the natives with their importance and authority. Their business was concession hunting—mining rights, water rights, railway concessions, municipal contracts, loan flotations—anything not nailed down. For its independence Georgia must mortgage itself, body, boots, and breeches, for generations to come, by much the same method of protected foreign capital investment as Venizelos had pledged in Greece as the price of his continued premiership.

The great copper mines of Alaverdi, in the Borchalo district, immediately south of Tiflis, were the capital prize. No sooner had the Allied missions arrived in Georgia than their intrigues to secure possession of this valuable property brought on a ten days' war between Armenia and Georgia, which Gen. Sir W. Rycroft ended by erecting Borchalo into a neutral zone. The French thereupon secured the mines from the Armenians, but the British countered by awarding the disputed district, mines and all, to Georgia, without the knowledge of the French. It was this anomalous situation, in which nationalistic passions had been artificially stimulated from without, which finally led to the hostilities between Soviet Armenia and Georgia, just ended with the sovietization of Georgia.

Similar procedure was followed by the Allied missions over the manganese mines of Mingrelia, the tobacco fields of Sukhum, the silk orchards of Kutais, and everything else of value or prospective value in the Georgian Republic. It was a scramble, with each mission undercutting the others, intriguing, cajoling, offering bribes of influence with the Peace Conference to obtain commercial prizes, or threatening the partition of Georgia among the other Transcaucasian states to prevent a concession going to rival interests. The British specialized in loans. A brigadier general represented a well-known financial house in London, with the aim of tying Georgia up by some such permanent mortgage as the Anglo-Persian agreement of August, 1919. The French specialized in mines, while the Italians, with an eye to immediate turnover, sold rifles, ammunition, and shoes captured from the Austrians to Georgians, Azerbaijanians, and Armenians without favoritism, to equip armies in each country to fight the others.

And in this process of exploitation the Transcaucasian ruble (based, after all, on quite as sound a foundation as pound, franc, or lira) was hammered down by the concerted action of three great Powers until its market value was little more than that of Confederate money. Then with their paper pounds, francs, and lire, they bought labor at a dollar a month and despoiled a poverty-stricken and desperate people of their last personal valuables—jewelry, rugs, furs, silver—which the Georgians were forced to sell for bread. In Batum I counted sixty bales of ten priceless Persian rugs, each, which one Allied army officer had bought and was shipping home. He had passed them through the Georgian customs duty free by declaring them as army blankets!

With a get-rich-quick opportunity like this within reach, none of the European nations wanted to see Georgia made economically stable by the advance of adequate credits to enable the little republic to begin its own regeneration. And resist as they would the efforts of these advance agents of civilization to strip their country of the last resources upon which it must depend for admission on a practicable basis to the markets of the world, the Georgians were forced to yield little by little—a concession here, a mining right there, a municipal contract or an order for railway rolling stock. And with each grant yielded, the avidity of the exploiters grew. The cash to enable the Georgian Government to pay its army, to employ its idle and grumbling workmen, to reduce its ruinous taxes, was withheld always a little longer to permit some belated profiteer to get in on the ground floor. It is the same policy which the Entente Powers have followed with every little nation, from Poland and Greece to Azerbaijan and Siam, since the armistice.

In the case of Georgia, which is merely typical, the goose was laying the golden eggs. But the representatives of Western Europe were blind to the increasing thousands in Georgia who did not know where their next meal was to come from. I saw families who had known every luxury—and who had never known anything else—thrown into the streets because they could no longer pay a rent of $5 per month. And when I went to the landlord to protest against such cruelty, I found him living in a great house from which he was slowly stripping the furniture, the table linen, the silver, room by room, to keep from starving.

It was horrible, grotesque, topsy-turvy. The country was rich, the people eager to work. They had their outlet on the sea (when the British finally evacuated it) to ship their products abroad, and their products were in demand in the world's markets. Yet by a combination of spoliation—a stupid combination, that killed the goose of the golden eggs—the country was robbed instead of being helped to its feet. The same is true of Greece, of Poland, of Austria, of Serbia, of Syria, of Persia—and will be true of Turkey, if Mustapha Kemal permits it.

Of course, in Georgia it could not last. Soviet Russia was too near at hand. Communism may not be desirable, but to many it is preferable to economic slavery. The example of Azerbaijan was there at hand, where an escape from Western European exploitation to communism had meant prosperity. The patience of the Georgians ended. After three years of waiting, the Supreme Allied Council finally, a month ago, recognized Georgia as *de jure* an independent nation.

It was too late. The operation was successful—but the patient died.

Acquaintance

By DAVID MORTON

All that we know of April is her way
  Of coming on the world through gentle springs,
Turning the hedge a whitening line of spray,
  Staining the grass with shivered, golden things.
She has a way of rain against the sun,
  Of moonlit orchards, ghostly white and still,
And the slow, silver coming, one by one,
  Of burning stars above a purple hill.

And this is all we know of such as she,
  These shining names she leaves for us to call:
The whitening hedge, the showery apple tree,
  And golden jonquils gathering by a wall. . . .
All that we know of April is her way,
  And these bright legends we have learned to say.

The second article in the series on Mexico—1921 by Paul Hanna, entitled A Labor Republic, will appear in the forthcoming issue of THE NATION.

Unemployment and Closed Shop in Cohoes

By CEDRIC LONG

COHOES, New York, has an unsavory reputation in both labor and social welfare circles. It is a textile city. It is a city owned by absentee landlords. Like so many communities that produce great wealth, it is indescribably dirty, ramshackle, unkempt. The rest of the State is quite in order if it asks how and why all this happens.

There is no finer water power anywhere than that of the Mohawk River just before it empties into the Hudson. Outsiders went there years ago and bought the rights to that power. They also bought up a great deal of land. Today these outsiders own one of the largest hydro-electric plants in the country, millions of dollars' worth of land, buildings and machinery, and hundreds of the tenements in which the workers live. The people of Cohoes own almost nothing. The local newspaper is supported by outside advertisers. There is no real public library in town, no reading room, no decent hotel or restaurant, no Y. M. C. A. A Salvation Army station leads a precarious existence; and this winter an outside evangelist has been giving the Protestant population twenty-eight consecutive days of hellfire-and-brimstone religion. The worker of Cohoes, in order to make a living, mortgages very much of his body and soul to non-residents, and now unemployment takes from this worker even his right to make a living—all of which requires an explanation.

During the war the textile industry prospered. Cohoes ran its thirty cotton, shoddy, batting, and woolen underwear mills to capacity, manufacturing surgical gauze, cotton batting, and woolen underwear. Between 4,500 and 5,000 men and women were employed at this work. Profits were high, wages good, and the city prospered. Workers paid their bills and laid up savings and it was not until the late spring of 1920 that real depression began.

But within the industry itself labor history was being made. Previous to the war, the manufacturers had, of course, taught their help the good American lesson which demonstrates that competition leads to success. The workers competed valiantly for jobs and for favor in the eyes of the boss. They competed, but wages went steadily downward and the speed of the machinery increased. A few of the wisest among them began to realize that the truly successful competitor in all this was the owner of the industry; and a union was started. But war came along and brought good fortune to the workers. Formerly they had competed for jobs; now the jobs grew in number and competed for workers. The bosses vied with one another for the favor of the men and bid against each other for labor. Wages went up and organizing activity was not discouraged. By 1919, the United Textile Workers had almost 100 per cent of the industry unionized. The workers, for the first time in their history, had economic power.

And yet, economic power is not economic understanding. There are 3,000 workers in the twenty woolen mills of the city alone. By late spring of 1920 orders came to the manufacturers in smaller volume than formerly. A few orders were canceled. Some of the manufacturers began to wonder if all was right with the market. Labor, however, was blindly optimistic. When the little independent union of mule spinners found a grievance with the powerful United Textile Workers over a matter of death benefit to the family of a deceased worker, warfare started between the two labor groups and the U. T. W. struck for a closed shop. The bosses tried some conciliatory methods at first, hoping that good times might continue if serious labor trouble could be averted.

Finally, the manufacturers saw the inevitability of a dead market. They decided to put the blame for unemployment upon labor. Therefore, when the union leaders came around next time and talked closed shop, they complied. On July 6 the woolen mills of the city were closed to all union members; and workers were told that they must apply to the office individually for jobs. A handful drifted back, worked spasmodically for a few days or a few weeks, and, with one exception, the mills closed down entirely. The industry was headed at full speed for an abyss; the union got the entire credit throughout the city for pushing it over the edge, for throwing thousands of God-fearing men and women out of work, for taking bread from the mouths of women and children, for creating eight months of unemployment. Priest, newspaper editor and preacher, storekeeper and mill foreman will tell you that the workers are floundering in a hole of their own digging, and many of the workers half believe it. In the early autumn the Harmony Cotton Mills gradually closed down and threw 1,500 more out of work. Since most of these also belong to the union, they likewise were held responsible for their own unemployment. The bosses got the credit for good times, the workers for bad.

Recently the manufacturers, textile and others, in the cities of Troy, Cohoes, and Waterford have united in a Tri-City Manufacturers' Association for the more effective waging of their open-shop campaign. Their secretary is a man who revels in unemployment and union-baiting. When he left the Poughkeepsie Manufacturers' Association office to take up work in Cohoes, the labor body of that city gave him a send-off in the form of a little pamphlet especially devoted to the exposure of his union-breaking methods and to warn Cohoes unionists against him.

To date this open-shop campaign is highly successful. The textile workers have no fighting power whatever. Troy collar workers have never been successfully organized, anyway. At present this Manufacturers' Association is conducting a fight against two or three smaller miscellaneous industries which are on strike—the millions of dollars of the Manufacturers' Association pitted against the staying power of a few score workers. Newspapers report that one factory is patrolled by State guards, each guard accompanied by a police dog. And meanwhile there are thousands of unemployed walking the streets of these cities, anyone of whom may have a job in these factories by applying to the Tri-City Manufacturers' employment bureau.

This secretary informed me that his office was a "clearing house for information" about workers (the union leaders already know it for a black-list office). I asked about discrimination. "We don't object to unions, but of course none of our members would hire a man who has been agitating and getting his name in the papers and that sort of thing." I thought of the Association of Textile Manufacturers in Passaic and their "employment office," which is today the center for a vast network of espionage covering the entire

toward neutralizing the acid in the maneuvers of the Bourne-Gasquet anti-Irish group in Catholic Italy, at least.

O'Riordan was the most philosophical intelligence which I have ever encountered. I had a chance to weigh and judge him, when we for weeks were fellow-patients in the Blue Nuns' hospital on the fringe of the Roman Campagna. He at the time was in his final sickness, and was philosophically traveling a tortuous road to death. His place as rector of the Irish College was subsequently taken by his more fiery assistant, that brilliant historian, Father O'Hagan. For years O'Hagan has been digging historical references to Ireland from the deep and little explored soil of the Vatican archives. Long buried documents have yielded up to him diplomatic secrets, whose public telling would not always rub the tiger fur of Catholic Ireland's national sensitiveness the right way. Once I asked an American friend of Father O'Hagan whether or not the fearless Irish priest intended to publish his findings. With his reply I close this already too lengthy letter.

"Don't you know," the American answered, "that diplomacy is the hand that publishes or fails to publish history! Will Father O'Hagan give the world his revealing notes on past Anglo-Vatican diplomacy? That depends upon circumstance. I would say that publication is not in the lap of the gods—or God—but in the lap of the diplomats."

New York, March 11 JOHN HEARLEY

The Prime Object of Industry

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Mr. Colcord's interesting article in your issue of March 16 he makes a sharp distinction between Capitalist and Communist industry. His distinction holds between a communist theory *at its best* and a capitalist system as administered by thoroughly selfish men. Why not compare each with the other at its best?

At present, of course, most men under any system are thinking first of getting their living and do not ask what their object in life is. They are animals before they come to act and think as men. Our real question, therefore, is what the mature and thinking men who are working any industrial scheme think of it and use it for? May I say then, as one brought up in the capitalist system (the truer name for it is the Free system), that I cannot recollect the time when I understood "that its prime object is to make money for its shareholders." I was brought up to believe that the object of every decent industry is the common welfare, that success in any industry is tested primarily by the abundance and the excellence of its product, that whether a man gets much or little money, his getting it is a shame unless he contributes something useful for human welfare. We were told that we must earn our living; this meant to do our part in the work of the world; moreover, we must be generous in our work and give "good measure, pressed down and running over."

Thousands of people were brought up with this idea of industry. I cannot see why the possession of capital is inconsistent with it, provided the individual does not claim as his own, to do as he pleases with, the common gifts of nature, such as lands, mines, water, etc. Do we need any other distinction than this, which lies between private capital, such as individuals produce, and communal or public capital, in which all men should share?

He must be very unfortunate (even as things are now) who does not know men and women who are engaged in all kinds of industry, with a fairly clear understanding of the real object of their work. Can there be any satisfaction to a man, as soon as he crosses the line from the animal to manhood, in finding that he is only a parasite on human society? That this is not yet generally understood is only another demonstration, just like the Great War, how far the world is still from genuine civilization.

Mr. Colcord closes his article well with the words: "We cannot understand the system unless we know what it is intended to do." May I suggest that we do not yet understand how beautiful a free social order may be. There are object-lessons already to show how the dreams of both individualists and socialists may be combined in some kind of free cooperation. But surely nothing that we know of history promises that we shall ever arrive at a higher plane of welfare by any method of violence or compulsion or constraint, whether at the hands of arrogant capitalists, who hold the reins over legislatures and congresses, or of other equally arrogant communists, who despise common people and claim dictatorial power over a whole nation.

Jamaica Plain, Mass., March 16 CHARLES F. DOLE

Why the Socialist Vote Shrank

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Outsiders, they say, see most of the game, so perhaps an interested observer from this side of the border who gained his first insight of industrial problems during a residence for some years in the United States can offer some explanation of the falling off in the Socialist vote. In the first place an increasing number of class-conscious workers, who otherwise would be disposed to support a Socialist candidate, have lost all faith in the political movement and advocate direct action for the overthrow of capitalism. But probably a greater factor is the falling away of the large class calling themselves Socialists without any clear-cut conception of genuine Socialist ideals, who in times of storm and pressure cannot stand the acid tests of social ostracism, the blacklist, or the boycott. Socialism in fair weather times has always attracted a number of soreheads, cherishing a vague dissatisfaction on purely personal grounds with existing conditions, and also many sentimentalists, who fancy themselves Socialists because they entertain a pious hope that the lot of the working class may be somewhat alleviated without interfering with the comfort of the propertied class or entailing any considerable inconvenience on themselves. The Socialist vote in the past has always been largely a protest vote, and this fact accounts in a great measure for the disappointing action of the German workingmen in supporting the war. The number of Socialists in Germany at that time was supposed to be 4,000,000. Had half that number been genuine class-conscious Socialists there would have been no war. We can see now that the returns of elections in normal times are deceptive and illusory as a test of the strength of socialism. Just as most of the German Socialists so-called forsook their principles to howl with the wolves under pressure of government intimidation or the influence of mob psychology, so the weak-kneed, the half-instructed, and the sentimentalists of American and Canadian socialism have been scared back into political orthodoxy by the bogy of bolshevism, skilfully exploited by the intellectual parasites of capitalism.

The shrinkage in the Socialist vote need neither surprise nor discourage anyone. It ought to have been discounted in advance. There is a valuable lesson in it which Socialists should take to heart. Instead of running election campaigns to make votes, they should be run to make Socialists—that is, purely as means of propaganda. It gets us nowhere to poll a large vote of mere malcontents, political indifferentists, and sentimental "friends of labor" uninstructed in the philosophy of socialism, who are sure to fall away when a crisis arises. In the present state of public opinion the only use we should have for elections lies in the opportunity they present for the inculcation of Socialist principles. To emulate the course of the old-party politicians by minimizing or keeping them in the background and putting the soft pedal on class-consciousness may win temporary and local victories, but can never permanently advance the cause.

Oakville, Ont., Canada, March 9 PHILLIPS THOMPSON

Victory

By LEONORA SPEYER

Day is the heart's red field,
And many an anguish there
Is lost or won,
And many a hope lies hopeless in the sun;
But night the conqueror kind,
Spreads its blessed treaty of the stars,
Where the heart's peace is signed.

Under the moon's white flag
I meet my ambushed dreams,
I see the foe—
Whom I have faced and put to flight, I know!—
Yielding his hosts to me;
And in strong, vanquished hands I lay
My weeping victory.

Books

Mr. Choate

The Life of Joseph Hodges Choate: As Gathered Chiefly from His Letters. By Edward Sandford Martin. Charles Scribner's Sons.

MR. CHOATE is one of the cherished possessions of the American people. Partly this is due to the joy of creation, for we have helped to make the humorist whom we love to quote. Yet it matters little that Mr. Choate said but a part of all that is attributed to him. Tradition with customary art has confined its overlay to anecdote that is characteristic—"qui fut dans son cœur sinon sur ses lèvres." The man we remember best is not so much the lawyer and the public official as the charming entertainer. This places Mr. Choate less with Mr. Root and Mr. Hughes than with Mark Twain, "Joe" Jefferson, and Mr. Crothers—a blend of all three, though in unequal proportions. Much of his public service was rendered in his congenial role of entrepreneur of enthusiasm for many good causes. Yet, lavishly as he spent himself in this way, he gave to an arduous professional career an unflagging industry that few can rival. This is the major impression made by these two volumes. They begin with an unfinished autobiography which gives Mr. Choate's reminiscences of his boyhood and early manhood. The rest consists chiefly of Mr. Choate's letters to his family, with here and there a newspaper account or an excerpt from a speech or address and a bit of binder by Mr. Martin.

Most of the letters are to Mrs. Choate. Necessarily they give an incomplete and one-sided picture of Mr. Choate and his work. A man writes to his wife when he is separated from her. For Mr. Choate these separations usually came in the summer when he stayed in the hot city, engrossed in the infinite details of complicated lawsuits. So what we hear most about is a hard-working lawyer who greatly misses his wife. All of the letters tell much more of what Mr. Choate is doing than of what he is thinking. They give little evidence of that interest in literature or philosophy so essential to the highest intrinsic value in personal correspondence. They owe their interest mainly to our interest in Mr. Choate when he was not writing letters. Mr. Choate, as he impressed himself upon his friends and upon the public, is more unique, more vital, and more enduring than Mr. Choate writing of his daily routine. It is a pity that Mr. Martin, with his rare gifts, should have remained so largely the editor and chronicler instead of becoming more the biographer. Wherever he ventures to relax his restraint, he makes us regret the more that he subjected himself to any self-denying ordinance. The letters would have been more effective as illustrative material than as the principal part of the record. This conviction which one has from the beginning is riveted by the concluding chapter which quotes largely from the tributes paid to Mr. Choate after his death. His was a life to be written as it was seen and appreciated by the audience rather than from behind the curtain.

This is not to say that the letters lack interest. The picture of village life in New York City in the fifties and sixties has the charm of an old print. The fights against Tammany are reminders that history repeats itself. The accounts of the way law was practiced before lawyers became mostly business men show why the bar as a profession was once a public career. The letters from England give a sympathetic picture of English homes and English functions. Mr. Choate's love of Harvard and all its associations, his interest in international understanding, his devotion to the many civic and charitable causes to which he gave so much of his time, bring home to us the delight and the value of such a spirit as his. From first to last one is impressed with the refreshing absence of any cant or vanity in Mr. Choate. He was little conscious of himself. He did his part as he saw it, without philosophizing about it. Success in his profession he took seriously, without taking himself seriously. For all his playfulness and lightness of touch, the sense of duty that came from Salem continued to cling close to him in New York. Doubtless it gave him pleasure to give pleasure to others, but his consent to attend dinners and make speeches was often given with reluctance and only because he found it hard to withhold a service. Those who envy his success will be interested to note his ante-prandial misgivings, his care in preparing himself, and his regret when, as he puts it, "I had to travel largely on my muscle." It may be not all in jest that he remarks that during a long life time he has "cultivated the habit of speaking without saying anything." He was not given to being too profound for those who had dined heavily. Yet it would be wrong to think of him as solely or chiefly a fun-maker. By and large his speeches were directed toward smoothing the way for enterprises which he had at heart.

When Mr. Choate was in England as ambassador, both President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay desired him to act as counsel for the United States in the Alaska Boundary Dispute. With his fine instinct for the amenities, the ambassador felt acutely the impropriety of being guest, negotiator, and hostile advocate at one and the same time. Though the President and the Secretary deferred to his reluctance, Mr. Hay wrote that neither of them sympathized with it. Perhaps the Secretary was merely loyal to his chief. Perhaps the point, which seems so obvious, is more readily appreciated by a lawyer than by a layman, particularly when the layman is a client. Mr. Choate could love Mr. Roosevelt without emulating the less lovely strains in his make-up. In 1896 he wrote: "Tonight I am to dine again at the Wolcott's to meet those jingling jingoes, Cabot Lodge and Theodore Roosevelt, both of whom I think would like very much *the fun* of a war with England." In his attitude toward war with Germany, Mr. Choate was with the President rather than with his vehement critic. After the sinking of the Lusitania he writes that "the Germans, so far as we can guess, seem to be taking the President's last note in a kindly way, and I have no fear of any war between us and them." As events moved, he moved with them, and became eager for our participation in the conflict. But even then he did not antedate his hindsight. In a letter to Lord Grey in April, 1917, he says that we must give President Wilson "credit for one signal result of his watchful waiting, and that is, that he was waiting to see when the whole nation would be wrought up to the point which has now been reached, so that he could safely announce to the world our alliance with France and Great Britain without any practical dissent." The un-Rooseveltian temper in which he took the war is evident from his address to the Allied Mission three days before his death. "I feared at one time," he says, "that we might enter it for some selfish purpose, for the punishment of aggression against our individual, national, personal rights,

city and environs and costing thousands of dollars a month. The Tri-City Manufacturers' Association is still young. In time it will doubtless develop the effectiveness of similar organizations in Passaic, Duquesne, Pennsylvania, and the Virginia coal fields. It has not yet begun wholesale espionage simply because it has not met the resistance which warrants such extensive methods. Upstate labor is extremely conservative; unemployment is prevalent. The opening of this office under such circumstances is a compliment.

A 22½ per cent cut in wages is scheduled for all textile mills upon resumption of work. Open shop is also on the schedule, of course. Huge bills to the grocer, the coal dealer, the landlord haunt many of the workers night and day. While they look ahead to all this, they are wandering about in a city of mean, small tenements, no recreation except the cheap movies, dirty streets, bleak winds, and a pervasive atmosphere of pessimism and gloom. Of the 7,500 wage earners in the city one-third have been idle since last summer, approximately two-thirds since autumn, yet the Polish, Russian, and Italian populations have devised methods of saving money. The sufferers are American and French Canadian, and even these run deeply into debt and endure extreme hardships before they withdraw their savings from the banks. It seems incredible that a city of 23,000 people, after many months without income, should have between eleven and twelve thousand savings accounts in its banks, and that not a store should have been forced to close its doors.

The working man of Cohoes, *as an individual,* is not, generally, experiencing any real physical hardship. He could continue his present manner of life for several weeks more. His worst suffering is mental and spiritual. He has continual cause for worry about the future of his family and himself. But the working man, *as union member,* is suffering severely. His organization is down in the mud and being trampled upon and everyone knows it and says so. In place of the spirit of independence which belongs to a man who carries a union card and fights beside his fellow-worker for decent living conditions there is now humiliation and anger. Doubtless the textile union of Cohoes was a very feeble affair, lacking in real leadership, a remnant of the worst traditions of antiquated unionism; but it was the instrument he had used to raise himself from a position of abject poverty and servility. He never philosophized much about capital and labor; he was willing to be patronized a good deal by his boss, and he thought of a "class war" only as a mental concoction of anarchists. But he now has a developing hatred of certain vague forces which conspire to push him back to where he was ten years ago. The press, some of his friends, the churches, all tell him that he, with his union, caused this trouble. The movies and the school teacher repeat the charge to his children. Are they right? He joins a few of his fellow-unionists for long talks in the union hall and together they try to untangle the great puzzle.

Meanwhile, the manufacturers, some and perhaps all of the ministers and priests, the bankers, many of the merchants, are happy and comfortable. Optimism prevails throughout the center of the city. Wages are back to normal, the open shop is an accomplished fact, the old "rights" are restored, labor domination is ended. What looked to the manufacturers like a tremendous financial crisis turns out to be an unemployment godsend. One druggist says the people are quite comfortable and affirms that he is losing no business. "I am cutting prices on goods, doing five times normal business, and making at least 30 per cent profit on everything." Furthermore, the machinery for maintaining normal labor conditions is now established and running smoothly. If labor becomes fractious, a little lubrication and careful manipulation of this machinery will render it as effective as that in Passaic or Lawrence or Bethlehem. For the black list leads to under-cover work, provocation, and possible violence as inevitably as armament on the part of competitor nations leads to war. The manufacturers, to be sure, are blind to the future; sufficient unto today is the knowledge that unemployment has brought them the Open Shop.

During the past few weeks the Harmony Mills have slowly begun operations again and 1,500 workers will gradually fit back into the places before their machines. These men and women have work at reduced wages; they lose the organization which lifted them from utter misery to a height where they could see some hope in life. There is work—and bitterness. And the stage set for future trouble if the spirit of independence breaks out again.

Other textile centers are resuming work gradually. They have had long periods of unemployment. Other industries the nation over are in much the same position. Is unemployment throughout the United States merely an introductory chapter to a fiercer warfare between Capital and Labor than we have yet witnessed? Certain political forces in New York State are strongly urging the abolition of the State Employment Service. Is this for the purpose of placing employment facilities in the hands of other manufacturers' associations and black-listing agencies? Are hundreds of thousands of workers who were good union members a few months back and who have been turned into the streets by the industrial crisis to be sifted carefully through the sieve of the open shop, union-baiting Garys, and William Woods, and Atterburys of industry? Cohoes is an indication that this is to become a general policy.

And what future has this little mill city just north of Albany? The United Textile Workers is notorious for its indifferent or reactionary leadership of the hard-pressed textile workers of the country. Yet the future of Cohoes, like the future of Pittsburgh or Paterson, depends upon the virility and intelligence of its workers and their leaders. Absentee landlords care nothing for Cohoes. The workers live in the midst of this squalor, small-town politics, unhygienic moral conditions, hell-fire evangelistic campaigns, sordid business life. Until they can formulate their aspirations in terms as unmistakable as those of the Tri-City Manufacturers' Association, and put them into practice, the textile workers of the Spindle City have a sorry future before them.

Contributors to This Issue

PAUL HANNA is the Washington correspondent of the Federated Press. He has just returned from a sojourn in Mexico undertaken at the behest of *The Nation* for a careful study of the political and economic situation there.

PAXTON HIBBEN is a student of Eastern affairs. He accompanied the Harbord Mission to Armenia and was Associated Press correspondent in Greece, 1915-1917.

CEDRIC LONG is field secretary of the New York State Consumers' League.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter, being a person of modest income, had enthusiastically joined the people's buying strike, and rejoiced in its apparent success. Recently, having become threadbare, he decided to desist. A Fifth Avenue department store which in recent months had opened a "Men's Shop," first attracted him. A gorgeous affair, the Drifter found it, but on discovering suits from $65 up decided it was not for him. He next ventured to his place of yesteryear's purchase, having noted with pleasure its alluring full-page advertisements, which described suits at "$50 and more." Slightly pained at finding next to nothing at less than $75, he called to the clerk's attention that prices were as high as last year. "We've come down," the salesman assured him placidly. "But how so?" replied the Drifter; "last spring I paid $70 for a suit here and these prices are now just the same or a trifle higher." "Oh well, they really are lower," responded the clerk, "the quality is better."

* * * * * *

NOW the Drifter, resolving that his long abstinence and resultant shabbiness should not be in vain, passed on to a great emporium on Madison Avenue, synonymous with the latest and best in men's clothing. Here, too, he found the late sixties and the seventies as the price level. Again he interrogated. "Yes, prices *are* lower," the clerk told him easily. "This line, for instance, was $75 last year; now it is $68." The Drifter inquired whether the clothes were all wool, and upon prompt assurance that they were, wondered aloud that the reduction was so slight. "The bottom has dropped out of the price of raw wool, labor is coming down," he urged. The clerk was ready for him. "Well, wool does not represent more than 10 to 15 per cent of the price anyhow. Labor is the big item, and that has not come down as yet." But the Drifter, disillusioned and cynical, turned on his heel and walked out, firmly resolved to continue his part, at least, of the consumers' strike, *jusqu'au bout.*

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The Vatican and Ireland

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: P. D. Murphy's Cardinal Bourne and Ireland, recently published in *The Nation*, carries a page from the war-time volume of Anglo-Irish activities at the Vatican. Here are additional first-hand excerpts from the same chapter of the unpublished history of that sometime baffling period:

Roger Casement's relatives went as far as to charge that Cardinal Bourne tried to prevent the Irishman's preexecution return to the Catholic church. After Casement's death they sent Monsignor Kennedy to Rome to institute a suit against the English prelate in the ecclesiastical courts. Kennedy, who was an old, retired British army chaplain, cooperated with Monsignor O'Riordan of the Irish College in the matter of Bourne's alleged unpriestly and un-Catholic conduct. Italy is a whispering gallery, and the Vatican, try though it did, could not keep the affair quiet. It was long a tidbit on the loose tongue of Roman gossip, and the American colony was considerably interested and intrigued.

In the end Bourne was privately reprimanded by the Pope. The Cardinal, even with the backing of his Tory colleague, Gasquet, and the reactionary British Mission to the Holy See, was no match for the keen-witted Kennedy-O'Riordan duumvirate. Besides, Monsignor O'Riordan and Monsignor Kennedy undoubtedly had a religious case against the political English churchman. Incidentally, Cardinal Gasquet sits in Curia, and together with French, Italian, and German cardinals resident at Rome endeavored to interpret war-time America for the Supreme Pontiff. For notwithstanding the fundamental democracy of Catholicity and the spiritual prosperity of the church in the United States, American Catholics have no cardinal representative in the church's government at Rome.

After the Pope's chastisement of Bourne the English Foreign Office made several diplomatic gestures, which did not escape the watchful eyes of the Papacy. In fact, these were regarded as something like psychological fists, openly pointed at Benedict. Again and again, Bourne was singled out by the British Government for conspicuous notice. He made noisily trumpeted trips to the British base in Southern Italy, to the British sectors in France, and, last but by no means least, to the Holy Land.

The same Bourne is now at Rome once more, significantly minus certain baggage, which he "lost" near the Italian border. It is probable that His Eminence was robbed, and possibly the thief got something more than ecclesiastical robes of office. Nevertheless, Catholic liberalism is far from believing the unsubstantiated rumor that Bourne in England and Bishop Cohalan, the would-be ecclesiastical climber of Cork, are acting and have been acting as diplomatic agents of the Vatican. Indeed, in addition to the Casement business, there is much indirect, if not direct, evidence to the contrary.

Considered as an abstract proposition, Bourne's statement that Sinn Fein is a secret conspiracy and its republican movement anti-Catholic strikes at the roots of Catholicity. In the last analysis his reasoning denies that sovereignty is in the people and affirms the divine right of kings. Have politics made him more than a modern bedfellow of the timid Peter, whose funeral dirge only in a temporary sense was the crow of a cock? Cardinal Bellarmine in the sixteenth century and Francisco Suarez in the seventeenth century recognized the fact that "political authority in general comes directly from God to the whole community."

Up to his death a year or two ago Rev. Charles Macksey, an American Jesuit, taught the same doctrine in the Gregorian University at Rome. He gave fresh and emphatic and a very human utterance to a theory of government which had not been expounded in Gregorian University classrooms for one hundred and fifty years. In the beginning the ecclesiastical Bournes of Italy tried to influence His Holiness against such "revolutionary teaching." The Pope, however, did not heed then, and we are convinced that he will not heed now. The world is too full of Irelands, and their voices like the "voices" of Joan of Arc will not cry forever in a wilderness. Ireland is a phase of world-wide social and industrial injustice—a single letter in the universal alphabet of anti-Christian practice. Fundamentally, Ireland is less a country than a Christian principle; less a protest against imperialism than a declaration of faith.

Father Macksey ran foul of Cardinal Bourne, when the Irish Red Book was published at Rome. The little pamphlet fell like a great stick of dynamite into the complacency of the British Mission at the Vatican. Father Macksey was priest enough to love and seek justice for all men, English as well as Irish, but he was falsely accused of being responsible for the part-authorship of the Irish Red Book. Besides, the book was not a composition but a compilation of clippings from the English press, explaining and extenuating or defending the Sinn Fein position. The Irish College at Rome collected and printed the data, sending a copy of the publication to every high church and state authority in Italy and to various foreign ambassadors and officials attached to the Quirinal. The first copy was placed in the hands of His Holiness by Monsignor O'Riordan himself. This carefully planned action did much

for the destruction of American ships or for a few American lives, ample ground for war; but we waited, and it turns out now that we waited wisely, because we were able at last to enter into this great contest, this great contest of the whole world, for noble and lofty purposes such as never attracted nations before."

All in all Mr. Choate stands as the perfect exponent of a genteel tradition. The greater part of his life was lived in those quieter days when the fortunate took for granted the necessity and the permanence of what contributes to make them so. One will not go to Mr. Choate for searching insight into what we now regard as the deeper issues of social and economic life. Mr. Martin tells us that he thought the Income Tax Case of 1895 "was of great importance to civilization—a case that would build a proper rampart around the rights of property, which he seemed always to feel were the real underpinning of civilization." That this feeling was more than an advocate's devotion to the cause of his client is evident from an address made by Mr. Choate after his cause was won. The tribute here paid to Mr. Southmayd and the acknowledgment of indebtedness to his brief in winning the income tax case is but one of the many illustrations of the generous spirit which made Mr. Choate lovable. Later events have brought forward the income tax as the ally of civilization rather than its enemy. There is more to be said for Mr. Choate's argument on constitutional law than for his views of public policy. Yet it would be a pity to judge such a life by standards that are quite alien to it. So few lives are perfect even of their kind that we must be grateful for one that approaches such perfection so closely. Mr. Choate was first and foremost a lawyer. Until his sixty-seventh year he gave to the promotion and protection of his clients' interests an amount of time and energy that would appall the ordinary practitioner. His hours of relaxation were not hours of ease. They were the hours of the many activities that will make Mr. Choate fondly remembered long after the lawyer and the advocate have been forgotten.

THOMAS REED POWELL

Delphi

Delphi. By Frederick Poulsen. Translated by G. C. Richards, with a preface by Percy Gardiner. London: Gyldendal.

DELPHI, the famous seat of the oracle of Apollo, has captured the popular imagination as few other spots on this earth. Surrounded by precipitous mountains, with a beautiful view over the plain of Itea and the sea in the distance, the site is one of the fairest and certainly the most dramatic in Greek lands. Moreover, it played a unique part in Greek history. In a country made up of small city states, each with a strongly developed local patriotism, it was practically the only international center. For it was not a political but a religious city. Emissaries from all parts of Greece and from foreign lands came to Delphi to consult the Greek oracle and to learn wisdom from Apollo and his Pythian priestess. And in thankfulness for help rendered they dedicated statues and other offerings, housed in little buildings called treasuries; so that Delphi soon became a great gallery of international art.

The good fortune to excavate so promising a site fell to the French. Excavations were begun by the French School at Athens in 1892, and carried on for a number of years with great energy and ability under the direction of M. Homolle. It was an arduous task. The site was occupied by the modern village of Castri, and the peasant proprietors had first to be expropriated and transferred to another place. Since Delphi was built on the slope of a hill, parts of monuments belonging to buildings of an upper level had continually rolled down to a lower, and much care in the interpretation of finds had to be exercised. Fortunately the detailed account of the precinct by Pausanias who visited the site in the second century helped greatly in the identification of the various buildings.

It is true that the results of the excavations were not commensurate with the highest hopes entertained. For those who thought that we might quietly rediscover the innumerable works which were dedicated during the centuries of Delphi's greatness, the actual finds were disillusioning. There was no trace of the famous work by Pheidias in honor of the victory of Marathon, which we know to have been erected there. Not a fragment of the gilded statue of Phryne by Praxiteles has survived. But a knowledge of the history of Delphi was sufficient to prepare the explorers for the wreckage which came to light. When we hear that Nero alone carried away from Delphi 500 bronze statues, and when we remember that such plundering went on throughout Roman and Byzantine times, nature and the course of centuries duly aiding in the work of destruction, we understand why more was not left. In our work of resurrecting Greek art we have learned to be thankful for what has survived rather than continually regret what has disappeared. And we certainly have enough to make us rejoice in what the spade has brought to light in Delphi. Any single excavation which can produce such works as the bronze charioteer, the Agias, the Naxian Sphinx, and the dancing women from the akanthos column, has made a worthy contribution to mankind. And Delphi has done even more than restore to us a number of masterpieces. It has given us a wealth of architectural and sculptural remains, ranging from early Greek times to the period of Roman occupation, so that our stock of knowledge has been greatly increased in all directions.

That Dr. Poulsen, the well-known director of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen, has undertaken the task of making these results generally known in a book with copious illustrations and a very readable and suggestive text, is a matter for hearty congratulation. Hitherto we have had to go for information about Delphi to the expensive and therefore rather inaccessible "Fouilles de Delphes," the official French publication of the excavations; or to M. Bourguet's "Ruines de Delphes," a topographical guide, also in French. In Dr. Poulsen's volume we have for the first time a book which will make this important chapter of Greek art generally and adequately known among the English-speaking public.

Dr. Poulsen has approached his task with great discrimination. Instead of following (as Bourguet did) the perhaps obvious path of describing the monuments in the order in which Pausanias saw them, he has chosen the much more interesting method of describing the monuments chronologically, and so presenting a coherent account of what would otherwise almost certainly have been a rather confused and unconnected story. And since the sculptural remains in Delphi are by far the most important, Dr. Poulsen has made them his chief theme, with excursions into other fields where necessary. Consequently, he has written what amounts to a history of Greek sculpture, illustrated not by the "rubber stamp" material found in other histories, but by the comparatively unfamiliar monuments from Delphi—thus infusing new interest and life into a familiar story, and linking up the new material with the known stock. The text gives not only accurate descriptions of what was found at Delphi, but discusses the many problems involved from a large fund of historical, literary, and archaeological knowledge, and with genuine artistic appreciation. To non-archaeologists the book not only presents a delightful account of Delphi and its remains but gives them a realization of the manifold avenues by which archaeological problems have to be approached, and a realization of how wide a range of knowledge—and imagination tempered by knowledge—is necessary for their solution. Archaeologists will find in the book the chief Delphian monuments assembled in excellent illustrations, and also a temperate scholar's conclusions on many still debatable points. For while a survey is given of the different theories of the prominent archaeologists who have made it their task to unravel the many mysteries presented—such as Pomtow, Courby, Homolle, and Dinsmoor—Dr. Poulsen generally presents also his own ideas, especially in the sculptural field.

GISELA M. A. RICHTER

The French Revolution in Germany

Germany and the French Revolution. By G. P. Gooch. Longmans, Green and Company.

THE title of Mr. Gooch's book is not indicative of the contents. One might expect an analysis of the political changes brought about in the German states as a result of the French Revolutionary wars or the Napoleonic invasion; or the story of the diplomatic sequel to the treaties of Lunéville, Basle, or Tilsit; or of the effect of the Continental Policy on Germany's economic life; or of the far-reaching consequences of the dispossession of German princes on the left bank of the Rhine; or, in fact, of any one of a number of political, constitutional, industrial, and social changes wrought in the limits of the old Holy Roman Empire by the world-shaking upheaval across the Rhine. But Mr. Gooch has no intention of telling over again the facts that have been so amply treated in the pages of Von Sybel, Sorel, and Häusser. His purpose is "to show the repercussion of the French Revolution on the *mind* of Germany." It is a study in national psychology, illustrated by a detailed analysis of the writings of leading German philosophers, poets, dramatists, and publicists which deal with the theories and behavior of the actors of the great Parisian drama, or are directly influenced thereby. The book would have been more fitly entitled "The Influence of the French Revolution on German Thought."

It is a novel and useful service that Mr. Gooch has undertaken for an English reading public, and he has performed the service with diligence and fidelity. Whether we can add, with discrimination also, is doubtful. Readers of Mr. Gooch's "History and Historians of the Nineteenth Century" know that he is "an austere man" with the pen, reaping wherever a seed has been sown. He has not the supreme gift of preterition. The closely printed pages succeed each other with an inexorable accumulation of names, titles, quotations, until long before one is half-way through the half-a-thousand pages one feels that one is reading a catalogue. It is safe to say that nine-tenths of our historico-literary students are intensely interested in the views of a Goethe, a Schiller, a Kant, a Fichte on the significance of the French Revolution, and moderately curious about the views of a Wieland, a Forster, or a Kotzebue, and not at all concerned with the views of a score of minor writers in the various duchies of the Empire whose names they are scarcely familiar with. Yet Mr. Gooch will not spare us. We must make the grand tour of the Empire with him, through Saxony, Brunswick, and Hanover, through Weimar, Gotha, and Baden. We must hear the testimony of Dietrich, Cramer, von Trenk, Kerner, Oelsner, and a dozen other men of comparative obscurity whose writings are but the echoes of the stronger voices. If Mr. Gooch had only left out half of his twenty-two chapters his readers would not lay down the book with a sense of relief and release. The truly valuable material would be greatly enhanced by not having to be salvaged from a pitiless mass of information.

The general trend of German thought in the Revolutionary era, as shown again and again in the treatises analyzed by Mr. Gooch, was a hearty welcome to the liberal reforming principles of the men of 1789, turning to coldness when faction frustrated the work of the Legislative Assembly and the Convention, and ending in disgust when the frenzy of Jacobinism swept away the throne, the altar, the constitution, and the customs of a great civilized nation. Of course there were a few Germans like Gentz who were hostile to the Revolution from the beginning, a few like Goethe who were indifferent to it, except as a spectacle, all the way through, and a very few like Adam Lux and Schneider whose zeal for the new ideas could not be chilled by the regicides or the terrorists; but the great majority of thinkers, from the Hanoverian Whigs (Schlözer, Rehberg, Brandes) who were imbued with the doctrines of British parliamentarism and Burke's reverence for tradition, to "insurgents" like Fichte and Schiller, went through the process of a more or less rapid disillusionment. From cherishing the hope that the enlightenment preached by Montesquieu and Voltaire and realized by Mounier and Mirabeau would shed its beams also in the dark places of the Holy Roman Empire, these men came to emphasize the assurance that Germany would never fall a prey to the murderous dogmatism of Robespierre and Couthon.

Mr. Gooch seeks to correct some current judgments on the attitude of infiuential Germans toward the Revolution. He thinks, for example, that Goethe was not as indifferent to the events of the Revolution as he was to the Napoleonic domination. It is true that Goethe predicted the Revolution in 1785 and that he accompanied the army of Duke Karl August to Champagne. It is true that he talked and wrote much about the new ideas in France and that he announced that Valmy opened "a new epoch of world history." But for all that, Goethe remained an onlooker only. He had no interest in democracy, which seemed to him but "the enthronement of mediocrity," and he complacently wrote from Weimar that aesthetics kept him "going" while "almost everyone else" was "suffering from the political disease." He was left equally unconcerned by "the death of democratic or aristocratic sinners" in France. The author is more successful in rescuing Anacharsis Clootz from the unenviable position of the buffoon of the Revolution which he is made to fill in Carlyle's impressionistic pages.

The chapter on Kant is stimulating and convincing. The author shows clearly how far the aged philosopher of Königsberg bore the disappointment of deceived hopes in the French Revolution in a manner unlike that of his younger contemporaries Schiller and Fichte. For Schiller 1793 meant refuge in the "Weimar gospel" of aesthetic self-realization; for Fichte the disaster of Jena meant the passionate advocacy of German nationalists; but Kant, fortified in his citadel of idealism, kept faith in man when men disappointed him. He never ceased to believe that, in spite of all its excesses and mistakes, the French Revolution meant a step forward toward the goal of reason and humanitarianism. Only we question Mr. Gooch's statement that Kant's treatise on "Perpetual Peace," based so largely on the belief that increased commerce in goods and ideas among the nations must inevitably bring in the age of brotherhood, sounded the "highest notes ever struck by a German publicist."

The last four or five chapters of his book Mr. Gooch devotes to a rapid survey of some of the actual political changes wrought in the moribund Holy Roman Empire by the Revolution and the work of Napoleon. One cannot help feeling that by omitting this material, which is only a résumé of other treatments already familiar to historical students, the author might have reduced the bulk of a book already too large without sacrificing anything of the value of his contribution.

DAVID S. MUZZEY

The Uses of Perversity

The Uses of Diversity. By G. K. Chesterton. Dodd, Mead and Company.

AS Dickens personifies the spirit of Christmas, Stevenson that of a child's birthday, Kipling of Guy Fawkes's Day, and D. H. Lawrence of May Day, so Gilbert Keith Chesterton would seem to be the fitting patron saint of April the First. He is the royal jester in the new court of King Demos; if he is a "poisson d'avril," he is a very whale of mirth. He dislikes seriousness because he thinks it irreligious, and, having come to the conclusion that it takes more brains to make a joke than to excogitate a philosophy, he has devoted the brain of a second Newton to working out the law, not of gravity, but of fun. Those who, like Max Eastman, fiercely protest against the result as "a puerile piddle of inanities," are irked by the more abstruse and recondite laws in this new Calculus of Risibilities. Most of us can follow the four fundamental processes of humor, but when it comes to extracting the square root of a joke, to a geometrical progression of puns, to sines and tangents of epigrams, to negative, irrational, transfinite, and imaginary jests, we begin to feel that after all wit may be no laughing matter.

But just as the modern theory of groups has brought order into the tangles of higher mathematics, so a classification of Mr. Chesterton's quips renders them more easy for the average mind to master. They rush through his brain with the bewildering frequency and velocity of radio-active particles passed through a vacuum, but long observation will make them obey the law of atomic weights as readily as do natural gases. Disregarding small and negligible quantities of jokes, the great bulk of his humor falls into three divisions, polarized by his three great antipathies, to Germany, to Protestantism, and to what he calls "Modern Thought." And this trinity is one substance under a triple form.

When Mr. Chesterton writes on the subject of history, he avows that he thinks the only useful parts of it are the good anecdotes and nursery tales told to children. He would not be so dogmatic, he says, as to exclude from history a story merely because it was true in the ordinary sense of the word, but he would regard the literal truth as entirely secondary. Now we know how he got his idea of Prussia and of German history. He proves that England has always loved France because her coast towns are called "The Cinq Ports." He proves that England has always hated Germany because Chaucer sent his perfect knight to crusade against the heathen Prussians. As the Prussians of that day were not Germans Mr. Chesterton might have as well said that England and Italy had a war when Caesar invaded Britain. Such a distortion of history is absurd and mischievous. If Mr. Chesterton took the trouble to read English literature of just a hundred years ago he would find in Wordsworth and De Quincey and Coleridge and Scott the same uncritical admiration for the Germans that he feels for the French and the same ugly hatred of the French that he feels for the Germans.

Much the same witty but overworked joke against Protestantism as the corrupter of the modern world adorns his pages in season and out of season. An essay on the Mormons is made the occasion for giving a good hard slap to Oliver Cromwell, though the average mind does not see the connection between the Latter Day Elders and Brigham Youngsters on the one side and the Protector and the Puritan Commonwealth on the other. Jane Austen is criticized for being a typical Protestant, and that she was so is proved by the fact that the title of one of her tales, Northanger Abbey, recalls "the crucial crime of the sixteenth century," Henry VIII's confiscation of the monasteries. Moreover, Jane Austen had "to do with the human heart, and it is that which cometh out of the heart that defileth a nation, philanthropy, efficiency, organization, social reform." Surely as a bit of literary criticism this overtrumps Mark Twain's saying that he considered any library good which did not include Jane Austen and that he wanted to hit the old girl's skull with one of her own shinbones.

And what does not Modern Thought (as Chesterton personifies various things he does not like) suffer at the hands of this scoffer? It goes through something like the "Bump the Bumps" slide at Coney Island, in which one is jolted and jerked this way and that, one's hat blown off, one's clothes disheveled and one's brain made giddy, all for the trifiing sum of ten cents. All the woes of the world, from Tennyson's poetry to prohibition and woman's suffrage, are attributed to this specter. Tennyson failed as a poet, it is said, because he believed in evolution, a theory as fabulous "as the centaur, the mermaid, and all other images under which man has imagined a bridge between himself and brutality." In Mr. Chesterton's category of criticism the maintainers of the simple, correct view often talk rather elaborately, like Meredith and Browning, but the believers in difficult pessimism talk in words of one syllable—mostly "damns"—like Swinburne and Hardy. Japan failed to become great because she refused to imitate Dante and medieval architecture and imitated instead only the commercialism of Birmingham and the militarism of Berlin, and so she is still "the same strange, heathen, sinister, and heroic thing" that she always has been. And so it goes through "that depth of mindlessness which calls itself the modern mind."

PRESERVED SMITH

Village Verse

A Few Figs from Thistles. Poems and Four Sonnets by Edna St. Vincent Millay. Salvo. Frank Shay.

Iron Men and Wooden Ships. Sailor Chanties collected by F. S. Salvo Two. Frank Shay.

This Morning. Poems by Hildegarde Flanner. Salvo Three. Frank Shay.

WASHINGTON SQUARE and the motley streets near by, with their mushroom cellars sprouting unusual literature, art, and food, have had in the long run, and will have in yet a longer one, small effect on poetry. Greenwich Village is a number of agreeable things, but it is not original—at least it has not been importantly so in poetry. More types of verse have ended there than begun. It is a refuge and a refuse place for the hunted and the tired; it is a limbo of tag ends. Its inhabitants make much of the fact that literature is a creation of conversation in groups, while they forget that there is a difference between conversation and gossip, between groups and litters. Too many persons, meeting too casually, admire one another too much and think too little, with the result that what might be composite masterpieces become only collections of foreign rubbish scraped together. How many of the first poets in England and America today are clubby? Hardy, Masefield, Davies, Bottomley, Robinson, and Frost are not. These might love Greenwich Village, as all do in a way, but they would not be of it.

Series after series of published village verse, born to be "different," has died an indifferent death. There is something more hopeful, perhaps, about Mr. Frank Shay's new series known as Salvos. It would be hazardous to predict long life for such an enterprise as a whole; but it is possible to say of the items already put forth that they are breaths of very fresh air, or, to adopt their editor's metaphor, good round shots and palpable clean hits. It was an excellent idea, for instance, for Mr. Shay in his second Salvo (since this is the village, a reviewer can begin anywhere and end nowhere) to print folk-poetry, to be unconventional by importing a convention, to depart from the artificial community of Washington Square into the real community of seamen. The chanties he has collected are all too few and fragmentary, but they are honestly, comically blunt, and the whiff of salt they bring is something that village expression rarely can be called, strong.

Strong is exactly what Hildegarde's Flanner's truly pretty poems are not. They come, as it happens, from California, but their faint free verse, conceived in the purest village manner, resigns itself rather wearily to the business of beauty and truth. Spoken in a sort of mild trance, with listless gestures, most of these pieces break prematurely off in delicate sighs, showing shortness of breath if not of inspiration. Their innocence and their wistfulness are managed quietly but with a deliberate art that would impress roomfuls of poetasters; their metaphors, usually good to begin with, are overdone. The only exception to all this, a poem called Discovery, is indeed a remarkable exception. A monologue spoken by a girl who looks for her soul in a mirror and finds her body, it gains by being dramatic, and it does not lose by being a little smart.

It has been the rule of Edna St. Vincent Millay to be dramatic, and it seems to be her necessity to be bright. Every page of "Figs from Thistles" has a gleam or a shout or a slap. In the matter of love, and particularly in the matter of inconstancy, Miss Millay can claim direct descent from Sir John Suckling, but she is an exceedingly competent poet on her own account. Three pieces here in ballad-quatrains, She

is Overheard Singing, Portrait by a Neighbor, and The Philosopher, ring with the joy of genuine creation, and shine with details that are permanently good for poetry:

Before she has her floor swept,
  Or her dishes done,
Any day you'll find her
  A-sunning in the sun.

It's long after midnight
  Her key's in the lock,
And you never see her chimney smoke
  Till past ten o'clock.

She digs in her garden
  With a shovel and a spoon,
She weeds her lazy lettuce
  By the light of the moon.

She walks up the walk
  Like a woman in a dream,
She forgets she borrowed butter
  And pays you back cream.

Her lawn looks like a meadow,
  And if she mows the place,
She leaves the clover standing
  And the Queen Anne's lace.

Miss Millay justifies Salvo; perhaps Salvo will justify village verse.

MARK VAN DOREN

Growth of the Soil

Growth of the Soil. Translated from the Norwegian of Knut Hamsun by W. W. Worster. Alfred A. Knopf. 2 vols.

MR. H. G. WELLS'S simple-hearted remark concerning Knut Hamsun, "Indeed, I did not know of his existence until now," illustrates once more the almost complete isolation of English and American literary culture from that of Central and Northern Europe. Ordinary people are not likely to know more than Mr. Wells, and thus we shall probably witness, in the course of the years, other sudden discoveries of writers whose names have been for a quarter of a century household words among a great portion of civilized mankind. Some day, after whispers and rumors, there will emerge into our literary consciousness a Dane named Hermann Bang, a Swede named Gustaf af Geijerstam, and two authentic masters, born respectively in Lübeck and Braunschweig, called Thomas Mann and Ricarda Huch.

One result of this whole situation is complete ignorance of a given writer's development and therefore of his true character. It is quaint and amusing to see "Growth of the Soil" characterized as possessing "the timeless appeal of Homer's Iliad" and as leaving a sensitive Chicago reviewer "dumb at the sheer power of its stark beauty." For the inference is, obviously, that we have here a great, naive artist, sane, bronzed, virile, who turns aside from the neuroticism of a decrepit age and brings us a wind that blows from some morning of the world. Alas, Knut Hamsun is the author of "Hunger," of "Mysteries," of "Pan," of "Editor Lynge," of "Slaves of Love," of "Victoria"; he is the cruelest and most self-tormenting of the psychological impressionists, abnormal, bitter, bitterly ironic and nervously erotic, fleeing from the banality of life in his native country to the ends of the earth and enduring starvation and loneliness rather than face "fishy boots, vermin, stale cheese, Luther's catechism, and the Philistines in their three-story huts. They eat and drink at need, have a good time over their toddy and electioneering twaddle, and trade in green soap, brass combs, and fish. But at night when it thunders they lie on their backs and read the hymn book in sheer terror." The tormented naturalist, who is a romantic at heart, fled in his youth to America; later he fled to the Caucasus and the Orient, pouring out his scorn over the drab and busy civilization of the North; today he flees to an Arcadia of his own imagining and writes "Growth of the Soil."

He found his ideal human qualities in the Caucasus. ("Im Märchenland," 1904.) "As one goes farther into the Orient, one finds men talking less. The ancient races have passed beyond the stage of chatter and laughter; they are silent and they smile. . . . We read novels and newspapers. The old peoples do not read." In these romantic contrasts and escapes we find the origin of the Biblical and primitive and massively idyllic character of "Growth of the Soil." It is a transference of the broad simplicity of a patriarchal age and society to the wild and waste places of the North. Hamsun heals his own restless, modern, neurotic imagination with the elemental strength and silence of Isak, the large fertility and sturdiness of Inger; he steeps it in a contemplation of primitive toil and in the idealized processes of the beginnings of civilization. For in the tirelessness and profound inner serenity of Isak there is an idealization that refreshed Hamsun's weary and sophisticated soul. Pioneer farming in a harsh climate has, in fact, little in common with the broad calm of a patriarchal age in the Orient. Here the two almost attain a sort of spiritual identity. Yet the Northern and romantic note steals back into the book in the shape of two infanticides and of Inger's later love life, and the enormously acute psychological naturalist of the earlier works reappears in the brilliantly subtle and exact delineations of the characters of Oline and Geissler, Brede and Barbro.

It is not the purpose of this analysis to belittle "Growth of the Soil," but to disengage its true character. It represents the culmination of the long career of a writer who, like so many Continental artists of his generation, described the realities that hurt their sensitive souls and nerves with all the acuteness of the pain they suffered. Born in a militantly scientific period, they curbed their dreams and longings and analyzed the impact of an intolerable world upon themselves. But always, as the years went on and as the pressure of a positivistic view of things lifted, they built themselves a symbolic or neo-romantic refuge for their hearts. Strindberg did that, and Hauptmann, and now Hamsun has followed their example. He has stripped his prose of pointedness and sophistication and used a broad and naive folk-speech; he feigns to tell his story with a simplicity of structure that recalls the Sagas and the Old Testament narratives. He builds a large idyl; he dreams a golden age; he admits finally the symbolical character of his protagonist. "A ghost risen out of the past to point the future, a man from the earliest days of cultivation, a settler in the wilds, nine-hundred years old, and withal a man of the day." "Growth of the Soil" is a book full of nobility and beauty. It has skill and insight and a large clarity of final effect. But it is not primitive, it is not Homeric, and it may be questioned whether its most permanent aspect is not its close, modern power of characterization rather than its deliberate and not quite ingenuous poetizing of the simple life.

Books in Brief

THE "Catalogue of The Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University" (Harvard University Press) is not only a fine tribute to those generous lovers of art who have made the museum what it is, but it is, besides, a valuable contribution to art criticism and a stimulant to the study of the early masters. The pictures in the museum are described as well as reproduced, and a detailed account of their past history is given with careful discussion of their attributions. The Introduction contains a history of the bequests and acquisitions of the museum and explanatory notes upon technical processes in early Italian paintings. The colors used in the pictures are so described that students in foreign lands may lack no necessary accurate information. The general bibliographies are adequate, and bibliographies of individual pictures are made as complete as possible. The catalogue is arranged by schools and chronologically under the schools. In order that the book may serve as a manual for students of the fine arts at Harvard and Radcliffe, a brief history of the various schools of art has been prepared by the staff of the museum. These histories are all well done as brief surveys, especially those written by Miss Margaret Gilman, secretary of The Fogg Art Museum. An interesting feature of the catalogue is the lists of paintings in this country attributed to the artists discussed in connection with the museum treasures. The catalogue in one respect is a fascinating surprise, for scattered lavishly throughout the discussions of the individual pictures are bits of recondite information upon medieval and Renaissance forms of representation. There is a discussion of the traditional representation of St. Jerome, of the devil, of the Adoration of the Magi, of the Annunciation, and of representations of God the Father before and after the twelfth century. Some interesting and curious material is introduced here and there explaining the symbolism of colors and flowers. We learn the significance of St. Jerome's lion, the skull and pelican in the Crucifixion, the pomegranate, the gourd, the sprig of cherries, the apple in the hand of the infant Christ. No theme in art is more curious than that which dealt with psychostasis or the weighing of the soul. The catalogue has an interesting account of this. The book fairly teems with such out-of-the-way matters as the enlisting of the Florentine painters in the Guild of Doctors and Apothecaries in the latter part of the thirteenth century, and the question of why the painters of Siena disliked the use of the traditional lily in their pictures of the Annunciation. It is rather unfortunate that the title "Catalogue of the Fogg Art Museum" cannot hold forth to the general reader a suggestion of the book's alluring contents—the beautiful reproductions and the learned and discriminating comment upon individual paintings.

THE Jew has always been one of the most instructive object lessons of history, and never more so than at present. It is interesting, therefore, to observe the effect upon him of the modern insistence upon nationalism. He has become a "divided self." Romantic sentiment, pseudo-historical obsessions, reason, and enlightenment are all struggling in him for supremacy. The nationalism of Europe takes the form of Zionism in the case of the Jew. By far the larger part of what has been written upon this subject in the past five years has looked upon Zionism as a manifestation of robust health in Jewry. Professor Morris Jastrow in "Zionism and the Future of Palestine" (Macmillan) diagnoses the phenomenon as a disease, and a very serious one. Zionism has three forms: religious, or the Zionism of the orthodox Jews; economic, or the Zionism of the Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine; and political, or the Zionism which seeks to establish a Jewish state in the ancient homeland. For the first of these Mr. Jastrow has respect, with the second the deepest sympathy, for the third nothing but reprobation. His reprobation is based on historical reasoning. He argues that political Zionism is both religiously and politically an anachronism, that it will add to the antagonisms already existing in Palestine, and will complicate in a most unfortunate way the problem of Jewish political emancipation outside of that country. The Zionist seeks to ally religion once more with nationalism, whereas the essence of the Jewish religion as preached by the prophets is individualistic. The Zionist would turn back the stream of history, and reestablish a nation in Palestine, not unjustly called by Professor Jastrow "a glorified ghetto," whereas the tendency of Judaism is to diffuse itself as a religion over the earth's surface in a way most helpful to general culture. It is further pointed out how such a state in Palestine is calculated to awaken the suspicions of its present inhabitants. The present reviewer has received, for example, recent information direct from Jerusalem to the effect that elements of the Mohammedan population are already beginning to wish for a return of Turkish rule because they fear lest the Jews under the British mandatory might oust them from the country. Finally, the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine would tend to emphasize the nationality of the Jews outside of Palestine. This emphasis has been one of the main causes of anti-Semitism and of the continued political disabilities of the Jews.

EXCEPT for references to Max Nordau, Thorstein Veblen, and Sigmund Freud, there is little or nothing in William Bayard Hale's "Story of a Style" (Huebsch) that would bewilder Martin Marprelate were he alive today. No sixteenth-century goad of Anglican clergy, no seventeenth-century berserker-pamphleteer, no Hall, no Milton, no Claudius Salmasius, would feel anything but at home in a book which tears the various texts of Woodrow Wilson line from line and withers each with scornful critical fire. Those old warriors would have only one qualifying suggestion to make, perhaps—that Mr. Wilson, being in a sense already extinguished, needed to be no further so. Mr. Hale's reply would be and is that he finished his terrible book before its victim fell ill. The fact is that he has published it, and the impression will remain, whether he likes it or not, that the glee which he felt in his critic's task was somewhat ghoulish. With unmistakable relish he has gone to work to prove in detail what a few knew always and what most have known recently—that Mr. Wilson's utterances have been hollow. He improves his close personal acquaintance with the man to become psychoanalytical, proceeding from a premise that Mr. Wilson is intellectually inferior, and knows it, to numerous evidences that his sole effort first and last has been to cover this inferiority with language sounding great not only to others but to himself. Being fearful of matching his mind with any other than the undergraduate's, he early resorted to the hope, and eventually arrived at the conviction, that he had been born imperially aloof, like Geo. Washington (whose name, thus signed, Mr. Wilson has frequently pointed out, contains, like his own, thirteen letters). Being subject from the start to mental incapacity, indolence, or fatigue (Mr. Hale favors fatigue), he developed a system of address which by intensification, super-asseveration, alliteration, personification, and miscellaneous mystification hypnotized "his people" and stimulated himself. All this is intensely interesting, whether or not it is strictly true, and there will be denials that it is true. One thing is certain. If Mr. Hale has not written the last word on Woodrow Wilson, he has written a valuable book on style.

"EARLY Persian Poetry, from the Beginning down to the Time of Firdausi" (Macmillan), by A. V. Williams Jackson, is an enthusiastic essay which, if taken with the more extended English work by Edward G. Browne treating Persian literature as a whole during the same period, furnishes an adequate and agreeable introduction to a field of poetry that seems to possess permanent fascination for Western readers. Sadi and Hafiz and Omar, of course, the favorites of Emerson and Fitzgerald, do not come in here, but the story includes at least one great preacher, Zoroaster, and one great epic poet, Firdausi. Mr. Jackson, not always sufficiently restrained in his recommendations to be exactly effective among the unconverted, is both at his most affectionate and at his most credible in the account of Firdausi, whose episode of Suhrab and Rustam he ably translates, and the traditions about whose career he composes into a brilliant picture.

THE second and last volume of Mr. Robert Withington's sumptuously printed "English Pageantry" (Harvard University Press), takes up the history of the pageant at the beginning of the seventeenth century and continues it to the present time. It is a somewhat bifurcated volume, two-thirds being taken up with an antiquarian study of the Lord Mayor's Show and the rest with a discussion of modern, or, as the author calls it, Parkerian pageant, which he treats in a somewhat soft, Drama-Leaguish fashion. We prefer the earlier part. Mr. Withington is of course not the first to study the subject, but he has gone over the field again and presents a wealth of

details from contemporary printed and manuscript sources and has added a comprehensive bibliography. The Lord Mayor's Show was formed upon that dignitary's annual procession, instituted with the office in 1209, to take his oath at Westminster. Apparently, it first began to take on pageant features in the sixteenth century and was at its height between 1585 and 1708, during which time the text was written by such men as Peele, Middleton, Dekker, Heywood, Tatham, and Settle. Early in the eighteenth century dialogue disappeared, and the show went steadily downhill until it was revived somewhat in the mid-nineteenth century. Today it survives to the delight, chiefly, of children, Americans, and country cousins. Mr. Withington finds the chief distinction between ancient and modern pageantry to lie in the fact that the former stressed allegory and entertainment, whereas the latter stresses history and instruction. Perhaps a deeper distinction lies in the fact that pageantry came into being spontaneously as the expression of an exuberant and childish imagination, while its modern form is a conscious revival.

Drama

Bricks and Mortar

IT was last season that Mr. John D. Williams, desiring to produce Eugene G. O'Neill's "Beyond the Horizon" and finding no available theater, hit upon the notion of using a playhouse during the four afternoons left free by the customary eight performances of the week. During the present season this method has been used by one group of artists after another, and no one who has not busily visited these so-called "special matinees" has had any correct sense of the quality or variety of the year's theatrical activities. O'Neill's "Diff'rent" and "The Emperor Jones" first saw the light in this manner; "The Tyranny of Love," the most distinguished Continental play, and Emery Pottle's "The Hero," surely the second-best American play of the winter, had both to be content with this imperfect manner of public appearance. For it is no cause for surprise that the greater number of these afternoon productions has failed. In a busy and nervous world it needs both the peace and the exhilaration of night to bring on the free and intense mood which the art of the theater demands.

It is clear, then, that the question of the mere physical existence of an American theater grows more urgent year by year. To the coming of that theater all signs point. Only it is coming homeless and as a beggar. Hegel justly observed that in order to have vital dramatic activity, "the free self-consciousness of human aims, of human difficulties, and of human fate must have been as thoroughly awakened and have become cultivated in such a degree as is possible only during the middle or later periods of a nation's development." Our literature bears witness to the fact that we are beginning to win that consciousness and that cultivation. An American art theater is struggling to be born. Cooperative groups of craftsmen and actors and playwrights are ready at any moment to bring the theater a little nearer to the level of our native fiction or our native poetry. But writers have publishers. The artists of the theater have neither land nor bricks nor mortar for a playhouse. They are helpless.

We have emphasized the fact before and shall not hesitate to do so again, that such groups or individuals are, as a rule, quite aware of the normal economic necessities of their situation and quite ready to reckon with them. But a regard for normal economic necessities counts for little when brought into competition with the spirit of the "promoters of theatrical enterprises." Thus it is no secret that one of the best and most artistic productions of the season is being withdrawn not because it is not self-supporting, not because the producer has failed to meet any obligations, but because the advance sales do not seem to guarantee the owners or lessees of the house huge enough profits extending far enough into the summer. If any expert of the theater desired to produce a play in New York today he might, after much persuasion and much treading of stranger's stairs, be able to secure a theater on what is known as the sixty-forty per cent basis. This means that the owner of the building is entitled to forty per cent of the gross box-office receipts. Unjust as such an arrangement is, it is not intolerable in itself. It becomes so because the owner demands that the forty per cent do not fall below a stipulated average sum and fixes this sum according to a scale of profits derived from the receipts of the frothiest musical comedies and the rawest melodramas. Thus it comes about that Shakespeare and Sheridan, Shaw and Schnitzler, Ibsen and Porto-Riche, and the new talents that are to create our dramatic literature are forced into open competition with Messrs. Otto Harbach and Sigmond Rorberg, Owen Davis and Willard Mack.

Whenever, as in the case of the Neighborhood Playhouse or of the Theater Guild, the evil necessity of such competition has been eliminated, it has been because the directors have either owned the playhouse or have been able to secure its lease on terms that are not crushing. And both of these admirable organizations, especially the latter, have been able to work on a perfectly sound and normal business basis in regard to both salaries and profits. The American art theater or repertory theater can now, in brief, hold its own on reasonable terms. But usually it is in the situation of, let us say, a Joseph Hergesheimer or a Theodore Dreiser, whose manuscripts are rejected by every publisher, not because they could not be published at a profit but because the profit of the venture would fall below the standard of earnings set by the books of Zane Grey, E. Phillips Oppenheim, and Harold Bell Wright.

The remedy for this situation does not lie, as we have also said before and hope to say again, in subsidies, endowments, or charity. In communities outside of New York there is no reason why private munificence should not build a theater as readily as it builds a museum of art or endows a symphony orchestra. In New York it is only necessary that a few theaters be built by men who are content with such profits as are expected from any other normally sound investment and that these theaters be turned over exclusively to artistic and conscientious directors. The best dramatic literature, both native and foreign, would then get a hearing; the competition offered by these houses would reduce the immoderately swollen profits of the purely commercial managers and minimize, even in their case, the temptation of always preferring a bad play to a good one. Thus the present hot-house production of false and shoddy theatrical goods would cease to command a premium and the average playwright would no longer strive to write—this is no jest, but a hard fact—as badly as his temperament and intelligence will let him. What a vista of usefulness is thus opened to kindly but sensible millionaires!

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

International Relations Section

President Obregon's Message

THE address of President Obregon at the opening of the extraordinary session of the Mexican Congress on February 7, was published in the *Heraldo de Mexico* on the following day.

In compliance with a constitutional duty, I have the honor to address the members of the honorable Congress of the Union, to inform them of the purpose of the Federal Executive in calling into extraordinary session the representatives of the nation, in exercise of the right granted by Article 88, Part XI, of the Mexican Constitution. . . .

It would be discreditable for a Government conscious of its duties and its powers not to take advantage of this opportunity, unique in the history of Mexico from 1910 to the present, for responding to the demands of public opinion and to the desire of all honorable men, and for carrying into effect reforms in accordance with its constitutional powers, the most urgent of which is to raise the level of culture of the people to a much higher point. . . .

The Problem of the Banks

The great confusion which the Republic has suffered because of the lack of a well-established banking system which would distribute throughout the whole country the benefits of mercantile credit can be readily seen and has provoked a crisis so acute that it is needless to call attention to it, and even more needless to dwell upon the supreme necessity of providing a radical remedy for the chaotic condition existing under our present system throughout the Republic. Therefore the first matter to which the Congress should turn is the pushing of a law to solve the problem of banks issuing notes. The Executive is fully confident that the project which he will present to the careful consideration of the Congress will be discussed in an impartial and calm spirit according to the principles which rule the economic life of the people.

Workmen's Insurance

Workmen's insurance is a means of protection for the working class the timeliness and utility of which no one can deny; the demands of modern thought and culture in this matter are so urgent that any government desiring to oppose a humanitarian movement of such importance would not only crumble but would fail to accomplish its duty. Therefore the Executive wishes to bring about one of the highest ideals of the Revolution and to give immediate effect to Article 123 of the Constitution. This is the second matter to be taken up in the Assembly.

Education

The nationalization of education, the creation of the offices of Secretaries of Public Education and of Labor, and the corresponding reform of the law relating to secretarial offices, are questions which afford such a ready response to the needs of a good administration and to the vital problem of increasing the culture of the people by all means at the disposal of the state, that merely the proposal of the respective laws is sufficient to make the Congress of the Union understand the importance of the affairs in question and the necessity for a prompt decision.

The Agrarian Law

The Agrarian Law has for its object the solution, so far as possible, of the old but important problem of the land. The first aim of the revolutionary program is the equitable distribution of land among the proletarian class, and the Executive must see to it that this promise does not remain in the realm of political dreams, also that it does not threaten to overthrow the whole existing agrarian regime, nor attack at their roots the foundations of the agricultural life of the country. The project of the Agrarian Law which I submit to the consideration of the legislature, even though it is inspired by more advanced revolutionary principles, is, however, founded on a concrete understanding of the needs of the country and of the practical difficulties which a law of this nature must encounter in its operation.

The Petroleum Problem

In turning to the question of petroleum, there are found grave problems of an internal and international character which will have no little effect on the future progress of the country. On one side is the principle of national autonomy which the Revolution proclaimed as indispensable for uniting all the active forces and all the elements of wealth in the Republic for economic progress; and on the other hand, the interests of owners of petroleum wells, who are opposed to the application of Article 27 of the Constitution, either before the courts of Mexico, or through diplomatic channels. Everything has contributed to make the petroleum problem of the greatest importance abroad, and to present grave difficulties which alone can be solved by patiently studying how best to preserve the interests of the nation, without unjust injury to the property rights of our own nationals and of foreigners, which have been established in accordance with law and justice.

Official Privilege

The Executive feels that political and administrative morality must begin with the high officials and extend throughout the entire body of public servants. For this reason, the law which fixes the responsibilities of the President of the Republic and of the Secretaries should be given preference in this Congress. From this it should follow that the high executive officials must be made subject to law and justice in all of their actions and not enjoy the immunity from taxes, which is so repugnant to honorable men and for the protection of which so many wrongs have been committed. In a true democracy the public official should be accountable for his actions, whatever may be his rank or legal power; the higher it is, the greater are his duties and responsibilities. The executive should, for the same reason, give proof of his democratic spirit and respect for the principles of the law, initiating the enactment of the law which fixes the responsibilities of the President of the Republic and his Secretaries.

Power to Call Extraordinary Sessions

With regard to Paragraph 10 of the Convention, it is highly satisfactory for the Executive to turn over to the permanent commission of Congress the power to call extraordinary sessions which according to our Political Code of 1857 the commission possessed, and which in a spirit of absolutism poorly disguised in the Constitution of 1917 was taken away without a just motive. For this reason it will follow that the legislature is able to enjoy the autonomy which most modern constitutions concede, and its action may not be made subject to the will or caprice of the Executive.

Administration of Justice

Public clamor has pointed out grave evils in the administration of justice, which is at present merely written in our laws and which absolutely lacks effectiveness notwithstanding that, according to our penal code, courts should be obliged to give justice to whoever seeks it. The principal reason for such a state of affairs is to be found in the Organic Law of Tribunals, promulgated under the past administration, the defects of which have been shown with rare unanimity. The Executive desires something practical and effective, and this does not signify, as has been the case until now, a vain hope and dream impossible of realization.

Gambling

Gambling should be, in the opinion of the Executive, vigorously attacked in order to diminish as far as possible the troubles which it causes not only in the way of speculations and immoral waste but also because it involves the administrative corruption of those officials who shut their eyes to it, or who have actual agreements with the managers of gambling dens. As the Federal authorities have not jurisdiction throughout all the Republic in this matter, it is necessary to institute a constitutional reform in order legally to prosecute and punish gamblers, not only in the Federal District and territories but also in the various local units.

Pensions

In regard to military pensions, the Government has considered it just and equitable to reform vigorously the present system, which establishes odious differences in relation to the military rank which the beneficiary holds at the time of his death or when he is disabled by accident. Nothing is more contrary to the need for a just and humanitarian compensation than these differences, and therefore the Executive wishes that all servants of the fatherland who die upon the field of battle or who suffer wounds which diminish their efficiency should be assured that the state will come to their aid and will compensate their efforts and sacrifices.

All the other laws which are to be taken up in the Congress are of importance, particularly those which relate to social, political, or administrative problems, the solution of which will result in marking out for the nation the path of progress and organization.

Deputies, Senators: At this moment the nation requires from its representatives a broad and lofty spirit of reform and the resolute purpose of working for the reconstruction of the country, the restoration of national credit, and the removal of those traditional evils which have paralyzed all the active forces of the Republic. The future of millions of human beings is linked with the action of the legislature, and it is not strange, therefore, that public opinion demands a strong determination, tenacious and coordinated, to solve all those questions upon which depends the future of the fatherland. See to it that the Congress of the Union secures the approval and satisfies the hopes of the Mexican people."

The Case of General Crozier

THE resignation of General Crozier, commandant of the Auxiliary Division of the British forces in Ireland, was announced on February 22. The circumstances leading up to it were reported in the press of England in the following general terms: Thirty cadets of the Auxiliary Division were caught in the act of looting a house which they had been ordered to search for arms. The case was investigated by General Crozier, who remanded five of the men for court-martial and dismissed the remainder from the division. According to General Crozier his action was approved by General Tudor, police adviser to the Viceroy, but the dismissed cadets on their return to England appealed to this official and the order of dismissal was overruled. Thereupon the commandant, General Crozier, resigned, together with the adjutant of the division. In answer to questions in the House of Commons on February 22, regarding the facts of the case, Sir Hamar Greenwood, Chief Secretary for Ireland, read the following report of the Chief of Police:

On receipt of a complaint that a party of the Auxiliary Division had been guilty of looting, the Chief of Police directed the Commandant of the Auxiliary Division to make immediate inquiry. The Commandant thereupon arrested five platoon commanders and section leaders and one cadet, with a view to their being brought to trial, as he considered there was clear evidence against them. The services of the remainder of the party were dispensed with.

Dismissal can only be carried out by direction of the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police sent instructions to suspend action against the twenty-six cadets until he returned to Dublin. This letter took twenty-four hours to reach the Commandant of the Auxiliary Division, with the result that the men were sent to England. On arrival in England they protested to the Chief of Police at the Irish Office that they had been dismissed without trial.

On his return to Dublin he directed that the dismissed cadets should be recalled without prejudice to any future disciplinary action if found guilty. He at once instituted a court of inquiry into the whole of the circumstances, which is now proceeding. The cadets have not been allowed to return to their own unit, and there is no question under any circumstances of allowing them to do so. They are now awaiting the finding of the court. The commanding officer and the adjutant have resigned. There is no condonation of looting of any sort. In all cases of this nature the accused are, if the evidence warrants it, sent for trial. The county inspector of police could not support the summary dismissal of these cadets without full investigation.

On the following day the letters which had passed between General Tudor, Police Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and General Crozier were published in the press. The first, from General Tudor to General Crozier, dated at Dublin, February 14, follows:

Dear Crozier: I think it will be best for you to keep these thirty T. C.'s suspended till I come back. I want to discuss it with the Chief Secretary. He gets all the bother. My main point is that it is an unfortunate time to do anything that looks panicky. I think also these T. C.'s will have a distinct grievance if the platoon commanders and section leaders are acquitted. Tell these thirty they are suspended pending my return or, if you prefer it, keep them on by not completing their accounts till I come back.

Yours sincerely,

H. H. Tudor

On February 19, General Crozier dispatched the following reply to the Police Adviser:

Dear General: The more I think over the matter the more I am of opinion that your attitude in the "Trim Incident" has made my position quite impossible in the Division, as I am all out to have the discipline unquestionable. I therefore propose to resign at the expiration of my leave. I still consider that theft on the part of policemen in the course of their duties is unpardonable, and I cannot honestly associate myself with a force in which such acts are condoned.

Yours sincerely,

F. P. Crozier

The whole incident was dealt with by the *Manchester Guardian* in a vigorous editorial appearing in the issue of February 24:

Fuller evidence gives a still blacker look to the virtual dismissal of General Crozier from the command of the Auxiliary Cadets for insisting on discipline in that force. There are published today the final letters between him and General Tudor, the superior who drove him out of his command. That General Tudor did this in order to make things easier for Sir Hamar Greenwood in Parliament is indicated in the letter in which his more dutiful subordinate was thrown over. General Tudor, then apparently in London and in touch with the politicians, seems to have lost part of that regard for discipline which had led him in the first instance to approve everything that General Crozier had done. General Tudor now felt he must consider the comfort of the Chief Secretary. "The bother," he says, would come upon Sir Hamar Greenwood if General Crozier's policy of "having discipline unquestionable" continued to be loyally backed. General Crozier's answer to this letter will be remembered as a model for every upright officer who may hereafter be the object of such an attack. . . . Now that the attempts to save Sir Hamar Greenwood "bother" at the cost of discipline, life, and property have failed, a grotesque medley of conflicting excuses are offered to Parliament. First there were flourishes about not punishing men without trial. Of course the incriminated men were tried before dismissal. It is to shirk the consequences of their trial that a different trial has since been resorted to. Perhaps conscious of this absurdity, Sir Hamar Greenwood next suggests that he only wants more punishment for them. Dismissal, he now suggests, is not enough of a penalty—as if dismissal from a police force ever precluded subsequent prosecution for such crimes as organized theft. Sir Hamar Greenwood had better own up. The facts are growing plain. In the present Government of Ireland there are clearly some elements, civil and military, which, like General Crozier, "consider that theft on the part of policemen in the course of their duties is unpardonable," and which "cannot honestly associate themselves with a force in which such acts are condoned." And there are other elements differently minded. All that we do not know is how far the expulsion of the former elements by the latter has yet proceeded.

The British Mandate in Mesopotamia

THE British draft of the Mesopotamia mandate, which was made public early in February, has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

Article 1. The mandatory will frame within the shortest possible time, not exceeding three years from the date of the coming into force of this mandate, an organic law for Mesopotamia. This organic law shall be framed in consultation with the native authorities and shall take account of the rights, interests, and wishes of all the populations inhabiting the mandated territory. It shall contain a provision designed to facilitate the progressive development of Mesopotamia as an independent state. Pending the coming into effect of the organic law, the administration of Mesopotamia shall be conducted in accordance with the spirit of the mandate.

Art. 2. The mandatory may maintain troops in the territories under his mandate for the defense of the territories. Until the entry into force of the organic law and the reestablishment of public security he may organize and employ local forces necessary for the maintenance of order and for the defense of these territories. Such forces may only be recruited from the inhabitants of the territories under the mandate.

The said local forces shall thereafter be responsible to the local authorities, subject always to the control to be exercised over these forces by the mandatory, who shall not employ them for other than the above-mentioned purposes except with the consent of the Mesopotamian Government.

Nothing in this article shall preclude the Mesopotamian Government from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of any forces maintained by the mandatory in Mesopotamia.

The mandatory shall be entitled at all times to use the roads, railways, and ports of Mesopotamia for the movement of troops and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

Art. 3. The mandatory shall be intrusted with the control of the foreign relations of Mesopotamia and the right to issue exequaturs to the consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to the citizens of Mesopotamia when outside its territorial limits.

Art. 4. The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Mesopotamian territory shall be ceded or leased or in any way placed under the control of the government of any foreign Power.

Art. 5. The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are definitely abrogated in Mesopotamia.

Art. 6. The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that the judicial system established in Mesopotamia shall safeguard, firstly, the interests of foreigners; secondly, the law and (to the extent deemed expedient) jurisdiction now existing in Mesopotamia with regard to questions arising out of the religious beliefs of certain communities (such as the laws of *wakf* and personal status); in particular, the mandatory agrees that the control and administration of *wakf* shall be exercised in accordance with the religious law and dispositions of the founders.

Art. 7. Pending the making of special extradition agreements with foreign Powers relating to Mesopotamian extradition, the treaties in force between foreign Powers and the mandatory shall apply to Mesopotamia.

Art. 8. The mandatory will insure to all complete freedom of conscience and free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Mesopotamia on the grounds of race, religion, or language. Instructions in and through the medium of the native language of Mesopotamia shall be promoted by the mandatory.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language (while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose) shall not be denied or impaired.

Art. 9. Nothing in this mandate shall be construed as conferring upon the mandatory authority to interfere with the fabric or management of sacred shrines, the immunities of which are guaranteed.

Art. 10. The mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over missionary enterprise in Mesopotamia as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government; subject to such supervision no measures shall be taken in Mesopotamia to obstruct or interfere with such enterprise or to discriminate against any missionary on the ground of his religion or nationality.

Art. 11. The mandatory must see that there is no discrimination in Mesopotamia against the nationals of any state which is a member of the League of Nations (including the companies incorporated under the laws of such state) as compared with the nationals of the mandatory or any foreign state in matters concerning taxation, commerce, or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of ships or aircraft. Similarly, there shall be no discrimination in Mesopotamia against goods originating in or destined for any of the said states, and there shall be freedom of transport under equitable conditions across the mandated area.

Subject to the aforesaid, the Mesopotamian Government may, on the advice of the mandatory, impose such taxes and customs duties as it may consider necessary, and to take such steps as it may think necessary to promote the development of the natural resources of the country and to safeguard the interests of the population.

Nothing in this article shall prevent the Mesopotamian Government, on the advice of the mandatory, from concluding special customs arrangements with any state the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic territory or Arabia.

Art. 12. The mandatory shall adhere, on behalf of Mesopotamia, to any general international convention already existing or that may be concluded hereafter with the approval of the League of Nations respecting slave traffic, traffic in arms and ammunition, traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, railway and postal, telegraphic, and wireless communications, or artistic, literary, or industrial property.

Art. 13. The mandatory will secure the cooperation of the Mesopotamian Government, so far as social, religious, and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy

adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating diseases of plants and animals.

ART. 14. The mandatory will secure the enactment, within twelve months from the coming into force of this mandate and will insure the execution of a law of antiquities based on the contents of Article 421, part 13, of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey; this law shall replace the former Ottoman law of antiquities, and shall insure equality of treatment in the matter of archaeological research to the nationals of all states members of the League of Nations.

ART. 15. Upon coming into force of the organic law, arrangements shall be made between the mandatory and the Mesopotamian Government for settling the terms upon which the latter will take over the public works and other services of a permanent character, the benefit of which will pass to the Mesopotamian Government; such arrangements will be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

ART. 16. The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of the mandate; copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ART. 17. The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of the present mandate provided that in the case of any modification proposed by the mandatory such consent may be given by a majority of the Council. If any dispute whatever should arise between the members of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or application of these provisions, which cannot be settled by negotiation, this dispute shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The present copy shall be deposited in the archives of the League of Nations, and certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all the Powers signatory to the Treaty of Peace with Turkey.

Workers' Control in Italy

THE Italian Government's project for "workers' control" of industry appeared in *Avanti* (Milan) for January 25. It is still under discussion and its extreme caution has evoked much protest among the workers; while the employers are divided between a clear-cut opposition to any measure of democratic control and a belief that some such modification of the present system is inevitable.

AIMS OF CONTROL

ARTICLE 1. Control of industry by capable workers is established with the following aims in view: (a) To instruct the workers concerning the conditions under which the industries themselves are run; (b) to promote improvement in technical education and in the moral and economic conditions of the workers within the limits determined by the conditions under which the employers carry on their work; (c) to insure the execution of all the laws established for the protection of the working classes; (d) to recommend improvements in methods which will increase production and render it more economical; (e) to bring about more and more normal and peaceful relations between the workers and employers.

INDUSTRIES CONTROLLED

ART. 2. Control is established separately for each class of industries as follows: iron and metal, textile, chemical, and electrical industries, land transportation, navigation, construction, extractive industries, mines, quarries, hotels, and allied industries.

Exempt from such control are industries run by the state, industries established within the last four years, and industries employing less than sixty workers.

FORMATION OF COMMITTEES

ART. 3. Adult workers in each class of industry shall elect proportionally a committee of control composed of nine members, six of which shall be chosen by the operatives and three by the engineers, office workers, and technicians of the industry. The unions having members among the workers of each industry shall present to them the lists of candidates.

A rule which shall be drawn up after hearing the opinion of the Superior Committee of Labor will establish the regulations and methods under which each class of industry is run. The committee shall be renewed every three years. Committee members may be reelected.

CONTROL IN SMALL INDUSTRIES

ART. 4. The committee shall appoint for each industrial establishment, whether a joint stock company or a limited liability owned by private employers, two or more workers, according to the importance of the establishment, chosen to exercise control and report to the committee.

The delegates shall be selected among the adult workers belonging to the establishment in question, and possibly among those who have served at least three years. The rules which will be carried into effect by Article 9 of this law will determine the way in which the delegates are to exercise their authority, taking into account the particular conditions in each class of industry.

With the renewal of the committee every three years, the renewal of delegates will take place; such delegates shall be eligible for reelection.

POWERS OF THE COMMITTEES OF CONTROL

ART. 5. By means of its delegates, the committee of control is entitled to the information necessary for a knowledge of: (a) Methods of obtaining and cost of raw materials; (b) cost of production; (c) methods of administration; (d) methods of operation, with the exception of anything depending on factory secrets; (e) wage of workers; (f) employment of capital; (g) profits of the business; (h) method of carrying out the laws which protect the workers and provisions relating to employment and dismissal of workers.

EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATION

ART. 6. Employers or their representatives (no more than two) may be present at the meetings of the committees of control; a representative of the Superior Committee of Labor may also be present. The representatives of the employers and of the Committee of Labor may make remarks and may ask to have them taken down word for word, but they have not the right to vote. They are entitled to prevent the publication, or the entrance into the minutes, or even the writing down, of any information which might prejudice the interests of the employers.

ART. 7. The employers in each class of industry shall, by the methods established by law, name their own representative body for any negotiations with the committee of control, to make certain that the separate employers fulfil the obligations arising from the present law and its various regulations, and to choose their representatives for the meetings of the committee of control. These representative bodies of the employers, like the committees of control, shall be composed of nine members and they also shall be renewed every three years. Two delegates of the committee of control may be present at the meetings of the representative bodies of the employers, and can make remarks, but have not the right to vote.

ART. 8. When special circumstances demand it, or in any case at least once a year, the representatives of the employers and the committees of control must hold a meeting under the presidency of a representative of the Superior Committee of Labor, to examine together the improvements which experience shows advisable to introduce into the management of the industry, to increase and improve production in the interests of public economy and of the workers, and to settle any controversies which may have arisen in the exercise of control.

EMPLOYMENT AND DISMISSAL OF WORKERS

ART. 9. Special rules to be drawn up for each class of industry, after hearing the opinions of the representatives of the employers, the committee of control, and the Superior Committee of Labor, shall govern the employment and dismissal of operatives, taking into account the special conditions under which each industry is run.

Such rules must, however, comply with the principles established in the two following articles.

PLACEMENT BUREAUS

ART. 10. In places which shall be determined by rule, as provided for in the preceding article, placement bureaus shall be established composed of representatives of the employers and of the committees of control. These bureaus shall keep a record of those asking for employment, and when it is not a question of providing work in which they are specially skilled they shall be given employment in order of their application, preference being given to workers living in the commune where the establishment is situated, and to those who return from military service and were formerly employed in the same establishment. In the placement of workers no attention must be given to considerations of a political or trade union nature. When workers skilled in the line required cannot be found among the applicants at the placement bureaus, the companies may employ casual laborers from other sources. Every firm must refuse employment to those who have undergone heavy sentences for criminal offenses and to those who have been dismissed for disciplinary reasons.

Differences between employers and committees of control relative to the employment of workers shall be settled without appeal by two judges, one chosen by each side, and under the presidency of a person selected by the two judges from the workers, and in case of disagreement, nominated by the president of the court.

DISMISSAL OF WORKERS

ART. 11. No dismissals shall be made for political or trade union reasons.

When industrial conditions call for a reduction of labor, and if the nature of the work permits, the normal working time shall be reduced to a limit of thirty-six hours a week. If that is not sufficient, work must be divided among the operatives as much as possible before workers can be dismissed.

When dismissals must be made, workers who have given long service must be kept in preference, as well as those having large families.

Controversies arising with regard to dismissals shall be decided by judges named as in the preceding article.

ART. 12. When particular industrial conditions demand it and especially when there is a great difference between the method in which a given industry is run in different parts of Italy, the rule established in Article 3 can provide for more than one committee of control in a single industry, in which case the number of employers' representatives must be proportionally increased.

The expenses for the committees of control shall be shared equally by the workers and the employers. The methods of contribution and assessment shall be determined by special men drawn up as provided in Article 9.

In next week's issue of
The International Relations Section
Lord Milner's Report on Egypt
The most important sections of the report of the British Mission.

The Nation

Vol. CXII, No. 2912 | Founded 1865 | Wednesday, April 27, 1921

OIL

MEXICO—1921

V. Relations with the United States

by Paul Hanna

Mexican Documents

In the International Relations Section

A Short View of Gamalielese

by H. L. Mencken

Teacher-Baiting: The New Sport

Editorial

Fifteen Cents a Copy | Five Dollars a Year

Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1887, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1921 No. 2912

Contents

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

TWO steps forward, and two only, President Harding took in his first message to Congress. He definitely discards the League of Nations and asks for a declaration of peace with Germany. These are substantial gains, but beyond that all is vague. Both camps claim that the President is with them, that the treaty will be eventually ratified in much amended form, that it will be discarded. The truth is, we are reliably informed, that ten days before the message was read Mr. Harding was for scrapping the whole treaty and that the Hoover-Hughes influence induced him to recede from that position, with the result of a document so obscure that sharply conflicting headlines in the daily press revealed the complete confusion of the editors as to what it meant. Emphatically, Mr. Harding is closely related to Mr. Facing-Both-Ways; equally true is the fact that he will take further positions only as he is forced into them by events or necessity. As for the treaty, we do not believe it can be ratified in any form. Mr. Viviani's visit, despite his enthusiastic characterization of its success, has been a failure. But he can at least report to Briand that the United States will take only a listless interest in the further coercion of Germany and will not act in the matter.

ON May 1 the curtain will rise for another act of the melodrama (so impossible that it sometimes seems like roaring farce) staged by the Allies in Germany under the title "Drawing Blood from a Stone." The expected refusal of Germany to pay the twelve billion gold marks that will then be owing will be the signal for France to step out in the leading role, while England, as the ingenue, twitters and pretends to understand less of what is going on than she does. At this writing the plan is to place at least the entire Ruhr region in the hands of an Allied receivership, which will take over the whole industrial output and sell it for the Allies' account. But receiverships are notoriously an expensive and ineffective method of administering property, and the new method will get us no farther than the old. The only hope lies in the development of a public opinion in America and England that will insist on a business-like treatment of a business proposition. Germany ought to pay every mark she can toward the restoration of France, but it is an industrial absurdity to prevent the revival of German trade and at the same time to expect that the country can raise an adequate indemnity. America has a right to speak, for the present hocus-pocus in Europe is as much a menace to the peace of the world as was ever German militarism.

THE collapse of the Triple Alliance strike in Great Britain settles nothing. It is a positive disaster. It indicates that the British public, like the public the world over, dulled from excessive emotion, is apathetic to fundamentals of right and fair-play; also that British labor needs further education and organization before it can put into effect its declared principles and policies. Now the hour of pitched battle is put off again, but the scarcely less devastating armed truce remains, and the sudden assumption of its old function which Lloyd George's bought Parliament has displayed does not offset the truth that nothing has really been settled, that suffering and bitterness remain. Great Britain continues a camp and Ian Hay writes in the New York *Times* of the government-recruited forces as "the new 100,000." So easily is enmity shifted from the Hun to the British worker! But the Government could still dispose of the issue within terms of reason by keeping its declared faith and abiding by the Sankey report. In a few months, or a few years at most, this situation, like Ireland, may have moved irrevocably beyond compromise.

THAT unquenchable comedian Judge Gary has walked down to the footlights again and joshed the simple public. He sheds tears like the carpenter and the crocodile over the poor workingman who unionizes himself and "becomes the industrial slave of the union"; he admits that in the wicked days of our grandfathers or some such there may have been a use for labor unions, for then labor was sometimes badly treated, but now—only union leaders have any need of unions. Why, the Judge runs on in his merry fashion, if labor unions had their way they would seek to influence public policies, elections, and even the conduct of the police!—a trespass upon the ancient and honorable preserves of the United States Steel Corporation and its fellows which those rollicking philanthropists of course simply must resist. As to the company for which Judge Gary is the jolly joker, it respects the unions with reservations: "We

do not combat, though we do not contract or deal with, labor unions as such." The labor unions, he apparently means to say, are all right in their place—and their place is always somewhere else. What the Judge really believes in, he says, is publicity (we remember the Interchurch Report and its fate), regulation (decently safeguarded by industrial espionage), and reasonable control through Government agencies (such, we doubt not, as the Department of Justice and the Pennsylvania State Constabulary). If this, the Judge has the air of concluding with a flourish, be not reason and justice to all men concerned, make the most of it.

GOVERNOR MILLER continues to establish his reputation for originality, this time by appointing two Democrats to the new Transit Commission of three which is to deal with the pending transit problems of the metropolis. Of course if he were playing the game by custom and by right he must have put in at least two Republicans. As chairman for this body, over whose creation so violent a storm has raged, the Governor chose Mr. George McAneny, than whom no city ever had a more earnest, devoted, or faithful servant. To him the Governor added Major General John F. O'Ryan, a modest soldier who persistently refuses to capitalize in the prints an excellent war service as commander of the Twenty-seventh Division. Other appointments like that of the former comptroller of the City, William A. Prendergast, to the Public Service Commission, show that the Governor has really sought to place merit above partisanship—which makes it all the more regrettable that he forced through the Legislature the abominable Lusk anti-sedition bills, which far offset his achievement in saving six millions of dollars in the new budget—the first saving in years. As for the transit situation in New York, Mr. McAneny and his associates will have an almost insoluble problem before them, one that cannot be solved without calling down infinite abuse from one side or the other.

NOWHERE have the facts governing our present economic distress been more clearly presented than in the Federal Trade Commission's letter to President Harding, just made public, upon which he based the recommendations in his recent message for a Congressional investigation of living costs. Throughout this communication, in so many paraphrases and in such varying contexts that it may well be held the dominant note, appears the statement that the consumer has only in the slightest degree been reached by the alleged reduction in prices. Raw material prices have in many instances been greatly decreased, but nearly all benefit has been extracted en route to the final purchaser. This is what *The Nation* has asserted repeatedly in warning against the deceptive current propaganda concerning the reduction in living costs. That "the consumer's cost of living . . . is too high and must be reduced before renewed buying and normal volume of trade will restore business to healthful conditions" is the conclusion formed by the Commission. It mentions the high cost of coal, of rent, and of transportation as important factors in retarding such restoration. Other factors emphasized are the unwillingness of the retailer to bear his share of the loss, and the so-called Open Price Associations. These are organizations of manufacturers controlling certain essential commodities who limit competition among themselves, keep costs high, and combine with retailers in deliberate understanding that certain price levels shall be maintained. The Commission makes a series of vigorous recommendations which should have the careful attention of the public and of its representatives in Congress.

STRONGLY confirmatory is Secretary Hoover's demand for immediate reduction in transportation rates, whi Chairman Clark of the Interstate Commerce Commissio declares that any further increase in railway rates "will result in less revenue"—obviously already the case. The coal situation was months ago called to the attention of the public by Senator Calder as was the housing situation by Samuel Untermyer. Prompt reduction of passenger and freight rates, thorough coal production at cost to the consumer as its purpose and a nation-wide investigation and prosecution of the building industry of the character of the Lockwood investigation, are essential. Nor should the brazen increase in public utility rates which are being levied on the public throughout the land be permitted. The admission of President Thayer that the American Telephone and Telegraph Company could easily have paid the increased dividend which it is now disbursing at any time in the last ten years, contains the entire argument against unwarranted increases in telephone service rates. Essentials at cost is the just demand of the times. Congress must resolutely set itself to solve this problem, and the Republican Party ought to realize that the best way to hold its power is by going to the relief of the ultimate consumer.

CLASS hatred, not justice, is served when seventy-nine Industrial Workers of the World, including "Bill" Haywood, go behind Federal prison bars, some on sentences of twenty years, as a consequence of the United States Supreme Court's refusal to review their convictions. Larg because of the lowly industrial and social status of most its members, the sincerity of their beliefs, the isolation their lives, and many misconceptions of their philosophy of life, the I. W. W. have been peculiarly subject to persecution by the crowd hysteria of the so-called "respectable element" in this country. The I. W. W. convictions in 1918 were under war legislation now no longer in effect and on evidence that their lawyers declare was illegally obtained by the Department of Justice. The imprisonment of these men now can serve no practical end, but will embitter thousands against the judicial system of the country. Their case is another argument for a pardon of all political prisoners.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT once declared apropos of the Colombian treaty that "the payment can only be justified upon the ground that this nation has played the part of a thief or of a receiver of stolen goods." He was quite right. The payment will be an indemnity for Roosevelt's own action in, as he said, "taking" Panama. The suddenness with which we recognized and protected a Panaman revolution organized in the United States with the knowledge of American officials is in strange contrast to our more recent hesitation to recognize revolutionary Governments in Mexico and in Russia. Colombia has a just grievance against us, and it will do us honor if even at this late date we settle it. Yet—it is strange that a Republican Administration should be so insistent upon an act which is in effect penance for the deeds of an earlier Republican Administ tion, particularly when it is recalled that Lodge and oth signed a report declaring the treaty "blackmail" and rob bery when Mr. Wilson submitted it—how different things look when it is your own President who does it! Can the fact that American oil interests find the ill-feeling due to non-ratification of the treaty a hindrance to development of their business in Colombia have anything to do with this sudden respect for our national honor, and are there new concessions in the offing?

JAPAN, with its usual habit of keen-eyed observation, has apparently learned something from the recent war, and is convinced that overpopulation is the root of most international evils. The Japanese family now averages eight members and the population of the country is increasing at the rate of 700,000 a year. In view of these facts and of the exceedingly limited area of Japan, the Government feels strongly that only by a speedy and nation-wide establishment of the policy of birth control can a war of aggression be avoided in the next generation. As a preliminary step toward this end, Dr. Kato, head of the Department of Medical Affairs under the Japanese Government, is studying the birth-control movement in the United States, Holland, England, and Germany. Here in New York, Mrs. Margaret Sanger has received visits from twenty-five representatives of various departments of the Government sent out to study the question. Dr. Kato reports that the Japanese Parliament is now convinced of the wisdom of national birth control and is concerned only with the methods of teaching it to the people. Sooner or later the rest of the world will have the intelligence to follow suit. At present the United States with laws defining discussion of this problem as "obscene" brings up the rear of the procession.

A NOTABLE event is the launching of the People's Legislative Service in Washington with Robert M. a Follette as chairman and Basil M. Manly as director. No recent departure promises as much. If it can avoid obvious pitfalls, create adequate financial support, and make a reputation for absolutely unbiased facts it will render a great service to Congressmen and Senators, press and public. Already the Service has the indorsement of all the leading Progressives in Congress. There is to be a bureau of research and information consisting of three divisions: first, a legislative division, to analyze and keep watch over all pending legislation, with a view to warning the public against improper bills; secondly, a statistical division, to compile the information required by Senators and Representatives to enable them to make effective fights in Congress; and finally, and perhaps most important of all, a publicity division, to give accurate and unbiased information as to what is going on in Congress to all who seek it. It is not to be a lobby nor a source of propaganda, but a source of facts and therefore an organization around which the free men of Congress should gradually coalesce. The address of the Service is 814 Southern Building, Washington.

THE recommendations made by President Harding in his first message to Congress in regard to our soldiers and sailors disabled in the European War are deserving of early and cordial attention. We must not allow these young men to suffer, and their youth and opportunity to slip by, while bureaucrats flounder in red tape. Mr. Harding sug sts, on the advice of a volunteer committee that has ooked into the subject for him, that the chief difficulty is lack of unity among the various services. He therefore recommends one directing head under whom shall be centralized hospitalization, vocational training, war insurance, rehabilitation, and pensions. This sounds like good business policy, and that is what is needed. Our duties to the victims of war do constitute, as President Harding says, a "sacred obligation"—one that calls not merely for "generous gratitude," but for prompt and effective action.

WHEN Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt at the Cleveland meeting of the National League of Women Voters called upon the persons present to begin a movement to end war she did something which she and other members of the League should have done long ago but for which she should now nevertheless receive the fullest credit. Skeptical as we feel toward the notion that women will be found to have interests or impulses very widely different from those of men where public matters are concerned, we believe that women—all the late evidences of war hysteria among them to the contrary notwithstanding—not only ought to be more anxious than men to see wars ended, but actually are. The mothers and wives of men will not forever be deceived into thinking that mass murder is necessary or that the sacrifice therein of sons and husbands is an honorable lot of women. The leaders of women cannot be forgiven if they omit a single effort to crystallize and capitalize the reaction against war which is now setting in. Let the women voters of this country make themselves heard and the programs for a larger army and a larger navy will melt like snow in summer; let them realize how imperialistic schemes spell the murder of youth in the interests of privileged old men and there will be one more nation at home minding its own business.

THE death of John Daniel in New York on April 17 deprives America and England of a personage than whom the two nations could better have spared many a better man. He had lived in Africa, he had lived in London, he had lived in New York, and in a sense he deserves to be called a citizen of the world; but something in his free spirit made him unable ever to accept the postulates and accouterments of civilization. Like others in our generation, however, he was constrained to live among cities and to be often oppressed by crowds. Not a man in years can be said more truly to have died from the disease of burdensome humanity; John Daniel was a martyr to that disease none the less because he was not a man himself but the gaped-at gorilla at the circus.

NO more appropriate or deserved tribute for the highest kind of service to mankind can be bestowed than the gift of a gram of radium to Madame Marie Curie which President Harding will formally present on May 20 as the gift of American women to the foremost living scientist of their sex. The $100,000 gift of this mysterious element will permit the continuation of researches begun by her and her husband, Paul Curie, nearly a generation ago, which won for them jointly the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1903. After his death, Madame Curie carried on the work alone, succeeding him as professor of physics and director of the physical laboratories at the Sorbonne. It is to her that the world owes probably the greatest achievement in physical chemistry in the twentieth century, and a contribution uniquely twofold. For most scientific discoveries are in the first instance abstract and only indirectly and subsequently beneficial to humanity. Madame Curie's researches not only altered fundamental conceptions of chemistry and physics, but opened up for the allied science of medicine a new and valuable form of therapy.

No War With England

II. Our World Trade Rivalry

THE facts about the United Kingdom from which all other considerations rise have to do with the sustenance of its population. On the British Isles live some fifty million souls, in an area less than half that of the State of Texas. They cannot feed themselves with the crops and animals they raise; if they were confined to their own resources a large part of the population would have to emigrate or starve. Imports of food into the United Kingdom have recently ranged in value from a billion to two and a half billion dollars every year.

These imports must be paid for. They cannot be paid for with other raw materials. Britain has few agricultural products to export. She has few animal products. She does not produce in any quantity valuable commodities like lumber, cotton, wool, silk, rubber, hides. Her mineral resources are limited. She has no copper, nickel, or precious metals, and little mineral oil, tin, lead, or zinc. Just two sizable deposits account for by far the greater part of her natural wealth—coal and iron. But if she exported all the coal and iron she can economically mine, they would not pay her annual bill for foods and other articles which civilized life demands.

She is forced, therefore, to pay by services—principally by manufacturing. She takes part of her coal, all her iron ore, and some imported ore besides, and uses them for making steel and its products, a large share of which she exports. But of course she does not stop there. Nearly ten times as many of her people are engaged in manufacturing and trade as in agriculture and fisheries. She draws in raw materials from all over the world, makes them into finished products, and ships many of them out again. This process greatly enlarges the value of her imports, but it increases the value of her exports even more. Britain's overseas trade is her very life. Whoever interferes with her sources of supply, with her foreign markets, or with the transportation between, strikes at her heart. With all her manufactured exports, moreover, the United Kingdom does not pay for what she receives. There is still a balance to be accounted for—a balance "unfavorable" in the terminology of economists, amounting in normal years to about seven hundred million dollars. This balance is chiefly settled in two ways: by the income on Britain's foreign investments, and by the freight paid for the carriage of goods in British ships.

To say all this is trite; yet it is here that we must begin any closer examination of the subject. The fact that the United Kingdom is and must be, so long as her world position endures, a manufacturing nation, need not lead to enmity against anyone, under certain conditions. Nations who sell raw materials to her will not wish to fight her. Customers who need and buy her manufactured products will not wish to injure her. Neither will anyone who wants to borrow of her capital, or any merchant who ships his goods in her fleet. Other manufacturing nations may be competitors, but if they make goods which Britain buys, and buy other goods which Britain makes, they will be friendly. To all those who stand in such relations to Britain, her world commerce is a guaranty of peace.

Suppose, however, there were a nation which stood in a different relation to her. This nation, let us say, had been sending necessary raw materials to England, but now cut them off. It had been buying British manufactures, but was now ceasing to do so. It increased the use of its own raw materials on the part of its own manufacturers, who not only seized the former British market in their own country, but began to compete with British manufacturers abroad as well. It strove to take from Britain her sources of raw material. In addition to this, it began to supplant Britain as a foreign investor, and it substituted its own ships for British ships on the high seas. Such a nation would be a commercial rival of the sort most dangerous to the United Kingdom. If the development of this rival were slow, Britain might adjust herself comfortably to the new state of affairs, but in proportion as it was rapid and aggressive, the shock to Britain would be severe.

Where does England buy her food? During the war, the United States led in the supply of grains. Canada and Argentina were close seconds. Before the war, however, we did not export so much, because there were more ships available for long hauls, and Russia was open to trade. British India sent much wheat, and Canada, Argentina, and Russia were often far ahead of us in other grains as well. We have long led in British imports of ham, but in bacon only during the war. The United States normally supplies only an inconsiderable part of England's beef and mutton, which come chiefly from Argentina and Australia. Since the war, our importance as a source of food has diminished. During 1920 we exported considerably more wheat to England than in 1918, but only a third as much wheat flour, and the exports of both have shrunk enormously in recent months. Our shipments of beef to the United Kingdom have fallen from five hundred million pounds in 1918 to eleven million in 1920. Exports of bacon to Britain have been cut in half, and we shipped only a quarter as much ham in 1920 as two years before. In short, our subordinate pre-war status is returning with interest. And we shall constantly become less important as food producers. The census of 1920 showed for the first time less than half our population in rural districts. We are now about to hasten the process by imposing a protective tariff on farm products, which will exclude foreign grain from our markets, force it upon Britain and other food-importing nations, and so decrease our exports to them and their dependence on us. Before many years, if present tendencies continue, Britain will not find us indispensable as a source of food, nor we her as a food market. We shall rather compete with her in buying our own supply abroad.

The industries depending on coal, iron, and steel are the most important in Great Britain. She mines her own coal, and has enough left over from her domestic needs to export. We have become large exporters of coal also, and are competing with Britain in many of the foreign coal markets, especially in South America, which she was obliged to neglect during the war. Britain buys some iron ore abroad, but it comes from Spain rather than from the United States. In the steel and all subsidiary industries we are increasingly competitors. British steel production was enlarged by half during the war, and she is pressing for more markets. Our steel capacity is constantly growing also, and we are more than ever turning our eyes abroad for sales. In spite of her increased production, Britain lost during the war about 70 per cent of her iron and steel exports to her colonies and South America, because of the necessities in France, and we stepped into these markets. Now she is fighting to regain the trade. We are both striving to fill the gap left by the cessation of German exports. In tractors, agricultural machinery, automobiles, and machinery of all sorts, competition between British and American manufacturers is growing keener, while each group is increasing its domination of its home market.

In respect to other metals Great Britain is less fortunately situated, but in none except copper and nickel is she to any large degree dependent on the United States. Even copper she can get in Chile, South Africa, Mexico, Spain, Australia, and elsewhere. She could not compete with us in foreign markets for manufactured copper products without buying our crude copper, but she could get enough for her domestic requirements elsewhere if it became necessary—that is, as long as she controlled the seas. The United Kingdom has political and commercial control of over half the world's tin—chiefly in Straits Settlements, Bolivia, and Chile. Lead she can get from Spain and Australia, zinc from Australia and Italy. Other essential minerals she controls in various parts of the world.

Next to metal products, Britain's most important industry is textile manufacturing. Over a million persons are employed in it. It accounts for about half the value of her imports of raw materials, and a third of her exports of manufactured articles. The largest section of it is devoted to cotton, although the United Kingdom cannot raise an ounce of raw cotton. Her supplies come, normally, 75 per cent from the United States, 17 per cent from Egypt, and 3 per cent from India. The manufactured product goes all over the world—except to the United States. Our own cotton mills have been rapidly increasing their production, with the result that they are using up more of the American supply, and competing with British export trade. In 1916 our mills took 20 per cent of our entire cotton crop, as compared with 12 per cent in 1913. In 1918 we supplied only 65 per cent of Britain's imported raw cotton. Much more cotton was manufactured in 1920 than in 1918. Although we exported not quite a third more raw cotton to the United Kingdom in 1920 than two years earlier, we exported more than twice as many cotton manufactures to the world as in the former year—especially to Britain's large markets in the Orient. So threatening to England's spindles is our increased consumption of our raw cotton that she has taken steps to enlarge its growth in Egypt, India, and South Africa. Here we see the gradual withdrawal of our raw material from Britain's industry and the injection of our manufactures into her markets. This tendency is all the more serious because British cotton exporters are also meeting more competition from Japan.

Great Britain does not depend on the United States for raw wool, which she receives normally from Russia, Australia, New Zealand, and South America. Of much of this supply she has commercial control, which on occasion has been converted into monopoly. The United States also is largely dependent on these foreign resources, since we import many times as much raw wool as we export. We are therefore competitive purchasers of this product. The United Kingdom sells much of her woolen and worsted cloth in the United States, but our growing woolen industry is encroaching on this market. The tariff will further weaken this link between the two Anglo-Saxon nations.

We do buy much of our linen from Great Britain, and she sells a large proportion of it to us. She does not manufacture enough silk for her domestic needs, and her market is open to our silk mills. Neither nation produces large crops of flax or raw silk. In these two trades, therefore, our interests do not clash—though the products themselves are not of the most important. The chemical supply from Germany which was cut off by the war was replaced by home manufacture as far as possible in both nations. England receives most of her hides and leather from other countries than the United States, and her timber and wood from Russia, Scandinavia, and Canada as well as from this country. With the rapid depletion of our forest areas and the reopening of trade with Russia our supply will steadily become a less important factor in foreign trade.

The questions of shipbuilding and merchant marine, of oil, and of finance, are so crucial that separate articles must be devoted to them. But from this briefest of surveys it is possible to picture the background of Anglo-American relations. As long as we sell Great Britain millions of bales of cotton, bushels of wheat, and barrels of oil, and buy her woolens and some of her metal products, there is little acute danger. But this margin of mutual interest is rapidly shrinking. We are in sober truth approaching the status of the hypothetical nation whose interests Great Britain must regard as hostile to her own. American banks and commercial associations are daily issuing statements which show that we are ceasing to be a self-supporting country as far as food and raw materials are concerned; that we are producing a "surplus" of manufactures which we must sell to foreign purchasers. In 1920 we exported nearly three billion dollars' worth of goods more than we imported. Of these exports, 34 per cent were crude materials and raw foods; 66 per cent were manufactured products. Of our imports, about 66 per cent were crude materials and raw foods, and 34 per cent manufactured products. Over one hundred associations of manufacturers for foreign trade have been registered under the Webb-Pomerene Act, each selling a different product, each pressing vigorously against European exporters throughout the world in fast-growing competition.

All European industrial nations, to be sure, have an excess of manufactures to sell abroad, but to none of them is their overseas trade so vital as it is to Britain. None of them is in anything like so strong a position. And with none of them is the competition of American manufacturers so direct. There is no escaping the fact that even today the foremost commercial rivals in the world are Great Britain and the United States. There is no escaping the fact that the development of both is intensifying that rivalry. The sketch that we have drawn does not threaten any immediate trouble. Tendencies of this sort could go on for years, and adjustments could be made which would enable the two nations to avoid a collision. The background would be appropriate for war only in case some bold stroke in the foreground brought the opposing forces to a dramatic issue. We do not wish to over-emphasize its importance; but it must be borne in mind in our future discussions of more pressing matters. It may all too easily become a setting for the tragedy we wish to avoid.*

* Next week's article in this series on the relations between England and the United States will deal with merchant marine problems.

A Race Commission—A Constructive Plan

THERE is no more useful paragraph in President Harding's message than that which deals with the race question because he has several constructive proposals to make. In the first place, he comes out against the abomination of lynching. In the second, he dwells on the suggestion that some of the difficulties of the race problem, might be ameliorated by a humane and enlightened consideration of it, a study of its many aspects, and an effort to formulate, if not a policy, at least a national attitude of mind calculated to bring about the most satisfactory possible adjustment of relations between the races, and of each race to the national life. One proposal is the creation of a commission embracing representatives of both races to study and report on the entire subject. The proposal has real merit. I am convinced that in mutual tolerance, understanding, charity, recognition of the interdependence of the races, and the maintenance of the rights of citizenship lies the road to righteous adjustment.

This is in marked contrast, of course, to the attitude of the Wilson administration, which sought, ostrich-like, to evade the whole question—after instituting segregation in the several departments at Washington. Now President Harding senses the possibility of at least obtaining the scientific facts. Who knows, for instance, whether there is or is not an undue criminality among the Negroes? Who knows all the facts about the actual economic status of the Negro? We have had our eyes opened to the existing peonage by the horrible murders, now declared to be eighteen, of Negro slaves upon the plantation of John Williams of Jasper County, Georgia. How much of this is there? Even the census helps little. Hence the very first step toward a readjustment of race relationships should be the obtaining of all the information necessary to sound and scientific judgments unaffected by theories, or prejudices.

Of course *The Nation* approves and commends Mr. Harding's proposal. Just eight years ago its present editor laid before President Wilson, then newly in office, this very plan to which Mr. Harding now leans. The approach to Mr. Wilson was in cooperation with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and a printed plan was laid before the President, after consultation with many different kinds of Northerners and Southerners. Mr. Wilson would not approve; he rejected it for fear that it might offend the feelings of the South, despite the fact that it was suggested that a Southerner be the chairman. Because the program has never been published before and the scheme seems to us as practical as it did eight years ago, we print it here in the hope that it will commend itself to President Harding. It is as follows:

A Proposal for a National Race Commission

(To be appointed by the President of the United States)

Plan and Purpose (May, 1913)

To be modeled on lines of President Roosevelt's Country Life Commission and President Taft's Industrial Commission.

To be financed by private subscriptions to the extent of $50,000 or $60,000.

Program:—A non-partisan, scientific study of the status of the Negro in the life of the nation, with particular reference to his economic situation. This study to include

A. Physical health and efficiency. B. Homes and property. C. Work and wages. D. Education. E. Religious and moral influences. F. Citizenship, legal status, and participation in government.

Organization and Membership

The proposed President's Race Commission should cons t fifteen persons, five Southerners, of whom one shall prefera be the Chairman; five Northerners, and five members of t Negro race. It is suggested that they be selected from the following lists:

SOUTHERNERS

Dr. James H. Dillard, Pres. Jeanes Fund and Director of the Slater Fund, of New Orleans.
Mrs. Desha Breckinridge, of Lexington, Kentucky.
Alfred H. Stone, of Mississippi.
Rev. Dr. J. G. Snedecor, of Alabama, Secretary of the Colored Evangelization of the Presbyterian Church, South.
Hon. James H. Slayden, Congressman from Texas.

NORTHERNERS

Jane Addams, of Chicago.
Hon. A. E. Pillsbury, ex-Attorney General of Massachusetts.
Prof. J. E. Spingarn, of New York.
Julius Rosenwald, of Chicago, Illinois.

COLORED

Major R. R. Moton, of Hampton Institute.
Prof. Kelley Miller, of Howard University.
Rev. Archibald Grimke, of Washington, D. C.
John Mitchell, Jr., Editor the *Planet*, Richmond, Va.
W. Ashbie Hawkins, Attorney-at-Law, Baltimore, Maryland.

METHODS OF WORK

They shall aim:

A. To systematize, evaluate, and make available material already collected. B. To collect further general material by questionnaires and reports covering the nation. C. To make ce tain local intensive studies by means of experts. D. To publ a report which shall indicate (1) the progress of the Neg during his half century of freedom; (2) the obstacles to progress in the past and future; and (3) practical suggestions as to his future welfare. This report to be submitted by the President to Congress if he so desires.

COOPERATING AGENCIES

The following organizations or groups, interested in the Negro or in the "Negro problem," should cooperate:

(1) The Federal Commission on Industrial Relations.

(2) Southern agencies: The University Commission on Southern Race Questions; the Southern Sociological Congress; the Southern Education Association, Nashville; the Y. M. C. A. international committee in the South (Weatherford); Social workers, like Little of Louisville; college teachers of the Negro like Hammond of Paine College, Augusta; the two Phelps-Stokes fellows on the Negro in the Universities of Georgia and Virginia.

(3) Negro agencies: National Business Men's League and other business organizations; colleges like Atlanta, Fisk, Wilberforce; industrial schools like Hampton and Tuskegee; religious, fraternal, and other organizations; women's clubs.

(4) Independent organizations, like the National League on Urban Conditions of the Negro, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, etc.

(5) General funds: Jeanes, Slater, Southern Education, General Education, Miner, Peabody, Phelps-Stokes, etc.

(6) Government agencies, such as Department of Education, etc., and trained sociologists and statisticians.

We sincerely believe that if such a race commission cou be instituted it would be a great step forward in the h tory of the Negro race in America provided only that it was properly manned and managed; and that it would be found to be of very great economic and spiritual benefit to the masses of colored and white people in the South.

Teacher-Baiting: The New Sport

TEACHER-BAITING is becoming one of the most popular sports of our State legislatures. It is cheaper than automobiling and requires less skill than one-old-cat; it is more refinedly cruel than a cocking main or a dog fight, and yet is not against the law; it is as safe as shooting skylarks, or stoning humming birds, because the victims haven't a chance in the world to defend themselves. They have already been reduced in self-respect, and the respect of others, by low salaries; they have had their individuality and spontaneity crushed by standardized curricula. It is easy to attack such brain and conscience as happily survive among them.

The first rule of the sport is to require an oath which singles teachers out as a particularly dangerous and unreliable class, and subjects them to the suspicion of pupils and parents—thus, of course, increasing their influence and usefulness. Through the efforts of gallant sportsmen of the American Legion, a law to this effect has been passed recently in Oklahoma. But the essence of the sport is best seen in legislation proposed in California and passed in New York (although, at this writing, not yet signed by the Governor), whereby it would be illegal for a teacher to advocate, or *believe in*, any change in government by lawful means. In sponsoring this legislation Senator Lusk, the celebrated heresy-hunter of New York, said:

> Teachers who are paid out of public funds to instruct school children have no right either to believe in, or to advocate changes in the State or national government. I do not deny that men and women have the right to advocate governmental changes by peaceful means, but they have not the right to do it while they subsist on public funds.

There is at least one thing to be said in favor of that view. Legislators as well as school teachers "subsist on public funds." Therefore they could not advocate any change in government, and the law that Senator Lusk himself proposes in regard to teachers would be impossible. But if teacher-baiting is to become a broad, national, and democratic sport, uniform rules ought to be adopted. We propose, therefore, that five times daily every teacher shall face the Past, and kissing the Book of Lusk shall repeat:

1. I swear that I do not believe in any change in the State or national government.
2. I swear that I do not believe in any change or progress in political science.
3. I swear that I do not believe in any change or advancement in any other branch of knowledge.
4. I swear that I do not believe in any change or improvement in the human race.
5. I swear that I do not believe in any change in anything.

This, we feel, is more comprehensive and logical than any law or proposal so far, and is calculated to eliminate among teachers the last vestige of ideas, ambition, or hope. It is certain to reduce pupils to a similar state, and thus in a few happy years to transform us into a nation of wooden Indians among whom Senator Lusk will naturally take his place as Grand Imperial Wizard of the Order of Blockheads. And then it will no longer be necessary to bait our teachers; for they will have been turned into squeaking manikins, croaking all day before lifeless classes: "Change not, progress not, aspire not! Think nothing, dare nothing! Every stupidity that is, is right—and Senator Lusk is its Prophet!"

Those Good Old Days

IN these wild days, says a sage of our time, young men call out "Hello" when they meet young ladies, and do not blush; they address them over the telephone in the same vulgar way, and the young ladies do not blush either. Both sexes jest and romp in unseemly fashions; they keep strange hours and dance to strange measures and on subterranean occasions drink strange beverages. Our grandfathers and grandmothers behaved quite otherwise, avers the sage. Yes, but their grandfathers constantly complained to them of the decay of good manners that had followed the Civil War, and pointed to the more decent days of their own youth—to the days of the early century when there were three-bottle men under the table at the end of every dinner and when the Prince Regent in England set the mode for the domestic virtues of the polite world among Anglo-Saxons. Lord Byron, a modest man in his way, was shocked at the waltz and thought things had been better in the good old days, and yet a hundred years before him Pope in London hardly less than Cotton Mather in Boston had bewailed the loss of simplicity and sobriety out of the world. Go back as far as you will and the accusing hands of sages point further still into the past when things were better. Medieval poets sang the virtues of the Roman Empire, but under the empire itself Juvenal remembered the republic. The imagination of Greece mounted up age by age to Homer, and he perpetuated legends of a long antiquity. Adam must have told his grandchildren of the superior proprieties of Eden; and like enough our earliest lake-dwelling ancestors often warned their young of the degeneration which had gone on since the anthropoids came down from their arboreal habitations.

For our part we do not find in history any adequate consolation for the praisers of times past. The rank and file of the virtues have not greatly changed, so far as we can see, during the comparatively few years in the life of the race over which the memory of man runs. All that appears is a certain pendulum swing from one repression or indulgence to another, reaction setting in whenever the virtues or vices of an age begin to bore it. Instead of repining that the present generation is unmitigably naughty, we observe that drunkenness throughout the world is pretty certainly on the decline and that the improving status of women bids fair to make them able to look out for themselves—a condition which we candidly prefer to all the chivalry that ever was invented. What worries us is not the age itself but the fear that its hilarities portend a reaction in the direction of insipid, smug propriety. The dour Commonwealth of Cromwell begot the Restoration, and that in turn the bourgeois reaction of the early eighteenth century. At the end came the Napoleonic eruption, the regency of the fat gentleman of fifty in England, and as an inevitable consequence the Victorian decorum. Now we feel ourselves at the end of the swing in the other direction; the sweep toward naughtiness is slowing up, for all the world is talking about it; almost before we shall be aware, and before we can do anything to prevent it, back we shall go. In a little while our children, more quickly susceptible than we to the new movement, will be looking with pained eyes upon the frivolities of their elders—and we shall be talking of the good old days before the blight set in upon us and carried us away from polite vice to violent virtue.

Mexico—1921

V. Relations with the United States

By PAUL HANNA

International politics today are oil politics.—Premier Briand.

To promote their vast design these oil magnates are capable of starting revolutions in Mexico, instigating civil wars in Asia, or setting fire to Europe and the world to crush a competitor.—*Le Pétrole*, Paris, January, 1921.

MEXICO'S relations with the United States, therefore, are her relations with the great rival oil corporations in the Tampico and adjoining petroleum regions. If the Administration of President Obregon can placate the oil companies the United States will enjoy peace and profitable trade with Mexico henceforth. If the oil companies remain obdurate and hostile then the press agent, trained bandit, and professional revolutionist will tighten their grip upon the scruff of our sovereign necks and lead us straight into bloody war and the conquest of Mexico.

To conquer Mexico would be comparatively easy—from the club arm-chairs and the editorial sancta thousands of miles from the burning mesa—and in harmony with innumerable precedents. Mexico is used to being conquered, and Uncle San is not unused to sharing in the conquest. But in 1847 we were fighting for real estate; we knew when we had won and, roughly, how much we had won. In this second go at our southern neighbor we should be drawn by the lure of a different prize. Oil! And oil is very slippery. How many Americans realize that a second glorious war with Mexico, accompanied by the usual suffering, death lists, bond issues, and higher taxes, may bring "under the flag" nothing more precious than a few miles of geysers gushing salt water! Well after well is turning to salt water in the Tampico field. The sun rises upon them blowing 10,000 to 40,000 barrels of heavy petroleum daily. At nightfall, and permanently thereafter, they blow nothing but salt water. While I was in Mexico newspapers reported that the Corona Company had completed a new pipe line to its prize gusher, at a cost of several million dollars. And the same week they reported that the prize gusher had "gone into salt." At Laredo I talked with Americans just up from Tampico who confirmed the story of the Corona disaster. Our cause for war with Mexico lies upon the surface of subterranean lakes; natural gas drives it through the drilled opening into the tanks of the exploiters. After the oil comes salt water, of which the seas are full and for which nobody would start a war.

While they last, however, these Mexican oil wells are the richest in the world. And fresh pools are still being struck to compensate for those that turn to salt. Into the ears of exploiters already flushed with enormous profits and the lust for greater gain the siren tongue of rumor whispers that Mexico's oil fields have hardly been tapped as yet. To one syndicate of world-wide fame its principal geologist is said to have reported that much of Mexico is but an earthy crust above a sea of petroleum! Tranquil readers may scoff, but in the feverish El Dorado of oil these tales are believed and acted upon.

With so much in hand and so much more in prospect, and supported by the modern world's ravenous demand for more and more oil, it is not surprising that the exploiting corporations should come to regard themselves as a rival sovereignty within the borders of Mexico. Ten years of revolution, moreover, gave the invading capitalists both pretext and opportunity to flout the laws and decrees of successive Administrations or to denounce them before the world as the looting devices of adventurous upstarts. In this sinister light the American people are asked to regard that provision of the Mexican Constitution of 1917 which reaffirms the Government's title to all deposits of oil, gas, minerals, etc. The retroactive application of that clause, decreed by Carranza and still in effect, has been especially attacked by the oil interests as a just cause for military intervention by the United States. I am convinced that the Obregon Administration will annul that retroactive application. I am convinced also that the oil interests know it will be annulled. But I doubt if that will satisfy them, since their real desire is for a right of way to the still undisclosed oil deposits and not a simple acknowledgment of title to their present rich holdings.

It has been carefully concealed from the American people that land ownership in Mexico has never, since the Spaniards came there, carried with it any title to the sub-soil deposits or any right to exploit them. To the soil and its contents three kinds of titles—always separate—are granted under the Spanish practice. There are, first, pastural titles granted to stock raisers exclusively; second, agricultur titles, granted to soil tillers exclusively; third, mining titles, procurable only from the Federal Government by persons desiring to prospect for clearly specified kinds of ore, gas, oil, coal, or asphalt. Owners of grazing or agricultural lands have always had to recognize the state's ownership of everything under the surface; and the Constitution of 1917 reaffirms that principle. Mining laws of some American States once a part of Mexico are still based on that principle.

In Kern County, California, the simple right to prospect for oil on 160 acres of public land was recently sold at auction. Newspaper reports state that the highest bidder was Edward L. Doheny, owner of the Huasteca Oil Company, dominating corporation of the Mexican oil field. For this right merely to prospect for oil Mr. Doheny offers nearly $500,000. In addition he agrees that the Government shall receive 25 per cent of all the oil taken out by his enterprise. The point is this: In an American field, where the richest wells produce only 1,500 barrels of oil daily, Mr. Doheny offers $500,000 and a quarter of his prospective output for the mere right to search for oil; in Mexico the same Mr. Doheny revels in a field where the wells gush from 10,000 to 50,000 barrels daily, yet his company declares it is being robbed because the Mexican Government tries to collect a reasonable tax on the selling price and to reassert its unquestionable title to oil not yet discovered. Extremely pertinent to this issue is the following declaration by Georg W. Dithridge, of Hollis, Long Island, on the recognized rig and practice of oil taxation:

> Fifty-five years ago I was president of the Grant Well Company, owners of the Grant Well at Pithole, Benango County, Pennsylvania, flowing at the moderate rate of 1,500 barrels daily. The United States Federal Government never had the original titles to the lands of the Thirteen Colonial States, and therefore never gave any concession or right for the boring for petroleum in the State of Pennsylvania. Yet in the year 1866, under its unchallenged power of taxation, the American Congress placed a Federal tax of $1 per barrel upon Pennsylvania crude oil, payable at the wells by the producers, that being the only place of production at that time. At the time the Federal taxgatherer appeared on the scene Pennsylvania crude oil brought only $2.50 per barrel, so that the tax was equal to 40 per cent of the gross value. Not only so, but the tax dated from the passage of the act, so there was a tremendous arrearage due the Government, and it took months of steady application of the entire receipts from the sale of 1,500 barrels daily to liquidate the claim of the Government. This was a sample of the taxing power of the American Government—of any government—in time of war, or to pay the indebtedness following war.
>
> In the Tampico field there has raged for a long time between the American corporations and the Mexican Government a quarrel over the payment of a 10 per cent tax on the selling price of crude oil. A common practice there illustrates the cupidity of the concessionnaires. A drilling company sells its output to an associated pipe-line company for as little as 40 cents a barrel, and demands that the Government take its tax on the 40-cent basis. The Government replies that this transaction between associated corporations does not establish a bona-fide selling price, and insists that the tax shall be 10 per cent of the New York quotation for crude oil, which is the basis of the enormous profits paid by the oil companies. The Obregon Administration has also offered to solve the controversy by accepting outright one-tenth of the oil produced.
>
> With respect to the charge that the Mexican Government has been oppressive in its administration of the laws [says Mr. Dithridge], there is something that the American people should know. During more than a decade of residence and business in Mexico I never knew the state or federal taxes or charges to be excessive, even upon concessions and privileges of great value. On the contrary, they have always been the acme of moderation and liberality. And no matter what taxes were imposed or supposable, the hundreds of millions of barrels of petroleum yielded from the treasure house of the Mexican people would represent a sum of profit so vast as to make it look both absurd and shameful for complaint to be made to a neighbor friendly Power to wantonly exert its power right along into war-coercion! It is infinitely worse than what is or could be expressed by "pulling the chestnuts out of the fire." It is rather up to Mr. Doheny to show that the chestnuts were ever his, whether before or after they got into the fire.
>
> Mexico's new Constitution is so easily defended in international law that the interventionists have begun to discard it as a cause for war. At present their propaganda deals more in generalities which aim to strengthen a lazy popular illusion that the Mexican people are inherently incapable of preserving order and protecting foreign interests, even when they are confessedly tired of revolutions and possess a government which is trying to do the right thing by everyone. Upon the cause of this change in tactics by the oil men an American business man of fifteen years' residence in Mexico City shed much light when he said to me:
>
> Hitherto the oil men have been able to play a fine game of bluff and wave a big club over the heads of Mexican officials. That was because the 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 pesos which they paid monthly in taxes was the Government's chief income. When they held back their taxes the Government couldn't pay its bills and began to totter. Carranza was in that fix, and several months before he went out he was able to meet only 70 per cent of the public pay-roll. When he fell the Treasury was empty. But the new Administration, with De la Huerta as Minister of Finance, has freed itself from such helpless dependence upon the oil companies. By the application of wise taxes, big economies, and efficient accounting, the National Treasury now enjoys a monthly revenue of some 6,500,000 pesos entirely apart from the oil revenue. So, when the oil men hold back their taxes, the Government does not totter. On the contrary, it prepares to enforce the delinquency penalties. Last month some of the companies withheld their taxes, but within three weeks they found they were living in a new era, so they paid up. That is why the Obregon Administration has today a treasury reserve of 16,000,000 pesos, and to this reserve it is in a position to add every month virtually the whole sum of six or seven million pesos collected from the oil industry. By midsummer I am sure that Minister De la Huerta will be able to resume interest payment on the national debt, with a good chance of meeting some of the deferred interest by the end of the year.
>
> Resumption of interest payment would win for the Mexican Government thousands of influential friends among foreign holders of its securities. This would divide the camp of those who have looked with more or less satisfaction upon the drift toward intervention. So De la Huerta's desire to resume the payments is equaled only by the need of the oil men to prevent it. And there are many observers of the struggle in Mexico City who believe the growth of the treasury reserve may precipitate some act of inspired mischief that would bring an international crisis and save the situation for the interventionists.
>
> Rumors of such inspired mischief fill the days and nights of an inquiring visitor to Mexico City. I have read extracts from letters written to a friend in the Mexican capital by a gentleman who was traveling on the special car of President-elect Harding during December and January last. This gentleman referred to a forthcoming complete reorganization of the Mexican Government, by force of arms, assisted or entirely accomplished by the United States. Although it had not yet been announced who would be chosen to fill those posts, this letter writer stated that under the Harding Administration "the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of War will both be friends of mine, and I know exactly what they will do." Was this private correspondent telling the truth or merely painting his own importance to a distant friend? I don't know. But I saw extracts from letters by a clergyman who busies himself quietly in international politics, and these letters referred to those I have quoted from and assured the confidential recipient that "there will be wigs on the green" in the near future. Another statement by the first correspondent explained that several millions of dollars had recently been expended in the United States to create opinion favorable to the Obregon Administration. But all in vain, he added; the problem would not be adjusted by friendly negotiation: "You have been told how it will be done, and it will happen just that way." At least one prominent editor in Mexico City is involved by the documents in this scheme to "reorganize" the Mexican Government by force of arms. On the other side, one may hear exciting and wholly unverified stories about how one Cabinet member has poisoned another, or attempted to poison President Obregon, and for his services will shortly be elevated to the Presidency by powerful American financial interests. Gossip among idlers in Mexico City knows no bounds and bothers with no proofs.
>
> In this atmosphere, however, the cause of the interven-

tionist thrives. For to make war easy the interventionist must furnish some "news" or rumor that will obscure facts and the calm consideration of them. He must make the American people forget that the total unpaid interest on Mexico's foreign debt is less than $45,000,000; must keep them from knowing that the vast majority of American business men in Mexico are prosperous and contented; must conceal from them that the Obregon Administration is anxious to make reparation for all loss of life and property as soon as foreign governments will consent to negotiations for that purpose. If the American people will forget these essential truths about Mexico, I am convinced that the interests capable of "setting fire to the world" to gain their ends will furnish a palace revolution, another raid over the border, the kidnapping of another consul, or whatever other preamble to invasion may be required.

These ruthless petroleum dynasties are already at odds and preparing for open war with each other. Regardless of her desire to satisfy both the American and British oil groups, Mexico may easily become a battleground because one of these groups is determined to overthrow and oust the other. On the floor of the United States Senate, April 12, Senator Lodge read from a letter to himself, in which Secretary Fall charged the British oil interests with having betrayed the American Association of Oil Companies by "accepting the Mexican Government's demands with reference to oil-drilling permits," and abiding by its laws! "British oil interests are giving every assurance to Obregon and Mexican officials of their support and friendly cooperation," Secretary Fall complains, "seeking advantage against or over American companies, while the British Government owning this company [Cowdray's Aguila Company], is ostensibly standing by the United States Government in its action" of resistance to Mexican laws. Was ever the identity of oil, governments, and diplomacy more perfectly established or more blatantly confessed? Was ever the menace to Mexico and the world's peace more clearly suggested? Secretary Fall and his oil friends are able to draw only one moral from the "conspiracy" they have uncovered. By conforming to Mexican laws and decrees, which Americans resist, the British are cutting under the American oil companies; therefore, down with Mexican laws and decrees! And the American Government and people are supposed to join in the cry. Mr. Fall does not intend that American business shall be undone by the laws of a neighboring country which bless those who obey and punish those who do not.

From President Obregon down to the humblest policeman, Mexican officials know that highly financed intrigue can produce "bandit" uprisings, outrages against foreigners, or "revolutions" which they are unable exactly to foresee or prevent. The nervous suspicions of an impulsive populace, no less than the weight of sheer bribery, makes this so. To an American visitor who had just recounted his reasons for believing that armed intervention was near, a highly placed Mexican official exclaimed: "I beg of you don't tell that story to many of our people. There would be riots before the American Embassy within twenty-four hours!" That is an indication of the human high explosives which alien mischief-makers have ready at hand. It is in large part a result of American conquest in 1848, revived by the invasions of Vera Cruz and Chihuahua under President Wilson, and kept alive by the elevation to Cabinet rank of Senator Fall, whose draft of demands upon Mexico has opened fresh wounds in the pride of every patriot below the Rio Grande.

In his letter addressed to a Mexican attorney, and then given to the press, Mr. Fall says: "Personally I am exceedingly desirous that this Government should cooperate with any such Government or proposed Government of Mexico in the most friendly, earnest, and sincere manner." Fine words. Yet the very letter in which they are set down carried insult to the Mexican Government as direct as if it had been deliberately drawn to humiliate a proud people. When I asked him to comment on the Fall demands President Obregon made a visible effort to reply with words that should not convey his bitter resentment. To understand this resentment, let us glance at the Fall demands. They are: (1) That a commission be appointed to ascertain the extent of damage suffered by Americans and American property, and by Mexicans and Mexican property on both sides of the frontier; (2) that another or the same commission be directed to settle boundary and irrigation disputes between the two countries; (3) that Article 27, or any decree or law issued thereunder, shall not apply to deprive American citizens of their property rights theretofore legally acquired; that clauses with reference to the teaching of schools by ministers of the Gospel, to the teaching of Christianity by Americans, and like clauses, shall not be enforced against American citizens; (4) that agreements be signed for the protection of American citizens and their property rights in Mexico in future; (5) that as the only acceptable price of recognition the Obregon Administration shall give previous signed allegiance to the above points, which "shall be embodied in a formal treaty between the two countries as soon as the Mexican Government is recognized." Religion and property rights are crudely mixed in Senator Fall's prescription. But this effort to mobilize the Church for war on Mexico ought not to get far in the light of comment by Enoch F. Fell, associate secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who says:

> So far as I have been able to ascertain, our missionaries in Mexico do not suffer any disabilities or persecution either from the Government or from non-governmental sources. I cannot say that our work has been seriously handicapped by any provisions of the Mexican Constitution or laws passed thereunder. I don't think that our Government would ever be justified in demanding that the Constitution of Mexico be changed to suit our tastes. As for the teaching of schools by ministers of the Gospel and the preaching of Christianity by Americans and so on, they do not bother us the least bit. Under no circumstances would we, the representatives of American churches, allow our missionary interests to be so closely tied up to those political and financial questions that are involved in Secretary Fall's letter. If any Protestant missionaries or Christian leaders urged these things upon Mr. Fall, then they must have done so in their personal capacity and not as representatives of the boards or churches.

Omitting the religious issue, which does not exist, Mexico is able and anxious to meet every requirement set forth in the Fall letter. But her leaders and common people regard as infamous Secretary Fall's contemptuous ultimatum that they stand at the point of a gun and give bond that they will not lie and steal from foreigners. I had been told tha several notes sent to Mexico by Secretary of State Colby were so insulting that no response was ever made to them. So, when, seated at President Obregon's side in the National Palace, I referred to the protocol demanded by Secretary Fall as the price of recognition for his Administration, I was not surprised when Mexico's new Chief Executive refused to repeat Mr. Fall's name or to discuss the terms of his proposal. "Is Mexico prepared to sign such a protocol as the price of recognition?" I asked. "Mexico has not sought recognition from the United States," the President replied, and then was silent long enough for the answer to interpret itself. In a moment he continued:

> Nevertheless, the Government and people of Mexico crave the friendship and good will of the Government and people of the United States, and the formal recognition that would naturally follow. We have much to gain through peace and cooperation with the United States, and much to give. And we have no objection to making a treaty which would establish important policies affecting the two countries. But a treaty between independent nations must contain reciprocal advantages. Such a treaty Mexico is ready to negotiate. There is, however, no factor in the actual circumstances between the United States and Mexico, and no precedent in international law, to justify a demand that Mexico sign a treaty as the price of formal recognition.

With two members of the Obregon Cabinet I enjoyed frank discussions of the intervention peril. The first of these officials professed to have no fear that the United States would provoke a war. He is an idealist in philosophy and a realist in action, yet his words sounded naive. "There is no cause for war," he said; "we have concluded our revolution, and American capital is secure in Mexico and returning a good profit to its owners. The oil corporations are much better off under our laws than they would be if they had to pay the heavy taxes made necessary in the United States by the World War. Your country has a terrible load of debt, and the party in control is pledged to curtail expenditures and reduce taxation. A war with Mexico would defeat that program, and win nothing more than Mexico is willing to guarantee through peaceful negotiations." Yet, I insisted, what if invasion should come in spite of all that? "We can hold out for many years," he replied; "we know the mountain paths and our people are skilled in guerrilla fighting."

The second Minister was a shade less sanguine, but still hopeful that peace would prevail. "We think Secretary Hughes will be just because he is honest and intelligent," this man told me. "We realize that the United States is an invincible Power, that it contains elements at present hostile to Mexico, and that our policy must conform to the actualities. But we will never accept the status of Cuba, whose position as a dependency of the United States is sometimes recommended as a 'solution' for Mexico. Within the shadow of a peril which we fully comprehend, the policy of this Administration is to busy itself with a just solution of its domestic tasks and not worry too much about a danger that we cannot control."

And so the peril stands, and grows. Yet if there be any reverence left in the American soul for illustrious example and acclaimed wisdom of the past, then intrigue, lies, and organized selfishness will not serve to stain the flag with ruthless conquest and strew the continent with fresh horrors of war. In concluding this brief study I commend to the people in general and to the Republican Party especially some words in which all I feel and far more than I have said about Mexico are luminously expressed by the best-beloved figure in American history. Were he alive today Abraham Lincoln could hardly pen a message more filled with wisdom and timely analysis than the note he sent forward to his representative in Mexico City a few months before violent death struck him down. Maximilian had fallen and Mexico was struggling again to her feet under the guidance of President Benito Juarez when Lincoln wrote:

> For a few years past the condition of Mexico has been so unsettled as to raise the question on both sides of the Atlantic whether the time has not come when some foreign Power ought, in the general interest of society, to intervene, to establish a protectorate or some other form of government in that country, and guarantee its continuance there. . . .
>
> You will not fail to assure the Government of Mexico that the President neither has nor can ever have any sympathy with such designs, in whatever quarter they may arise or whatever character they may take on. . . .
>
> The President never for a moment doubts that the republican system is to pass safely through all ordeals and prove a permanent success in our own country and so be recommended to adoption by all other nations. But he thinks, also, that the system everywhere has to make its way painfully through difficulties and embarrassments which result from the action of antagonistical elements which are a legacy of former times and very different institutions.
>
> The President is hopeful of the ultimate triumph of this system over all obstacles, as well as in regard to Mexico as in regard to every other American state; but he feels that these states are nevertheless justly entitled to a greater forbearance and more generous sympathy from the Government and the people of the United States than they are likely to receive in any other quarter.
>
> The President trusts that your mission, manifesting these sentiments, will reassure the Government of Mexico of his best disposition to favor their commerce and internal improvements. *I find the archives here full of complaints against the Mexican Government for violation of contracts and spoliation and cruelties practiced against American citizens.* It is not the President's intention to send forward such claims at the present moment. He willingly defers the performance of a duty which at any time would seem ungracious, until the incoming Administration in Mexico shall have had time, if possible, to cement its authority.

To that utterance nothing can be added in definition of the duty owed to Mexico by the United States.

The British Coal Strike

By HAROLD J. LASKI

London, April 4

WITHIN less than four months since the last great strike the coal industry of this country is again plunged into complete chaos. This time the stoppage can without exaggeration be described as the most serious the country has ever known. For the first time in its history the Miners' Federation has withdrawn labor of every sort from the pits, so that the flooding of the deeper mines will be, if the stoppage be at all prolonged, a certainty. For the first time also, it has definitely appealed to the remaining partners of the Triple Alliance for aid; and it is difficult to believe that assistance can be withheld at so critical a time. Unless, therefore, something unforeseen occurs in the next two or three days the country will be confronted by the greatest industrial dislocation of its history. It is purely idle as yet to talk of revolution, though there are doubtless elements in both camps to whom that prospect is inviting. The present issue is purely one of wages. How much more

it is to become will depend upon the policy of the Government.

The present dispute turns upon the sudden decision of the Government to decontrol the mines. The causes of that step are very difficult to assess. Everyone knew that peace depended upon owners and men having a sufficient amount of time to work out a solution of their common problems. If control had been maintained until its normal date (August 31) a settlement would have been inevitable for the sufficient reason that the united public opinion of the country would have demanded it. But the sudden resolve of the Government to predate decontrol to March 31 made settlement impossible. The owners were living through a bad financial period. They disliked the system of national wage agreements to which control had committed them. They saw an admirable opportunity not only of returning to the old system of district settlements, but thereby also of striking a decisive blow at the prestige of the Miners' Federation and of destroying the large increases of wages which the men secured from the war. The time, moreover, was from their standpoint excellent. Large stocks of coal had been everywhere accumulated; the trade position made coal-getting profitable only in a bare handful of the best mines; and the miners' funds were low as a result of the November strike. Postponement of decontrol would, at most, have cost the Government a few scores of thousands; the present dispute, if it be prolonged, will cost not only millions, but possibly the export trade in coal. The decision taken fits in so admirably with what the owners must have desired as to make the hypothesis of collusion between them and the Cabinet at least worthy of consideration. It comes moreover at a moment when Mr. Lloyd George has been insisting on the danger of the Labor Party to the State.

Once it was seen that decontrol was inevitable, the owners took the steps expected of them. Mining, they argued, is no longer profitable; therefore wages must be reduced. There is to be no standard reduction uniformly through the coal fields, but district reductions varying from a 50 per cent cut in South Wales to something like 20 per cent in Durham. That, broadly speaking, would mean in real wages the loss of all the miners' war gains, including the special Sankey award made in March, 1919, on the special and specific ground that the miners' standard of life was inadequate. It is to be noted that no statistical proof of the degree to which the industry is unprofitable was offered. We do not learn of the profit in by-products, the sale of coke, and the transference of coal to blast furnaces connected with not a few mines. We do not learn how the rate of profit varies from mine-field to mine-field, much less from mine to mine. We are simply given the owners' contemptuous *ipse dixit* as the basis of action. Nor was there consultation with the men. The reductions decreed were simply posted at the pithead; all existing contracts were terminated; and the Miners' Federation was absolutely ignored. Autocratic government could hardly go further.

The miners' position is a simple one, though they have hardly succeeded in making their case plain to the public. That decontrol must mean a reduction in wages is common ground. Mr. Frank Hodges, indeed, has asked for a national subsidy for the mines until the present crisis has passed; but that is not practical politics and may well be ignored. In our present financial position no one industry can be allowed to become parasitic upon the country. Alternatively, they demand national negotiations of wage-rates. This, it should be noted, they have already had for six years, and it does not preclude variation according to districts, so long as the center of negotiation is the executive of the miners. What they resent, and rightly resent, is that their wages should be cut without regard to a standard of life, to the price of coal, to their employers' rate of profit, or even to the necessary data without which the owners have left them to fight in the dark. Their one tactical mistake is to have withdrawn the pump and enginemen and so to have made possible the flooding of the mines. This has set the opinion of the usually indifferent man in the street against them; it is a grave menace to the recovery of our trade; and it is a positive inducement to the owners to prolong the dispute. The explanation offered is that if the mines were kept open, the Government might have helped the owners to blackleg; but most people will think that a prior agreement on this head could have been had. Probably the action is simply a symptom of the temper in which the struggle is to be fought.

That the real culprit in the struggle is the Government will be obvious to everyone. Its action is akin to that sinister folly which in Ireland and India, in Egypt and Central Europe destroys both our good name and our prosperity in the interests of reaction. Mr. Lloyd George was committed to the Sankey Report, and when he deliberately evaded that pledge he laid all the foundations of the present trouble. He had to choose between power and his honor, and, characteristically enough, he chose power. That the mines are a good investment for the nation will be obvious to anyone who remembers that in the six years from 1914 the owners received more than their capital value in profit; an investment which pays 100 per cent in six years might have attracted even a vote-catching Prime Minister. But just as Dr. Addison was afraid of the building guilds and did his best to block their progress, so Mr. Lloyd George was afraid that if the nationalization of the mines was a success, the railways and shipping would follow. As virtual head of the Tory Party he had, of course, to reject nationalization if he wished to retain office.

The effect on the nation of this strike is bound to be disastrous. If the miners lose the present strike, they will merely gird up their loins for a further struggle, and it is that absence of certain peace which is chiefly working havoc with the coal industry. If they lose, their defeat will, confessedly, be the signal for a frontal attack upon wages, which will result in a grave degradation of the national standard of life. That is why the railway men and the transport workers will probably think it imperative to assist the miners now. It is better to have a strike of their own choosing than to have one forced upon them, and it is well that capital the country over should be taught that wages cannot be reduced with impunity. But we have far to travel before that realization will have been grasped. When it is, I think a different government will be in power.

Contributors to This Issue

HAROLD J. LASKI, formerly of Harvard and the School for Social Research, is a professor at the University of London.

GEORGE P. WEST is a well-known writer on political and sociological subjects.

Contemporary American Novelists

By CARL VAN DOREN

IV. WINSTON CHURCHILL

THE tidal wave of historical romance which toward the end of the past century attacked this coast and broke so far inland as to inundate the entire continent swept Winston Churchill to a substantial peak of popularity to which he has since clung, with little apparent loss, by the exercise of methods somewhat but not greatly less romantic than those which at first lifted him above the flood. Those early methods, certainly, were not his own inventions. Full allowance being made for the dubiety of literary lineages, "The Virginians" will still do well enough as an ancestor of "Richard Carvel," in both of which gallant young American provincials learn the way of the world in England; and "Lorna Doone" will do well enough as an ancestor of "The Crossing," in both of which precocious and virtuous lads of a backwoods disposition rise through adventure to marriages with charming ladies. "The Crisis," one of the earliest Civil War romances on something like the grand scale, and "Coniston," with its Jacksonian democracy misbehaving among the Yankees, seem perhaps hardly so legitimate in descent. The proportion of originality among the four, however, is of course neither determinable nor important. Romance always actually follows the methods it obviously followed during the Middle Ages, advancing somewhat anonymously through the generations, alternately waxing and waning like the moon; and Mr. Churchill is of the sound romantic tradition.

He came when romance was in that ascendant mood, enlarged by that moment of national expansiveness, which attended the war with Spain. Patriotism and jingoism, altruism and imperialism, passion and sentimentalism shook the temper which had been slowly stiffening since the Civil War. Now, with a rush of unaccustomed emotions the national imagination sought out its own past, luxuriating in it, not to say wallowing in it. In Mr. Churchill it found a romancer full of consolation to any who might fear or suspect that the country's history did not quite match its destiny. He had enough erudition to lend a very considerable "thickness" to his scene, whether it was Annapolis or St. Louis or Kentucky or upland New England. He had a sense for the large general bearings of this or that epoch; he had a firm, warm confidence in the future implied and adumbrated by this past; he had a feeling for the ceremonial in all eminent occasions. He had, too, a knack at archaic costume and knack enough at the idiom in which his contemporaries believed their forebears had expressed themselves. And he had, besides all these qualities needed to make his records heroic, the quality of moral earnestness which imparted to them the look of moral significance. Richard Carvel, by the exercise of simple Maryland virtues, rises above the enervate young sparks of Mayfair; Stephen Brice in "The Crisis" by his simple Yankee virtues makes his mark among the St. Louis rebels —who, however, are gallant and noble though misguided men; canny David Ritchie in "The Crossing" leads the frontiersmen of Kentucky as the little child of fable leads the lion and the lamb; crafty Jethro Bass in "Coniston," though a village boss with a pocketful of mortgages and consequently of constituents, surrenders his ugly power at the touch of a maiden's hand.

To reflect a little upon this combination of heroic color and moral earnestness is to discover how much Mr. Churchill owes to the elements injected into American life by Theodore Roosevelt. Is not "The Crossing"—to take specific illustrations—connected with the same central saga as "The Winning of the West"? Is not "Coniston," whatever the date of its events, an arraignment of that civic corruption which Roosevelt hated as the natural result of civic negligence, and against which he urged the duty of an awakened civic conscience? In time Mr. Churchill was to extend his inquiries to regions of speculation into which Roosevelt never ventured, but as regards American history and American polities they were of one mind. "Nor are the ethics of the manner of our acquisition of a part of Panama and the Canal," wrote Mr. Churchill in 1918 in his essay on The American Contribution and the Democratic Idea, "wholly defensible from the point of view of international democracy. Yet it must be remembered that President Roosevelt was dealing with a corrupt, irresponsible, and hostile government, and that the Canal had become a necessity not only for our own development, but for that of the civilization of the world." And again: "The only real peril confronting democracy is the arrest of growth." Roosevelt himself could not have muddled an issue better. Like him Mr. Churchill has habitually moved along the main lines of national feeling—believing in America and democracy with a fealty unshaken by any adverse evidence and delighting in the American pageant with a gusto rarely modified by the exercise of any critical intelligence. Morally he has been strenuous and eager; intellectually he has been naive and belated. Whether he has been writing what was avowedly romance or what was intended to be sober criticism, he has been always the romancer first and the critic afterwards.

And yet since the vogue of historical romance passed nearly a score of years ago Mr. Churchill has honestly striven to keep up with the world by thinking about it. One novel after another has presented some encroaching problem of American civic or social life: the control of polities by interest in "Mr. Crewe's Career"; divorce in "A Modern Chronicle"; the conflict between Christianity and business in "The Inside of the Cup"; the oppression of the soul by the lust for temporal power in "A Far Country"; the struggle of women with the conditions of modern industry in "The Dwelling Place of Light." Nothing has hurried Mr. Churchill or forced his hand; he has taken two or three years for each novel, has read widely, has brooded over his theme, has reinforced his stories with solid documentation. He has aroused prodigious discussion of his challenges and solutions—particularly in the case of "The Inside of the Cup." That novel perhaps best of all exhibits his later methods. John Hodder by some miracle of inattention or some accident of isolation has been kept in his country parish from any contact with the doubt which characterizes his age. Transferred to a large city he almost instantly finds in himself heresies hitherto only latent, spends a single summer among the poor, and in

the fall begins relentless war against the unworthy rich among his congregation. Thought plays but a trivial part in Hodder's development. Had he done any real thinking he must long before have freed himself from the dogmas that obstruct him. Instead, he has drifted with the general stream, and learns not from the leaders but from the slower followers of opinion. Like the politician he absorbs through his skin, gathering premonitions as to which way the crowd is going and then rushing off in that direction. If this recalls the processes of Roosevelt, hardly less does it recall those of Mr. Churchill. Once taken by an idea for a novel, he has always burned with it as if it were as new to the world as to him. Here lies, without much question, the secret of that genuine earnestness which pervades all his books: he writes out of the contagious passion of a recent convert or a still excited discoverer. Here lies, too, without much question, the secret of Mr. Churchill's success in holding his audiences: a sort of unconscious politician among novelists, he gathers his premonitions at happy moments, when the drift is already setting in. Never once has Mr. Churchill, like a philosopher or a seer, run off alone.

Even for those, however, who perceive that he belongs intellectually to a middle class which is neither very subtle nor very profound on the one hand nor very shrewd or very downright on the other, it is impossible to withhold from Mr. Churchill the respect due a sincere, scrupulous, and upright man who has served the truth and his art according to his lights. If he has not overheard the keenest voices of his age, neither has he listened to the voice of the mob. The sounds which have reached him from among the people have come from those who eagerly aspire to better things arrived at by orderly progress, from those who desire in some lawful way to outgrow the injustices and inequalities of civil existence and by fit methods to free the human spirit from all that clogs and stifles it. But as they aspire and intend better than they think, so, in concert with them, does Mr. Churchill. In all his novels, even the most romantic, the real interest lies in some mounting aspiration opposed to a static regime, whether the passion for independence among the American colonies, or the expanding movement of the population westward, or the crusades against slavery or political malfeasance, or the extrication of liberal temperaments from the shackles of excessive wealth or poverty or orthodoxy. Yet the only conclusions he can at all devise are those which history has devised already —the achievement of independence or of the Illinois country, the abolition of slavery, the defeat of this or that usurper of power in politics. Rarely is anything really thought out. Compare, for instance, his epic of matrimony, "A Modern Chronicle," with such a penetrating—if satirical—study as "The Custom of the Country." Mrs. Wharton urges no more doctrine than Mr. Churchill, and she, like him, confines herself to the career of one woman with her successive husbands; but whereas the "Custom" is luminous with quiet suggestion and implicit commentary upon the relations of the sexes in the prevailing modes of marriage, the "Chronicle" has little more to say than that after two exciting marriages a woman is ready enough to settle peacefully down with the friend of her childhood whom she should have married in the beginning. In "A Far Country" a lawyer who has let himself be made a tool in the hands of nefarious corporations undergoes a tragic love affair, suffers conversion, reads a few books of modern speculation, and resolutely turns his face toward a new order. In the same precipitate fashion the heroine of "The Dwelling Place of Light," who has given no apparent thought whatever to economic problems except as they touch her individually, suffers a shock in connection with her intrigue with her capitalist employer and becomes straightway a "radical," shortly thereafter making a pathetic and edifying end in childbirth. In all these books there are hundreds of sound observations and elevated sentiments; the author's sympathies are, as a rule, remarkably right; but taken as a whole his most serious novels, however lifelike and well rounded their surfaces may seem, lack the upholding, articulating skeleton of thought.

Much the same lack of spiritual penetration and intellectual consistency which has kept Mr. Churchill from ever building a very notable realistic plot has kept him from ever creating any very memorable characters. The author of ten novels, immensely popular for more than a score of years, he has to his credit not a single figure—man or woman—generally accepted by the public as either a type or a person. With remarkably few exceptions he has seen his dramatic personae from without, and—doubtless for that reason—has apparently felt as free to saw and fit them to his argument as he has felt with his plots. Something preposterous in the millionaire reformer Mr. Crewe, something cantankerous and passionate in the Abolitionist Judge Whipple of "The Crisis," above all something both tough and quaint in the up-country politician Jethro Bass in "Coniston," resisted the argumentative knife and saved for those particular persons that look of being entities in their own right which distinguishes the authentic from the artificial characters of fiction. For the most part, however, Mr. Churchill has erred in what may be called the arithmetic of his art: he has thought of men and women as mere fractions of a unit of fiction, whereas they themselves in any but romances must be the units and the total work the sum or product of the fictive operation. Naturally he has succeeded rather worse with characters of his own creating, since his conceptions in such cases have come to him as social or political problems to be illustrated in the conduct of beings suitably shaped, than in characters drawn in some measure from history, with their individualities already more or less established. Without achieving fresh or bold interpretations of John Paul Jones or George Rogers Clark or Lincoln Mr. Churchill has added a good deal to the vividness of their legends; whereas in the case of characters not quite so historical, such as Judge Whipple and Jethro Bass, he has admirably fused his moral earnestness regarding American politics with his sense of spaciousness and color in the American past.

After the most careful reflection upon Mr. Churchill's successive studies of contemporary life one recurs irresistibly to his romances. He possesses, and has more than once displayed, a true romantic—almost a true epic—instinct. Behind the careers of Richard Carvel and Stephen Brice and David Ritchie and Jethro Bass appear the procession and reverberation of stirring days. Nearer a Walter Scott than a Bernard Shaw, Mr. Churchill has always been willing to take the memories of his nation as they have come down to him and to work them without question or rejection into his broad tapestry. A naturalistic generation is tempted to make light of such methods; they belong, however, too truly to good traditions of literature to be overlooked. A national past has many uses, and different dispositions find

in it instruction or warning, depression or exaltation. Mr. Churchill has found in the American past a cause for exaltation chiefly; after his ugliest chapters the light breaks and he close always upon the note of high confidence which resounds in the epics of robust, successful nations. If in this respect he has too regularly flattered his countrymen, he has also enriched the national consciousness by the colors which he has brought back from his impassioned forays. Only now and then, it must be remembered, do historical novels pass in their original form from one generation to another; more frequently they suffer a decomposition due to their lack of essential truth and descend to the function of compost for succeeding harvests of romance. Though probably but one or two of Mr. Churchill's books—perhaps not even one—can be expected to outlast a generation with much vitality, he cannot be denied the honor of having added something agreeable if imponderable to the national memory and so of having served his country in one real way if not in another.

A Short View of Gamalielese

By H. L. MENCKEN

IN the first sentence of the historic address from the east front of the Capitol, glowing there like a gem, was that piquant miscegenation of pronouns the *one-he* combination, for years a favorite of bad newspaper reporters and the inferior clergy. In the fourth sentence of the first message to Congress is *illy*, the passion of rural grammar-teachers and professors of rhetoric in one-building universities. We are, as they say, getting warm. The next great state paper—who knows?—may caress and enchant us with "*Whom* can deny?" And the next with "I would *have had* to *have had*." And the next with "between you and *I*." And the next, going the whole hog, with *alright*, to date the gaudiest, loveliest, darndest flower of the American language, which God preserve!

Hog: flower? Perhaps the distemper is contagious. But certainly not uninteresting to study and snuffle over—certainly no dull thing to the specialist in morbid philology. In the style of the late Woodrow there was nothing, after all, very remarkable, despite the orgiastic praises of Adolph Ochs, the Hon. Josephus Daniels, and other such fanatics. It was simply the style of a somewhat literary and sentimental curate, with borrowings from Moody and Sankey and Dr. Berthold Baer. Its phrases lisped and cooed; there was a velvety and funereal gurgling in them; they were made to be intoned between the second and third lessons by fashionable rectors; aided by fifes and drums, or even by cost-plus contracts, they were competent to vamp the intellect. But intrinsically they were hollow. No heart's blood was in them; no gobs of raw flesh. There was no passion there, hot, exigent, and challenging. They could not make one puff and pant. . . . One had to wait for Dr. Harding for that. In his style there is pressure, ardency, effortcy, gasping, a high grunting, Cheyne-Stokes breathing. It is a style that rolls and groans, struggles and complains. It is the style of a rhinoceros liberating himself by main strength from a lake of boiling molasses.

In the doctrine that it is obscure I take no stock whatever. Not a single sentence in the two great papers is incomprehensible to me, even after I have dined. I exhume a sample strophe from the canto on the budget system in the message: "It will be a very great satisfaction to know of its early enactment, so it may be employed in establishing the economies and business methods so necessary in the minimum of expenditure." This is awful stuff, I grant you, but is it actually unintelligible? Surely not. Read it slowly and critically, and it may boggle you, but read it at one flash, and the meaning will be clear enough. Its method is that of *pointillisme*. The blotches of color are violent, and, seen too closely they appear insane, but stand off a bit and a quite simple and even austere design is at once discerned. "I hope it is adopted soon, so that we may employ the economies and business methods needed to hold down expenses": this is the kernel. What else is there is the style. It is the style of what the text-books of rhetoric call "elevated" discourse. Its aim is to lend force to a simple hope or plea or asseveration by giving it the dynamic whoop and hoopla of a revival sermon, an auction sale, or a college yell. The nuclear thought is not smothered in the process, as Democratic aesthetes argue, nor is it true that there is sometimes no nuclear thought at all. It is always present, and nine times out of ten it is simple, obvious, and highly respectable. But it lacks punch; it is devoid of any capacity to startle and scorch. To give it the vigor and dignity that a great occasion demands it is carefully encased in those swathings of sonorous polysyllables, and then, the charge being rammed home, it is discharged point-blank into the ears and cerebrums of Christendom.

Such is the Gamalian manner, the secret of the Gamalian style. That style had its origin under circumstances that are surely not unknown to experts in politico-agrarian oratory. It came to birth on the rustic stump, it developed to full growth among the chautauquas, and it got its final polishing in a small-town newspaper office. In brief, it reflects admirably the tastes and traditions of the sort of audience at which it was first aimed, to wit, the yokelry of the hinterland, naive, agape, thirsty for the prodigious, and eager to yell. Such an audience has no fancy for a well-knit and succinct argument, packed with ideas. Of all ideas, indeed, it is suspicious, but it will at least tolerate those that it knows by long hearing, those that have come to the estate of platitudes, those that fall readily into gallant and highfalutin phrases. Above all, it distrusts perspicuity, for perspicuity is challenging and forces one to think, and hence lays a burden on the mind. What it likes most of all is the roll of incomprehensible polysyllables—the more incomprehensible the better. It wants to be bombarded, bawled at, overwhelmed by mad gusts of the parts of speech. It wants to be entertained by orators who are manifestly superior—fellows whose discourse is so all-fired learned and unintelligible, so brilliant with hard words and trombone phrases, that it leaves them gasping. Let the thunder sound, and it takes all else on trust. If a sentence ends with a roar, it does not stop to inquire how it began. If a phrase has punch, it does not ask that it also have a meaning. If a word stings, that is enough.

Trained to the service of such connoisseurs, Dr. Harding carries over the style that they admire into his traffic with the Congress, the effete *intelligentsia*, and the powers and principalities of Europe. That style is based upon the simplest of principles. For every idea there is what may be called a maximum investiture—a garb of words beyond which it is a sheer impossibility to go in gaudiness. For every plain word there is a word four times as big. The

problem is to think the thing out in terms of harmless banality, to arrange a series of obvious and familiar ideas in a logical sequence, and then to translate them, one by one, into nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and pronouns of the highest conceivable horse-power—to lift the whole discourse to the plane of artillery practice—to dignify the sense by all the arts of sorcery. Turn to the two immortal documents. The word *citizen* is plainly banal; even a Congressman can understand it. Very well, then let us make it *citizenship*—and *citizenship* it becomes every time. But even that is not enough. There comes a high point in the argument; a few more pounds of steam must be found. *Citizen* now undergoes a second proliferation; it becomes *factor in our citizenship*. "We must invite . . . every factor in our citizenship to join in the effort"—to restore normalcy. So with *women*. It is a word in common use, a vulgar word, a word unfit for the occasions of statecraft. *Also*, it becomes *womanhood*. Again, there is *reference;* it swells up a bit and becomes *referendum*. Yet again, *civil* becomes *civic*—more scholarly, more tasty, more nobby. Yet again, *interference* has a low smack; it suggests plow-horses that interfere. *En avant!* there is *intermediation!* And so with whole phrases. "The views of the world" gives way to "the expressed views of world opinion." "Heedless of cost" becomes "in heedlessness of cost." "Public conscience" becomes "the expressed conscience of progress." The "uplift," now ancient and a trifle obscene, is triumphantly reincarnated in "our manifestation of human interest." "The Government's duty to develop good citizens" shrieks upward like a rocket and bursts magnificently into "the Government's obligation affirmatively to encourage development of the highest and most efficient type of citizenship." And so on and on.

Naturally enough, this style has its perils, no less hellish than war's. A man, so blowing up the parts of speech, may have one burst in his face. I discern something of the sort, alas, in "Congress might speed the price readjustment to normal relationship, with helpfulness of both producer and consumer." Here there has been an accident. just what I do not know. I suspect that "normal relationship" was substituted for *normalcy,* and that *normalcy* somehow got its revenge. Or maybe *helpfulness* came to its rescue and did the dirty work. Furthermore, the little word *of* has a suspicious look. I let the problem go. It is not one that a literary man engages with much gusto. He knows by harsh experience that words have a way of playing tricks—that they run amok at times, and toss him in the air, or stand him on his head—that fooling with them is like training leopards and panthers to leap through hoops and play the violoncello. There is, I have a notion, a foul conspiracy among words to pull Dr. Harding's legs from under him. He has tortured them for years—on the stump, in the chautauquas, beside the felled and smoking ox, at the annual banquets of the Chamber of Commerce, the Knights of Pythias, the Rotary Club, the Moose; above all, on the floors of legislative halls and in the columns of the Marion *Star*. He has forced them into strange and abhorrent marriages. He has stretched them as if they were chewing-gum. He has introduced pipes into them and pumped them until they screamed. He has put them to cruel and unusual uses. He has shown them no mercy. . . . Now, at last, they have him before a crowd that loves mirth, and make ready to get their *revanche*. Now they prepare to put the skids under him.

The Mooney Case Today

By GEORGE P. WEST

ONLY a pardon from Governor Stephens can give Mooney and Billings their freedom. Each has spent more than four years in prison, under life sentences following their conviction for planting the bomb that killed a score of people during the San Francisco Preparedness Day Parade of July, 1916. No intelligent citizen any longer denies that they were convicted on perjured testimony. Recent confessions by witnesses and a city detective have completed the destruction of the case against them. The Judge who presided at Mooney's trial, the detective sergeant who procured the State's witnesses, the Attorney General of California, the district attorney who succeeded Fickert, the Episcopal Bishop of San Francisco—all these and many more have urged action to correct a flagrant miscarriage of justice.

The Supreme Court has washed its hands. Denying the petition of the trial judge and the Attorney General, it held, more than two years ago, that inasmuch as the official record of the Mooney trial contained no evidence of perjury the conviction must stand, because the court cannot go outside of the record. It would take a legal training to understand how such a decision could have any other effect than to bring the law and the whole judicial process into contempt. But at least the decision put the case squarely up to Governor Stephens, and for two years the responsibility has been solely his. His latest acknowledgment was to deny rather brusquely, a year ago, the request of an official delegation from the State Federation of Labor for an audience on Mooney's and Billing's behalf.

District Attorney Brady, who defeated Fickert last year largely with the help of Fremont Older, editor of the *Call* [of San Francisco], and others who had organized the demand for Mooney's and Billings's release, stands ready to investigate every new disclosure bearing on the corruption that resulted in the convictions. When John McDonald, the migratory laborer whose testimony identified Billings as the planter of the bomb, came to San Francisco prepared to testify that he had perjured himself, Mr. Brady took him before the grand jury and attempted to get him immunity. A committee of six members of the grand jury promised the immunity, but it was later withdrawn and McDonald was threatened by agents and friends of principals in the original frame-up. Mr. Brady's good faith is not questioned, but no ambitious politician would yet dare to show zeal and enthusiasm in Mooney's behalf. Many of Mooney's friends are urging that Mr. Brady bring Mooney to trial on one of the remaining indictments, while others insist that a new trial would be a farce, as all the available witnesses have been already completely discredited, and if Governor Stephens will not now sign a pardon there is no reason to suppose that he would act after an acquittal. The Mooney prosecution might even be strengthened, because attention would be diverted from the record as it stands to the merits of the second trial, in which the prosecution's failure to make a case would be excused on the ground of the time that has elapsed and the dispersal of the witnesses. The first convictions would, of course, stand.

Melodrama and sordid comedy and amazing corruption are in the tale that has been told and retold. What the world outside of California must wonder, must want to know, is why nothing is done about it, why the years pass and Mooney and Billings still remain in prison. What does the Californian opposed to a pardon have to say for himself? Simply this, that Mooney was a Bolshevik, a bad egg, a dangerous man, and belongs in jail on general principles! Here is the most interesting and significant fact of the whole case. You can go about among the pillars of society anywhere in California and hear one champion of "law and order" after another calmly waive the question of whether there was a single bit of valid evidence proving Mooney's guilt and still insist that Mooney belongs in prison and should stay there!

The sensational arrests a few hours after the bomb explosion centered on Mooney and his fellows the abhorrence and hatred of the community. The weight of it has never been lifted, because the trial proved, not that he was a murderer, but that he was a particularly obstreperous agitator who dramatized his rather childish and malicious mischief-making as an important contribution to the class struggle. Mooney "never grew up," and left alone he would have exhausted the patience of the few radicals who still applauded his abortive, inept, melodramatic attempts to organize the unorganized or to capture control of unions already in existence. Trades union bosses hated him as bitterly as the managers and promoters of San Francisco's big public utilities. Labor union politicians have been half-hearted and halting in coming to his defense, and privately they have cursed him even while publicly urging a pardon or a new trial. The story of Mooney's alleged transgression in addressing a priest who called on him in prison as "Mr." probably has done as much to keep him in prison as the strongest link in the chain of perjuries that make up the record of his trial. He has a genius for antagonizing people.

What has all this to do with the conviction and continued imprisonment of an innocent man? Well, in California at least, everything! Adherence to an abstract principle such as justice breaks down when it conflicts with a strong prevalent emotion. San Francisco differs from other towns only in being a little more sophisticated, a little more cynical, a little less prone to render lip service to these abstractions. It is a little more deliberately and consciously lawless than other communities. Not many years ago the graft prosecution disclosed a lot of popular corporation promoters, restaurateurs, and politicians as law-breakers. The town had to decide whether it wanted to enforce the law and put these men in prison or condone their offenses. It chose to condone, and it is more than a coincidence that the same election that registered this choice, by defeating Heney, put into office as district attorney the Charles M. Fickert who prosecuted Mooney and Billings seven years later. His first mandate from the community was to dismiss the graft prosecutions. The same lawless public opinion that kept Schmitz and Calhoun out of prison put Mooney and Billings in prison, and is keeping them there. Fickert could do as he pleased at the Hall of Justice so long as he regarded and followed the town's major prejudices. These prejudices were often lawless. They demanded immunity for corporation bribe-givers. They demanded a victim for the bomb outrage. They demanded non-enforcement of State laws against vice. What the town wanted required a district attorney not too scrupulous, and the town was not deeply shocked last year when Fremont Older exposed a system by which justice was habitually bought and sold under Fickert's nose in the police courts. It did finally defeat Fickert. It even elected a district attorney who favors a square deal for Mooney. But there was no indignation, nor even intolerance, in the gesture of dismissal. Fickert "made good." He carried out his mandate. But he had served ten years. The police court scandals *were* pretty raw! Fickert remains a popular figure.

Not that even San Francisco is cynical and honest enough to see it this way! It is still the forces of "law and order" that oppose Mooney's pardon. And a large part of the business community thinks of Fremont Older as an enemy of law and order because he has stood for those things on several occasions when they were the antithesis of what San Francisco wanted!

The judge who sentenced Billings was discussing various things with Charles Edward Russell during a week-end at Mr. Older's ranch some years ago in the days when Mr. Russell's grouches ran along less unexceptionable paths than they at present take.

"But surely you believe in law and order?" asked the judge.

"I don't know," replied Mr. Russell. "I never saw any."

The Mooney case is a sensational enough demonstration of how justice may miscarry in an American court. Yet it is merely better advertised than scores of similar miscarriages in which public officials have been equally brutal and corrupt. They are almost typically so in isolated industrial communities dominated by open-shop employers afraid of labor unrest. Congressional hearings and the reports of government agents supply many instances. The Mooney case is, after all, a shocker for the naive and the uninformed. And it is even something when public officials are forced to become law-breakers in order to work injustice. In California prisons today are a score of men serving long sentences legally inflicted under laws that throw a mantle of respectability over the ferocity of the ignorant and the malice of men who manipulate the passions and prejudices of the mob. No bishop concerns himself over their fate. Personally I should rather see intolerance and hatred and stupidity break the laws than make them. The entirely legal conviction and imprisonment in California of members of the I. W. W. and the Communist Labor Party strikes me as more sinister than the plight of Mooney and Billings. If Southern States were to pass laws legalizing the lynching bee for unpopular Negroes the race question would appear even more hopeless than it is today.

The Informing Spirit

By CARLYLE FERREN MACINTYRE

Galatea gently slumbers
In a womb of marble stone.
Cold, austere, the shell encumbers
Prisoned loveliness unknown.

Quick, Pygmalion, with tender
Chisel strike this beauty free;
Softly, lest you mar the slender
Lily of eternity.

In the Driftway

SO the prisoners at Sing Sing are no longer to get out a newspaper! Too bad! The Drifter has read that publication with pleasure in the past, and he has always thought that it would lessen the monotony of prison life to write for it if sometime he were sent "up the river" for bigamy, mayhem, or subornation of perjury. He must be careful now to choose a crime—and thus a prison—that will not entirely shut off his journalistic activities. The reason given by the officials of Sing Sing for stopping the prison newspaper is that it was costing too much money. This sounds familiar; it has been the reason for stopping many another publication from the days of papyrus down to the advent of the news-print trust. A correspondent of the Federated Press suggests another possibility—that the newspaper was stopped because of the publication of an editorial stating that 176 out of 1,200 inmates of Sing Sing had served in General Pershing's forces overseas and suggesting army life as a cause of crime. However this may be, the Drifter conceives that the first serious mistake was the change of the newspaper's name. When started more than twenty years ago, it was known as the *Star of Hope*. A pleasing and appropriate name, that, which ought to have been retained. But in recent years a rival called the *Bulletin* was started. The two were eventually merged, after the manner of modern newspapers; the combination was called the *Star-Bulletin* and, finally, just the *Bulletin*. That was a pathetic mistake. There is a *Bulletin* of some sort in almost every sizable city of the country, but the *Star of Hope* was unique.

* * * * *

A GOOD deal has been said of the uplift value of prison journalism, but the Drifter thinks its possibilities as a punishment have been too little appreciated. Instead of putting the insubordinate poet on bread and water, would it not be more salutary to cut off the last two lines of his sonnet in the prison review? Or, in the case of a disobedient essayist, his article might be revised and "decked out" by the prison officials without his knowledge, after the fashion instituted by the wardens that preside over the editorial sanctums of some of our great metropolitan newspapers and magazines. But perhaps that would be precluded in prison—though possible in the "free" world outside—because of the Constitutional prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment. Anyhow one of the attractions of Sing Sing is gone for the Drifter. He fears now that when he goes "up the river" there will be nothing for him to do but break stone—and even an honest life might be preferable to that!

* * * * *

"NOTABLES to Aid in Unveiling Bolivar Statue," says a newspaper headline. Needless words. Was a statue ever "unveiled" for any other purpose than that "notables" might "aid"?

* * * * *

ACCORDING to a newspaper dispatch from a correspondent in London, "The Government has scotched the Bolshevist snake in the situation before it had a fair chance to sting." Many strange things have been said of Soviet Russia, but this is the first news that Bolshevist snakes sting. Perhaps it is only the correspondent who was stung.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

A New Destiny for Ireland

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Is not the true solution of the Irish problem suggested by the recent remark of a prominent supporter of Irish independence that an Irishman is an American who has had the misfortune to be born under the British flag? Why should not Ireland become the forty-ninth free and independent State in this great and glorious Union? Ireland is as near to Washington as California and far nearer than Hawaii or Alaska, both of which will eventually become States. Ireland's senators and representatives could make the trip by fast steamer from Queenstown to New York in five days. As a part of the United States she would be more truly independent than as a miniature European republic at the mercy of any strong predatory power. With our markets thrown open freely to her products, she would prosper commercially as never before. Her State government would have absolute freedom in local affairs, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. Her sons would be eligible to the Presidency and all Federal offices. America would welcome her, for while Irishmen have always made bad British subjects, they have always made good American citizens. Half of them are with us already, and from the battle of Bunker Hill to the battle of the Argonne, Kelly and Burke and Shea have proved their loyalty on many a hard-fought field.

The English people repeat every day that Ireland can have anything she wants save only her separate republic. They say, too—and all good Americans except those blinded by ancestral hate say it with them—that good-will between Great Britain and the United States must be maintained and that war between them must be made forever impossible. Why, then, should the British not cordially acquiesce in the plan suggested? A perpetual treaty of amity and alliance should follow hard upon the admission of the State of Ireland. Great Britain could, indeed, make this a condition of her consent; but she would surely feel no fear of the nation that has lived in unruffled peace with Canada for more than a hundred years and never lifted a finger to erase imaginary boundary lines.

Objection, it is true, might come from Ulster—so lately herself in rebellion against the British Crown. Still, we have millions of citizens of North of Ireland descent who rank among our best. Who knows but that Ulster, too, could be won over, and a political revolution which would be far more significant of progress and more hopeful than any that has yet followed the war be peacefully carried through with scarcely a dissenting voice?

Brooklyn, N. Y., April 8 F. C. W.

A College of Solid Thinkers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Gopher Prairie College, so aptly labeled by C. G. J. in your issue of March 16, pretends to be nothing more nor less than what she is. She did not pawn her soul to an ad writer, in preparing that book, because the text was written by a highway engineer around the fundamental points outlined by the president of the college himself, and with the directing influence of a dealer in liquid hog remedies, all graduates of the college.

That Golden Calf will not be found under one tree but under many of those fine beeches, elms, and maples of the historic campus of Gopher Prairie College. It is each of those young American men who are seeking in the classic halls, even as C. G. J., verification of their ideals. For they have ideals, and rather high they are if you remember your own college days.

It is this young man whom the Wabash of 1832 and the Wabash of 1921 has set up to honor. It is he to whom deference is shown, for whom sacrifices are made—for a professor too often does make sacrifices—and it is he, the student of history and of man, who is the firm foundation for this republic and for every other democratic government under the sun.

Ah, C. G. J., don't you remember when you were one of those Golden Calves? Perhaps my father was one of those professors who gave you in the classroom some of the basic reasons why Wabash is what it is. He was and is an American, and he typifies the great class of solid thinking people which accepts what is new if it is good.

Wabash is proud of the fact that she has not altered her course from Pure American Idealism in eighty-nine years. And few of her sons, thank God, have charted their courses in other, more dangerous channels, as has C. G. J., if I mistake not.

Chicago, April 7 ROBERT KINGERY

Kansas Court of Industrial Relations

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read with amazement and much indignation the article on the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations law by Clyde M. Reed in your issue of April 6. As a coal miner and member of the United Mine Workers of America, along with all organized workers in this country, I am vitally interested in this law and I have closely followed the news with reference to it. With the exception of several articles that have appeared in employers' publications, I fail to recall a more misleading or unfair article on this subject than the one in *The Nation*.

Organized labor the country over has condemned the Kansas law for the reason that it provides for compulsory labor and makes it a crime to quit work, thereby curtailing the constitutional rights of the workers. That is the issue, the only issue. That is the principle involved, the principle upon which organized labor will fight it out. There is no room for compromise; there is no middle ground.

The fight in Kansas is not Alex Howat's fight, as Reed, in line with the employing interests, would have it appear. Neither does the radicalism or the conservatism of the Kansas miners, nor the claim that "80 per cent of the Kansas miners are foreign born or of the first generation in this country" have any bearing on the question. The matter of the personality of Alex Howat, whom Reed brands, without citing proof, as a "radical of radicals, alleged to be a member of the I. W. W., the Coal Miners' Industrial Union, and charged with contributing to the financial support of the Communist Party, in touch with the extremists of the country, and viciously fighting the Miners' International Union," does not and should not enter into the controversy. I am not writing this letter as a partisan of Howat, but I might enlighten Reed by informing him that the Illinois miners by referendum vote last summer appropriated $100,000 to aid the Kansas miners in their fight against this law. It might enlighten him further to know that the officials of the Miners' International Union are as strongly opposed to the Kansas law as is Howat. In spite of other differences between them, on this they are agreed, that the Kansas industrial court law is a menace to the workers of America, that it interferes with their constitutional rights, and must be resisted to the last ditch.

Reed cites a few individual cases and draws the inference that by these minor settlements the Kansas law can be judged. He cites that in the first year of its existence the court handled twenty-eight cases in the essential industries of the State. What is this compared to the thousands of cases settled in the same year by the Mine Workers' joint conference method in Kansas alone and the hundreds of thousands throughout the jurisdiction of the International Miners' Union, not to mention other unions? But the mere *settlement* of industrial disputes is not sufficient. No matter how well governed a people may be, if they have any self-respect they will not be satisfied unless they have something to say in their own government. So it is with the settlement of our affairs in industry. We, as self-respecting workers, demand a voice in the settlement. The voice labor demands is not that of the petitioner, but a voice in a joint conference with equitable representation, with the right to dissent and resort to its only weapon, the strike, when manifest injustices are being thrust upon the workers. The Kansas law is especially vicious in that it not only denies labor a voice in deciding these questions, but makes it a crime to disobey the mandate of a board composed of politicians appointed by a politician.

Let no one make the mistake of believing that labor in America will quietly submit to such laws. Only after our organizations have been destroyed will we be subjected, and then the need for anti-strike legislation will not exist—the employer will be able to exploit us without the aid of the power of the State. The enactment of similar legislation in other States will find organized labor in those States no more conciliatory than is Howat of Kansas.

Belleville, Illinois, April 12 EDW. A. WIECK

The Offspring of Familiarity

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Mr. Villard's editorial on ex-Secretary Lansing's book I find this paragraph: "Mr. Lansing thinks that Mr. Wilson's distrust of him came originally from the fact that he is a lawyer. At the conference of the American Peace Commissioners on January 10, 1918, Mr. Wilson bluntly told Mr. Lansing that he 'did not intend to have lawyers drafting the treaty of peace.'"

Turning to the biography of Mr. Wilson in the Congressional Directory I find this statement: ". . . Following his graduation [from Princeton College] he entered the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., as a law student, and was graduated in 1881. For two years he practiced law in Atlanta, Ga." My information is that on leaving the Presidency Mr. Wilson resumed the practice of law in Washington, D. C.

What is the answer? Perhaps this excerpt from "Treasure Island"; at their first meeting, Ben Gunn says to Jim Hawkins: "Gunn . . . puts a precious sight more confidence—a precious sight, mind that—in a gen'leman born than in these gen'lemen of fortune, having been one hisself."

Washington, D. C., April 4 J. A. HENNESY

The American Legion

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wonder if a sufficient number of American Legion members, especially those high in the counsels of the New York County Chapter, read the two brief editorials in *The Nation* of April 6, anent the fundamental point of consequence involved in the expulsion of Lieut. Col. Alexander E. Anderson. Inasmuch as I am a member of the American Legion and take a keen interest in its good works in behalf of the ex-service men, I wish that everyone of my comrades might give your point of view careful and thoughtful consideration.

As a non-political organization, the American Legion is doing itself immeasurable harm by attempting to pass judgment on the private or public opinions of its members. Lieut. Col. Alexander E. Anderson, expressing himself openly against the use of African troops by the French in the occupied parts of Germany, may or may not have the approval of the American people. But his motive in saying what he thinks in the matter is surely without blemish and in complete agreement with true Americanism. Personally I find nothing in his stand that is destructive of the principles and aims for which the American Legion is so energetically working. It is to be regretted that it still harbors irresponsible local agencies, such as the New

York County Chapter, which permit themselves the costly luxury of governing their action in various important cases by their narrow-minded and bigoted views.

The issue is clear; there are no two ways about it. For the American Legion to endure as an active force in our national life, the watchword should be: "Hands off politics and leave the individual members to think and speak and write as conscience dictates!" Our ex-service-men brotherhood will thrive best under a constant discussion of the conflicting opinions concerning the great problems of the day.

In order to reestablish itself in the good opinion of the American people, the Legion through its National Executive should unequivocally repudiate the action of the New York County Chapter in expelling Lieut. Col. Alexander E. Anderson and demand his prompt restoration to his former place of honor in the post.

Hurley, South Dakota, April 5 ISADORE BERKOWITZ

Correcting a Historian

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Charles Andrews, in a recent issue of *The Nation*, characterizes Lincoln Colcord's attempt to demonstrate similarity between the struggle of the American colonies for independence and the present Irish struggle as not "particularly good history." Without entering into the issue under immediate controversy, upon which I have nothing to say, may I point out a statement in Mr. Andrews's letter which is not "particularly good history." Mr. Andrews states that "in the middle of the last century the concession of representative government [to Canada and Australia], the repeal of the corn laws and the navigation acts, and the eventual granting of responsible government brought to an end all desire for independence." Professor Andrews should know that the repeal of the corn laws and the navigation acts was deeply resented by the colonies, and that instead of conciliating them to the British connection it led to the development in Canada in the late forties and early fifties of a formidable movement for annexation to the United States.

Chicago, April 11 JACOB VINER

The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The foundations of our liberties are being destroyed. In fact, the cornerstone—"freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to peaceably assemble"—has been blasted by legislative action, executive policy, and judicial decisions and interpretations. Our supposed Bill of Rights has been treated as a "scrap of paper." There is no need to elaborate, for everybody knows that our boasted liberty is the standing joke of the world. I am not writing this as a protest. The tyrannical usurpers care nothing for protests or petitions. I am writing to urge action, from one end of the land to the other, to secure the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall—an amendment to the Constitution restoring to the people the power to initiate and make laws, to demand a referendum upon laws made by Congress or unmade by five of the Supreme Court judges, and to recall representatives who fail to do their bidding, such as all employers have.

If in the face of all the legislative blunders and outrageous wrongs of our representatives, the rulings of departmental chiefs, and court decisions the people fail to exercise their sovereign power and demand to be clothed with the power to approve or disapprove of the acts of their servants, then there is little hope that they ever will. If the Bolshevists' regime of the dominating few is to continue unchecked, who can deny the possibility of a real bolshevist revolution?

Paicines, California, March 21 J. W. WELLS

I Should Like to Live in a Ballad World

By EDA LOU WALTON

I should like to live as a ballad maid
Who loves, is loved, and dies,
Or bears four sons as a matron staid
To her lord's amazed eyes.

Birth, and youth, and womanhood,
Ripe lips and golden hair,
Death and a lover understood,
And a black silk shroud to wear;

And all the long years left untold
The long hours left unsaid,
While swift, rare moments of life unfold
Bronze and silver and red.

I should like to live in a ballad world
While vivid lips of song
My leaping, lingering tale unfurled
Of a fate six stanzas long.

Plaint

By VIRGINIA WOODS MACKALL

You can do so many things!
And I only one.
You can build monuments of triumphant stone,
You can compass large and awesome subjects,
You can subdue the sea with tree trunks,
And catch the stars in steel nets.

All I can do is to tell you about it—
To sing how great you are!
Naturally, you listen with impatience;
You have known it for a long time.

Books

On Fighting Japan

Must We Fight Japan? By Walter B. Pitkin. The Century Company.

THIS is a powerful and compelling book, packed full of meat and worthy of the most careful consideration. It is a non-partisan study of the conflicts, corrosions, and conciliations where East meets West and greed meets greed across the narrowing Pacific. The author aims to dispel illusions whether roseate or sinister and strikes hard at some of those most widely cherished. In places its tone is dogmatic, a fact to be forgiven in view of the author's wide studies and evident sincerity.

The unsophisticated visitor to the Far East is surprised and bewildered at the apparent absence of any middle ground in the judgment of Japan. Every American or European is anti-Japanese or pro-Japanese and does not care who knows it. Fulsome praise and biting criticism are heard on all sides, and each is in its degree founded on fact and each subject to gross exaggeration.

In the pro-Japanese view, the busy people of the islands are human beings like the rest of us, simple-hearted, sincere, courteous, lovable, idealistic folk for the most part, acutely patriotic, sensitive to praise or blame, very hospitable, very fond of companionship, prone to making judgments gregariously, and having a special genius for adaptation and cooperation. Their speech, dress, and customs have grown up in isolation, but such matters are skin-deep, in no wise fundamental to race or nation. Politically they do the best they can under changing circumstances, for the traditions and conciliations of two thousand years cannot be obliterated in a half century. The status of a people cannot be judged by present conditions, but rather by the line of direction in which it is moving.

The anti-Japanese view goes somewhat as follows: The Japanese know that Western civilization cannot be escaped, but they despise and fear it. They imitate what they cannot understand, therefore undertake what they cannot carry through. Being extremely clannish they are bad neighbors to outsiders. Individually eager for wealth, pull and graft beset every walk of life. Militarism they cherish because Germany has taught its value and it has already brought Japan into the front rank of the nations. Hence its ruling forces follow German models. The Government is a close corporation of bureaucrats, directed by the "Elder" statesmen (Genro), a clique of leaders of the three "fighting clans" (Satsuma, Choshu, Settsu), exploiters, militarists. Bureaucrats direct foreign policies and the Government subordinates personal freedom to its system of public welfare (minhon). Their water-front mobs clamor for war because war brings a livable wage. The village boss controls the rural population. Only fear of revolution gives the people any voice, and that voice, through the adroitness of the Circumlocution Office, is mostly still and small. The prophets cry in the wilderness, most earnestly, no doubt, but unheard by either of the chief political parties.

These two paragraphs I wrote in 1911. Each can be defended as true so far as it goes. They represent merely different points of view. The first arises from knowing the student-class and the bourgeoisie of the provincial towns. The second pictures some phases of the political life of the capital.

But American opinion, friendly as a whole, has become embittered by recent events in which the rulers of Japan are concerned. Toward China Japan has behaved even as the other powers have done and to the scandal of her rivals in spoliation. The twenty-one demands, the operations in Siberia, the control of Shantung, the mandate-absorption of a chain of coral reefs, have shocked our moral sense. The assertion of a "Monroe Doctrine" of monopolistic spoliation as unlike that of Monroe as our own worst attempts at perversion is naturally offensive to our own exploiters, who cannot admit it unless they can indeed strike hands with its perpetrators.

Hence arises another picture of Japan, elaborately and accurately drawn by Professor Pitkin as a composite of our "yellow journals." This view (page 40) is as false as malice can make it, but it matches perfectly the portrait of America as drawn by the yellow press of Japan, a vile caricature which seems justified by the atrocious moving picture films which our dealers dump on Japan. The "rising wave of crime" which is breaking over our cities, as shown on the front pages of our great dailies, also serves to confirm the low opinion water-front Japan already has of us.

It is true, of course, that the commercial classes in both nations are on excellent terms with each other. "Hands across the sea" are reached almost daily in San Francisco and Tokyo, and "the Pacific binds together, not separates," "two peoples destined to be each other's neighbors for a thousand years." But friendly banquets, good intentions, and fine words from internationalists and business associates do not reach the heart of the matter. The memory of Perry at Kurihama, our magnanimity at Shimonoseki, and the modesty of General Grant at Nikko do not touch the hearts of militarists bent on exalting their calling. Nor does it reach the narikin (new rich), who, bent on the conquest of Asia, regard army and navy as their own lackeys. From such conditions, found in a degree in every country, together with the ever present fear of the loss of power on the part of those who wrest it from the people, arises the "hyena theory of nations," to borrow a phrase from Pierre Loti. In accordance with this theory every nation must maintain a perpetual or chronic enemy—which is by no means to be allowed an increase of armament, such as we plan for ourselves.

This abhorrent idea being still "in the saddle," strengthened by the moral and political lapses of the war, Mr. Pitkin asks his question "Must we fight Japan?" His answer, of course, is "No," but he is not blind to dangerous tendencies on both sides of the Pacific. That such a war, whatever its nominal cause or motive, would be incalculably senseless, degrading, costly, and futile will not of itself ward it off. The wisdom of Norman Angell's "Great Illusion" did not save Europe in 1914. Powerful forces are working now for war; greater forces, though less active, are drawing toward peace. War and peace are possibilities; neither is a certainty.

Mr. Pitkin has developed a number of vital propositions, only a few of which I have space to summarize. The Japanese press notes our imperial expansion in Asia, while we are active in blocking all Japanese moves in that direction. In these matters and others our attitude is regarded as both unjust and provocative. From Perry's expedition of coercion through our successive seizures of Hawaii, the Philippines, and Guam we have stood in the way of Japan's normal extension. We have been high-handed in dealing with Japanese who are legally in America and we have drawn lines of racial discrimination such as we have not dared to apply to Europe. We (that is, some Americans) have tried to monopolize Asiatic trade, to withhold Japan's coveted prizes of war, to restrain her salutary entrance into Siberia and Mongolia, to stimulate Korean unrest, to bankrupt Japan by forcing on her a ruinous naval expansion, to say nothing of the varied mendacity tolerated in our press. In every Congress humiliating bills are introduced, without official check, and apparently for no other purpose save insult, our two political parties being alike in these regards.

Without discussing this one-sided view of patent facts, I have found Japanese officials rarely able to understand why our Government allows the press to promulgate slanderous lies. Examples of this are found in the wild extravagances which centered in 1911 about Magdalena Bay and which gave rise to the "Lodge Resolution," fortunately left unsigned by President Taft. We may read any day that the "Japanese have no home life," tea-house and geisha monopolizing men's attention; that Japanese banks employ Chinese tellers, not trusting their own people; and the like *ad nauseam*. In 1911, I had what was called "a heart-to-heart talk" with members of the Sayonji ministry, and the question of why our Government allows such wholesale lying was the first that arose. The answer was simple: A free press, even if venal and mendacious, is safer than a censored one, as it is better for the people to decide public questions badly than to have them adjusted from above.

Mr. Pitkin regards the strongest influence for peace, so far as the United States is concerned, as resting in "the widespread disgust and disillusionment as to the value of war as a method of getting results." The only result of the late victory worth the name has been the crumpling of a pasteboard Caesar, at the cost of a ruined continent. Our author finds further that the intellectual classes of the world are getting together. "In this movement the intellectuals of Japan are playing a worthy part, at times under handicaps little realized by us." Moreover, Japan as a nation is on the verge of bankruptcy without the resource utilized by Germany of wholesale robbery of her own people. Japan's industries are dependent on the United States, and our nation "will not be dragged into any but the most obviously defensive war, *unless the public* is tricked by politicians or propaganda." That "Europe, as everybody knows, but few like to say, is insolvent from Bordeaux to the Urals" is also "a tremendous insurance against war." "The most un-

popular proposal that the mind of man could invent and present to Americans today would be one calling to an increase of taxes to be spent in an army and navy."

But nations bankrupt and inchoate still fight on, throwing stolen money after bad, their soldiers the only people who escape starvation. Meanwhile Japan has not learned the lesson of "The Great Illusion." Rulers and common people alike fail to realize that "money spent on wars of conquest is a dead loss and worse." There is danger not alone from militarists and from fools or kaisers in power. Beggars have been known "to smash in shop windows to seize a loaf of bread." Two classes in every country can always be reckoned as in favor of war: those who gain by war and war preparation, and those who have nothing to lose. Withal we have to deal with "that fatal incapacity of most men to think clearly and take intelligent action concerning matters that lie beyond the routine of everyday life." The crimes of diplomacy are due far more often to ignorance than to malice. Even in high places, "there is no substitute for intelligence." Moreover, we must count on the venerable tradition that an insult from one politician to another is reasonable cause of war even at the cost of national suicide. This idea is a sort of survival which used to lead the insulted Samurai to commit suicide when homicide was not practicable.

Our author gives us a certain assurance that both Japan and the United States are impregnable from the sea. The most that either could do, without base of supplies in a military way, would be the burning or poisoning of a few coast cities. Incidentally Japan would be debarred from her best customers, her necessary machinery, and from future trade—a corresponding result, though less damaging, naturally following on the other side.

I cannot claim the space necessary even for an outline of this close-packed book. Mr. Pitkin regards the Japanese question in California as part of a world problem never to be settled, but to be ameliorated by wise statesmanship. Japan, with small areas of great richness and a wilderness of mountains, is vastly overcrowded. The great empty areas in the north and in Korea, fit for grazing and little else, cannot be utilized without capital and without a market for products. Milk, butter, and cheese find little market in Asia. Cattle, dwarfish and half-starved, are beasts of burden mainly and in regions virtually destitute of roads. The outlook for sheep raising is better and is being considered. Japan has been too much occupied with her place among the nations to build adequate railways, or even public roads. Korea has the former, thanks to the enterprise of Baron Shibusawa, but a system of highways would be a grotesque novelty. Those farmers who have any capital or hold on the land will not leave their present homes "where our customs fit us like a garment." Those who can be moved are in general the homeless farm-hands, the class with which the enterprise of our steamship companies populated Hawaii, or the unskilled workmen of the cities. The birth-rate question, I may say in a word, appears nowhere as racial. The percentage falls just as soon as woman is emancipated to the extent involved in separate apartments. And within limits as the birth-rate falls the survival rate rises.

The notion that the Asiatic races will by a "rising tide of color" get together and overwhelm the white races our author deservedly treats with scant respect. The white races have their enemies within—mainly war and vice. I may note further that the blend of races which inhabits Japan is at least as near Caucasian as Mongolian, and in everything except looks has more in common with Southern Europe than with China. The Japanese are no more inscrutable than any other divergent race, if we get behind the veil of language and tradition. The rising generation of Japanese who acquire citizenship assimilate almost perfectly in all matters except in looks, much more readily and fully than most of the Mediterranean races. And in this connection I may add that the strongest single bond of peace is found in the thousands of Japanese men and women educated in the universities of America and England. These imbibe all our traditional college loyalty, with a real appreciation of the advantages of democracy, however defective, over the bureaucracy and political favoritism which they encounter at home.

Mr. Pitkin's work, so far as details are concerned, center about affairs in California. In spite of his thoroughness and general sobriety, he finds this problem full of pitfalls. Special criticism of minor matters is ungracious, but the light needs shifting a little.

It is quite true, as he says, that the state of mind in California cannot be set aside as "a case of nerves." It is rather a recurrent malady which comes on every fourth year, after the fashion of the seven-year cicada. Save for a few internationalists and a few purveyors of cheap labor, no one here wants to see California racially stratified or marred by class distinctions. Cheap labor or alien labor would enrich the State, while impoverishing its society. In the late election the act further restricting Japanese agricultural activities was passed by a vote of about two to one. The vote of the 200,000 who opposed this bill deserves an analysis. It comprises in general the commercial classes, the churches, the university people, and the large number who hate to see California take a blundering initiative in international affairs, matters in which it entangles the whole nation while assuming no responsibility of its own. As Roosevelt is largely quoted, they would not discredit his dictum: "It always pays for a nation to be a gentleman."

It is not true that Japan in any official sense has pushed into California. Apparently most of the farm laborers came from Hawaii. When we annexed those islands, half the population was Japanese. It is so still. It was then dominated by a small but interesting and forceful oligarchy of Americans with thousands of plantation serfs, brought in from every country from which cheap labor could be secured. Hawaii was then, and is still, in a degree a commercial and social annex of California. As to the acts of their nationals in Hawaii, the Government of Japan may have wishes or opinions but can exercise no control The "Gentleman's Agreement" might be made more restrictive. The Japanese Government will respond to any courteous request, or to any adjustment that will not overturn politics at home, but there is no evidence that the present agreement has been violated even in a single case. Nor is it likely that any considerable number of Japanese have been illegally smuggled in. A system of registration could be used to prevent this.

The agitation against the Japanese in California seems to have four separate motives: (1) The desire to elect officials on an anti-Japanese platform; (2) the desire to prevent the growth and spread of alien colonies; (3) the desire to cut off immigration of labor from Asia; (4) the desire to keep up a chronic sore in our relations with Japan. This fourth may be the motive of the yellow press, to see that "something is doing," or it may have the motive equally sinister, but more dangerous, of spreading war-scares, for the purposes of a larger army, a greater navy, or even a bigger naval base on San Francisco Bay.

As to the second of these, I may say that Japanese legally here will not go home. They are clannish partly because we make them so. It is never wise to exclude from citizenship any group of permanent residents. The Japanese, Chinese, and Hindus should be allowed to find their way to citizenship, not an easy way, and not without renunciation of any rights at home. To enter our cosmopolitan nation does not mean intermarriage—that is a personal matter. Nor should it depend on race or religion or any other condition save personal fitness and orderly behavior.

As to checking immigration from Asia, we shall find ample help in cooperation with the Japanese Government. They would rather our people knew Japan from scholars, travelers, and business men than from the overflow of the rice fields. The leaders understand, as I have often said to them, that just such an opposition as has grown up in California would rise in Japan if a colony of Americans, Italians, or Siamese should establish

themselves among the "Seven Beauties of Omi." The case is "a condition not a theory." But the matter is not helped by gross exaggeration of the present "menace," nor by its use as leverage in local politics. To use it as a means of promoting militarism and war expense is even more reprehensible and more dangerous. The real problem of immigration is how to maintain our own democratic standards of living in the face of hordes who have never known it and have never known how to demand it.

Mr. Pitkin outlines an international policy which should permanently dispose of the "Japanese crisis." Not much (however wise) of it will be accepted by America or Japan, for rulers are short-sighted as compared with professors, and the art of government is the most backward of all human enterprises. One element of most importance is the restoration of farm industry by relieving it of the heavy burdens laid on it in the interest of manufacture and commerce. The rush to the cities is becoming appalling. Meanwhile it is "not a mass movement" but individual. "Every person who moves from the country to the city does so for individual reasons."

To this volume are contributed certain "expert opinions" of high value. Professor E. T. Williams of the University of California writes on Conflicting National Policies; Mr. Warren S. Thompson on Cheap Labor and Standards of Living; Professor Elwood Mead on New Agrarian Policies; and Professor S. J. Holmes on Racial Intermarriage. The last essay may be specially commended as a just summing up of our knowledge and ignorance of much-vexed questions.

DAVID STARR JORDAN

From Locke to Bentham

Political Thought in England from Locke to Bentham. By Harold J. Laski. (Home University Library.) Henry Holt and Company.

RARELY has the task of summarizing the main characteristics of an intellectual movement been performed with more notable success than that which Professor Laski has attained in this concise account of the development of English political thought from Locke to Bentham. Any writer who essays to narrate the history of ideas is beset by two dangers. One is the danger of framing a series of essentially detached studies whose subjects are the more striking personalities of the period with which he deals. The other is that of forcing an appearance of development or logical connection where in fact little or none exists. Mr. Laski has avoided both of these pitfalls. Naturally, the men whose writings bulk largest in his brief survey are the dominating thinkers of the time—Locke, Hume, Burke, Adam Smith; but the sketches of the work and teachings of these leaders are so skilfully interwoven with equally just appreciations of lesser writers and, what is quite as important, with a review of the political and economic history of the period, as to show clearly such coherent development as actually took place. It was with the eighteenth century as history shows it to have been with other centuries—a few profound thinkers opened the greater highways while a host of lesser workers scouted the forests, blazed connecting trails, or toiled at the debris which others had left; and if we get from Mr. Laski's illuminating pages a matured philosophic view of Locke and Hume and Burke, we also see in judicial setting the work of Leslie and Hoadley and Bolingbroke, of Blackstone and Tucker and Delolme, of the nonjurors and the protagonists of the Bangorian controversy.

Broadly stated, the problem of English political philosophy the eighteenth century was to find a sound doctrine of democracy after the Revolution of 1688 had made an end to the doctrine of the divine right of kings. It was the task of Locke to justify the changes of 1688. He was hampered by his lack of perception of "the psychological foundations of politics," he was bound to the theory of the social contract as "the only possible retort to the theory of divine right," and in his doctrine as a whole there is little that is novel; but he nevertheless stated more clearly than either Hobbes or Burke "the general problem of the modern state." One would like to know, however, why Locke's view of toleration was apparently less generous when he published his great "Letter on Toleration" than it was when he drafted the "Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina," some twenty years before. Mr. Laski's exposition of the long controversy over the theory of the relation of church and state, which followed naturally from Locke's attempt to separate the visible church from the essence of religion and to exalt the state above the church, is able to the point of brilliancy, and the more because the essential nature of the problem of religion as distinct from the problem of ecclesiasticism is not at any time lost sight of. If the problem remained unsolved throughout the period to which the book relates, and remains unsolved now—witness the diametrically contrasted claims of Lord Haldane and the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1919 (pp. 125, 126)—it was not from lack of proffered solutions or acrimonious debate, but because the problem itself is insoluble save on the familiar British plane of compromise. So also one must say of the mooted issues of non-resistance and passive obedience and of the deeper question of revolution.

The period of political stagnation which extended from the accession of George I to the fall of Walpole, in 1742, at least prepared the way for Hume, the first series of whose essays was published in the latter year. The most that Mr. Laski can say for Hume is that he is suggestive and that utilitarianism owes its foundation to him, but neither the man nor his times permitted the erection of a system. Until 1770, when Burke's "Thoughts on the Present Discontents" appeared, "there is no work on English politics of the first importance." But it was the period in which the ideas of Montesquieu and Rousseau were making themselves felt, when Blackstone in his "Commentaries" was presenting a picture of the English Constitution as it was not, and when the beginnings of revolution in America were dividing political theorists and practical politicians alike. That Burke should have had "the singular good fortune . . . not merely to obtain acceptance as the apostle of philosophic conservatism, but to give deep comfort to men of liberal temper" is the more surprising in view of the fact that "he was not a democrat, and at bottom . . . had little regard for that popular sense of right which, upon occasion, he was ready to praise." It is easy to see that his unselfishness, his keen insight, his maxims of political wisdom, his emphasis upon practical accommodation in the face of complex difficulties, and the noble sweep of his literary style should have made him lovable; but in hardly any other respect, and least of all as the expounder of a coherent system of political philosophy, is anyone who reads Mr. Laski's analysis likely to think Burke great. The real precursor of liberalism Mr. Laski finds in Adam Smith. It was, indeed, to be a liberalism which saw the state as something "untrammeled in its economic life by moral considerations," but it was also "the road to those categories wherein the old conception of cooperative effort might find a new expression."

WILLIAM MACDONALD

First Aid to Authors

The Lure of the Pen. By Flora Klickmann. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

If You Don't Write Fiction. By Charles Phelps Cushing. Robert M. McBride and Company.

A Plea for Popular Science. By Edwin E. Slosson. Eilert Printing Company.

SOMETIME in his life, it would seem, every magazine editor becomes surfeited with manuscripts pencil-written on both sides of foolscap sheets, rolled, and tied with a pink ribbon. Then he does one of two things. Either he becomes a hopeless

misanthrope, or he writes a book to inform the young and ambitious author how it should be done. To the second class belong Miss Klickmann, Mr. Cushing, and in a measure Dr. Slosson. All write from editorial experience. All write to that vast army of inexperienced men and women who wish to write acceptable articles on some subject or other for contemporary magazines.

Miss Klickmann, editor of *The Girl's Own Paper and Woman's Magazine*, has chosen a good title for her purpose. "The Lure of the Pen: A Book for Would-be Authors" would lure few readers who would not profit from her remarks. The high school girl who writes of bloody murder and disappointed love, the idle wife who essays descriptive fiction because her friends assure her she writes charming letters, the heartbroken biographer of a deceased lapdog would find Miss Klickmann's volume full of much needed, even if discouraging advice. They are warned against sending to the editor illegible manuscript, writing voluminous explanatory letters, or camping on his or her doorstep. They are urged to have something to say, to say it in straightforward, colloquial language, and to send it to the editor of a publication which circulates among that class of readers who are likely to want to read it. One would suppose that such elementary advice would be unnecessary; but in spite of the correspondence schools, the fact remains that there are still novices who would profit from Miss Klickmann's devastating common-sense and who could follow it if they had a chance.

Mr. Cushing has addressed a similar reading public of inexperienced young people who "want to write." But in subject matter there is a difference. Conceding the fact that the publisher's lists are well supplied with textbooks and treatises on the technique of the short story, he has written a guidebook to the marketing of non-fiction. Mr. Cushing says very little about composition. He believes that if the writer has the "nose for news" and sends to the proper magazine an article on the proper subject, illustrated with proper photographs, post-card size, on gloss paper, the absence of style will matter little. The rewrite man on the magazine will inject the style along with the grammar. But in the entertaining exposition of the obvious Mr. Cushing is at home. He tells the neophyte to start his manuscript half way down the first page, and inclose a self-addressed envelope for its possible return, but he tells him so gaily and with such an air of comradeship that his advice loses its power to blight. The charm of this thin little book lies in the delightful autobiographical chapters. These chapters of narrative are more instructive and heartening than the exposition of how long to expose a film. They instruct the ambitious youngster by their examples of industry, common-sense, and persistence, and hearten him with their good spirits, vigor, and the example of the common obstacles overcome.

But after all it is Mr. Slosson who should have done a book on the art and craft of writing informative articles for the magazines. Authors, old and young, would have profited from his fourfold angle of vision as scientist, teacher, author, and editor. Instead, in a pamphlet of fifteen pages he has reprinted two articles and the substance of an address to the School of Journalism, Columbia University. In the first article he laments the scientist's inability to write clearly and interestingly for a wider public, and the writer's blindness to the rich material buried in scientific publications. In the second paper, The Middleman in Science, he points out the importance, the difficulty, and the methods of communicating to the intelligent but uninformed reader the revolutionary truths discovered by the scientist. The last item is a series of Don'ts for would-be writers of scientific articles for the public press. Quotable as these aphorisms are, they should be read in their context. Two kinds of people study the art of writing—those who "want to write" and those who wish to learn how to say something to someone. Mr. Slosson is writing for the second group.

DONALD LEMEN CLARK

Books in Brief

"THE Behavior of Crowds" by Everett Dean Martin (Harpers) is not an attack on democracy, like Gustave Le Bon's "The Crowd." Mr. Martin, believing the crowd to be identifiable with no particular class, is interested merely in analyzing its processes whenever and wherever they begin, and in suggesting a cure for its invariable intellectual devastations. His analysis is psychoanalysis, and his cure is pragmatism or pluralism. The crowd mind, he says, is a sick mind, requiring some such treatment as is required for paranoia in the individual. It is collective self-delusion, feeding on platitudes and never learning anything. Among the governing classes—in a Department of Justice, for instance—it takes the form of the persecution-mania; a group begins to consider itself society and charges that another group—the Bolshevists, for instance—is the negation of society. Among the governed classes it lives on the dream-stuff of Utopias, which comprise "a mechanism of compensation and escape for suppressed desires." In time of war among all classes it automatically releases the cruelty in our natures which the censorship of peace has kept unconscious. Always it is futile, obscuring, and vicious, and we shall continue to suffer from its fogs until we cease to be idealists, absolutists, Platonists, until we cease to hunger after unity, and become strong enough to stand each by himself before a complicated world whose problems call for analysis rather than agitation. Mr. Martin has written a stimulating book, less valuable perhaps for its formal applications of Freud and Schiller and James than for its detailed diagnoses and its numerous illustrations drawn from a rich experience.

FROM the notebooks kept throughout his thinking years by "W. N. P. Barbellion," or Bruce Frederick Cummings, two volumes, "The Journal of a Disappointed Man" and "Enjoying Life," have been published. Now "A Last Diary" (Doran), scribbled between March 21, 1918, and June 3, 1919, while Barbellion was dying and waiting chiefly for a copy of the "Journal" to come from the printer's with H. G. Wells's preface, is put forth with an excellent life of the naturalist by his brother, A. J. Cummings. The volume is much shorter than either of the other two, and in a sense contains no ideas that they did not, but it will be welcome to those who are for possessing every published word of this brilliant, pathetic man. His passion for life is as hopeless and strong as ever here, except that death, being definitely expected, presses his humor into constant play and sharpens his vision of nature till it is desperately keen. On almost the last day he observed: "Rupert Brooke said the brightest thing in the world was a leaf with the sun shining on it. God pity his ignorance! The brightest thing in the world is a Ctenophor in a glass jar standing in the sun."

SEVEN new anthologies with a civilizing trend attest the vitality of literary man's passion for "selecting and arranging." "A Book of Jewish Thoughts, Selected and Arranged by the Chief Rabbi (Dr. J. H. Hertz)" (Oxford) is a learned collection of the profoundest tributes that have been paid to the Jewish race by its own members and others, and a summing up of the best that has been said by Jews. "The Great Kinship, an Anthology of Humanitarian Poetry," edited by Bertram Lloyd (London: George Allen and Unwin), represents an unusually intelligent and profitable search for zoophilist poetry among the peoples of Europe during the past three centuries. "French Fireside Poetry, with Metrical Translations and an Introduction by the late M. Betham-Edwards" (Small, Maynard) attempts to do for French poetry what more pretentious volumes in English have never done—show the kind of verse which the French are fond of and safe in reciting en famille. Many of the pieces are mediocre in translation because they were insipid in the original, but eleven fables from Florian are included, and they are delicious. "The Writer's Art, by Those who have Practiced It" (Harvard), selected and arranged by Rollo Walter Brown, is a corpus of disquisitions on the art of prose by nineteenth-century masters who were all reflective and attentive as regards their art. "Songs of Joy" (Oxford), compiled by Grace Beckett, is a brilliant little repertory of the highest-spirited lyrics in the English language. It has no false note anywhere—something that cannot be said for "Star-Points: Songs of Joy, Faith, and Promise from the Present-Day Poets" (Houghton Mifflin), selected by Mrs. Waldo Richards, which mixes trash with treasure in about equal proportions. "A Physician's Anthology of English and American Poetry" (Oxford), selected by Casey A. Wood and Fielding H. Garrison, is an excellent volume intended as a tribute to Sir William Osler before he died and dedicated now to his memory. It is calculated to humanize doctors who are too stern realists, but members of other professions may benefit by Shakespeare and Whitman.

Drama

Margaret Anglin

MISS ANGLIN dares to be heroic; she has the courage of the grand style. It is a rare thing today and only success can make it a virtue. For all the arts have a constant tendency toward the ease of the rhetorical gesture, toward externality and glitter and the trumpet tone. The danger is never so far that we can afford many unguarded moments. To write merely sonorous verses, to wear golden armor on the stage and use one's voice like a 'cello, to build orotund prose periods—these are great temptations to the child strutting in each of us. Think of the fine writing we once perpetrated, the noble gestures with which we once debated. Now our cheeks burn at the memory. Yes, to dare to be heroic is to dare greatly. Perhaps it was to prepare herself for this venture that Miss Anglin acted all winter in "The Woman of Bronze" and wrung the last ounce of inner veracity from an inferior part. Now she acts Joan of Arc (Shubert Theater) and Clytemnestra in the "Iphigenia in Aulis" (Manhattan Opera House) and gives one a strong impression of bound wings set free.

"The Trial of Joan of Arc" by Emile Moreau cannot, by any stretch of language, be called a good play. It is like an old-fashioned historical painting. Its explicitness is deadly and its purpose is to edify. It draws largely upon historical fact but in a wholly uncritical fashion. It does not attempt to interpret a spiritual crisis but to solidify a legend. That legend, however, has a beauty of its own, and one allows, in the end, for the too immaculate dungeon, the hopeless artificiality of the alternation of jangle and pause in the trial scene, the conscious over-picturesqueness of the poses when the smoke of the pyre floats into the portico. It is a devotional picture. But in the center of the picture stands Miss Anglin as Joan, dun and simple amid the flash of color, unbelievably young, almost with a touch of boyishness, quite unaffected amid so much tortuousness and stiff sophistication. Yet she always remains within the picture. Her simplicity is not that of a peasant girl, carefully as the human touches and recorded words are woven in, but that of a saint. She is not simple like a tree but like a staff of bronze; it is not a simplicity that has grown but one that has been fashioned. She writhes on the wooden couch of the dungeon not like a woman in pain but like an angel in exile, and even her great human moment of terror and recantation is, we know at once, only the prelude of a more eloquent and fervent triumph. Style, in a word, is substituted for reality—a style that glows and has deep modulations, but always style. The imitative function of art is slurred. And Miss Anglin, when she lifts up her voice, declaims. At all the tense moments it is not acting; it is pure declamation. But it is like the declamation of gorgeous yet clear odes. Her voice has a great swell and lift and curves of tonal beauty that never become monotonous by repetition but are like the recurrent stanzaic measures of a noble poem—not the flaming music of Crashaw or Shelley, but the easy though determined elevation of Pindar or Gray. There is more breadth than intimacy and more splendor than passion. Yet do not the very terms of this characterization illustrate the nature of Miss Anglin's achievement? To what other American actress could they have been applied without obvious absurdity?

The "Iphigenia in Aulis" of Euripides is, of course, a play of very different caliber from Moreau's picturesque chronicle. It is a very curious play indeed, full of a conscious or unconscious but unmistakable world-historic irony. Iphigenia is to be sacrificed so that the gods may raise a wind by which the Greeks can set sail for Troy. And why are the Greeks to sail and the bodies of thousands of them to be eaten by the ravens of the Ilian plain? Because a light woman who happened to be the wife of a magnate had run away with a roving gallant. The other magnates were naturally indignant and went in for a pompous anti-Trojan propaganda and declared the country to be in danger. When Iphigenia first appears the propaganda had obviously not touched her yet. The notion of having her throat cut on the altar of Artemis does not commend itself to her. But presently the patriotic flame kindles her heart. She is willing to die, glad to die—for Greece, for Greece. As Miss Mary Fowler stood there and spoke to the skilfully orchestrated strains of Dr. Walter Damrosch's music, one almost believed that it was indeed for Greece instead of for the shabby interests of an individual and a class. Is this an ultra-modern and irreverent interpretation of the tale of Troy divine? Well, it is no more than Euripides makes Clytemnestra say in terms that admit of no misunderstanding. No doubt he had to confine this reasoning to the lips of an angry woman and outraged mother. Perhaps the one-hundred-per-cent Athenians in his audience would not have tolerated a more directly rational interpretation of the great national legend. But the words and their meaning are clear and no one can doubt, from the Euripidean account, that Clytemnestra did right to be angry and had cause to feel outraged. Her story throws a strong light forward into the future and makes the murdered Agamemnon seem a far less tragic and pitiable figure.

Miss Anglin plays the part of Clytemnestra with passion but with less iron forcefulness than one had, perhaps, a right to expect. Mellowness and aspiration and a soaring energy are more native to her than rage and reason and compact power. When she uses the grand style her wings are better than her feet. The performance, however, was a notably interesting and beautiful one. The choral odes were declaimed a little thickly. We have heard them more clearly enunciated and far more rhythmically led. The dances, on the other hand, had a wild and natural grace, and the blending throughout of primitive force with tempered and harmonious motion showed the skill and imagination of the producers.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

International Relations Section

A Decree Establishing Free Ports in Mexico

THE following decree of Provisional President de la Huerta on the establishment of free ports in Mexico appeared in the *Diario Oficial* of October 11, 1920. It represents the beginning of two great social reforms—free trade and the single tax. Engineers, headed by Modesto C. Rolland, the originator of the project, are at work now on the practical details involved in the carrying out of this decree. The first free ports will be those of Puerto Mexico (Coatzacoalcos) on the Atlantic and Salina Cruz on the Pacific. A railroad connects the two, and before the days of the Panama Canal an enormous traffic was carried on between them. By means of its free-trade project, the Government hopes to revive these ports. A free zone will be established midway between the two ports, and here the single-tax system will be tried out with the idea of extending it to the rest of the Republic if it proves successful.

I, Adolfo de la Huerta, Acting Constitutional President of the United States of Mexico, in accordance with the extraordinary powers granted to me with relation to the treasury, considering:

1. That the geographic situation of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec qualifies it to serve both as a transportation route and as a commercial distributing station for European and Oriental countries, as well as for North and South America, and that the National Railroad of Tehuantepec was constructed and improved for the purpose of filling the needs of international traffic;

2. That in spite of the fact that the merchandise transported from one ocean to the other is not subject to customs duties, being merchandise for transportation only, nevertheless, fiscal intervention in the conveyance of these goods between Puerto Mexico and Salina Cruz has been a serious obstacle to international commerce because of the red tape with regard to customs and other matters to which the merchants and transporters are subject; wherefore it is necessary to abolish all this red tape relating to merchandise which is not being brought in for home consumption if the railroad is to fulfil the purpose for which it was created;

3. That some European ports, even though not situated in such exceptionally advantageous locations as the ports of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, have extensions known as free ports, where fiscal formalities do not apply and where merchandise destined for reexportation is not subject to duty;

4. That the customs extensions must not favor any merchandise except that for transportation or for reexportation from the country, and that the creation of these extensions must not injuriously affect other ports on the Gulf or on the Pacific used for importation or exportation of merchandise meant only for home consumption or produced in the country, and that there is, therefore, no obstacle of a mercantile nature to hinder the establishment of free ports on both shores of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec;

5. That the zones of the free ports can serve as districts for the concentration of raw materials produced in various countries of the world, which can be manufactured in these zones, and in general free ports can be used for the establishment under favorable conditions of industries for the manufacture of all kinds of national and imported raw materials, which when manufactured can be freely reexported abroad, thus improving the general economic situation of the country, and most particularly of the working classes;

6. That at the same time the establishment of free ports will permit the opening of large stations where various raw materials can be mixed, for the advantage of those that can be sold only in that form in certain regions, to all of which the fiscal organization now existing constitutes an obstacle;

7. That the port of Guaymas is admirably situated because of its location on the Gulf of California, because of its position with regard to American and Asiatic commerce, and because also of its importance as an outlet of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which would transport to this place the native products of the whole western part of the Republic, the organization of a free extension in this port will convert it into a most active center of traffic and industry, an impossible condition today because of the present economic situation which the creation of the free port would radically change;

8. That the establishment of free ports on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and at Guaymas, besides giving an extraordinary impetus to national commerce, will bring the other nations into closer contact with our country;

9. That for its most effective operation it is indispensable that the zone established by the free port should be exempt from fiscal laws which are detrimental to industry and commerce, because this zone is considered neutral and must be so, in order to get rid of all kinds of obstacles to the natural development of free ports, and because the sum total of these fiscal charges will be considered as included in the rents and indemnities paid by the commercial and industrial establishments, as provided in this law;

10. That the establishment of these ports is a public utility and justly constitutes a case for the application of expropriation as constitutionally authorized; and that, in accordance with the constitutional provision, and because otherwise it would be difficult in every way, it must be established that all lands pertaining to the zone of the free port must always belong to the nation, and can never be taken away from it;

11. That it is imperative to establish a relatively autonomous council of directors to take charge of the management, administration, and development of the free ports and other enterprises connected therewith, in order to make of them a commercial organization and to bring about the greatest amount of decentralization, as well as to determine the most efficient method of holding responsible those who manage public works;

12. That the members of this council must be named by the Government, which must draw up a contract for their services for a reasonable term, in order to insure the cooperation of competent persons who can dedicate themselves to the important work which is intrusted to them with the security offered them by their respective contracts;

13. That to carry out the purposes of the free ports of Salina Cruz and Puerto Mexico, as well as to fulfil the aims for which the National Railroad of Tehuantepec was created, it is absolutely necessary for this enterprise also to be administered by the above-mentioned council, in order to facilitate traffic and to avoid tariff difficulties, as well as to prevent, by means of an adequate organization, fiscal obstacles from interfering with the free interoceanic traffic of merchandise, and also to protect the interests of the national treasury;

14. That since the climate of Salina Cruz and Puerto Mexico might be detrimental to the development of certain industries, it is advisable to establish a neutral zone or free port in the interior of the Isthmus along the route of the National Railroad of Tehuantepec, where climatic conditions are more favorable, and where, moreover, the products of the region can be more easily concentrated and can find a certain market;

and, acting upon these considerations, have decided to decree the following:

Article 1. Free customs extensions shall be established in the ports of Salina Cruz, Puerto Mexico, and Guaymas.

Art. 2. These extensions, which shall be called "free ports," shall be considered as additions to the marine customs houses to which they belong, and consequently shall be subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal authorities.

Art. 3. The free ports shall be governed exclusively by this law, its regulations, and the provisions of the sanitary laws.

Art. 4. In the free ports merchandise of all kinds shall come and go without being subject to tariff laws. For the entrance of arms and munitions of war, authorization by the consular officer of the country concerned will be needed.

Art. 5. In the free ports all kinds of merchandise may be stored, exhibited, unpacked, repacked, refined, purified, manufactured, mixed, and transformed into any form freely, subject only to the provisions of this law.

Art. 6. The ships entering and leaving the free ports shall not be subject to any formalities except those established by the laws for sanitation and for employment of pilots.

Art. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury shall organize and direct the free ports, designate the extension and boundaries of each one, generally determine upon the methods necessary to carry out the present decree, and, wherever advisable, reform and add to the General Customs Ordinance and the regulations relating thereto.

Art. 8. The organization, administration, and management of the free ports shall be directly under the control of a council composed of five members, one of whom shall act as chairman. The Secretary of the Treasury shall draw up a contract for each member of the Council of Directors, for a period not exceeding five years. The council shall have full authority to appoint and remove all other employees.

Art. 9. All contributions and duties that should fall upon industrial or commercial establishments and operations in the free ports will be considered as included in the rents and indemnities paid by these establishments in accordance with the following article, for which reason such establishments should not be called upon to pay any duties.

Art. 10. The Council of Directors must draw up contracts which provide against the transfer of ownership, and which are favorable to the establishment and development of mills, stores, general storage houses, factories, shops, banking and commercial institutions, and public works within these free ports, in accordance with the tariffs and regulations approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Art. 11. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Council of Directors, shall expropriate the lands necessary for the establishment and enlargement of the free ports, in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Payment of indemnity to the owner of the expropriated land, as provided in paragraph 8 of Article 27 of the Constitution;

(b) The declaration of expropriation shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury, after which the Council of Directors can, in case of failure of the owner to comply, apply to the district judge to obtain immediate possession of the land;

(c) Any owner resisting the declaration of expropriation can oppose it through judicial channels within thirty days following the date of expropriation;

(d) When the owner of the land is not definitely known, the declaration of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be made public for two weeks in the form designated by the regulation, and if at the end of this period the owner appears, the procedure designated above shall be followed;

(e) The whole process shall be governed by these regulations.

Art. 12. When the Council of Directors declares that the free ports of Salina Cruz and Puerto Mexico are open for traffic, the administration, management, and development of the National Railroad of Tehuantepec shall be turned over to this council, which shall make a careful inventory of the enterprise.

Art. 13. There shall be established, at a point designated by the Council of Directors, on the route of the National Railroad of Tehuantepec a free interior port, with the exemptions established by this law.

Art. 14. The Council of Directors shall determine the methods necessary to bring the free ports of Salina Cruz and Puerto Mexico in contact with the interior free zone referred to in the preceding article, in such a way as to avoid fiscal obstacles and formalities, and at the same time to provide a reasonable guaranty to financial interests.

Art. 15. The Council of Directors shall name the day on which the free ports authorized by this decree will be opened for international traffic.

Article 16. The Council of Directors shall propose to the Secretary of the Treasury the regulations and provisions necessary for the carrying out of this decree.

Art. 17. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest a sum not exceeding $500,000 toward the expropriation of lands, the construction of the necessary works, and the maintenance of the personnel and services of the free ports.

Art. 18. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller-General of the Nation shall be responsible for the employment of funds, and for the execution of the laws, regulations, and tariffs, as well as of the contracts made by the Council of Directors, through the agency of an authority which each of them shall appoint for the purpose.

Meanwhile, I demand the printing, publication, circulation, and careful examination of this decree.

The Reduction and Reorganization of the Army

In the *Diario Oficial* of March 17 appeared the following Presidential decree on the reduction and education of the army:

CONSIDERING, That one of the most urgent demands of the nation is for the reduction of the standing army to a size which may permit it to accomplish its important function, and at the same time not be a heavy financial burden upon the nation by disturbing the equilibrium of the public finances and contributing to the imposition of onerous taxes, and estimating that an army of 50,000 men, well-armed, organized, and disciplined, could carry out the task intrusted to it, and realize the strongly felt national aspirations;

CONSIDERING, That it is also palpably necessary to spread, as far as possible, education and culture among the troops, so as to place the army on a level with contemporary civilization and to obtain a better military discipline. . . ;

CONSIDERING, That the army is the guardian of the country's honor and of its institutions, and for that reason it ought not to, nor can it, be stained by sending out under its banner individuals stamped with the stigma of vice or crime;

Accordingly, I have the honor to submit for the approval of the Chamber of Deputies the following proposed law, which reforms Articles 1, 3, and 673 of the General Organization of the army and adds notes to the same regulation, in the following terms:

ARMY

Article 1. The forces of the nation which carry on war in defense of independence, integrity, and honor and secure constitutional order and peace in the interior constitute the army and navy of the country and are directly responsible to the President of the Republic, and in time of peace will have an effective organization of not more than 50,000 men.

Art. 3. The standing army is characterized by length of service. Those who belong to it follow a professional career, the term of which will be decided by a general of a division in the army, and a rear-admiral in the navy.

It is strictly forbidden to recruit into the army, and give promotions to, individuals of notoriously evil character and to delinquents under prison sentence or to those who are on trial.

Art. 673. Elementary and higher instruction shall be obligatory for all members of the national army who are not educated. Said instruction will be gratis and laical and will be

given by the State without prejudice to military instruction, which must be received by all who are not engaged in the work of recruiting in such form and order as may be determined by the proper regulation.

Note

Art. 3. The Secretary of War will proceed to the prudent and gradual dismissal of the troops, to the end that on March 31, 1922, the effective forces of the national army will be reduced to 50,000 men.

President of the Republic,
A. Obregon
Secretary of War and Navy,
E. Estrada

Mexico, March 15, 1921

Army Manifestos

THE manifestos printed below were issued by soldiers and officers of the Mexican Army who are desirous of forming cooperative agricultural colonies with the assistance of the Government.

The Appeal of the Soldiers

To the Director of the Department of Colonization and Industry

We, the undersigned, who form a part of the First Reserve of the National Army, and who are farmers by trade, declare to you with full respect that, desiring to be useful to our country and not wishing to be a constant charge upon the public treasury, believing that we have fulfilled our duty as revolutionary soldiers, and considering the fact that peace actually exists, without fear that the present order may change, we have decided that just as yesterday we took up arms to defend our rights, which we have fortunately preserved, and since the betterment of the country depends on work, so today we desire to take up the plow; and for this purpose we have resolved to form a union of revolutionary elements with the object of developing, by means of our labor, one of the estates actually at the disposal of the Federal Government.

The Federal authority is not unconscious of the relations that exist between us and the rest of the country, which judges us by its attitude toward all revolutionary elements, which is based not on our acts as such, but on acts of individuals with notoriously bad pasts, who drink heavily and under cover of the cause of liberty give free play to their criminal passions. And so when we, strong workers, try to return, we find all doors closed against us—we are faced with *civil death*. For which reason, we turn to the Federal Government, asking from it the aid that we need; and we also inform this Government that we do not see how we can satisfy the needs of our families without the aid which we seek; if we do not obtain help we shall find ourselves in the most wretched circumstances. In view of the fact that what we had before throwing ourselves into the armed struggle we naturally had to spend for our families, and in view of what we have said above, it can be seen that we have now no credit with which to start our work, and consequently no means of livelihood. This subsidy for the establishment of the colony will be a guaranty to society and a stimulus to our comrades in arms, since it will show that the Government gives facilities to men of good-will, who, in devoting their energies to work, will be useful to society and to their country, instead of being a burden upon it. Moreover, if the Government will favor us by granting what we ask, it will put an end to the idleness of many individuals who used the revolution as a means of livelihood, who have not realized that the country needs productive elements for its progress, and who are, therefore, a constant menace to the society in which they live. Furthermore, as the Federal authority knows, each one of our members, in his own sphere of activity, has worked for the consolidation of the present Government, which justifies our feeling that setting us on the road of labor will be for the welfare of the country. This is especially true since what we ask is to be no longer a burden upon the public treasury, inasmuch as all the materials at our disposal for a period to be fixed by the Government will be paid for in such a way that neither the colonies nor the nation will suffer.

With the assurance of our support, we have the honor to extend to you, once again, our loyalty and respect.

Signed by the Colonists

The Officers' Manifesto

We, the undersigned, have the honor to make to the personnel of the First Reserve of the Army an appeal for the formation of one or more agricultural colonies, on the national lands and estates now owned by the Government, because we believe that this form of work is the only thing which can save the country and assure the future of our families, and because we are convinced that the time will come when the nation will not be able to sustain the number of military units it is now supporting. We feel that as we were the first to take up arms to defend the rights of our people, so we should be the first to return to the use of the plow which gives life to the nation and honor to its inhabitants.

Mexico, D. F., February 25, 1921

In the City of Mexico, D. F., on March 1, 1921, there assembled in No. 2 Palmer Street, the undersigned, chiefs and officers of the First Reserve of the Army, who proposed the formation of a military agricultural colony, and received from the commission appointed on the 18th of last month, the following information: "On the 25th of last month we were received by the President of the Republic, to whom we explained the purposes of the corporation in a most detailed manner, and we obtained the promise of the Chief Executive to aid us in this work and his congratulations for the whole group which we represent. After seeing General Antonio Villareal to find out what lands were at the disposal of the Department of Agriculture, we told the President that we wanted to send a commission to study these lands and decide for us on the most suitable one, and that since we lacked the resources to carry out this work, we should like to count on his aid, which would consist in providing the money and means to cover the expenses of the commission. The President agreed to help us. This ended the interview and convinced us that the President not only sympathized with our idea but made it his own, for he had asked us to extend it to the whole army. He authorized us to give to the press the facts of our interview with him. On the 28th of last month he received us again and we showed him a report on the properties owned by the nation. Again he promised to help us in every way he could."

In view of this information it was decided to appoint a commission to examine the lands, and the following members were agreed upon: Brigadier General Roman Bonilla, Colonels Nestor Arana, Porfirio Sanchez, and Emeterio Guerra, and Lieutenant Colonel Juan Rivera, who were informed that the object of the commission was to visit the lands indicated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to choose the one most suitable to our needs. It was decided to create a commission for propaganda and for the regulation of any matters relating to our project. Since there was no other business, the votes were taken, resulting in the appointment of the following members: Colonel Edward Royo, Major Manuel Viniegra, First Captains Pedro Velasquez and Alberto Herrera, Second Captain Ezequiel Torres, and Second Lieutenant Nicolas Lundes. The meeting was then adjourned.

The plans of the officers were accepted and fifteen government haciendas were put at the disposal of the officers for a beginning. The Government, however, added three conditions to the officers' plans:

1. That all military rank disappear in the colonies;
2. That the products of the colonies be offered in all cases to workers' cooperatives or directly to their organizations in case they have no cooperatives because "it is the duty of these military cooperatives to help the city proletariat";
3. That any officer member of the colony who misbehaves or refuses to become a good cooperator be returned to the army with the rank he held *as a punishment*.

The Organization of the Colony

A SUMMARY of the basis for the formation of the agricultural colony, to be called the "First Reserve," follows.

1. This colony shall be formed by forty or more individuals, according to the size and value of the property.
2. To be a member of this colony, one must be well known as a revolutionary, have some agricultural knowledge, be honest, and submit to all the regulations relating to the colony.
3. Without ceasing to belong to the First Reserve of the National Army, we constitute a rural agricultural colony, and we shall continue to be paid for two years only, after which time we should begin to see the fruits of our labor, provided the other members of this institution live up to their obligations.
4. We are to be allotted land, either public or private, at a satisfactory price, as well as implements, seeds, etc., necessary for agriculture, live stock of all kinds, and the most modern equipment, only on condition that the value of the property be not less than two hundred thousand pesos, provided that the number of colonists does not exceed fifty.
5. The Secretary of Agriculture is to allot to us a part of the public lands, the location, price, and grade of which are to be determined by a commission appointed for the purpose.
6. The property sold to us is to be estimated at its statistical value, plus a charge for interest.
7. The value of the property, as well as of the implements, seeds, etc., and the amount of the subsidy for general expenses, is to form a debt to be paid off in annual amounts after the first year of labor, within a period of not less than twenty years.
8. When the problem of installing the colony is once solved, we are to be granted allowances for five or six persons, who shall constitute the commission for the revision and examination of the estates with the object of designating the most suitable one, this commission to determine the subsidy needed to cover its own expenses as well as those of subsequent commissions to be established by the colony.
9. For security in the regions where the property is situated, we are to be given arms and munitions to be used to guard our lives and property, and to be ready to give military aid when ordered by the Government.

Additions

A. For the payment of our wages, a paymaster is to be named who shall make the payments at the colony.

B. Schools are to be established for the inhabitants of the colony, and we are all to be given books on agriculture, to instruct us in our work and to stimulate progress, and we are to make a library of them.

C. We are to have a doctor with his medicines.

D. Free transportation is to be granted to our families from their present place of residence to the new colony.

E. The colony is to be allowed to appoint some of its members as representatives to cooperate with the civil authorities.

F. In case our proposition is accepted, we respectfully ask that the necessary steps be taken to put it in practice, with attention to our needs and the pressure of time, for we wish to carry it out very soon.

Form in which the Debt for the Agricultural Colony is to be Paid

1. If the debt is $200,000 for the property, and $50,000 for the implements, seeds, and other expenses, the total debt will

amount to $250,000, which will be paid by the fifty colonists.

2. This debt shall be divided into amounts of $5,000 for each member, to be paid in twenty years in payments of $250 a year, making a total of $12,500 which will be paid back each year.

3. In order to avoid any injury to the properties placed at the disposal of the colonists, the Federal Government may appoint someone to inspect the operations of the colony, or the colony can submit a detailed report at the end of each year.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE COLONISTS DURING THE TWO YEARS IN WHICH THEY FORM PART OF THE FIRST RESERVE

1. To guarantee against banditry the region wherein the property is situated, to protect the interests of the colony, and to be prepared for any service ordered by the Government.

2. Not to permit any colonist to leave the corporation without having paid the sum total of his contracted debt.

CONSIDERATIONS

We call the attention of the Government to the fact that in asking to form part of the First Reserve for two years, we desire support for our families until we have time to see the fruits of our labors.

Since our families have suffered untold privations during the seven years that the struggle has lasted, we feel that they have a right at least to the necessities of life.

We extend to you our most distinguished consideration and esteem.

Mexico, D. F., February 25, 1921.

Regulations for Members of the Colony

THE plan for the formation of the "First Reserve" includes regulations for all persons making up the colony. These regulations appear below.

1. It is absolutely necessary for anyone wishing to belong to the colony to possess the qualities of morality necessary for all who are obliged to live in society, as well as to enjoy all his faculties, so that he may not be hindered from carrying out any work assigned to him by the Board of Directors.

2. For the favorable progress of the work of the colony, a Board of Directors shall be appointed from the members, to which the rest shall be subject, and whose orders relative to work and administration shall be respected. The Board of Directors shall be composed of a president, a vice-president, a secretary, an assistant-secretary, a treasurer, an assistant-treasurer, only three possessing votes.

POWERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. To convoke a general assembly whenever deemed convenient and when the necessities of labor demand.

2. To distribute work among the colonists in accordance with their knowledge and ability, as well as to supervise the execution of all measures undertaken, making sure that no work is neglected for any reason whatsoever which affects the interests of the colony.

3. The program of work shall be intrusted to various commissions at the beginning of each week, and announced publicly to all the colonists, and none of the members of the colony shall modify the said program of his own accord, but when a change may be necessary under special circumstances it shall be made by agreement with the Board of Directors.

4. To care for the well-being, progress, and welfare of the colony in general, providing that, in case of accident to, or illness of, any one of the colonists, efficient attention be given him, and that he receive all the necessary supplies, which shall be in charge of a section of the reserve created within the colony.

5. Secret meetings are prohibited. To keep all colonists constantly informed regarding the needs and progress of the colony the Board of Directors will always keep its books and documents up-to-date so that when any colonist wishes to have any data it may be supplied to him as well as to the Departments of State.

6. For no reason shall the Board of Directors permit the removal or destruction of any property, or the sale of products without its authorization, since the only authority responsible for all that the land produces and all operations which are to be undertaken, besides the Board of Directors, is the unanimous will of the members of the colony attested by their signatures.

7. When the Board of Directors finds a colonist who does not obey orders, who becomes habitually intoxicated, or who is a reckless character, and in any way molests another colonist, and also if any trouble of an economic nature arises among the colonists, the Board of Directors shall meet and constitute itself a council of justice, and if the judgment against one or more colonists is severe enough for dismissal, an act of dismissal shall be passed and shall be referred to the Department of the First Reserve, a higher body.

8. For the execution of the preceding article, the Board of Directors shall be careful to keep constant watch over the conduct of each one of the colonists, so that when occasion arises it can do its work with absolute justice—as it must set an example of morality as well as of labor.

9. When a colonist is dismissed on account of misbehavior the colony must see that he is compensated for the amount of money which he has actually given, so that he will lose only the labor which he has performed, and only if he is destitute, will the amount needed for transportation to the place where he wishes to settle be given to his family.

10. Causes for which the Board of Directors shall ask the dismissal of colonists are: pillage and theft; continual and offensive drunkenness; acts of any character which would be obstacles to the favorable progress of the colony.

11. The Board of Directors shall not permit any colonist to cease work without due cause for a period of more than fifteen days; though in case of necessity, he can take all the time he needs, if he leaves a person in his place who can perform his work to the satisfaction of the Board.

12. In order that the Board of Directors may be able to render an annual account, it shall keep a memorandum of work accomplished during its tenure of office, as well as one for each individual member.

13. The Board of Directors shall take care that, in the interior regulation of the colony, military rank is not taken into account in the performance of labor, since in this every one should be on an equal footing, working for the common good.

14. The Board of Directors shall see to it that whenever feasible all questions of consumption of goods in the colony, and matters involving considerable expense, shall be discussed by the colonists, in order to promote the welfare of the colony in general.

15. As one of the aims of the colony project is to help also the city proletariat, the products shall not be sold to storekeepers, but in the principal places of the Republic, markets shall be established where the products will be sold without competition, so that the consumers in general will benefit, and the colony can at the same time sell its merchandise more profitably than it could to merchants.

16. All the undertakings which, after due consideration, it proposes shall be investigated by properly qualified persons before they are put into practice. . . .

20. The Board of Directors shall not accept any debt, nor can it contract one, with private individuals. Such action would be cause for asking it to resign and immediately appointing another to take up the responsibilities of the outgoing Board. . . .

The New Secretary of Labor

THE duties usually performed by a Secretary of Labor have heretofore, in Mexico, been assumed by various other secretariats, to the consequent confusion and neglect of this important phase of the government.

CONSIDERING, That among the economic questions of great importance which now occupy the attention of legislators and statesmen are found those relating to labor in its many and varied aspects; and that the social, political, and moral problems which these questions have brought up are of such magnitude that in reality the social problem which so fundamentally concerns the governments of the civilized world reduces itself clearly and completely to the lawful regulation of labor and to the complete determination of the rights and prerogatives of the laboring class, from the humble peasant of the fields to the technician or professional man who solves the most difficult problems of human life; and that, on the other hand, it is well-known that the confiict between capital and labor presents very serious incidents of a political and legal nature which profoundly affect the economics of society, and to solve these troubles a detailed knowledge of their various inter-related questions is needed, as well as possession of data which only offices created for that purpose can supply;

CONSIDERING, That the economic and moral situation of the workers which exists in the Republic makes it especially necessary for the government to go to their aid and to secure their betterment in the various spheres of human activity, particularly because modern public law has definitely placed upon the state the obligation of forming institutions established for the improvement of the worker's condition and the raising of his intellectual and moral level; and that to realize the former it is necessary to create the office of a secretary of labor whose duties will be the study and solution of the aforesaid economic problems and the administrative organization of the various offices by means of which the aspirations of the proletariat will be satisfied, and the much desired economic equilibrium established between capital and labor;

THEREFORE, In view of the importance and complexity of all the matters which we have mentioned, the need is indisputable for creating a new branch of the executive power whose duties will lie particularly in that field, which will undoubtedly bring greater efficiency and skill to the solution of all the questions pertaining to labor, so that our laws may respond to the actual demands of the times, and for establishing the office of Secretary of Labor which already exists in the great European nations.

From the foregoing considerations it is decreed:

Article 1. The office of Secretary of Labor shall be created, whose administrative function shall be to provide for everything which relates to the rights and obligations of the worker and to the aid which is due him from the state.

Art. 2. The Secretary of Labor shall have jurisdiction over workmen's compensation, courts of conciliation and arbitration, strikes and lockouts, chambers of labor, workers' associations and syndicates, savings banks, societies, especially cooperatives, and consumers' leagues, labor funds, professional associations, labor contracts, apprenticeship and technical instruction, workers' legislation, and statistics of occupations.

Notes

1. The duties which are now vested in the various state secretaries and those which, by the terms of this law, pertain to the Secretary of Labor shall from this time on be vested in the latter.

2. This law will go into effect from the date of publication.

A. OBREGON

ZUBARAN,

Secretary of Industry, Commerce, and Labor

Before the High Court of the World

HAPPY CHILDHOOD, *Plaintiff*
vs.
PAINFUL HUNGER, *Defendant*

Application for an Injunctional Order.

Now comes the above named plaintiff and for a cause of action respectfully shows to this court, hereinafter designated "the reader":

First: That at all the times prior to the commencement of this action this plaintiff has by all humane people been termed the inherent right of children throughout the World.

Second: That there are now resident in Central Europe more than 15 millions of children of tender age, who have never had the pleasure of an acquaintance with this plaintiff.

Third: That the defendant is the prime cause for this deplorable state of facts, in that it has wantonly, wilfully, and maliciously prevented this plaintiff from entering the life of said 15 millions of children, most of whom since birth have been so molested by the defendant, that they have never even known the sensation of a full and satisfied stomach.

WHEREFORE, this plaintiff prays this "reader" that the defendant be forever enjoined and estopped from harassing, hindering or interfering with said distressed children or their comfort; and

THIS PLAINTIFF FURTHER PRAYS that this "reader" will grant to them such substantial and material relief as is within his means and power to give, by the purchase and contribution of one or more assortments of the foodstuffs listed below.

Happy Childhood

Assortment "A"—$5.75
Contents: 1 can Libby Corned Beef, net weight per can 12 ounces, 1 can Libby Roast Beef, net weight per can 12 ounces, 1 can Libby Pink Salmon, net weight per can 16 ounces, 2 cans Libby Sliced Bacon, net weight per can 9 ounces, 2 cans Libby Beef Fat, net weight per can 14 ounces, 1 tin Libby Oven Baked Beans, net weight per can 17 ounces, 2 cans Libby Raspberry, Strawberry or Apricot Jam, net weight per can 21 ounces, 2 cans Libby Sweetened Condensed Milk, net weight per can 14 ounces, 2 cans Evaporated Milk, net weight per can 16 ounces, 1 dozen Bouillon cubes.

Assortment "B"—$20.50
Contents: 6 cans Libby Corned Beef, net weight per can 12 ounces, 3 cans Libby Roast Beef, net weight per can 12 ounces, 3 cans Libby Boiled Beef, net weight per can 12 ounces, 6 cans Libby Pink Salmon, net weight per can 16 ounces, 6 cans Libby Sliced Bacon, net weight per can 9 ounces, 4 cans Libby Beef Fat, net weight per can 23 ounces, 3 tins Libby Bouillon Cubes, containing 1 dozen each, 6 cans Libby Oven Baked Beans, net weight 17 ounces, 6 cans Libby Raspberry, Strawberry or Apricot Jam, net weight per can 21 ounces, 6 cans Libby Sweetened Condensed Milk, net weight per can 14 ounces, 6 cans Libby Evaporated Milk, net weight per can 16 ounces, 3 cans Libby Oxtail Soup, net weight per can 11 ounces, 3 cans Libby Mulligatawney Soup, net weight per can 11 ounces, 3 cans Libby Vegetable Soup, net weight per can 9 ounces.

All those who desire to furnish these food packages to friends or relatives in Central Europe should fill out the attached blank. Those who have no friends or relatives there should fill out the blank to the Central Relief Committee, who will deliver such food packages free of charge to the home of some destitute family with children in the countries named and obtain an acknowledgment for the donor from such recipient.

The goods furnished under these orders are now on hand in the European warehouses of the central Relief Committee, and are of first quality only.

Assortment "C"—$10.00
Contents: 24½ lbs. Wheat Flour, 10 lbs. Rice, 5 lbs. Macaroni, 10 lbs. Sugar, granulated, 2 lbs. Farina, 2 lbs. Corn Starch, 2 lbs. Sweetened Chocolate, 2 lbs. Coffee, 1 lb. Cocoa, 1 lb. Tea, ¼ lb. Cinnamon, ¼ lb. Pepper.

Assortment "D"—$7.00
Contents: 48 tins—16 ounces net—Evaporated Milk, United States Government Brand.

Assortment "E"—$9.00
Contents: 48 tins—14 ounces net—Condensed Sweetened Milk, United States Government Brand.

Assortment "F"—$15.00
Contents: 12 lbs. specially cured and smoked ham, 11 lbs. Fat Backs, 10 lbs. pure refined lard, 5 lbs. hard Salami.

Assortment "G"—$11.00
Contents: 140 lbs. Wheat Flour.

Assortment "H"—$6.50
Contents: 1 case containing 1 bag of 50 lbs. Granulated Sugar.

Assortment "I"—$6.00
Contents: 1 case containing 1 bag or 50 lbs. Fancy Blue Rose Rice.

Assortment "K"—$12.00
Contents: 1 case containing 50 lbs. (2 tins each 25 lbs.) Pure Refined Lard.

CENTRAL RELIEF COMMITTEE,
247 East 41st Street, New York, N. Y.

Please ship Assortment.....for which
(Indicate by Letter)
I enclose $....., and deliver to
(1) Name.....
Street Address.....
City, District and Country.....
Sender .....
Name and Address
If donated for general relief write at (1) "At your discretion"
(Please write plainly)

In next week's issue

Jewry at the End of the War

By JUDAH L. MAGNES

A review of the present world situation of the Jew.

THE NATION also announces the publication in forthcoming issues of two highly stimulating articles dealing with

The New Education

I. Its Trend and Purpose II. The Modern School

By EVELYN DEWEY

The "No War with England" series continues in the next issue with an editorial article on the situation of the Merchant Marine. The balance of the series—Naval Competition; Oil; Finance; Communications and Canals; Ireland and British Imperialism; Fact, Fancy, Myth, and Rumor; Conclusion, follow in consecutive issues.

Let us enroll you as a subscriber at once in order that you may follow every article in this important series in addition to much other interesting material appearing from week to week. For $6.00 we will send you, in addition to THE NATION for 52 weeks, a copy of Robert Lansing's book of the hour, "The Peace Negotiations." A year's subscription to THE NATION is regularly $5.00, and the Lansing book costs $3.00, so by taking advantage of this special offer you will save $2.00. Fill out the blank below and send in with your remittance.

THE NATION,
20 Vesey Street, New York City.

Please send me THE NATION for 52 weeks and a copy of Robert Lansing's THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS, for which I inclose $6.00.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

Foreign postage $1.00
Canadian postage .50

4-27-21

The Nation

Vol. CXII, No. 2917 | Founded 1865 | Wednesday, June 1, 1921

Recognize Obregon!

Editorial

Why Obregon Has Not Been Recognized

by John Kenneth Turner

The China Consortium

First Publication in America—Text and Correspondence

In the International Relations Section

Franklin K. Lane

by Oswald Garrison Villard

Fifteen Cents a Copy | Five Dollars a Year

Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1887, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Nation
FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1921 No. 2917

Contents

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S New York visit was an event to bring cheer even to an abandoned cemetery. He embarked upon a sea of words early in the morning, and by midnight had circumnavigated the dictionary and discovered countless hitherto uncharted islands in the ocean of rhetoric. The thought of war in connection with the soldier dead gave him the chance to thunder, amid touching tears, "It must not be again! It must not be again." We must have a nation "so powerful in righteousness [i.e., so armed to the teeth] that none will dare invoke her wrath." In Brooklyn he was inspired to think of the "sweet, rollicking, laughing, hopeful children of the republic," and at the Fox Hills Hospital he was able to shake hands with the soldier patients and ask: "How are you boys?" Somehow he failed to kiss a baby—but otherwise it was a perfect day. Full speed ahead!

IF a good time was had by all at the Pilgrims' dinner in London at which Col. George Harvey unveiled the astounding fact that the Harding Administration will never, never enter the League of Nations, it is certainly not the last occasion during the new Ambassador's stay in Great Britain in which he will furnish headlines and draw and deliver fire. The performance was eminently Harveyesque as to manners and style; yet there was a surprise in it—the cool and deliberate way in which the Ambassador set forth his official view that the United States did not enter the war "to save this kingdom [England] and France and Italy. This is not the fact. We sent them [our troops] solely to save the United States of America and most reluctantly and laggardly at that." Naturally, the Democrats have raged ever since. This calm overriding of all the delightful Wilsonian bunkum about our preserving humanity, making the world safe for democracy, and going to the rescue of small nations naturally causes to rage those who have held forth to us the vision of a United States going into the war a veritable Sir Galahad among nations. Well, gradually some of the old fictions which were so effective in bamboozling the public are being destroyed. Woodrow Wilson himself did yeoman's service in this respect by admitting that the war had its origins in economic rivalry—for saying which earlier Mr. Debs went to jail. Now Colonel Harvey, as spokesman for the great Republican Party, describes it as a purely selfish, nationalistic war, waged by us without thought of our beloved Allies, merely because of fear on our own part for ourselves and our property. What an interesting time the historian of the World War is going to have!

ALL thanks to Senator Borah, who by courageously sticking to his disarmament amendment to the naval appropriation bill, has gained the day. Senator Borah asked that the bill appropriating money for the navy carry with it an instruction to President Harding to initiate a conference of Japan, Great Britain, and the United States for the purpose of considering a lessening of armament. The proposal was opposed at first because it was understood that Mr. Harding thought it an invasion of the executive function of the government and likely to prove embarrassing. More recently the word was passed around in the Senate that the President had withdrawn his objections. The outcome is definitely a victory for public opinion of the best sort, which daily is growing more outspoken and insistent that the danger and burden of vast international equipments for murder and suicide must be ended.

SECRETARY HOOVER deserves hearty commendation for his designation of seven engineering experts to assist the Department of Commerce in the solution of the troublesome problem of housing which now confronts the country. To an engineer like Mr. Hoover it seems, he says, obvious that we should not suffer from unemployment at the moment when for lack of labor many persons are without houses, if the workless hands can possibly be put to work to house the roofless heads. His advisers will concern themselves with building codes, standards of materials, items of waste, and improvements in building practice. The United States, for all its great contrasts of empty regions and congested slums, has until the past four or five years never known how serious the housing shortage in a modern industrial nation can become. And though our own shortage is now acute, concerted action taken by some such central body as Mr. Hoover designates can go a long way, if so disposed, to unsnarl our tangles.

IT is of course obvious that the Holy See is and must be neutral in international affairs—its relationship is to people, and essentially to those of Catholic faith the world over, whatever their nationality. So that the position of the Pontiff in touching on Ireland, with the two involved groups unable to meet on common ground, is inevitably beset with difficulties. Yet while the Pope's sentiments about the need of cessation of warfare in Ireland are unimpeachable, the *Nation* feels that he is mistaken in his recommendation that "the question at issue be referred to some body of men selected by the whole Irish nation." For the whole Irish nation has already spoken unmistakably. It spoke in the elections of 1918, when four-fifths of its population voted for self-determination. Granting that the Irish question is not simple, as is so often asserted, the principle that the peoples of the earth shall have the right to govern themselves must today be regarded as fundamental. The way to achieve peace is to withdraw the troops and let the Irish people work out their own destiny.

MUCH has transpired since the days when Britain used to talk about shaking hands with murder and dispatched armies to annihilate the Bolsheviki. The Bolsheviki obstinately persisted in surviving, and Britain saw that prosperity lay along another way. So moralizing has been forgotten, and the Soviet Government is basking in the recognition of the strongest Power in Europe. The decision of the British Court of Appeals that property confiscated by the Russian Government and exported to England cannot be recovered by the original owner in the British courts has removed almost the last barrier to a complete resumption of trade. Will the United States follow after England? Or will the present Administration continue to display the dogmatic rigidity that made Mr. Wilson's behavior toward Russia a painful mixture of moralistic incompetence and callous indifference to suffering? Great Britain has cleared the way for a restoration of economic stability, and the United States should follow suit.

WE should be the last to discourage gifts for the relief of suffering in Europe, but there are efforts in that direction which seem inappropriate. For instance, the Phoenix *Republican* (Arizona) published on one page recently two ironically incongruous headlines. One of them read: "Greenlee Leads all Counties for European Relief." The other said: "Men Will Work Just for Board is Report." Greenlee County, it appears, was assigned a "quota" of $1,500 for European relief, but owing either to generosity or duress of the kind we learned to apply during the war, the people went "over the top" with $4,805.48. Meanwhile, labor conditions in the State are wretched, unemployment is widespread, and hunger is driving men into the situation revealed by the second headline quoted. Charity does not necessarily begin at home, and should not end there; but it is poor charity—and worse justice—which both begins and ends in a detached sentimentality.

IN Georgia, where folks are talking of impeaching the Governor because he gave the State a bad name by attacking the peonage system, a necktie salesman apprehends the former Governor of Florida, a fugitive from justice on charges of direct participation in the practice of peonage. Where but in the liberty-loving United States of America could it be said that two Governors stand in the shadow of the law's mighty power, one because he opposed human slavery, the other because he gloried in it? And what would be more consistent with the past conduct of these sovereign commonwealths in matters of racial equality than that the Governor of Georgia should be incontinently thrust from office and that the former Governor of Florida should be triumphantly acquitted and ride a white horse in a parade of the organizations to whose bigotry and intolerance he owed his political success, the True Americans and the Guardians of Liberty?

THAT there are propagandists for foreign commercial interests at work in Washington—we call them lobbyists when they represent domestic groups—is undoubted. But all their combined efforts could do nothing as injurious to American commerce, or so effective in retarding our return to prosperity and "normalcy," as the fastening of a protective tariff on our nation by the Republicans. America's foreign trade is steadily waning. South America, whose commerce was presented to us during the war, is now reverting to its former associations. Our exports to Europe approach the vanishing point. The situation was clearly summed up at the recent meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers by Ambassador Jusserand when he said:

> The big question is the tariff. America needs foreign markets and foreign markets need America. Can any reasonable person expect foreign markets to come to America when this country raises a wall to keep them out? France has little gold left and must pay for what she buys with goods. The rest of the world is in the same condition. Can America foster foreign markets when she erects a tariff wall to exclude their only way of buying?

By diminishing our foreign markets a protective tariff decreases our production and increases unemployment, which, in turn, means less purchasing at home. And ultimately the tariff benefits no one in this country except relatively small manufacturing groups.

SENATOR SPENCER of Missouri has made another—probably the last—contribution to the controversy that arose between him and Mr. Wilson during the Presidential campaign. Senator Spencer said that Mr. Wilson had told the Rumanian and Serbian delegates at the peace conference that "if any nation ever invaded their territory he would send the American army across the seas to defend their boundary lines." Thereupon a statement was issued from the White House that Senator Spencer's words were "absolutely and unqualifiedly false." Senator Spencer called for the official minutes, but Mr. Wilson replied on October 7, 1920, that he had no copy and so far as he knew there was none in the country. Later, however, he made public a letter from one of the official stenographers at Paris, Fred A. Carlson, in which the latter reproduced from his notes what Mr. Wilson had said. After the present Administration came in, Senator Spencer wrote to the Department of State, and received a copy of the official minutes of the peace conference, with a letter from Secretary Hughes saying that 500 copies had been received on July 9, 1919, and 300 more on February 20, 1920. The text corresponds with the Carlson version in quoting Mr. Wilson as saying:

> And yet there underlies all of these transactions the expectation on the part, for example, of Rumania, and of Czecho-Slovakia, and of Serbia, that if any covenants of this settlement are not observed, the United States will send her armies and her navies to see that they are observed.

LET us not forget, in our excitement over having a President with a style, that we have a Vice-President with a style too. And he uses it. Not content with cracking the whip over the Senate, he extends his lash to the broad public which a great man addresses in a great magazine. Just now the magazine is the *Delineator*, for June, and the theme is the wicked "Reds" who are slinking into the girls' colleges and corrupting the virgin minds there assembled. Why, there is a thing called the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, he warns the world, which has chapters in the colleges and tells the girls about radical literature and bolshevism and Russia and such. Barnard is a hotbed, and so is Radcliffe; at Wellesley "the library has books for and against socialism which show considerable use"; Smith seems sane, for there discussions of radical matters are "under direction and supervision," and not many girls read the dangerous books in the library; Bryn Mawr has been kept safe for orthodoxy "by a rather complete representation of books in opposition to socialism, which have been much more read than like books in opposition in other colleges"; Mt. Holyoke is almost immaculate. Let us not be alarmed, he says, but merely armed against this stealthy propaganda. "Adherence to radical doctrines means the ultimate breaking down of the old sturdy virtues of manhood and womanhood, the insidious destruction of character, the weakening of the moral fiber of the individual, the destruction of the foundations of civilization." (Pull for the shore, sisters, pull for the shore! The Vice-President will help you.) Interestingly enough the President of the Senate does not mention the fact which practically all competent observers will agree upon—that the women's colleges, taken as a whole, are the most active centers of intelligence and free speculation in the United States.

THERE seems to be a growing belief that high railroad rates are at least as much to blame for poor railroad earnings as is industrial depression. Thus a committee appointed by the Governors of the New England States recommends against a further increase of rates, saying that a decrease is rather to be desired from the standpoint both of the railroads and of business revival. Senator Capper of Kansas has said in Congress:

> To ship a bushel of wheat from Buenos Aires to New York costs twelve cents, while to ship a bushel from Minneapolis to New York costs thirty-eight cents. A bale of cotton can be shipped from Galveston to Germany for thirty-five cents a 100 pounds, while to ship the same cotton 300 miles by rail in this country means a freight charge of ninety-five cents a 100 pounds.

Not only high rates but heavy losses worry shippers. Small articles are now largely shipped by the far more expensive parcel-post and express services, because even though damages are paid for losses on the railways, trade is spoiled. According to the railways' own figures, robberies and losses due to defective equipment in 1920 cost no less than *one hundred and four millions of dollars*. Is it any wonder that the cost of living stays up?

THERE are three ways now in vogue of bringing about lower labor costs. One is the perilous way of the United States Steel Corporation and the Frick Coal and Coke Company, whose executives meet in private and come forth with a decree reducing wages 20 to 30 per cent, put into effect without any hearing of the attitude of the workers, or any present resistance on their part, since they are unorganized. The second is the costly way now being employed by Admiral Benson and the American ship-owners, who refuse arbitration in order to enforce a cut of 15 per cent or more against the active resistance of unions. The third way has just been employed in the men's clothing industry in Chicago, Rochester, and Baltimore. Here both sides presented their arguments and evidence before the "impartial chairman," paid jointly by both, who has been adjusting disputes steadily for months and knows the needs of the industry. The result in this case has been a reduction of from 5 to 10 per cent in Chicago and Baltimore, and no reduction in Rochester, but a change in method of payment from "week work" to piece work. Valid objections can be urged even against the award in the clothing industry, but at least it involves far less danger to the employer, the worker, and the consumer than the other two cases. Its reductions are not utterly disproportionate to the fall in retail prices. It gives the manufacturer some relief during the period of depression. The workers accept it knowing that their case has been properly presented and heard. And everyone benefits by the steady continuance of production.

THIS reservation made, it is possible to criticize the clothing decisions more in detail. In this industry, as in many others, wages were never adjusted to the cost of living at its peak in June, 1920, and therefore a reduction of even 10 per cent may make it impossible for the workers to live as well as they did a year or more ago. In view of the fact that most wage-earners have never received enough to maintain a family according to decent standards, this is a serious matter. Furthermore, since neither the workers nor the public have access to the books of the employers, it is impossible to be sure that even higher wages than those now received might not be paid without unduly curtailing the earnings of the invested capital. The change to piece work in Rochester is a dangerous precedent and may, without careful supervision, lead to overspeeding. And how necessary are wage cuts, after all, in enabling employers to weather periods of depression? The employers have all the advantage of high profits in boom times, and should be called upon to meet deficiencies as far as possible from the reserves thus accumulated. It is necessary now to reduce prices, but if labor cost, as in the clothing industry, does not make up more than 40 per cent of the total cost of production, a wage cut of 10 per cent reduces the wholesale cost of clothing only 4 per cent.

THERE has been an alarming decrease of candidates for the Methodist pulpits as well as for the Episcopalian and other churches, so that a "life service commission" has been organized, with Bishop Henderson of Detroit at its head, to begin a "vigorous campaign" to supply Methodist needs. The Episcopalian theological schools have so fallen off in attendance as to have aroused the anxiety of those connected with them. Thus we have another interesting side-light upon that great spiritual revival which was scheduled by the war-makers to follow upon the holy business of wholesale slaughter on behalf of democracy and humanity. What kind of a recruiting campaign ought to be instituted? Should it be by scouting in the colleges, by large display advertising in the daily press, as one calls for purchasers of motor-cars and phonographs, or by much

stressing of the fact that ministers' salaries have gone up? To our mind men of consecration cannot be recruited unless outlived creeds and shibboleths are done away with, until the church of today is directly correlated with life and, above all, with the aspirations of the masses. Moreover, the "life service commission" ought to recognize clearly that its problem is chiefly to prove if it can that the Methodist Church is one in which brave spirits are soaring unfettered, free to range where they will and say only what conscience dictates.

THE centenary of the birth of Charles Baudelaire should be celebrated not only in France but by lovers of poetry everywhere. Merely as a maker of music he stands high. Assuredly the French language has never known more enchanting rhythms than those of "Le Balcon" or "Harmonie du Soir" or "Hymne." This quality of the author of "Les Fleurs du Mal" has often been neglected in favor of his originality of subject matter. He was, as his "Journaux Intimes" show, a terribly sincere and terribly frank writer. And as he had all the maladies of the soul of his day and extraordinarily acute senses, he said what many felt and few dared utter, and thus exerted a profound influence on the poets of his own and the succeeding generation. Today his boldness no longer seems quite so bold, his frankness no longer quite so revolutionary. The aching sense of the sinfulness of his desires to which his rigid dualism condemned him no longer stirs a more rational and a more pagan world. The verses remain, and not only remain but keep their strange thrill and somber loveliness, their gigantic images, their psychological accuracy, their penetrating fragrance, and their rich perfection of form.

Recognize Obregon!

WILL the Mexican policy of the Harding Administration be controlled by the demands of a handful of oil men and the banking interests that back them? Or will it be controlled by the will of the vast majority of the American people—business men included? On the answer to this question depends the fate of Mexico—and the chance of peace. No one wants war with Mexico—a new war with new taxes, new drives, new oppression, new propaganda. No one wants a revolution in Mexico, where for the first time in many years banditry is out of style and contentment and growing prosperity are everywhere felt. No one wants the United States to dominate a "Mexico consortium," which shall prevent Mexico from raising independently a cent of money abroad or establishing credits without the consent of the United States. No one wants the United States to withhold recognition from the Mexican Government—a government constitutionally and peacefully established, financially sound, democratically organized. No one wants any of these things for Mexico—war, revolution, a financial protectorate, international outlawry—except a handful of American gentlemen who claim title to vast millions of acres of Mexican land and the oil that is under the land, and a handful of gentlemen who provide the money to make this land exude its oil and to spread it over the face of the earth.

The men who have forced the Government to withhold recognition from Mexico and who will try to force the Government to withhold recognition until Mexico is in a state of bankruptcy or revolution and war is inevitable—these men could be mentioned by name in two minutes. They are so few, compared with the rest of us, that it seems strange that they should be able to force the Government to do just what the rest of us want it not to do. We are almost driven to the conclusion—which to us unsophisticated Americans is a painful one—that the Government listens more attentively to the voice of business than it does to the voice of the people; or perhaps the voice of business is louder.

Mexico by its own efforts has largely achieved peace, order, financial stability. It desperately needs recognition; it wants to be received into the society of nations. It does not either need or want intervention, or financial help in the form of loans for which its customs revenues shall be held as security and administered by the United States. It wants only a chance to borrow abroad, if necessary, as other countries borrow (as Poland, for instance, can borrow!) without forfeiting its right to independence. It wants a chance to establish credits, since credits are essential to international trade. It sees no reason why it should not tax Americans as it taxes Mexicans.

It is easy to see why the oil men who are thus being taxed and the bankers who want an opportunity to lend on their own terms disapprove of Mexico's desires. Their power and their purposes are convincingly set forth by John Kenneth Turner in this issue of *The Nation*. But the rest of the people naturally approve of Mexico's desires for independence and peace, and it is the task of the majority to make its approval felt. Professor Chamberlain stated the position of all disinterested Americans when he said at the recent Congress on Reduction of Armaments:

> Our southern neighbor is no longer a country of great ranch and primitive industrial and mining development. It is modern state in process of formation, provided with means of rapid transit, which make it a part of the commercial world. Our interests point to a closer friendship with Mexico, especially now, when our manufacturers and merchants need the Mexican markets.
>
> Beyond Mexico lies South America, always fearful of the shadow of the northern Colossus. A wrong step in Mexico would have instant effect sympathetically throughout Spanish America, an effect which European competitors would see was not smoothed out.

Let every business man in America and every peace-loving American of any profession say with a voice louder than the voice of oil: "Recognize the Mexican Government. That is the only Mexican policy the United States needs." Already, it is encouraging to note, the legislatures of Arizona, California, and Oklahoma have adopted resolutions urging early recognition; and Senator Ashurst of Arizona, in a recent speech, stated his belief that a continued delay by the State Department in recognizing the Mexican Government would result in disaster for Mexico. So far, however, the behavior of the State Department gives us little reason to count on a new policy. Secretary Hughes's note to the Governor of San Luis Potosi, protesting "in the name of interested Americans" against the enactment of a law dividing landed estates among the peasants, displayed an arbitrary tone and a strange disregard for the ordinary methods of international intercourse. On the other hand, the Government is apparently feeling the pressure of those groups business men and exporters who want to take advantage the present tranquillity and solvency of Mexico. This fact offers some reason to hope that the Government will recognize Mexico without demanding from her a formal treaty giving up her sovereign rights.

Chief Justice White

THE death of Chief Justice White removes one of the stalwart figures of American public life. Confederate soldier, wealthy planter, successful lawyer, Louisiana politician, United States Senator, a member of the United States Supreme Court for twenty-seven years and for eleven years Chief Justice, untiring worker, modest, genial, fun-loving, Mr. White impressed all who knew him with his lovable human qualities and his steadfast devotion to public service. His efforts to expedite business had met with notable success in spite of the facts that much more work is forced upon our high tribunal than it can possibly do promptly and well and that the issues brought before it often raise sharp differences of opinion that tend to set the judges on edge and to provoke acrimonious and prolonged debate. The published opinions of recent years testify to antagonisms that under a Chief of less character and less human leadership might have blazed forth into more open hostility. Although Chief Justice White enjoyed no such intellectual supremacy or personal domination over his colleagues as did Chief Justice Marshall, and although he frequently found himself in the minority, he nevertheless won distinction as an able presiding officer and a firm upholder of the traditional dignity of what remains the most powerful tribunal in the world.

By reason of his striking personality and his lovable human traits, the late Chief Justice will for a while receive higher tributes to his judicial services than time is apt to confirm. He will rank higher as Chief than as a member of the court. Several of his colleagues were wiser in judgment, abler in reasoning, and more effective in expression. Whether from native bent or from training or from both combined, he indulged in intellectual processes that are baffling and irritating. His propensity for unwarranted antitheses and for artificial verbal logic make many of his opinions models of what judicial opinions ought not to be. His famous "rule of reason," which has received such acclaim from those who have not carefully analyzed it, was but an involved piece of casuistry built on a submerged pun. By using "reasonable" now in the sense of moderate or limited and now in the sense of something reached through the exercise of the reasoning powers, he sought to make out that the court was not overruling itself in its interpretation of the Sherman Act when the contrary was perfectly plain.

In his judgments the Chief Justice belonged with those who hold that the doctrines of individualism and of *laissez-faire* are firmly imbedded in the due-process clauses of the Constitution. With Justices Van Devanter and McReynolds he frequently objected to police measures that all the rest of the court found free from constitutional fault. These three, like Justices Brewer and Peckham of the preceding judicial generation, could be most confidently relied on to oppose legislation of a collectivistic character. The Chief Justice voted against the Washington and the Arizona workmen's compensation laws, the Oregon ten-hour law, and against both State and Congressional legislation designed to enable employees to make wage contracts by collective bargaining. In the divisions of opinion on the application of the Sherman Law he was usually in favor of giving a clean bill of health to the important defendants before the court. For the most part he continued to be dominated by the beliefs of an earlier generation. When he surprises us by joining with his more enlightened colleagues in sustaining such legislation as the Adamson Law, the explanation is usually to be found in some widespread public interest in the issue. The Chief Justice had a keen sense of the possibly precarious political position of the court, and he was solicitous to avoid the popular criticism that might start an agitation to deprive it of the control over legislation which it has so long exercised. Contrary to natural inferences, this Confederate soldier was more of a nationalist than a States' rights man. Old ways of feeling found expression in his vote against the Federal Child Labor Law and against the effort of Congress to apply State workmen's compensation laws to injuries within the admiralty jurisdiction of the Federal courts, but these were exceptions to his general attitude in favor of a broad interpretation of national power. As a rule he allowed wide scope to the taxing powers of the nation as well as to those of the States. His outworn views on social and economic questions were frequently curbed by a political instinct and a sense of practical necessity that saved him from being the obstructionist that he might otherwise have been. Notwithstanding his strength of character, he was not rigidly stubborn. His personal qualities largely compensated for his lack of the highest vision and of a sure intellectual technique.

The tremendous political power wielded by the Supreme Court makes it of prime importance that those who compose it be chosen with conscious reference to their capacity to act as governors in a democracy. Under constitutional clauses couched in such general language that they afford little or no guide to their application, the Supreme Court enjoys a veto power more untrammeled than that of the President. Had Chief Justice White been of different mind, Congress would not have been thwarted in its efforts to tax stock dividends as income and to close the channels of interstate commerce to goods made by child labor. All too frequently important acts of Congress and of State legislatures are set aside by a Supreme Court divided five to four. The division of opinion is seldom due to disagreements as to the meaning of language or as to any other matters on which lawyers may be deemed to be expert. It is usually due to a difference of social outlook. How much the social outlook of our judges is left to chance is evident from the fact that the same President could appoint two justices of such diverse propensities as Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis. Unfortunately, too, it is only occasionally that the practicing lawyer with the requisite technical skill and learning for high judicial office has at the same time the breadth or depth of social vision that is needed for a wise judicial governor. Nor is it common that Presidents and Attorneys General understand sufficiently the qualities demanded for a justice of the Supreme Court to be able to make even approximately the best appointments to that body. Chief Justice White's successor should be a man picked not for his genial personality or for his party services, but for his capacity to engage in unremitting intellectual toil of the highest order, to understand the complicated relationships of an industrial nation of the twentieth century, to have a vision of the future as well as a knowledge of the past, and to do for his generation a work of the same constructive statesmanship that Chief Justice Marshall did for his.

No War With England

VII. Cables and Canals

IF Americans still possess their traditional sense of humor, they must be hugely intrigued to find that one of the chief spoils of war turns out to be a tiny island in the South Pacific by the name of Yap, that our Government has for many months been exchanging weighty diplomatic notes about Yap with the Imperial Government of Japan, and that all the great Powers of the world are in some measure involved in the controversy. Whoever heard of Yap before? Can obscure trifles like this, lying in the files of foreign offices, suddenly emerge to confound us with international friction?

The sole reason for this impressive debate is that Yap is the meeting-point of four submarine telegraph cables. One comes from Guam, which we seized in the Spanish War. It is in turn connected with San Francisco, Tokio, and Manila. Another comes from Shanghai. Another goes to Borneo and another to New Guinea. Our Government's fear is, crudely stated, that any nation which controls the cable station at Yap might interrupt, censor, or read the contents of messages passing between San Francisco on one side of the Pacific, and Shanghai, Borneo, and New Guinea on the other. Of course no nation could do so publicly without compromising its honor. But apparently we have reason to believe that nations are in the habit of doing so privately. If they do, they steal an unfair advantage not only in secret diplomacy, which of course still exists, but also in trade and business. That is the whole story.

There are other cables which have been in controversy. Before the war there were two cables connecting New York with Germany. In 1914 Great Britain and France interrupted our communication with Germany by cutting both these cables, and towing the eastern ends respectively to Penzance, England, and Brest, France. Two years later Britain cut the western end of the Penzance cable outside of New York and connected it with Halifax. What was a cable between the United States and Germany has now become, therefore, a cable between Canada and England. We cannot communicate with the European continent without having our messages pass through French or British hands. We cannot communicate directly with the continent of Asia without having our messages pass through Japanese hands. The Allies have seized all the German cables and claim them as the spoils of war. Great Britain owns most of the other important ocean cables, having laid them as a result of her commercial enterprise and her virtual monopoly of guttapercha. But the matter has not stopped here. Many of us are puzzled to read in the newspapers about what seems to be a private war between the United States Government and the Western Union Telegraph Company. The company is trying to land a cable at Miami, Florida, and the Government has prevented it from doing so by the power of the navy. The cable in question is British owned; it comes from Barbados, which in turn is connected with Brazil, and it would, if completed, give British interests control of the most important line between the United States and western South America. The Department of State was so eager to prevent this result that it actually employed arms against a domestic commercial concern.

An International Communications Conference was held December to adjust the question of the former German cables. The American delegates urged a compromise and gained the support of the Italians for it, but the British and French delegates would not agree. Presently the latter requested that the conference be adjourned, since they wanted to be at home for Christmas. The American delegates reluctantly let them go. The conferees were to meet again on March 15 of this year. They did so, almost in secrecy. You may search the newspapers in vain for the story until March 19, when an inner page of the New York *Times* carried a circumstantial account of what had happened. Nothing could be announced officially, said the article, for "technical" reasons. Yet it was understood that a tentative arrangement had been arrived at by which the United States was to receive full ownership of the New York-Brest cable and of the Guam-Yap line, while Japan was to hold the Yap-Shanghai and the Yap-East Indies wires. The question of the control of Yap itself was differentiated from the ownership of the cables, and until the mandate issue was settled, Japan insisted on operating the Yap end of the Guam-Yap cable. Official approval of the French Government had to be obtained before any final announcement could be made. Since March 19 there has been a silence about cables.

Wireless is, in one sense, a substitute for the cable, but it will be a long time before wireless facilities are as well distributed or as dependable as the submarine telegraph. Besides, since secrecy is the chief desideratum, wireless is really no substitute, because there is little hope of concealing the contents of a wireless message from anyone who is willing to take a little trouble to decipher it.

While we are thus in effect questioning the good faith of other governments in the matter of cables, we are preparing to exercise bad faith ourselves in the matter of canals. The Suez Canal, owned by Great Britain, is open to the ships of all nations on equal terms. The Panama Canal, owned by the United States, is also, in consequence of an explicit clause in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, open to all ships without discrimination. But the United States shipping interests are trying to get lower tolls for our vessels, backed, apparently, by Congress and the Administration.

These two controversies have much to teach us about international relations. They prove again, to anyone who still doubts it, that most of the quarrels between nations are concerned not with high and pure ideals like democracy and honor, but with material interests like trade and profits. They show that the Allied and Associated Governments, which only yesterday proclaimed to the world that they were engaged in a mighty crusade to crush selfish imperialism, to banish war forever, and to establish the sanctity of treaties, cannot even trust each other not to snoop or not to violate solemn agreements when there is a little money to be made by it. These difficulties are too insignificant, taken by themselves, to lead to open hostilities, but they indicate how alert peace-loving peoples must be if they are to prevent rulers who place business above humanity from leading them into a situation where wholesale slaughter becomes "inevitable."

The next article in this series will deal with Ireland and British imperial policy.

Why the Obregon Government Has Not Been Recognized

By JOHN KENNETH TURNER

ALVARO OBREGON has been President of Mexico now for six months. No question has been raised as to the validity of his election. Refusal of one government to have dealings with another is an affront which requires the most cogent reasons to justify it. Why did the Wilson Administration, and later the Harding Administration, omit to send an ambassador to the capital of Obregon, and to receive an ambassador of Obregon at Washington? This is a question that is emphatically the public's business, especially since danger of war lurks more threateningly in our relations with Mexico than in those with any other country.

Within her own borders Mexico is more nearly at peace than she has been for ten years. Not a single Zapatista remains in arms. "Pancho" Villa has turned to the arts of agriculture. The followers of Pelaez have become a part of the government forces. The Yaqui Indians have forsaken the war-path. Banditry has all but disappeared. Although it is not usually considered that the form of a government, or its internal policies, may properly determine the question of recognition, it happens that the conditions which our political leaders—whether Democratic or Republican—have claimed to desire in Mexico are more nearly [illegible] than in any previous period in the past decade.

The Obregon Government is not so radical that there need be any fear of its leading the country into bolshevism; nor is it so reactionary as to be likely to provoke another popular revolution. Its chief energies are being directed, on the one hand, toward removing the causes of past disorder at home, and, on the other, toward demonstrating a desire for American friendship, a wish to meet "legitimate" demands of business, a determination to fulfil "international obligations." In a word, it has met the ordinary conditions for recognition and a great deal more. It is probably the best Mexican government that could be found for the present time and circumstances. Any change would almost surely be for the worse, and no immediate change is possible without another period of war.

It may be, however, that these kind things cannot be said of the Government of Obregon six months or a year from now, and should that be so it will be due to circumstances for which we are directly responsible. So long as the Mexican Government is not recognized it not only cannot borrow a dollar abroad, but it is precluded from obtaining ordinary business credit. The stability of any government depends largely upon its ability to maintain transportation, so that the people can buy, sell, and be fed. We have complained of the condition of the railroads, holding that as a point against the capacity of Mexicans to solve "the Mexican problem." Under the circumstances, it is a tribute to Mexican efficiency that the railroads can be operated at all. Mexico has been prevented from getting railroad material on credit, prevented from borrowing the cash, prevented even from taxing the necessary cash out of the nation's industries. Due to the railroad situation, the cost of living in the centers of population at the present moment is an inevitable source of discontent. At the same time the merchants are complaining of losses arising from non-delivery of goods. The Department of Agriculture can proceed with its program of land partition, and even distribute plows among needy agriculturists, but it cannot furnish the animals and the seed which in some cases must be provided if the land is to be worked this year. For lack of cash a hundred admirable and necessary projects, looking toward the reconstruction of the country, are held up. Promises must be carried out or the Government will experience a loss of popularity. Obregon may survive without recognition, solve the country's immediate problems, keep the peace, and stave off intervention, but the chances are against it. Would we really like to see a stable regime beyond the Rio Grande? Again, why have we withheld recognition from the present Mexican Government, while according it to other governments that were newer, less "stable," less democratic, and whose rise to power was by more questionable means?

The answer is that we have demanded a price for our recognition; we have laid down conditions which no government should ask of any other government, and to which no independent government could agree. We are willing to take advantage of the difficulties of a neighbor in order to force upon her illegal and slavish terms. Rather than abate our demands we are willing to wreck a government that has begun its work in the best of faith, to encourage rebellion against it, even to make war upon it ourselves.

Evidence of a conspiracy to this end has come out bit by bit until the case is now fairly complete. It is well known that the hearings upon Mexican affairs conducted by a Foreign Relations Sub-Committee of which Albert B. Fall was chairman were directed toward manufacturing sentiment for intervention against Carranza. At the height of these hearings the Obregon revolution occurred. The Fall Committee immediately prepared a report, recommending that the Government of the United States refuse to recognize the new Mexican Government except under certain conditions. The specified conditions were so cunningly framed as practically to give our neighbors the choice between American overlordship and war. The crux of the Fall recommendations was that the Mexican Executive should be required to *agree in writing* to various things; among others, to suspend the application to American citizens of Article 27 of the new Constitution—a step which, of course, the Mexican Executive is constitutionally precluded from taking.

But Fall was a notorious interventionist, a Republican, and a critic of President Wilson. Wilson had nine months in which to recognize the successor of Carranza, De la Huerta, or De la Huerta's successor, Obregon. Although a large portion of the public had been led to believe that Wilson was not in accord with Fall, when the Mexican representative sought recognition Secretary Colby laid down the condition that the Mexican Government should *agree in writing* as to the consideration to be accorded American business men, not forgetting the application of Article 27 of the Constitution. It was the refusal of Obregon to enter

into a treaty along the Fall lines that caused the breaking off of negotiations. Had President Wilson not approved of the Fall scheme he could have checkmated it by recognizing Obregon. In the end the Mexican policy of "non-interventionist" Wilson and of interventionist Fall were revealed as one and the same.

And Harding? Speculation as to what will be the Harding policy is superfluous. So long as Harding postpones recognition he is *carrying out* the Fall policy. What other motive can there be for withholding recognition except to compel acceptance of the Fall terms? Harding was a member of the Senate Committee that approved of the Fall report. After his appointment to the Harding Cabinet, and only two days before taking his seat, Fall reaffirmed his inflexible adherence to the Fall policy through the press (letter to the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico); declared that "no government in Mexico will be recognized, with my consent, which government does not first enter into a written agreement practically along the lines suggested"; held up the two alternative courses open to our Government should Mexico refuse to sign, the first, "inaction," the second, "other action." This pronunciamento did not cause Harding to change his mind as to the eligibility of Fall to a position in his Cabinet. Indeed, is it likely that Fall would have accepted a cabinet post without assuring himself that there was no intention to subject him to humiliation? Considerations yet to arise may cause President Harding in the end to recognize Obregon on a basis short of the Fall terms, but up to the time of writing the Harding policy is the policy of Fall.

Fall-Wilson-Harding—the Republican Party—the Democratic Party; where is the source of such sweet harmony? Secretary Fall has been represented as standing almost alone, but a little investigation reveals him as the spokesman for a most respectable and powerful company. In a written statement published widely in the press March 3, the Association of Producers of Petroleum in Mexico pointed out that "the Sub-Committee of which Senator Fall was chairman, a representative of one of the groups of members of the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, and the State Department at Washington have arrived at substantially the same conclusion, that any settlement of the Mexican problem must be a comprehensive one embracing all questions in which American citizens are interested, and that it should be in the form of a formal treaty between the two governments." One day previously the National Association itself had indorsed "unqualifiedly the views expressed and the policies outlined by Senator Fall"; and during the same week the American Association of Mexico published its program, which is nothing more nor less than a restatement of the Fall "five points." Active spirits of these three organizations had promoted the Fall hearings and the Sub-Committee was fully informed as to their views before writing its report. Upon the executive board of the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico are represented America's richest banks, railroads, oil and mining corporations. They dominate the policy of the Association. The Fall-Wilson-Harding policy is the policy of Wall Street.

Now what is the full program of this financial and political alliance, and what means are being taken to realize it? There is evidence that it goes even beyond the specifications already acknowledged. The American Association, paraphrasing the words of the Petroleum Producers, makes the sweeping demand for the removal of "*all* governmental restrictions upon American enterprise." Make no mist this is not merely a question of oil. The National Asso tion echoes that it is "opposed to any partial settlement the problem that does not comprehend protection to *all* American citizens and respect for *all* property rights." This is a large order which could hardly be filled by any means short of a general and protracted supervision of Mexican affairs. For the most authoritative hint as to the physical form such supervision would take we have to go to a fourth organization, that of the international bankers.

The formation of the international committee of twenty bankers on Mexico—ten Americans, five from France, and five from Great Britain—was announced simultaneously in New York, Paris, and London, on February 23, 1919. It is significant that during the secret conferences previous to the announcement of this body the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico was launched, with representatives of the same great American banks on its executive committee. In New York the news of the formation of the International Committee of Bankers was given out in the library of J. P. Morgan, personally by Thomas Cochran, a member of the Morgan firm. Mr. Cochran's outline of the purposes of the organization suggests the question whether Albert B. Fall is the real author of what is known as the Fall Mexican policy, or whether the author is the International Committee of Bankers.

We find that the committee assumes to act for all "investors who hold interests in Mexico" and that its plans require that "the status of foreign investors" shall be "r the subject of a clear and precise pronouncement" by Mexican Government. The bankers are not indisposed to undertake "the rehabilitation" of Mexico, but there must be a "guaranty" as to how the public moneys are to be spent. In the conferences leading up to the formation of the committee "representatives of the American, French, and British governments" took part. Remember that this was in the midst of the peace conference; heads of governments and of great banking houses, including President Wilson and Thomas W. Lamont, who became the active chief of the committee, were together in Paris. Finally, the scheme is disclosed cautiously in the following words:

> A plan for refunding Mexico's debt and for supplying capital for new developments has been tentatively prepared . . . this plan calls for the refunding of the Mexican debt into a comprehensive issue of bonds of one description, the issuance of new bonds for capital with which to develop the natural resources of Mexico, the pledging of the national customs revenue as security for the whole debt, and the administration of the customs revenue by a joint commission or international board of representatives of the United States and Mexico.

In plain language, a financial and political protectorate, where the bankers hold the natural resources and the railroads, expending their "loans" to promote their own enterprises, where the bankers collect the revenues, the bankers supervise the disbursements, the bankers dictate the policies of a puppet government—their rule made good by armed might of the American people. It is useless to tend that we are too moral to stand for such an arra ment. We have it precisely in Nicaragua and Honduras, and with possibly slight variations in Santo Domingo and Haiti.

In these four little countries we made war to impose the

scheme. A war with Mexico would cost a great deal of money and men, and it would require psychological preparation. So, while the psychological preparation goes on we try other measures, among them non-recognition and the financial boycott. If Obregon will sign, everything will be delivered to him that can be delivered by America; if Obregon will not sign—then see what happens to Obregon! "It was indicated that nowhere outside of the United States, Great Britain, and France is there sufficient surplus capital to enable the Mexican Government to borrow in quantities sufficient for its needs," is one of the points given to the newspapermen by Mr. Cochran. "It is a fortunate circumstance for the United States," remarked James Speyer (New York *American*, January 8, 1921) "that ours is probably the only country where new money could now be obtained, and this should facilitate matters." March 17, a report was spread abroad that the French Government had recognized Obregon. The next day, after inquiry at the State Department, the Associated Press sent out the following dispatch:

> The recognition of Mexico by France would be the occasion of some surprise in the State Department, because according to information there has been an understanding existing for several years between the principal European Powers and the United States that the relations of those governments with Mexico would be predicated largely upon the attitude assumed by the United States. One of the immediate effects of the recognition might be, it was explained, a serious disturbance of the agreement between the chief banking houses of the world not to lend money to Mexico unless action was concurred in by all the banks who are a party to the agreement.

Which means that we have made the Fall policy the policy of France and England.

Although Obregon has made repeated overtures looking toward a reasonable business arrangement with business men and business governments, Wall Street and Washington stand pat, and they are seeing to it that France and England stand pat. The policy of "inaction" that we are for the moment pursuing is in effect a policy of action; for "other action" is almost certain to follow as a direct result of it. The oil companies are making sure of that; they are refusing to comply with Mexican laws, boring wells in defiance of regulations, forcing the Mexican Government into a position where it will either have to back down or assert its authority—and bring on a crisis with the United States.

The bankers are confident that Obregon cannot last in the face of their hostility, active or passive; his difficulties will be too great and new disorders will arise. Should Obregon surrender that, also, would provoke disorders. No policy is better calculated to insure a renewal of Mexican "turmoil" and prepare an excuse for armed intervention than the one we have chosen. Never have we had a more favorable opportunity decently and honorably to stabilize a worthy Mexican government, and so help solve "the Mexican problem." The first step is immediate and unconditional recognition of the existing regime.

Enter the Labor Press

By ARTHUR WARNER

OF course we have long had labor papers. For the most part, however, they have been published by labor organizations primarily for the benefit of their members; they have been devoted to narrow propaganda and to news of limited interest. In addition, we have had publications by political organizations friendly to labor, such as the Socialists, but these publications have suffered from the same shortcomings. Among all these journals only a handful have been dailies. There has been no cooperation and hardly any community of interest; no effort to reach the public as a whole or even to build a common constituency. In other words, we have had many labor papers, scattered and of limited appeal, but only since the armistice of 1918, and largely within the past year, have we evolved in the United States a journalism entitled to be called a labor press.

Within the period of a year, a considerable number of new dailies have been started, including the *Minnesota Daily Star* and the *Oklahoma Leader*, both launched last summer, two of the best publications of their kind in the country. In western Pennsylvania miners who were dissatisfied with their treatment by the press during the coal strike bought one of the newspaper plants of their locality, installed their own editors, and became responsible for the daily *Panther Creek News*. Within the last few months the Sheboygan *Telegram*, also a daily, has been taken over by a company of Wisconsin workingmen, chiefly Socialists. On the Pacific Coast a movement has been started to convert the *World*, the organ of the Socialist Party of California, from a weekly into a daily, while in Chicago Socialists are raising funds to establish their own daily.

These newer ventures give the workers control of a daily in almost every section of the country when taken together with longer-established publications like the *Union Record*, supported by the trade unions of Seattle; the Butte *Daily Bulletin*, published by miners and other labor organizations of Montana; the *Daily Eclipse* and the *Courier-News*, issued, respectively, in Parsons, Kansas, and Fargo, North Dakota, primarily in the interest of farmers; and the New York *Call* and the Milwaukee *Leader*, established by Socialists. This is to mention only newspapers published in English, but to grasp the development of labor dailies, as a whole, one must remember the foreign-language publications, which are as many again as the list just enumerated.

More important, even, than the establishment of new daily newspapers is a change in the character of such publications, old or new, that is giving them greater power and appeal. They are becoming newspapers in the true sense of the word. The standing trouble with labor publications in the past is that they have had no adequate news service. There is probably a clientele in all of our larger cities for one working-class daily, but it must be sufficiently strong in news and general features so that it can be read as a substitute for, not in addition to, the other newspapers. It must satisfy the man and woman who read only one paper a day. There are probably half a dozen labor dailies in this country today that meet such tests—that are at least as good from the standpoint of the general reader as any other newspapers in their cities.

A change in the tone of the propaganda is equally ap-

parent. The old shouting and ranting and calling of names still persists in too great a degree, but it is more and more displaced by a sober and intelligent effort to interpret current history and explain in simple terms fundamental economic and political truths. The narrow appeal to organization or party is giving way before the need of developing a broad proletarian movement. To this the Socialist Party is showing itself commendably sensitive. The New York *Call* is now less a party and more a workers' newspaper than once. The editor of the Sheboygan *Telegram* writes that although the Socialist branch of that city was primarily responsible for the organization of the company that made the purchase, the journal aims to be "the recognized organ of the workingman, and not essentially a Socialist newspaper." It is "independent in politics, free to defend or criticize any party or individuals." The business manager of the *Oklahoma Leader* writes that there has been criticism because that publication has not been "purely Socialist." "We are trying to publish," he says in explanation, "a real labor newspaper." Likewise with the *Minnesota Daily Star*. It is commonly spoken of as a newspaper of the National Nonpartisan League, because League members, assisted by organized labor in Minneapolis and St. Paul, raised the money to establish it, but above its editorial columns is this declaration:

> Owned and controlled by twenty thousand stockholders. Established and maintained to defend and cherish the freedom of the press and liberty of public opinion. . . . The opinions expressed in the editorial columns of the *Daily Star* are those of its editors. . . . It aims to give all sides to important public questions a fair hearing.

Both the *Oklahoma Leader* and the *Minnesota Daily Star* instance the way in which farmers and city workers are getting together on a common basis as producers and consumers, to the surprise and consternation of privileged interests that have hoped to play off one against the other. The farmer element behind both of these publications consists mostly of members of the National Nonpartisan League, and any treatment of the labor press would be incomplete without mention of the admirable insistence that the League has placed on its official and unofficial journals. The League publishes a semi-monthly national organ, the *Nonpartisan Leader*, in Minneapolis, and a semi-monthly newspaper in each of the half a dozen States in which its strength principally lies. The dues which members of the League pay include a subscription to the national magazine and to the newspaper of the State in which the person in question lives. There is also the daily *Courier-News*, in Fargo, North Dakota, and a considerable number of unofficial journals. While League publications are primarily for farmers, they defend the cause of the wage worker, and wherever they are in territory that includes any number of the latter, a definite attempt is made to obtain their support and cooperation. This new solidarity between city and farm worker is one of the powerful influences in the creation of a true labor press.

The same tendency away from sectarian appeal and toward broad labor interests that one notices in the dailies is apparent also among weeklies and monthlies. The Labor Publication Society has just been incorporated to take over the *Socialist Review*, started a year and a half ago by the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, and to issue it monthly as the *Labor Age* along the wider lines, and with the wider support, that such a name suggests. So too *Labor*, which was begun by the railway brotherhoods specifically to advocate the Plumb plan, has grown into one of the most influential and broad-visioned weeklies devoted to the workers' interests.

Most important of all the forces at work during the past year in welding the detached and inadequate labor papers of the country into a common structure, and in creating a public to support it, is the Federated Press. This is a cooperative news service designed to supply the factual content that labor papers have so long needed and to tell workers the truth about events and movements that most concern them. Inaugurated on January 2, 1920, with only eight assessment-paying members, the Federated Press had grown to 110 such members when the first annual report was made by the executive secretary on January 15 last. This number included twenty-two dailies, with a combined circulation of 339,980; seventy-three weeklies, with a combined circulation of 354,196; fifteen semi-monthlies or monthlies, with a combined circulation of 41,550; a total circulation of 735,726, or allowing an average of three readers to each publication, an audience of more than 2,000,000. Of the 110 members at the time of the first annual report ninety-six were English-language publications, the character of the subscribers to the service ranging from the *New Majority*, national organ of the Farmer-Labor Party, to *Solidarity*, official journal of the Industrial Workers of the World; from the Butte *Daily Bulletin* of the Montana mining fields to *Chanticleer*, a fortnightly issued by students of the University of Chicago.

In the course of the first year of its existence the Federated Press increased its service from 10,000 words a week to more than 50,000, and is supplying special articles, features, and cartoons in addition to current news. It has correspondents abroad as well as in this country, and its membership has been extended to Europe, where an organizer is now stationed. In respect to its membership, the Federated Press is, in fact, the first international news service to come into existence, and has issued a call for an international convention in Amsterdam this summer.

Owing to its slender financial resources, the service of the Federated Press has been limited so far to news of special concern to labor, but as soon as it can obtain the means, its scope will be widened. One plan afoot for increasing its income is the publication in Chicago of country weeklies, the Federated Press supplying the bulk of the material, uniform in character, and the local editor sending in a page of his own. Meanwhile, the Federated Press League has been organized, with dues of $5 a year, to obtain individual interest in and support for a free labor press and a news service to sustain it.

The Federated Press is by all odds the most hopeful—and the most worthy of support—of any development in American journalism within a generation, although candor compels one to say that it is not yet the unbiased and dependable news service that it should be. It is no less partisan (from its own standpoint, that is) and rather less accurate than the Associated Press, the inadequacy of which in regard to labor news was chiefly responsible for the organization of the Federated service. It is not yet a substitute for, but only a corrective of, the Associated Press. Even so, it is supremely useful, and with greater experience (and the clearer vision resulting therefrom) and larger resources, it ought to become the fairest and best gatherer of news in existence.

In conjunction with direct forces working for the development of a labor press in America, there has been a reflex movement making way for it—a growing distrust of and resentment toward the other newspapers. The war and its aftermath has been the great cause of this. For a long time labor has been accustomed to see its specific interests ignored or misrepresented in the ordinary business-controlled press, but in the last few years it has seen almost every other issue vital to working men and women manhandled on the news pages and misinterpreted in the editorial columns; it has seen a shameless abandonment of the news-gathering and disseminating functions in favor of disingenuous and dangerous propaganda. An appreciation of this condition has come not merely to labor in the narrow sense in which that word is commonly used, but to a large body in the general community, so that there is a new and eager public ready for a new journalism as fast as the labor press can equal in general contents the business-controlled newspapers, and provided it can show itself free from the same kind of partisanship and deception in respect to its own interests that is the source of complaint against its rivals. The issue is fairly joined now between the labor press and the business-controlled journals; it will grow more acute. Indeed a counter offensive has already been started from the other trenches, news coming from Detroit recently that the local dailies had refused the use of their advertising columns to union cigarmakers desiring to make an appeal to the public against a reduction of wages and the "open shop."

The labor press has made no attempt to reform journalism beyond its effort to give what it regards as a truer representation of facts and an interpretation of them more in the interest of the worker. There is much in present journalism that is vulgar and absurd, but it is not the immediate mission of the labor press to change it. For the most part it does well to employ the vehicle to which the public is accustomed. Its own essential reforms are enough to begin with. One cannot quarrel too seriously with the Seattle *Union Record*, therefore, because it daubs a red ribbonhead across its entire front page, because it has a page of "Love, Life, Laughter" and a column devoted to "Beauty Chats," or because it prints all it can get of the Stillman divorce case and runs as execrable "comics" as any of its competitors.

The most pressing difficulty of the labor press is financial. "We are always short," writes the business manager of the *Oklahoma Leader*, with pleasing directness and candor. It is equally true of most of the other publications. Few are yet self-supporting from their circulation and advertising, but encouraging progress has been made. The New York *Call* has increased its advertising revenue 425 per cent in the last four years. Most of the paid publicity of the labor press is what may be called sympathetic advertising—inserted by persons favorable to the policies of the publication in question. There are some who hope that with wider circulation and prestige the labor press will get more patronage purely as a business proposition. This is open to question. With the lines forming as they are today, it seems more likely that business will be compelled by its affiliations to employ all its resources on one side or the other. This, however, does not mean a lessened support for the labor press. On the contrary, the infiltration of labor organization into the clerical and professional classes is going to increase its members and buying power, while the disgust of many small—and some large—merchants and manufacturers with the present industrial autocracy will tend to line them up with the wage-earners. In addition, the development of cooperative business will give the labor press a valuable clientele.

Probably the most subtle and perilous problem of the labor press is to keep its news columns free from partisanship and disingenuous propaganda, its editorials clean from vilification and rancor. In this connection it is to be hoped that labor newspapers will presently realize the absurdity of referring to their business-controlled rivals as the "kept press." No press is more a "kept" one than that of labor. Only, alas, the labor press is not as well kept as that of business!

The labor press is not a liberal press. It is frankly printed to advance the cause of labor and to present news from that standpoint; but it ought to be a free press, to present the facts as best it can obtain them, without deception, suppression, or editorial bias. One cannot condemn the labor press of today for its inadequacy; it is doing the best it can with its resources. But one may criticize it for news articles that are too editorial or too careless of facts, too much based on innuendo or hearsay. It is not enough that the labor press refute the untruths of the business-controlled newspapers, or be no more biased in the treatment of news. Readers must be won by a fresher atmosphere and a cleaner countenance. The past year has seen the beginning of a labor press acceptable to labor. The future demands a labor press that will serve the entire community.

Three Wise Men of the East

By FREDERICK PETERSON

I

One Seer from out the Bo Tree's mystic shade
Saw visions of the world that is to be—
The self forgot and thus from prison made free
Man facing fate serene and undismayed;

Freed from the blight of wealth and power and fame
He turns to truth and service to mankind,
Right thought, right striving, and a mindful mind
To reach Right Rapture his diviner aim.

II

A wise Old Man through blossoms of the peach
Beside the Yellow River saw the Way
In the spring splendor to a better day—
The Way to live, the Way that he must teach:

Be simple in your every want, be just,
Free of desire, compassionate, and mild;
Be gentle, humble as a little child;
Do good for evil, be obscure as dust.

III

And One saw from the shadow of the Cross
Peace in the world, a common brotherhood,
Each seeking lovingly the other's good
Finding his life through losing all its dross;

One Father smiling on the faults forgiven
As all come arm in arm and happily
Like little children to a father's knee—
The earth at last become the Kingdom of Heaven.

Franklin K. Lane

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

IT is a commonplace to say that if Franklin K. Lane had not been foreign born he would have been President of the United States or at least a Presidential candidate at the polls. In view of recent happenings is this not rather a dubious compliment? Certainly he was not of the traditional Ohio kind, waiting carefully to see what his party wished him to do before he took a position. Mr. Lane was a forthright, four-square man, a profound Liberal—what is called "a real character." That is he had marked individuality. But he had more than that: he had courage, conviction, conscientiousness, coupled with a philosophy of existence. He had seen various kinds of our American life, something of our border-life, and he had made his way in a give and take which, fortunately enough, did not mar the finer side of him. He could be gentle as a woman; one ran across streaks of tenderness in him unexpectedly. Then he had sentiment and eloquence—if anybody doubts it let him read Mr. Lane's apostrophe to the flag which deserves a place in every Americanization primer, but is probably much too "radical" in its tendencies and its implications to be beyond the suspicion of our professional hundred per-centers.

It may, however, be truly said that if Mr. Lane had lived and had been free to enter political life again he could easily have made himself a notable force. For he could arouse great personal enthusiasms and could readily have marshaled a group of young enthusiasts about him. Until he took service with the Doheny oil interests there was hope that he might be the leader of the routed liberal and progressive forces even though he could not be a Presidential candidate. Only a week before his death I heard of his having drawn up a list of the men he thought should lead in the reconstruction and reorganization of the Democratic Party. But to be a Cabinet member on the existing salary without private resources means to go into debt; Mr. Lane held on as long as he could and had only just got his head above water again. He was just the kind of man Mr. Wilson ought to have put forward as his understudy to be the party leader—but Mr. Wilson could not delegate a task like that to anybody—political fences were left to a Burleson!

Mr. Lane was most approachable as a Cabinet officer and was profoundly concerned with the welfare of his subordinates of the Interior Department. To build up an *esprit de corps* among them, to give them fellowship, to help them to lift themselves beyond the routine deadening drudgery of a government department, which blights so many ambitious and promising young men and women, were things close at heart. But beyond all that he had a brain; his thoughts ranged free; he knew both East and West; he was constantly turning out constructive ideas and plans and his was a real breadth of vision. So in the Washington wilderness those who like real men admired him greatly. The foreign diplomats who are accustomed to genuine intellectual power in high office quickly sought his society. It was instantly recognized that he, Lindley Garrison, and McAdoo were the forceful figures of the original Wilson Cabinet—Bryan had force, too, but was too untrained and unversed to apply it.

Yet one by one the forceful men went out and no such men took their places. When the war came for which Mr. Lane had hoped—he wrote the threat into the original Lusitania note and was ready then for the ultimate—the greatest responsibilities went elsewhere. Mr. McAdoo at once received eight or nine offices and other men received great powers—it is difficult to recall the additional duties intrusted to Mr. Lane. Behind the scenes, however, he was credited with many valuable things; it is said that he helped notably in working out the schedule that made possible that marvelous bridge of boats across the Atlantic. But long before the pinch of financial necessity compelled Mr. Lane's resignation it was quite too evident that he had lost the Presidential favor, that he was no longer in the inside Cabinet circle. Perhaps, like Lindley Garrison, he was too outspoken, besides having the temerity to disagree; at any rate an unhappy situation ended when he retired. If anyone should make a study of Mr. Wilson's letters accepting the resignations of secretaries and assistant secretaries he will find that the one to Mr. Lane is quite inadequate for the man whom Republican and Democratic dailies alike have been rightly praising as one of our great Americans.

In a sense there was poetic justice in the failure of Mr. Lane to play the great role another than a Mr. Wilson would have assigned to him. Great liberal that Mr. Lane was, he had not learned the lesson that when war touches liberalism it shrivels and withers where it does not utterly destroy it. He came to Mr. Wilson's standard an ardent upholder of the "New Freedom" and all that it connoted for social progress. He saw it dead before he left the Cabinet; he was shocked, I know, at the excesses of which the Burlesons and Lamars and Palmers were guilty, for he was one who loved justice, who personified tolerance, who knew the real and the lasting bases of our American freedom and of true democracy. He never spoke out against the acts of his associates, but he never publicly approved them. "Life," he once said to the writer of these lines, "is just a beautiful adventure, to be flung away for any good cause." But he did not understand that the manner of the flinging counts a great deal, that one must be quite certain of the cause; that one must be even surer as to the correctness of the weapons to be used. So he lived to see the utter collapse of the Wilson Administration—in its moral quality and in its home reform policies as soon as the war began, and in its foreign policies after Versailles. He lived to see a hundred thousand young Americans make a beautiful adventure of their precious young existences, at the behest of Mr. Wilson and his Cabinet, flinging them away for some exquisitely painted ideals which have not materialized and will not materialize in any such way. He lived to see how profoundly true in 1921 were Mr. Wilson's words in January, 1917, that "peace without victory" was what the world needed—for by now it is, after all, a little difficult to find out just who it was that won the war and just exactly what was won. Certainly no one can contend that we have achieved a true peace by our great victories in battle.

But there can be no question of Mr. Lane's bigness of heart and soul, nor of his acting ever from profound conviction. It is a pleasure to read that one of the great mountain peaks in Rainier National Park is to be named for him; it should be as outstanding as he was himself.

Why Our Budget System Will Not Reduce Taxes

By HARRIET CONNOR BROWN

CONGRESS has passed the Budget Bill—passed it with a joint flourish of trumpets by the Republican and Democratic bandmasters of both Houses of Congress. And now, let economies begin!

The country has been told repeatedly that there is waste in government expenditures—and none denies it—and that a budget system will enable officers of the Government to eliminate that waste—which I, for one, deny. It is well that we establish a budget system, but let us not deceive ourselves as to its efficacy. It is in the interest of clear thinking to have a balanced statement of revenues and expenditures. But reduction of taxes will not follow.

In the current year, we spend 68 per cent of our appropriations for the expenses of past wars, 20 per cent for the upkeep of our Army and Navy, and the remaining 12 per cent for all other expenses of government. Let us imagine ourselves looking over the shoulder of the new Director of the Budget, seeking with him to lighten the taxpayer's load. Suppose he turns first to that 68 per cent expended for past wars. It is composed of items like this: pensions, war-risk insurance, compensation for disability, the upkeep of soldiers' homes and soldiers' hospitals, the vocational education of mutilated soldiers, the interest on the war debt. What can be done with such items? Nothing. These are debts of honor—sacred and solemn obligations to the dead, the maimed, the sick, the bereft.

Suppose we turn next to that 20 per cent for future wars. Congress could do a great deal to relieve the people from the incubus of militarism and do it at once, but a Director of the Budget will be able to do very little unless Congress undergoes a change of heart and refuses point blank the requests of the Army and Navy. The first budget bills presented to Congress expressly excluded from the consideration of the Budget Bureau all appropriations for the sacred War and Navy Departments. That was as silly as if the head of a household were to say to his family sternly: "Now we must economize. We can't have food or shelter or clothing, but we can buy all the automobiles and shotguns and flying machines that any of you want. Don't forget, we are poor and must economize."

In the Budget Bill which Congress has passed, the Director of the Budget will, theoretically, have the same chance in the War and Navy Departments as elsewhere to save money by lopping off useless jobs or simplifying routine tasks, but actually he will be powerless to effect a saving. The trouble is that Congress gives those two departments their money in lump sums. While scrutinizing with an eagle eye and a carping tongue every cent of the $481,744,726 appropriated to the civil departments of the government, it hands over the military and naval allowances in large lump lots to officers of the Army and Navy and asks few if any questions. The result is that nothing a Director of the Budget may do toward "coordinating" or "unifying" expenses in those departments will be reflected in corresponding reductions of their estimates. The money saved will simply go to promote new war activities.

Only in the little area covered by the 12 per cent of our appropriations devoted to all non-military purposes of government will the Director of the Budget have power to effect economies. Considerable saving has already been made in that area and something can still be done there, but it is very much less than the public has been led to suppose. Many people—sober, public-spirited leaders of intelligence and influence—have declared that it was time to call a halt to the mad expenditures of Congress. It is. But it is also time that such people analyze correctly the problem which confronts the American nation. They have apparently believed that by administrative reforms in the government offices billions may be saved. Can they not see that, with 88 per cent of our appropriations expended for wars, no more than the whole of the remaining 12 per cent could possibly be saved? But if that were salvaged, it would be less than half a billion dollars. And in that case, all functions of government would have to cease except such as are performed for us by the War and Navy Departments and the self-sustaining Post Office Department.

To cut off absolutely the State and Treasury, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce and Labor Departments, and the office of the Attorney General as well as Congress and the Courts, is, of course, not feasible or desirable, feebly as some of those agencies function. The most a skilful pruner of the budget may hope to save in the 12 per cent area to which his operations are necessarily confined will be from 1 to 2 per cent of the total annual appropriations, hardly enough to be reflected in the tax bill of the individual.

People do not seem to realize that in the Executive Branch of the service earnest efforts have been made to purge the government offices of extravagance. The Cockerell Commission of 1887, the Dockery Commission of 1895, the Keep Commission of 1905, and the Cleveland Commission of 1910 all made valuable suggestions to Congress as to how government methods might be improved and money saved, but Congress regarded their efforts with an unfriendly eye. All of these bodies died of abuse or malnutrition after two to four years of struggle to keep alive.

The most recent effort to stop the waste of public funds has been made by the Bureau of Efficiency, an office which, authorized by a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, has managed to hang on for eight years. As far as possible, under the restrictions imposed by Congress, it has worked at the four great problems of administration—the problems of organization, of personnel, of accounting, and of office methods. Until they are solved, no budget system can operate effectively and until armaments are reduced, no taxes can be light.

The point to note is this: Notable progress has been made in the Departments toward saving the people's money, but unfortunately Congress keeps on wasting the bulk of it on the Army and Navy. The people complain and then Congress tells them that the Executive Departments are so extravagant that a Bureau of the Budget must be established to teach them economy. The facts do not warrant this diagnosis. Admirable as is the idea of a Bureau of the Budget, it cannot do what Congress alone has power to do—REDUCE ARMAMENTS—and thus make possible the reduction of taxes.

Producers and Consumers in the Land of Opportunity

[Items gleaned from recent issues of *Capper's Weekly*]

BEEF STEERS DOWN; STEAKS UP

Good beef steers at Chicago dropped from $9.50 a hundred pounds on February 15 to $7.45 on April 12. During the same period the price of dressed beef of this quality was increased from $14 to $16.50.

A HEADLESS PROCEDURE

Last spring a Kansas farmer bought cattle and put a 300-pound gain on them. Now they are worth $5 a head less than he paid for them.

In the year ending January 21, 1921, the U. S. Department of Agriculture reports that farmers lost in beef cattle not only all they had gained during the war but 50 per cent more.

WOOL LAMBS

George A. Todd, a McClain County, Oklahoma, wool grower, recently shipped 2,000 pounds of wool to a Kansas City commission house for which he received $210.97, less $64.39 freight charges, $1.93 war tax, $4.80 storage, and $46.73 commission, a commission of more than 20 per cent. These trimmings totaled $117.22, or nearly $25 more than Todd was paid for his wool, and the commission man wrote he ought to be glad to get that.

The wife of a Colorado ranchman paid $5.25 a pound for the yarn to knit the children some mittens.

A Washington restaurant gets more for one lamb chop than a farmer receives for a whole sheep.

STORY OF A FLEECING

When M. E. Haskins, Kansas farmer, shipped 155 pounds of wool to a commission broker in Kansas City two weeks ago, he asked the broker to send him a sweater and buy and pay for it out of the wool money.

After the freight, war tax, commission, storage, and insurance were paid by farmer Haskins, he had $11.40 coming for his wool, but the sweater and express charges cost $15.15. And it only takes one pound of yarn to make a sweater!

As the account stands now, Haskins owes the commission man $3.75 and has $4 to pay for shearing.

LEATHER HIDE

Hides have suffered a slump of 50 per cent in price in New Zealand, but even then bring a value, translated into American money, of 12 to 13 cents a pound and first calfskins 24 cents.

In this country, with much less live stock per capita, and far greater demand for shoes and leather, the price ranges from 2 to 3 cents and commission houses advise farmers that hides are unwelcome at that price.

FOUR LEATHER STRINGS

A Clovis, N. M., farmer sold the hide of a yearling steer. He got 45 cents for it. Then needing four hame strings for a harness, he went to another store to buy them. The charge was 60 cents.

A farmer can get about $2 for a 60-pound cowhide if he will pay a little more than that to ship it. The hide makes from 40 to 50 pounds of leather, for which he will have to pay from $1.50 to $2 a pound if he wants to buy back a piece for harness repairs or to re-sole his shoes.

WHEN A HIDE BECOMES A ROBE

James Pratt, Baker, Mont., farmer, obtained a beautiful coal-black hide from a 2-year-old steer which he wished to have tanned for a robe. He sent it to a hide and fur company. The fur company wrote:

"To tan this hide will cost you $12.17 freight coming here. To line it and make it into a robe will cost you $22.50 complete. We are not doing any tanning this season without $5 in advance, and will ask you to remit us $5 on account. If we do not hear from you within 10 days we shall be compelled to send you check for the value of the hide which is $1.13 less deduction of 72 cents for freight."

CABBAGE PAYING THE FREIGHT

The freight on cabbage from the Rio Grande District to Chicago is $25 a ton, including refrigeration charges and war tax.

The growers get from $5 to $7 a ton. Cabbage retails in Chicago at $130 a ton.

Freight rates are blamed by both producer and consumer. But in most cases there also is a toll-taker somewhere along the line who is not getting the blame that is coming to him, although taking more than his share of the benefits.

WHERE TWO HEADS ARE WORSE THAN ONE

A Kansas City business man who owns a ranch in Arizona shipped a car of cabbage to New York and when he heard from the commission man it was not a remittance, but a bill for $70 balance to cover charges.

HAY A PRODUCER

Forest Luther, Cimarron, Kan., recently shipped three cars of hay to Kansas City. After paying the freight and terminal charges and expense of baling, he had to put up 50 cents a ton out of his pocket.

FIFTY-FIFTY

A Kansas commission man writes: "Our rate on hay to Kansas City is $3.40, to Chicago $8.90, to St. Louis $7.40, to Memphis $7.40, or about half of what ordinary prairie hay is bringing on these markets."

POTATOES TALE OF A BUSHEL

During the investigation of the cost of living by the Senate Committee it was found that a bushel of potatoes for which a farmer in Michigan received $1 was sold in Washington for $6.

The committee traced its many sales. The farmer sold to the village dealer. The agent of a Detroit buyer took the potatoes. The buyer sold them to a commission agent from Washington. The Washington wholesaler sold them to the retail dealer. Each of these six men, of course, took his commission.

H. N. Armstrong, member of the Marinette County Potato Growers' Association, writes from Wausaukee, Wis.:

"It cost Wisconsin potato farmers $1 a bushel to raise potatoes last year. Now for No. 1 U. S. grade we are offered 31 cents, while the people are paying from $1.50 to $4 for the same grade of potatoes. We cannot hold over our potatoes as a grain farmer can his grain, so we have to sell for nothing."

COTTON PICKING BUT NOT CHOOSING

"I have made nearly 100 bales of cotton, and when I pay for the picking and the rent, I won't have enough left to buy a pair of shoes. I stopped my children from going to school to pick cotton to get enough to run us awhile. Guess I will catch it as we have compulsory school laws. But it was either pick or starve," writes a Texas grower.

GRAIN CHICKEN FEED

A car of maize and other grain recently shipped from Goodwell, Okla., to Chicago, cost the shipper $550 freight charges and brought the grower a return of $592.

Another car shipped from the Panhandle to market at an expense of $525, netted the producer $475. Out of this he had to pay 15 to 20 cents a hundred pounds for threshing in addition to the 51 cents a hundred paid the railway company in freight charges.

A Curious Delusion

By BARON BEAN

INDIVIDUALS sometimes go crazy and imagine things that aren't so. But this is the first authentic case on record of the whole world doing so.

The world is pretty sick. It has hallucinations. For two and a half years, now, it has been laboring under the amazing delusion that the Allies stopped the Kaiser's last drive on Paris, repulsed his armies, and ended the war victoriously. It's a case of a sick man in his fatal delirium imagining himself well. Like all hallucinations this one speedily invented the most remarkable fictions to jibe in with its original proposition. We were told, and we believed, that the peace conference was held at Versailles instead of at Berlin, that the Allies and not the Kaiser dictated the terms, that there was formed a League of Nations based on President Wilson's Fourteen Points, and—oh, a whole imaginary history of two years.

The writer was himself afflicted by this strange malady for a long time and has only just recovered. He knows that he will be looked on as crazy by those who are still under its effects. Therefore, if you are one of those who are still afflicted with this distemper he begs you to read this through carefully, not to skip a word, to use your reasoning power as far as you possibly can, and to see if you cannot convince yourself—you are wrong, you are mistaken, you are harboring a delusion, consider carefully, look about you.

Now, if you are sure that you are in a state of mind where you will not let your delusion affect you, if you will take a new orientation, and reason out the matter without prejudice, we will go ahead.

Was it not the Allies who fought for democracy? Was it not the Kaiser who tortured Belgium, who countenanced the atrocities of the Turk, who ravished women in France, who shot civilians and murdered non-combatants, who enslaved subject peoples and tried to dominate the world? Commencing to remember, eh? Now, just try a little harder. The Germans were brutal blood-beasts, they threatened to overrun the world with horror; and the civilized nations of the world banded themselves together against the menace. So the issue was clearly drawn. If the Allies won, they would make the world a decent place to live in, safe for democracy and the small nations; they would see to it that this would be the last of all wars; they would reestablish the freedom of the seas. And if the Kaiser won, the world would be enslaved to imperialism and militarism, new generations would be trained up to war, the common people would be downtrodden and oppressed.

Now, consider, safely out of your trance: Is the world safe for democracy? Are the seas free? Are atrocities abolished? Are small nations safe? Is war wiped out? Clearly, clearly, the Allies *did not* win the war. On the other hand, is not militarism rampant? Imperialism omnipresent? The commonest rights of democracy, like free assemblage and free speech, everywhere denied? Clearly, the Kaiser has achieved his ambition and rules the world.

Are you coming out of your coma, now? Commencing to comprehend? Contrast then the facts that English soldiers are committing atrocities in Ireland, and American soldiers (God help us!) in Haiti, that France is building a huge army and America and Japan huge navies, that warfare and blockade are being waged against women and children in Russia—contrast all these things with the Allied utterances during the war, and what do they mean but that the Kaiser's viceroys rule these countries, and compel them to use their master's methods? Compare the Treaty of Berlin, the so-called Treaty of Versailles, with the German treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and then contrast it with the Allies' professions culminating in the declaration "No annexations, no indemnities."

Do you feel better now? Cheer up! You'll get over it, with rest and care. It's like coming out of ether at first. But take it easy, and you'll soon be all right again.

In the Driftway

TWO interesting questions have been raised in a suit in Boston in which $1,000 in damages is asked by the owner of a dog that was killed on a city street by an automobile. To the contention that the animal was killed in spite of its exercise of "due care," the driver of the car responds that the dog committed suicide. The attorney for the driver contends that "the dog was crossing the street in front of the defendant's automobile. He suddenly turned and revolved in a circle, snapping and biting at other animals. Becoming despondent at his inability to dislodge said animals, he hurled himself under the defendant's automobile, and thereby committed suicide." The court is thus called upon to determine what constitutes "due care" in a public highway on the part of a dog, and whether such an animal may be considered to have ended its life intentionally.

* * * * *

WITHOUT attempting to settle the legal question of "due care," the Drifter may record his impression that neither dogs nor cats have yet synchronized themselves to accord with the speed, power, and noiselessness of the automobile. He is constantly struck with the heedlessness and helplessness of these animals in the midst of modern street traffic. He is not familiar with any statistics of automobile accidents among dogs and cats (it's hard enough to keep track among humans), but he believes the death-rate to be high. Heaven knows it's high among men and women—especially among little children—but still the human animal, generally less alert and less quick than the dog or cat, seems to be adapting himself more rapidly to the perils of automobile traffic. Take, for instance, that popular pastime of country dogs of running out toward passing vehicles, barking, jumping up at them, and following them. This was all right in the day of the horse and wagon, but it's mighty dangerous with the motor car. Still, few but dead dogs seem to have learned the lesson. The other day the Drifter saw a cat, strayed from some office building, making its way through the crowded downtown section of Broadway at the noon hour. It was plainly frightened and out of its element. Crouching and halting, it tried now the sidewalk and now the roadway, at home in neither. It did best on the curb between the two, but it didn't seem to realize even that. Time and again it missed by a hair's breadth the wheel of an automobile or the shoe of a pedestrian. The Drifter would have picked it up and carried it, but did not know where it belonged or wither it was bound. The city-bred man, with all his bodily failings, has adapted himself to his environment. In the forest or on the plains, he is scorned by the Indian, keener in respect to everything that

counts in such an environment. But transfer the Indian to one of our cities. He does not know how to handle himself in a crowd. He has not learned how to "step lively"—to pack himself or be packed in a subway train. Ten thousand of him in downtown New York at once would hopelessly obstruct street traffic and disorganize the transportation service.

* * * * *

IN regard to the custom of suicide among animals, the Gentle Reader may be reminded of the Faithful Pig. As recounted by William J. Locke in "The Beloved Vagabond," the cafe of the Cochon Fidèle in Paris came by its name because of the blameless life and the tragic despair of a pig that was the family pet. They kept the pig not only in the parlor but pretty much all over the shop, and it fell in love with the daughter of the proprietor of the cafe, if the Drifter remembers aright. (He usually does not.) Anyhow, the Faithful Pig fell in love with one of the young women about the cafe, and used to sit on his haunches gazing soulfully at her by the hour. His love was unrequited, and one day the adored one disappeared to marry—another. For several days the Cochon Fidèle waited in desolation. Then, walking out into the street, he stepped deliberately under the wheels of a street car—wasn't it?—and was snuffed out. The Locke story, to be sure, is not everywhere credited. André Warnod in his "Bals, Cafés, et Cabarets," says that the only client of the place in question for the first six months was a spy who sat there nightly to hear what the walls were conspiring about. Hence the name Faithful Pig. Locke's version is the one the Drifter prefers to believe. And he is sure that if a pig can commit suicide, a dog would not let himself be outdone. For a dog must live up to his reputation as man's best friend, while a pig is an animal little esteemed in polite society except—as Charles Lamb preached—in the state of a roast. THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Ireland, England, and the United States

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Charles Noonan, in your number of February 16, stated some plain facts which you commented on very widely, and wisely. It is quite true, as you say, that even in your country the facts are not known, and less so in England.

The main facts of the unjust treatment of Ireland by England through the centuries are fairly well known, for even such British historians as John Richard Green have exposed them. This is what I presume Mr. Noonan means. But the invariable answer to this by Britons is that there was much injustice all over the world a hundred years back and it is only the Irish who remember these.

This is not the case, however, because while the British grievances have mostly been corrected or eliminated the Irish grievances have continued to the present day. I will not here refer to the half century of bad government which culminated in the egregious famine of 1847-8, which in its consequences I may add gave you some of your more valuable citizens because they were driven from their native land, but propose to deal with events since 1914.

When the war broke out, after reporting for duty at Belfort in Alsace, I was ordered home and did a considerable amount of recruiting in London and in England generally. Then I was ordered to Ireland as a major in the Irish Division where, as I had been successful in recruiting in England, I was asked to recruit in Cork and Munster generally. The first point I wish to make is this and I will take the others in succession:

1. That in the early months of the Great War, from November, 1914, to January, 1915, the Irish were as enthusiastic or even more so than the British; that they were as keen to fight for chivalry, for their old ally France which was being attacked, and for a small nation like their own which was being bullied. The Irish—I mean especially the Nationalist Irish of the South and West—were glad to find themselves alongside the English in a fight against wrong. They were nearer to the English in heart in those months than they had ever been for at least 150 years. But there was a subtle influence at work in Ireland at that time against Irish Catholic recruiting—and it was used in a very base manner. The Unionists, the active "so-called" loyalists, did not want their case destroyed by the production of an enormous Nationalist army fighting for France alongside England. They did everything possible to prevent recruiting among the true Irish and nearly wrecked the Allied cause in so doing. The very men who are the most bitter against England now are those who helped me most in my recruiting campaign in November and December, 1914. You cannot have an effect without a cause and I leave you to think out the cause of this change.

2. The Rebellion in 1916, a small rebellion of not more than 10,000 persons out of a population of nearly 4,000,000, was suppressed in a brutal, a stupid, and a hysterical manner. There would have been no rebellion had we been allowed to recruit on sane and human principles in 1914—appealing to the sentiments of the Irish rather than to English jingoism.

The inexcusable murders of innocent men in Portobello Barracks, the murders of the young men in North King Street, Dublin—after the surrender of the leaders of the revolt, actually within the sound of their mothers and wives—though the coroner's juries confirmed the indictment of wilful murder against the troops concerned, have never to this day formed the subject of an inquiry. Then the slow doing to death of the so-called leaders of the revolt (among these two assistant scoutmasters of Sinn Fein scouts of 21 and 22 years of age) set Irish nerves on end.

These events confirmed them in the belief—not an unnatural one in the circumstances, and in spite of all that had been gloriously said by that hero and martyr, Tom Kettle—that there was not two ha'pence to choose between Prussia in Belgium and England in Ireland.

3. But I must remind you that in spite of this for two years and more there was little or no political crime in Ireland. It is admitted that Ireland is more immune from ordinary crime than any of the four states which constitute the so-called United Kingdom.

In spite of immense provocation—the imprisonment of more than 4,000 persons without charge or trial—Ireland remained calm. Most of these persons have now been released, it is true, but they have been released because there was no possible charge to bring against them. After such an experience of British justice it is not to be supposed that they went home singing "Rule Britannia." It was not in fact until the Irish were driven by the withholding of the ordinary precautions which the common law provides for the liberty of the subject and after years of martial law methods that they hit back as they are now doing. It is ridiculous for us to speak of the universally condemned methods of the Auxiliary Police (the Black and Tans) as retaliative—as "reprisals." The fact is that the spontaneous actions of the Irish people against a state of affairs which no free people should be called upon to endure was in retaliation for their sufferings. It is certain that many government officials have been shot and many troops ambushed and this will continue inevitably until the cause is withdrawn and they are given that security from governmental persecution which is the right of every free people.

FRANCIS FLETCHER VANE
Florence, Italy, April 17 OF HUTTON (Baronet)

Charles Genung

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you permit a memorial word on Charles H. Genung, whose passing was chronicled on May 13, by one who knew him long and well? He was a Brooklyn man who, after being graduated from Columbia, went to Germany for a residence of several years. As the private secretary of Hermann Grimm he had exceptional opportunities to see the best of the literary, artistic, and court life of Berlin in the amiable pre-war days. His knowledge of German letters was wide and genial, and hardly less was his culture in music, with Wagner the special god. A proof of all this was his translation, with Edward Breck as collaborator, of a well-known German novel of musical life in which Liszt was the principal figure.

Returning in the nineties to his own country, Mr. Genung became a steady contributor to *The Nation*, his particular province being the review of German literature. His work in this field was much esteemed and truly authoritative. When, over twenty years ago, the late Charles Dudley Warner came to New York to edit his comprehensive Library of The World's Best Literature, Mr. Genung was made an associate editor and in that capacity many of the essays and critical estimates in those volumes were signed by him, covering both German and other continental writers; notable among them, his paper on Sienkiewicz.

During the war, Mr. Genung did honorable special government work at Washington, straining his physical powers in so doing; and throughout these late troublous years his patriotism was as intense as was his sorrow keen to see Germany fall away from the elder ideals which had won his love in the past.

Charles Genung was the soul of genial, jovial comradeship. His wit, bonhomie, social grace, and sincere love for the things of the mind and the spirit will keep him in the affectionate remembrance of his fellows.

New York, May 17 RICHARD BURTON

The President's English

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Mencken's sufficiently Menckenese discussion of the Gamalielese language opens its broadside with the charge, first of all, that Mr. Harding uses the pronoun "he" to refer back to "one," a construction which Mr. Mencken characterizes as a fault of the present day.

Mr. Mencken might learn from the dictionary, if he did not scorn to be dependent on such auxiliaries, that this construction of "he" after "one" is classic, and that the tendency to prefer a repetition of "one" is an innovation of the present day—an innovation which has by no means yet attained to universal acceptance by first-class speakers and writers.

But suppose the case were otherwise. Suppose that forms like "one thinks he knows" or "one puts on his hat" had fallen totally into disuse; or suppose that no other form than "one thinks one knows" or "one puts on one's hat" had ever yet occurred in English. What then?

Why, then it would remain true that the construction of "he" after "one" is one of those constructions which are so perfectly consonant to the general meaning and use of the words employed that it must always be legitimate to introduce them as neologisms even in the absence of precedent. "He" is a pronoun to refer to any sufficiently identified person who is grammatically treated as third person masculine; "one" is capable of sufficiently identifying a person to serve as antecedent; therefore "one thinks he knows" would be all right tomorrow even if it did not anywhere exist today.

Unquestionably there are cases where the consecution "one . . . he" involves some awkwardness which makes it preferable to use the other form. The same is just as true of "one . . . one." It is the characteristic of a rich and free language to be able to use either form at will, according as circumstances give occasion for this or for that; and, for the better maintaining of this freedom, that in cases where neither form is intrinsically objectionable personal habit should be allowed to prefer either form without being subject to censure therefor. Of course, there will be fashions of the day, making the one form commoner at one date and the other at another date; but such fashions must never be so pretentious as to undertake to taboo either form, else we shall be impoverishing the language by unmotivated strictness of regulation.

And if the English language is to be corseted into an academic strait-waistcoat of schoolmadamly rules, is Mencken the man for the job?

Ballard Vale, Mass., May 4, 1921 STEVEN T. BYINGTON

The Tools of Reason

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish to protest, on behalf of The Principia School, against the spirit and language of the editorial relative to Christian Science which appeared in your publication of May 4. It is not that I resent your antagonism to Christian Science, nor do I wish to suppress the free discussion of any matter of public interest. However, unless free speech is accompanied by truth and justice, in its efforts to sway popular opinion, it becomes a menace rather than a blessing. Ridicule and venom are not the tools of reason. I therefore ask you to discontinue our subscription to your publication, for if this editorial is indicative of the spirit inspiring your writers we certainly cannot expect our students to arrive at the truth of any situation by reference to your columns.

St. Louis, May 10 FREDERIC E. MORGAN

[The editorial here objected to contained, to our best knowledge and belief, no venom. If there was ridicule in it, it was directed not at reason but at the sort of unreason which is willing to be addressed only in "the accents of compliment or at least of considerate euphemism."—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Andrew Carnegie in the Homestead Strike

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I was reading in *The Nation* for May 4 a long review of "The Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie." I came upon a pyrotechnic display of phrases, "extraordinary firmness of character, indefatigable energy and initiative, and a 'creative' benevolence, together with abundant humor, poetic sentiment, and deep feeling with regard to the things that matter."

I rubbed my eyes, wondering what was happening to me. Then I turned the page and saw the name of the reviewer, Stuart P. Sherman. So I understood in part—everything but *The Nation's* part. Will you tell me what it was—a joke on your readers, or a case of cold feet, or a sudden temporary reversion to respectability, a visit from the ghost of E. L. Godkin? It was exactly like walking down Fifth Avenue and meeting a lady in hoop skirts!

There is no use making any protest to Professor Sherman, of course, for his ideas were crystallized a hundred years ago. But won't you for the protection of your readers discuss the part of Andrew Carnegie in the Homestead Strike, how and why he ran away from it; and also how he came to make so many rotten armor plates for United States battleships, and how he supported President Cleveland's tariff policy as his private punishment therefor?

Pasadena, California, May 6 UPTON SINCLAIR

[By printing Mr. Sinclair's letter we call attention to aspects of Mr. Andrew Carnegie's career which were not touched upon in Professor Sherman's review.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Books

He Did the Right Thing

The Man Who Did the Right Thing. By Sir Harry Johnston. The Macmillan Company.

GIVEN an average conscience a man may, like the pious grocer, sand the sugar, dust the pepper, and then go to prayers; he may follow these edifying occupations with unalloyed satisfaction from his own point of view and, if he piles up a handsome fortune, with entire approval on the part of the community. It is easy and profitable to do the right thing if you see the world through the same moral spectacles as your neighbors. But suppose a man has a high-class conscience, one that obliges him to uphold a moral code far more complex and subtle than the code prescribed by law or custom? In that case, his efforts to follow his inner promptings will quite transcend the grasp of the average mind, and he will probably find himself shunted to a steep and thorny path which only an equipment of unusual courage, intelligence, and good humor will enable him to cope with.

A man with a conscience and an equipment of this sort is Roger Brentham, English consul and explorer in German East Africa. He does the right thing, not in the vulgar cash interpretation of that phrase, but in the sense in which Samuel Butler's "best people" would understand it. That is, he acts like a public-spirited gentleman in choosing between his appetites and his responsibilities, in managing his love affairs, his consular duties, and his political aspirations, in dealing with relations, friends, political superiors, missionaries, Negroes, and even Germans!—and, above all, in developing the resources of the Happy Valley, an African concession of which he becomes the director. By way of requital his career is impeded, his talents for African administration go a-begging, and the duffers of the Foreign Office shove him into the background until his extraordinary success in "German East" causes British Colonial circles to prick up their ears.

The book is no lyrical monologue woven solely of the stuff of Brentham's dreams, neuroses, complexes, intimations, fears. The reader divides his very lively time between Africa and England; and while he comes and goes with Brentham, he picks up an intimate or a nodding acquaintance with some forty-odd characters representing a remarkably wide range of social rank as well as all sorts and conditions of rectitude and scoundrelism. These characters torment or delight us just as they would if we were to meet them without, instead of within, the covers of a book; and the fact that the principals rub shoulders with easily identifiable public figures thinly disguised by names like Choselwhit or Lord Wiltshire, and even with descendants of famous fictional personages like Sir Willowby Patterne (a grandson of the Egoist), subtracts nothing from our sense of reality. Why indeed should it, when this is precisely what happens in real life?

The chief beauty of Johnston's portraiture is its vitality, its stormy, dynamic, pulsating vitality. Consider the jolly Stotts ("who were born perfectly good so that getting religion could not make them better or more likable, but only afflicted them with a mania for quoting hymns, psalms, and Bible texts *à tout propos*"); the worldly churchman, Bream ("whose dress was so nearly unclerical that you might have been pardoned for not spotting him at once for a parson, and he would have been the first to pardon you"); Vicky-Long-i'-the-tooth; the ineffable Molyneux; the sulphurous Mrs. Baines; not forgetting the swashbuckling Stolzenberg (a thoroughly plausible and acceptable scoundrel, and not a celluloid caricature like the Teutons who disfigure Conrad's romances)—what a matchless collection of vignettes they are! And how naturally these deft sketches, like the larger portraits of Lucy, Ann Jamblin, or the ever-dependable Maud, are fitted into the epic breadth of the story! In affording us a survey of the humanity of a period, they irresistibly call to mind the gallery of masterpieces in Chaucer's Prologue.

Sir Harry Johnston is a man of action and an artist to boot, and this amplitude of interests doubtless accounts for the open-air vigor and wholesomeness that permeate his story. We value an author's writings according to the intensity of life that he feels and that he makes us feel. Judged by this test, Johnston's work belongs in the very first rank of contemporary novelists. His books are conceived in the great tradition of the English novel—the Fielding-Dickens tradition—a big canvas and a big spiritual attitude on the part of the artist who handles the brush. Life as he depicts it in his African novel has depth, solidity, picturesqueness, and magnitude. Even the "natives" are flesh and blood (and brains!) like ourselves—witness how adroitly they ply the soul-saving missionary with questions "as to how the white man became so rich and why he could not teach this method to their young people."

Here, and always in the atmosphere of ideas that accompanies the physical atmosphere of English landscapes and African escarpments, Johnston tips his satiric lance with light and reveals "the great character that can follow a great theme to a great conclusion." For the high level on which the action is pitched is a sustained one. True, it is no thanks to England that Brentham never flinches from serving her well. When the Empire celebrates its Diamond Jubilee, the hero of the Happy Valley is permitted to watch the procession from the side lines instead of being invited to act as a participant. Yet Britannia rules the waves (and a good bit of mother earth) and continues to give the world points on government and sundry other matters of moment. What is the trick that enables England, in spite of Ireland, Imperialism, muddling through, Pecksniffianism, and Podsnappery, to outdistance her competitors? We part with Brentham satisfied that the secret lies in the siren fascination by which she contrives to keep in her service a proportionately greater number of men like Brentham, men who set their purposes beyond hope and above despair, and who, from this vantage point, become the men who do the right thing.

FELIX GRENDON

Whitelaw Reid

The Life of Whitelaw Reid. By Royal Cortissoz. Charles Scribner's Sons. 2 vols.

WHITELAW REID'S claim to remembrance rests upon his work as an editor, as a diplomatist, and as one of the leaders of the Republican Party. Whether in either of these capacities he may properly be accounted great depends a good deal upon the point of view. He certainly made the New York *Tribune* for many years one of the best known and most influential American newspapers, broadening constantly the range of its news, expounding Republican doctrine in clear and forcible fashion in its editorial columns, training and disciplining a staff to whom his word was law as well as gospel, and drawing into his staff of correspondents and contributors a long list of distinguished names. In these several respects, but particularly as an editorial writer, he was a worthy member of the group of great American journalists to which Godkin, Dana, and Watterson belonged. That he left no successor in the newspaper field was due in part to the change in political habit and public taste which has subordinated editorial comment to news, "features," and correspondence, and in part to a jealous sense of prerogative which saw to it that no member of the *Tribune* staff developed a capacity for editorial writing which might seriously rival his own. His career as a diplomatist was less distinguished, but he made an agreeable impression in Paris and London as a courteous and cultivated gentleman and an accomplished host—the latter a function which his wealth enabled him to perform with becoming lavishness—while as one of the American peace commissioners at the close of the war with Spain he did all that could be expected of an envoy whose every important step was dictated from Washington. His position as a Republican leader was a natural consequence of his control of the *Tribune*, and made him for a generation an important, although hardly a determining, influence in party councils. If he cannot be said to have made presidents, he may at least be credited with having done more than most men to help elect them and to commend their policies to the country.

Mr. Cortissoz has a lively newspaper style and has written a book which is easy reading. No important facts of Reid's public career appear to have escaped his pursuit. His consistent presentation of Reid's view of the case, however, to the virtual exclusion of any other, robs his work of the critical character which political biography at least ought to possess, and gives us a book which in all essential respects is as partisan as was Reid himself. "Rebels" and "Jeff Davis" were undoubtedly the language of the time as they were of Reid and the *Tribune*, but they are hardly in place today in elaborate biographical writing. The *Tribune* magnified Hayes, minimized Arthur, presented Grant as a low type of politician from whom no good was to be expected, and pilloried Cleveland for his appointments and his attack upon protection; and Mr. Cortissoz sees no reason to interpose dissent. It is, in fact, a *Tribune* biography of a *Tribune* editor. Its relieving feature is its wealth of letters to and from Reid, some of them delightful pieces of letter-writing.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

Balkanized Europe

Balkanized Europe. By Paul Scott Mowrer. E. P. Dutton Company.

PAUL SCOTT MOWRER has chosen an excellent title and lives up to its implications in a survey of recently belligerent continental Europe outside of Russia and the new Baltic states. He asks indulgence because "the book is frankly 'journalistic.'" But the really scientific study of the whirling politico-social cinema would be impossible. The moving finger scrawls in Europe. The philosophy of Heraclitus—that all is flux—is its only certain creed. "My neighbor is my enemy, but my neighbor's neighbor is my friend"—is the political principle which guides the new "Balkan" states. In each there rage also suspicion and hatred of minorities. The people live "in an atmosphere of war rather than of peace"; their military burdens are crushing, yet the tendency is to increase these, in the belief "that the latest war was by no means the last." "Boundaries have ceased to be imaginary lines of demarcation. They have become more impenetrable than 'Chinese walls.'" The fantastic tangle resulting from the self-imposed isolation of the new states Mark Twain should be alive to chronicle. "It is the Dark Ages over again," concludes Mr. Mowrer, after ample proof.

His characterizations of the various countries are vivid and distinct. Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia receive honorable mention. Despite the devastation suffered by the former, its various groups are not far apart, tolerant in spirit, and filled, though not chauvinistically, with ambitions for their national growth and welfare. Czecho-Slovakia, while gravely beset by the problem of insurgent minorities and the difficulties imposed by natural barriers, has made the greatest progress of all the new states.

Austria and Poland, on the other hand, appear to have a far less favorable outlook. For the former, the author sees no hope of survival except by union with Germany, which the French now forbid. Among Poland's difficulties Mr. Mowrer cites the continued warfare and "two formidable obstacles: first, the indifference of the Polish Government, and second, the superstition and fatalism of the Polish masses." Typhus is endemic. "The entire Polish administration is so inexperienced and so torn by personal jealousies and lack of coordination that the few measures which the Government has endeavored to enforce have remained dead letters." Trains filled with typhus-infested refugees unload their pestilential burdens in a Warsaw station and leave an hour later as passenger trains, "without the cars being even so much as swept."

In Hungary, shorn of much territory which its inhabitants consider theirs, Mr. Mowrer detects a great menace for the future peace of Europe. The Magyars—hating and harboring designs against their neighbors—will use every means to regain their lost provinces. Moreover, Hungary is classed as the chief among propagandists—the foremost among the nations of Europe in point of advertising efficiency. Yet curiously Mr. Mowrer seems himself to have fallen a partial victim to this propaganda. He seems to doubt the existence of any "White terror" in Hungary. Possibly he has not read the Wedgewood report.

He does not present by any means a hopeless picture. He is distinctly optimistic about Europe's recovery, and his analysis of the factors delaying it is in most respects sound. He is clear about the responsibility of the French for many of Europe's present difficulties, while sympathetically understanding the background which created the present French psychology of fear. His detachment is the more valuable in that he is the Paris correspondent for American newspapers and his natural leaning has always been strongly pro-Entente and genuinely Francophile. Yet he is in no doubt as to the permanent collapse of the Entente by reason of the complete divergence of the interests of its constituents; and his conception of the purposes of British imperialism on the Continent by no means suggests intertwined Allied flags, nor the pledging and toasting of all the after-dinner speeches of recent years.

In his attitude toward Russia he is conventional and betrays less understanding. His comments on the League of Nations are unimportant. But his analysis of the failure of the United States to understand European psychology is illuminating, and he concludes with the urgent plea to America to become informed regarding European affairs. "We should have, not only a general European policy, but we should know what we think of in the case of each separate European country, great or small. A wilful ignorance of international politics is the worst possible preparation for the inevitable emergencies of the future." This is sound advice, and furnishes an excellent reason why the average American should be possessed of the information which "Balkanized Europe" in part supplies.

E. H. G.

Poetry in Plays

The Two Mothers. By John G. Neihardt. The Macmillan Company.

King Lear's Wife. The Crier by Night. The Riding to Lithend. Midsummer Eve. Laodice and Danaë. Plays by Gordon Bottomley. Small, Maynard and Company.

SO seldom now do verse plays have anything vivid in them, either by way of action or by way of poetry, that it is a relief to come upon volumes like these two. The first is very much slighter than the second, and certainly inferior; Mr. Neihardt has only recently turned from narrative poems of the American scene to more or less exotic drama, whereas Mr. Bottomley in England has been engaged with romantic tragedy for almost a quarter of a century. But both men are undeniably artists, and both make definite contributions to the body of beautiful English speech.

The two mothers dealt with by Mr. Neihardt in his two brief tragedies are a nameless Russian peasant woman, who murders her son, and Agrippina, Nero's mother, whose son murders her. Both pieces are laconic and bitter, with considerable power in their grim epigrams and their tigerish phrases. "Eight Hundred Rubles" is hackneyed in plot—the son returns from his travels disguised as a stranger and is killed for his money—but spare and impressive in style. "Agrippina," taken, like Arthur Symons's recent "Death of Agrippina," from Suetonius and

Tacitus, where many even better subjects lie unused, is a profoundly touching piece, treating as it does the love of a gorgeous woman for a bestial son whom she has put in high place. Her animal affection as he pets her, being drunk, and her incredulity at the end when his officers arrive at the country house to stab her, are handled with speed and concentration in Mr. Neihardt's heroic couplets, if not with fine or reflective temper. Mr. Neihardt seems better able to manage his action here than he was in "The Song of Hugh Glass," where the necessity of explaining the scenes and rationalizing the transitions in regular verse led frequently to an unhappy stiffness.

The five plays of Mr. Bottomley, published in a Chiswick quarto, contain blank verse that is practically unique today for variety and sincerity, delicacy and weight. Their author is so saturated with the poetry of his island that even the verses in which he addresses dedications to his friends give off a musty fragrance as of the seventeenth century, when poets cherished their poems above all other things, and frankly exulted to commend them. And he is so much a master of the poetry inhering in old times and far places that his volume seems already to have been a long while written, his lines seem this soon to have gathered luminous mold.

In choosing his subjects he evidently has been directed by an interest in feminine cruelty; he has been absorbed in studying the wills of relentless women as they carve their gray designs on backgrounds of black fate. In "King Lear's Wife," a play whose atmosphere is cold and thick with prehistoric frost, Hygd, the invalid queen, Goneril, her virgin daughter, and Gormflaith, a faithless waiting woman, are all three of them detached and deadly quiet in their hates. The blood that flows when Goneril stabs Gormflaith for her sinning with the king is not hot blood but cold—cold and severely decorative. The scene, after all, is no real place on earth, but rather "the gray chambers of a fantastic brain," as Edward Thomas said. "The Crier by Night" drifts back into Celtic legend, its persons being a Norse peasant and his cruel wife Thorgerd, their Irish bondmaid Blanid, and an Old Strange Man of the mere in the mountains who comes with the mist one soothing night and carries the bondmaid away. "Midsummer Eve" is crusted thick with the purest ancient speech of peasant England, is redolent of timeless lanes and barnways. Five kitchen and dairy girls, Nan, Bet, Ursel, Maudlin, and Lib, steal to the barn on Midsummer Eve to await apparitions of the men who will become their husbands, but see only the fetch of Nan, who therefore will die before she has lived. "Laodice and Danaë," which shows how Laodice put Danaë to death, is the one southern piece among the five. "The Riding to Lithend," strongest of all, comes virtually whole from the great "Saga of Burnt Njal," being the story of Gunnar Hamundsson's last fight and death in the presence of his glittering wolf-wife Hallgerd and his magnificent mother Rannveig. Nothing could be less sentimental and more satisfactory than Rannveig's line to Hallgerd when through Hallgerd's treachery Gunnar at last has fallen:

A murdered man should have a murdered wife.

Books in Brief

NO one in the least acquainted with contemporary British politics denies that the House of Commons has suffered a marked decline during the last two or three decades. The fact is admitted with sorrow by those who believe in parliamentary government and proclaimed with joy by those who do not. What are the causes of the decline, and what is to be done about it? In "The House of Commons and Monarchy" (London: George Allen & Unwin) Hilaire Belloc undertakes to answer these questions. England as a result of the Reformation became, he tells us, an aristocratic state and remained such until our own times. Its sovereign organ of government was the House of Commons, an assembly which, though containing a representative element, was essentially not representative but oligarchical. An oligarchy can function only if it is an aristocracy—only, that is to say, if it enjoys the quasi-religious homage of the nation. This it can do only if it plays the part of an aristocracy, and, still more important, if the nation is aristocratic in temper. Neither of these conditions exists in England today. The House of Commons and the governing class, of which it is a part, have ceased to be aristocratic in character and conduct; and the nation, principally as a result of modern industrialism, has ceased to be aristocratic in temper. Under these circumstances, Mr. Belloc is quite sure, the House of Commons cannot be bolstered up; none of the many reforms that have been proposed could restore its lost prestige and power; it is a discredited oligarchy tottering to its fall. What then is to be done? The only alternative to the decay and dissolution of the state is the establishment of monarchy in some form. Mr. Belloc is always entertaining, but his habit of making asseveration do duty for demonstration should make his readers duly dubious about his conclusions. The Englishman with an inveterate prejudice against personal monarchy of the historical sort can take heart from the author's assertion that the president, the governors, and the mayors in the United States are "all monarchs, if ever there were such."

THE scholar who meditates writing a textbook on civics for public school use should consider well the idiosyncrasies of school boards as official censors of ideas. A textbook, in the opinion of our school bureaucrats, should serve as a pipe-line to conduct water from the great reservoir of truth, to irrigate the virgin mind. Now the test of efficiency in a pipe-line is the minimum of friction engendered in the process of conduction from the source to the desired spot. In like manner the test of efficiency in a textbook is a similar reduction of friction—friction being interpreted as the gravel of debatable matter. Unfortunately, in the fields of the political, economic, and social sciences, such a reduction of friction is peculiarly difficult; for where pretty much everything is being acrimoniously debated, the attempt to refine till there remains only the pure, ineluctable truth, is likely to result in sterile platitude, pleasing to the censor but scarcely inspiring to the student. Edgar Dawson's "Organized Self-Government" (Holt) is an attempt to humanize the pipe-line conception by applying principles of self-government to such grammar-school activities as the organization of athletics and the like. It is an attempt to overcome the indifference of the normal boy to platitude by a better pedagogy. The result, however, is singularly colorless. Mr. Dawson almost succeeds in having no views. He has eliminated debatable matter until he can confidently assert that "there are only a few . . . accepted principles of sound political cooperation," the chief of which are the short ballot, civil service reform, the executive budget, and responsible leadership—surely not the British system! He seems to incline to the city-manager plan for municipalities, but the question of a revision of our State governments involves too much danger of friction, and he leaves it with a series of questions. Mr. Dawson's pedagogy is sensible, and there are certainly worse textbooks than this; but if the study of civics is to become anything other than sheer puerility, there must be very much better books. Very likely, however, the bureaucrats would refuse to adopt them.

IT is a little distressing to find that Arnold Bennett persists in hunting gnats with his trusty and formidable elephant gun. His "Things That Have Interested Me" (Doran) is the note-book of a man who has seen much, who has thought considerably, who is satisfyingly familiar with the English language, but who rashly relies on these things to make inconsequential things important. It is perhaps unjust to suspect Mr. Bennett of pot-boiling, but certainly no publisher would have touched the present volume if it had been the work of an obscure young man. Not that it does not contain writing worthy of its author. There are passages written with a crackling, sharp, visual style; there is wit that achieves its end by the deftest understatement and the most excellent dryness and brevity. But as a whole these hundred and forty odd notes, many of them less than a page long, ranging in subject from Grand Opera to Saccharine and from the Siege of Paris to Orthodoxy, are trivial. It is even likely that they seemed trivial to Mr. Bennett; that, in fact, is probably what is wrong with them.

Drama

Curtain

THE impression of high and startling brilliancy which remained in one's mind at the end of the season of 1919-1920 does not quite renew itself this spring. Perhaps that impression was due to the sharp contrast between a mass of abominable and abominably successful trade-goods of the stage and the somber beauty of "Night Lodging," the compactness and veracity of "Jane Clegg," the splendor and eloquence of "Richard III." It is possible that the season now closing did not touch quite such altitudes; it is possible, on the other hand, that its more sober coloring in retrospect is attributable to a reasonable degree of artistic merit in practically every successful play that it brought us. In that fact, at all events, lies its significance for the American theater. Only one melodrama of the conventional type, "The Bat," was steadily popular. A frank recognition of the facts of human nature saved Craven's "The First Year" even as it had saved "Lightnin'" and "The Gold Diggers." "The Green Goddess" is clap-trap, but clap-trap not unadorned by subtlety and adroit characterization. To name the other preeminent successes of the season is to destroy finally the legend of the dulness of our audiences. For these successful pieces are "Heartbreak House," "Samson and Delilah," "The Skin Game," "The Mob," "The Woman of Bronze," "Miss Lulu Bett," "The Emperor Jones," and "Liliom." Neither "Samson and Delilah" nor "The Woman of Bronze" is a good play. But neither one is a crime melodrama nor a sentimental comedy. Each is written in a civilized tradition and was supported by acting of the first order. And every other drama on the list may be said to have some connection with the spirit and the qualities of permanent literature. Of what previous season of our theater could so much have been said?

In casting up the larger accounts of the season, we may begin with the native drama. Susan Glaspell's "Inheritors," despite a diffuse first act, and Emery Pottle's "The Hero," despite a raw catastrophe in the last, must head this list. In these two plays the concrete stuff of American life reached dramatic form and spiritual significance. The two plays of Mr. Eugene G. O'Neill, "The Emperor Jones" and "Diff'rent," remarkable as they are, suffer from a thinness of moral atmosphere and touches of psychological violence. Their originality lacks the ease of a freely functioning creative energy. It is conscious, wavering, and fantastic. "Miss Lulu Bett" would rank higher were it not, after all, that unhappy thing, a dramatized novel. Magnificent at moments, it is ephemeral as a whole. To add a mention of Evelyn Scott's "Love," "David Liebovitz's "John Hawthorne," and Michael Strange's "Claire de Lune" is to complete the count of American plays that have in their intention, not to speak of their execution, any connection with dramatic literature. Such a connection was once faintly discernible in the work of Rachel Crothers. Her latest play, "Nice People," rules her out pretty definitely. Clare Kummer's "Rollo's Wild Oat" and Rida Johnson Young's "Little Old New York" escape the vulgar but do not reach artistic sincerity. A gleam of Mark Twain's vision, a bit of solid observation in the early acts, an exercise of intelligent irony saved passages in "The Prince and the Pauper," "The Meanest Man in the World," and "The Bad Man." "Wake Up, Jonathan" showed remnants of a sincere criticism of life once in the authors' minds, and "The Tavern" commended itself, for similar reasons, to many hearers. The rest is silence. But no one will think this a wholly contemptible showing who, season after season, has watched and waited for one symptom of intelligence or inner truth in any native play. It leaves such a one, indeed, with a livelier feeling of hope and exhilaration than the mere display of the season's American pieces seems superficially to justify. The soil is stirring and the plants will rise.

The British contribution was impressive. It included Shaw's "Heartbreak House," "Galsworthy's "The Skin Game" and "The Mob"; it included St. John Ervine's "Mixed Marriage," the magnificent revival of "The Beggar's Opera," and inferior but not uninstructive ones of Synge's "The Playboy of the Western World" and Wilde's "The Importance of Being Earnest." To these it is possible to add Drinkwater's "Mary Stuart," and possible, though injudicious, to add Barrie's "Mary Rose." Whoever considers the latter a good play must think Granville Barker's "Harlequinade" a brilliantly good one and will find little fault with William Archer's "The Green Goddess." British comedy was represented by A. A. Milne's "Mr. Pim Passes By," Arnold Bennett's "The Great Adventure," and Harold Chapin's "The New Morality."

Compared to the British drama the French does not shine, for the fundamental reason, among others, that it has today far less to offer. Porto-Riche's "Amoureuse" ("The Tyranny of Love") is a great play. But it is thirty years old. Sacha Guitry's romantic and sentimental pictorialism ("Deburau"), Flers and Caillavet's crackling situations ("Transplanting Jean"), Hennequin's hollow posturing ("Toto"), and even Kistemaecker's strong theatricalism ("The Woman of Bronze"), could easily have been spared for truer and serener things. Two German tragedies of authentic beauty, Max Halbe's "Youth" and Karl Schönherr's "Der Weibsteufel" ("Thy Name is Woman") were hopelessly caricatured on our stage, the first by an inept production, the second by a vulgarized adaptation. The production of Paul Frank's feeble and fantastic "The Mandarin" was a clear mistake. Our solid borrowings from Central Europe consist, then, of Franz Molnar's "Liliom" and—to name them as a matter of simple justice—the marvelous German films "The Cabinet of Dr. Galigari" and "Deception." The Scandinavian drama was represented by a few inferior Ibsen productions, Sven Lange's "Samson and Delilah," Sigurjonnson's powerful but rather epical "Eyvind of the Hills," and an interesting dramatization of Karen Michaelis's "The Dangerous Age" under the title "The White Villa." To this list of foreign plays may be added the Yiddish drama "The Treasure" by David Pinski and the Spanish idyl "The Cradle Song."

This dry enumeration speaks for itself. The gaps are obvious. A few Shakespearean productions and Euripides's "Iphigenia in Aulis" alone represent the great classics of dramatic literature. Yet the list has a variety and wealth probably unrivaled in the records of our theater, and only the dustiest pedantry would fail to enrich it by adding such charming musical comedies as "Mary," "Lady Billy," "Sally," "The Passing Show" at the Winter Garden, and Oscar Strauss's "The Last Waltz" (Century Theater) with its disappointing score but superb decorative and vocal execution. Finally, we may join our colleagues in the amusing if futile game of preferences. The finest theatro-technical productions of the season seemed to us, named in the order of merit, the following: "Liliom," "The Beggar's Opera," "Claire de Lune," "The Green Goddess," "Harlequinade," "Joan of Arc," "Deburau"; the finest examples of the art of acting, not named in the order of merit (which seems impossible), were the performances of Mr. Jacob Ben Ami in "Samson and Delilah," Mr. Grant Michell in "The Hero," Mr. Charles Gilpin in "The Emperor Jones," Mr. W. E. Holden in "Miss Lulu Bett," Miss Margaret Wycherly in "Mixed Marriage," Miss Estelle Winwood in "The Tyranny of Love," and Miss Margaret Anglin in "The Woman of Bronze."

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Art

Aesthetic Blind Spots

"I DON'T know anything about art but I do know what I like." The scene, any art shop or gallery; the speaker, everybody at some time. And yet, and yet, unless you do know something about art, can you know what you really like in it? For when you look at a work of art, there is not merely you and the object face to face, vision clear, mind empty and receptive to the impressions. Suggestion comes in to deflect preference; the strong glare of fashion blinds judgment; literary or historical interest, chance association, habit—each distorts the vision, until you cannot be sure how clearly you see the real object, how clearly know your real preference.

You go to see a painting. You are led aside into a secluded room, low lights and soft carpets, a deep divan, quiet, repose. There is a minute's pause for composure and anticipation. Then noiselessly, by unseen hands, the velvet curtains are slipped apart. There, glowing in light from a hidden source, is the picture. You see it long enough to be impressed, not long enough to have the impression dulled. The curtains slip back. A mediocrity has become a masterpiece.

Suggestion is not always, of course, so elaborately or so consciously induced. It may be only the passing opinion of a friend, it may be the unvoiced attitude of those around you, that carries the unconscious hint. But whatever the circumstances, the time, the place, the presentation do condition judgment.

It is most often opinion generalized and formulated into fashion that colors the experience. Gothic architecture was conceded to be barbarous throughout most of the seventeenth century. Not so very many years ago modern painting began with Giotto, and even Giotto's work was regarded merely as an historic link rather than an aesthetic value. In the eighties in this country Japanese prints were referred to condescendingly, yet ten years later the same condescending people found them beautiful. There is as much a vogue in art as there is in dress, and if it does not fluctuate from year to year at least you can see it shift from decade to decade. And with every shift some works of art have their worth revealed, but some real and fine values are clouded over again.

There are, of course, the conscientious, the skeptical, and the determinedly individualistic who refuse to succumb either to suggestion or to fashion. They, too, feel the pressure, only in their case it works by contraries. Yet in their very perversity they are being determined by non-aesthetic influences. Though we are an unsentimental generation, sentiment insists on creeping in, especially in our aesthetic judgments. Too sophisticated after several decades of warning to admit, openly, that the graphic arts have a story-interest, we nevertheless let it slip in by the side door. It makes its entrance usually through the title. Most people are quite uncomfortable in an art gallery without a fully annotated catalogue, and many spend quite as much time looking up names as they do looking at pictures.

The soft sentiment of personal association makes its way into aesthetic judgment more secretly. We let it play around in our emotions avoiding a more explicit recognition. We see quality in a painting of the sea when there is really the faint echo of happy days on a beach, technique in a hillside that looks like home, color and light in the garden that is pervaded with a vague recurrence of our youth.

It is an effort and something of a nuisance to pass judgment on a new problem, but to repeat an opinion already formed creates a satisfying sense of confidence and reinforces our self-esteem. So taste degenerates into habit. And once the habit is well established novelty outrages it. Thus the strange is readily equated with the ugly, while the familiar is taken for granted as the beautiful. You may know what you like without knowing a thing about art, but what you like is not the art. What you like is certain habits of your own mind, the habit of concurring with the predominant opinion or of combating it, according to your temperament; never, in any such case, is it the real aesthetic significance and value of the painting or the statue or the rug itself.

And for every false aesthetic preference that is founded on some accidental element of choice there is an aesthetic blind spot. The person who is used to reaching what he has supposed to be aesthetic satisfaction by the open, level paths of sentiment and habit will find the breathless ascent to the real aesthetic heights forbidding. The naked beauty that is stripped of association and the conventional forms will reveal no beauty to him.

So the great public, even the cultivated public, comes into a modern art gallery ill equipped to see the values that are there. Baffled, they ask first for a catalogue and then are only baffled more. If it gives no titles it is no help to them. If it gives titles they become absorbed in the problem of identification. For every subject they have seen numerous presentations in the accepted conventional forms and so they approach it with a certain set expectation. But the new art has reinterpreted the themes into new forms. Expectation is thwarted. This is a disagreeable feeling, and the feeling is attributed to the picture which is therefore violently rejected.

In proportion as the visitor is baffled and puzzled he becomes self-conscious, and this increases the difficulty of aesthetic judgment. Instead of absorbing himself in the picture he begins to search anxiously for something in his past experience to serve as basis for an opinion. There are no established categories to come to his support. He feels himself and his self-confidence sinking. It is at this point that the trivial-minded become facetious. Cheap humor is the defense reaction of an uncertain little soul. But the serious and sincere, not having even this reaction to sustain them, become more and more confused and end by attributing to the pictures the discomfort generated by their own unsuccessful introspection.

There is one way to correct the vision that has been distorted by the intrusive influences of fashion, suggestion, romance, and habit, and to clear out the blind spots. Give up trying to find out what you like without knowing about art, and find out what art is. Take any picture you like, and abstracting from the subject, single out the line directions and patterns, the space divisions, the counterplay of thrusts and strains, the interrelations of color, until it appears not as a Madonna or a hillside or a tree but as an organization of aesthetic elements. This will give you an analytic interest which is at first remote from the aesthetic, but it will in time train the vision to grasp and explore the essentials. With vision thus stripped of sentimental associations, with incidental differences of form eliminated, fashion will drop out of sight and art will appear as it is in itself—the energetic equilibrium of vital forms.

PHYLLIS ACKERMAN

International Relations Section

The China Consortium—I.

THE negotiations leading up to the signing of the China Consortium Agreement on October 15, 1920, were in many respects more significant than the terms of the agreement itself. They have never been published in the United States—nor, indeed, has the text of the agreement—and the presentation in this and the succeeding issue of *The Nation* of the more important notes and memoranda relating to the consortium should throw light upon a subject about which there has been much obscurity. In the present issue appears the correspondence between the American group of bankers, the Department of State, and the British Government. In next week's issue will be printed the correspondence following the inter-group conference at Paris relating principally to Japan's reservations in regard to Mongolia and Manchuria, the text of the consortium agreement, and the notification of China. The documents are taken from a recent White Paper, published by the British Government.

THE AMERICAN BANKERS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NEW YORK CITY, JULY 8, 1918.

We have been giving very earnest consideration to the suggestion you made in Washington respecting a loan to China, and wish, in the first place, to assure you of our disposition to be of service in the matter, and to help in finding some way in which the wishes of the Administration can be carried out.

In the course of our discussion the following points have seemed to us to be fundamental:

1. An arrangement of this sort which contemplates transactions spread over a considerable period of time in our opinion should be made on the broadest basis in order to give the best protection to our investors, and, with the right foundation established, confidence would follow and anxiety and jealousy disappear. At the conference held in Washington recently, there was mentioned, as a course perhaps advisable, that Americans and Japanese cooperate in a loan to China. We are disposed to believe that it would be better if such an international cooperation were to be made broader. We suggest, therefore, that this can best be accomplished if a four-Power group be constituted consisting of financial members to be recognized by the respective Governments of Great Britain, France, Japan, and the United States; our Government to recognize as their member of such group the American banks or firms which may become associated for this purpose, and which we should hope to have representative of the whole country. Although under the present circumstances it would be expected that Japan and the United States should carry England and France, such carrying should not diminish the vitality of their memberships in the four-Power group.

One of the conditions of membership in such a four-Power group should be that there should be a relinquishment by the members of the group either to China or to the group of any options to make loans which they now hold, and all loans to China by any of them should be considered as a four-Power group business. Through cooperation of England, France, Japan, and the United States much can be accomplished for the maintenance of Chinese sovereignty and the preservation of the "open door"; and, furthermore, such cooperation might greatly facilitate the full development of the large revenue sources, from only a very few of which China at present realizes a satisfactory income.

It would seem to be necessary, if now and after the war we are successfully to carry out the responsibilities imposed upon us by our new international position, that our Government should be prepared in principle to recognize the change in our international relations, both diplomatic and commercial, brought about by the war.

2. We have considerable doubt whether, under the present circumstances, the people of the United States could be induced to buy the debt of any foreign country on any terms. We feel quite certain that no loan could be sold unless the Government would be willing at the time of issue to make it clear to the public that the loan is made at the suggestion of the Government. With such announcement we think it possible that a reasonable amount of Chinese loan could be placed in this country.

If these two fundamental conditions are agreed to by our Government, we hold ourselves at your disposal to go further into the details of any proposed loan, and will cooperate with you most earnestly and sympathetically.

Yours very truly,

J. P. MORGAN & CO.
KUHN, LOEB & CO.
(For the National City Bank of New York),
F. A. VANDERLIP, *President.*
(For First National Bank, New York),
GEO. F. SABIN, JUNR., *Vice-President.*
(For Chase National Bank),
E. R. TINKER, *Vice-President.*
(For Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago),
JOHN JAY ABBOTT, *Vice-President.*
LEE, HIGGINSON & CO.
(For Guaranty Trust Company of New York),
CHARLES H. SABIN, *President.*

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE BANKERS

July 9, 1918.

Your letter of the 8th July, 1918, has had my very careful consideration. It contains several elements of an important nature, which I will take up in order.

This war has brought the countries of Great Britain, France, Japan, the United States, and some others into a state of harmony and helpfulness, and has supplanted an intense spirit of competition by a spirit of mutuality and cooperation in matters relating to their interests abroad. Doubtless this situation is a measure due to the absence of capital seeking foreign investment at the present time because of the demands upon it for war purposes.

If international cooperation is necessary, as seems to be the case, for the successful flotation of the proposed loan, I realize that the support of Great Britain and France would be desirable even if it should be necessary for the United States and Japan to carry for the time being their respective portions of the loan. All four Powers are of course deeply interested in any measures taken to strengthen China and fit her for a more active part in the war against the Central European Powers. Japan is already considering rendering financial assistance, while two of the loans that have been mentioned as desirable are loans by which the interests of British and French citizens would be directly affected, and it would of course be unwise to undertake their negotiations without consulting parties so immediately concerned.

In these circumstances, the formation of a four-Power group, to consist of financial interests of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan, to deal with the Government of China for purposes of making loans to that Government seems advisable, and it is my hope that in this way the whole subject of finance in China can ultimately be treated in a broad way. If the terms and conditions of each loan are submitted to and approved by this Government and the other cooperating Governments, and by the Government of China, this Government would not only interpose no objection, but on the contrary

would consider such an arrangement an assurance that the welfare of China and the proper interests of the other Governments were of such a mutual character as to permit of close and friendly intercourse for their common good. I think that I should say frankly that this Government would be opposed to any terms or conditions of a loan which sought to impair the political control of China, or lessened the sovereign rights of that republic.

In response to your inquiry as to whether the Government would be willing at the time of its issue to state that the loan was being made at the suggestion of the Government, I will say that the Government has suggested that this loan be made, and would have no hesitancy in formally stating that fact at the time of issue.

The question of relinquishment by the members of the American group of any options to make loans now existing in favor of any of them seems to be a reasonable condition of membership in that group. Such relinquishment by a member of a foreign group is a matter over which this Government would have no control. However, I may say that if the members of the American group come to the conclusion that they desire it, this Government will use its good offices, in so far as it can properly do so, to bring about such relinquishment. . . .

ROBERT LANSING.

MR. BALFOUR TO AMBASSADOR DAVIS

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 14, 1918.

I have the honor to inform your Excellency that I have now received from Washington the full text of the confidential letters exchanged between the United States Secretary of State and certain leading American banks relative to the proposal to form a new four-Power group for the purpose of making a loan to China.

His Majesty's Government welcome the decision of the United States Government to encourage the formation of a group of American banks to cooperate with similar British, French, and Japanese groups in affording financial assistance to China, and they are prepared to assent in principle to the proposal to constitute a new four-Power group in the place of the existing international consortium.

There are, however, certain points arising out of the correspondence communicated to His Majesty's Government which in their opinion call for further elucidation in order that they may be in a position to appreciate fully the scope of the American proposals.

In the first place, it would appear that it was decided at the conference held in Washington, prior to the exchange of the letters, that it was desirable that a loan should be made to China by the proposed four-Power group, and Mr. Lansing in signifying his acquiescence in that view, in his letter of the 9th July, indicates that the object of such a loan would be to strengthen China and fit her for a more active part in the war against the Central European Powers.

As your Excellency is aware, the only loan to China which is now under consideration by the existing international consortium is a projected issue of a second or Supplementary Reorganization Loan of £20,000,000 for currency reform purposes, in respect to which the Japanese group have already made two advances to the Chinese Government. It is not clear whether the American group contemplate participating in this loan which is now in course of negotiation with the Chinese Government and carrying the shares of the British and French groups by arrangement with the Japanese group, or whether they have in view an entirely different financial transaction. The correspondence exchanged between the banks and the Secretary of State does not mention the amount of the projected loan, the revenues on which it is to be secured, or the purposes to which it is to be applied.

Again, the scheme proposed by the United States Government and the American banks appears to contemplate not only the prompt issue of a special loan to China by the four-Power group, but also the issue of other loans by that body. His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington was accordingly instructed to inquire whether it was the intention of the United States Government to confine the activities of the new four-Power group to making administrative loans to the Chinese Government or whether the new consortium would be empowered also to make loans for industrial and railway enterprises in China. Lord Reading has replied that he is informed by the State Department that, so far as concerns the American group now forming under the agreement between the Department and the bankers, it is the expectation of the Department that industrial loans will be made as well as those for administrative purposes.

I must explain to your Excellency that this question of the scope of the four-Power group's financial activities is a matter of considerable importance in view of the decision taken at the Inter-Group Conference held in Paris on the 26th September, 1913, by the representatives of the British, French, German, Russian, and Japanese groups in the international consortium, when it was resolved and agreed that the provisions of the Sextuple Agreement should no longer apply to industrial and railway loans. The meeting was informed by the chairman that a communication had been received from the American group stating that they agreed to the unconditional elimination of industrial loans from the scope of the Sextuple Agreement. His Majesty's Government were impelled to agree to the modification in this sense of the Sextuple Agreement of 1912 by the desire of the Japanese Government to resume their freedom in respect to industrial loans, and also by pressure from independent banking and other interests outside the British group which made it impossible for them to continue to recognize the British group in the consortium as alone entitled to their official support for the financing of industrial enterprises in China. Your Excellency will understand that in these circumstances it would be difficult for His Majesty's Government, and presumably for the other Governments concerned, to agree to the revival of the Sextuple Agreement of 1912 in so far as it purports to prohibit the independent conclusion of industrial loans, supposing that it is the intention of the United States Government to renew the original six-Power contract in the form of a four-Power contract, and to seek the consent of the participating Governments to the principle of guaranteeing exclusive official support to their respective groups for the negotiation of industrial as well as of administrative loans.

The letters exchanged between the American bankers and the Secretary of State also deal with the question of the relinquishment to China or to the four-Power group as a whole of any options on loans now held by the individual members or groups. I have to observe that, so far as administrative loans to China are concerned, which alone fall within the scope of the existing consortium's activities, there is only one option held by individual members of that body, viz., an option for a currency reform loan held by the British and French groups, and previous to China's declaration of war on the Central Powers, by the German group. The currency reform loan has, with the consent of the British and French groups, been incorporated into the Supplementary Reorganization Loan, and should the American group agree to cooperate with the British, French, and Japanese groups in raising such a loan, it would naturally participate in any advantages which the possession of this option confers on the original holders.

Should it be the intention, however, of the United States Government to invite the other Governments to induce their respective groups to agree to the relinquishment, in favor of the new four-Power group, of options on industrial and railway loans held by those groups or their individual members, I fear that such a proposal would present considerable difficulty, and the question would have to be examined very carefully in consultation with the British interests involved before His Majesty's Government could express any opinion, and still less signify their concurrence in the suggestion.

Finally, I notice that in his confidential answer to the American bankers' letter, Mr. Lansing states that the United States Government would be opposed to any terms or conditions of a

[*Continued on page* 802]

loan which sought to impair the political control of China or lessened the sovereign rights of that republic. His Majesty's Government presume that in making this statement the Secretary of State did not mean to imply that the United States Government would not entertain favorably any loan scheme submitted for their approval by the American group which provided for foreign control of the collection of the revenues earmarked as security for the loan, such as exists in the case of the loans secured on the Chinese maritime customs revenues and on the Salt Gabelle. Similarly, His Majesty's Government conclude that the United States Government would not consider, for example, the appointment under the terms of a currency reform loan of a foreign adviser to supervise the introduction of currency reforms in China as an infringement of that country's sovereign rights. I venture to suggest that the favorable consideration of the American proposal would be facilitated if His Majesty's Government and the other Governments concerned could be reassured as to the precise intentions of the United States Government in this matter.

There is one further point which, although it is not a matter of urgency or likely to impede in any way the realization of the four-Power group project, should, I think, be brought to the notice of the United States Government. Toward the end of last year the British, French, Russian, and Japanese Governments finally agreed to the inclusion of a Belgian group in the existing bankers' consortium in China. It was, however, stipulated that the admission of Belgium into the consortium should only take effect after the war. A. J. BALFOUR.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE

On October 8, 1918, Mr. Lansing, then Secretary of State, addressed a memorandum to the British Foreign Office through the British Chargé d'Affaires at Washington outlining in further detail the position of the United States in regard to the Consortium.

Memorandum

The Government of the United States is gratified at the cordial reception given, in principle, to the general plan for loans to China as recently presented to the respective interested Governments.

This Government is now happy to reply, in the following sense, to the several requests of those Governments for further information as to certain features of the proposed plan:

1. It is not intended that the American group, recently formed, should rejoin the existing consortium, but that there should be organized a new international group, consisting of representative financial institutions of the United States, Japan, Great Britain, and France.

The plan, as proposed by the Government of the United States, does not contemplate that the former consortium should necessarily be dissolved, but that each of the Governments concerned should arrange for the formation of its own national group, which it is hoped might be made so comprehensive as to include all those parties interested in the former consortium and such others not so associated who are engaged or might engage in loans to China, as well as any others whose participation might be desired.

Nor did the American Government, in making its proposal, have any specific loan in mind, but was endeavoring to lay down some general rule for future activities which might, in a broad way, meet the financial needs and opportunities in China. It was for this reason that no specific reference was made to the amount of the loan or loans to be raised, the revenues to be pledged, or to the precise objects of the proposed loan. It was contemplated that these questions would be determined in respect to each case as it might arise.

With respect to the Second or Supplementary Reorganization Loan for purposes of currency reform, this Government is prepared to state in advance that it would be ready to recommend to the American group that it should not only take a part in that loan, but be prepared to carry also, in conjunction with the Japanese group, the shares of the British and French groups, not only in this particular loan, should it be included in the business of the new international group, but in such other loans as may develop while circumstances are such as to prevent their more active participation.

2. The reference to "a relinquishment by the members of the group either to China or to the group of any options to make loans which they now hold" applied primarily to the American group alone, and to an agreement between the banks and the United States Government whereby all preferences and options for future loans in China having any governmental guaranty held by the individual members of the American group should be relinquished to the group, which should in turn share them with the international group. Such relinquishment of options was considered by this Government to be a reasonable condition of membership in the American group; and while it is recognized that such interested government must necessarily make its own arrangements with its own national group, it is submitted that it is possible properly to conduct the business of the international group only by similar relinquishment to the respective national groups by the individual banks forming those groups, without distinction as to the nature of the options held.

3. The proposal of the Government of the United States contemplated that industrial as well as administrative loans should be included in the new arrangement, for the reason that, in practice, the line of demarcation between those various classes of loans often is not easy to draw. Both alike are essential fields for legitimate financial enterprise, and both alike should be removed from the sphere of unsound speculation and of destructive composition. The intention of this Government was to suggest, as a means to that end, that the interested Governments should, by common consent, endeavor so to broaden the membership in the newly formed national groups that all financial firms of good standing interested in such loans might be included in the respective groups, and should withhold their support from independent financial operations without previous agreement of the interested Governments.

As regards the Inter-Group Conference held in Paris 26th September, 1913, and the agreement to which the American group adhered, stating that they had no objection to the elimination of industrial loans, it can only be said that the American group prior to that had withdrawn from active participation in the consortium, and was, therefore, not in a position to object; but that it is now felt that with the establishment of a new group, the question may properly be reconsidered.

4. The expression "any terms or conditions of a loan which sought to impair the political control of China or lessen the sovereign rights of that republic" had reference only to the future activities of the American group, and was not intended to call in question the propriety of any specific arrangement in operation between the former consortium and the Chinese Government, or between any other government and the Chinese. It can be definitely stated that the United States Government did not mean to imply that foreign control of the collection of revenues or other specific security pledged by mutual consent would necessarily be objectionable, nor would the appointment under the terms of some specific loan of a foreign adviser—as, for instance, to supervise the introduction of currency reform.

5. With respect to the Russian and Belgian groups and their rights in the former consortium, no present action is contemplated either by way of reservation as to the old or of participation in the new group. As previously stated, it is not anticipated that the existing consortium will necessarily be dissolved, nor, on the other hand, do present conditions warrant the expectation that effective Russian and Belgian national groups could readily be formed at this time.

It is not the intention, however, of this Government to ignore, much less to exclude, any just claim of participation in the new international group, but merely, for practical considerations arising out of the war, to associate the interests of the governments now so closely and actively associated and most able to

[Continued on page 804]

finance the proposed loans to China, and to reserve for further consideration the inclusion of any other groups of friendly Powers which may at a later time be in a position effectively to cooperate.

On March 17, Earl Curzon, on behalf of the Foreign Office, notified the State Department that the British Government had authorized the British banking group "to participate in the operations of the proposed international consortium" and had "guaranteed to it exclusive official support as regards all future public loans to China which involve a Government guaranty and a public issue, whether for industrial, administrative, or financial purposes." Subsequently, however, the phrase "exclusive official support" became the subject of prolonged negotiations between the British Government and the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, representing the British group, and the question was finally settled by the adoption by all the governments concerned of the following definition suggested by the Government of the United States:

The governments of each of the four participating groups undertake to give their complete support to their respective national groups, members of the consortium, in all operations undertaken pursuant to the resolutions and agreements of the 11th and 12th May, 1919, respectively, entered into by the bankers at Paris. In the event of competition in the obtaining of any specific loan contract the collective support of the diplomatic representatives in Peking of the four Governments will be assured to the consortium for the purpose of obtaining such contract.

Important Italian documents, including preelection manifestos of the various parties, and proceedings of the Congress of Socialist Communes, will be published in the International Relations Section of an early issue of The Nation.

The Nation

Vol. CXII, No. 2918 | Founded 1865 | Wednesday, June 8, 1921

ALSACE

The Facts About the "Lost Provinces"

Beginning a Series of Articles

by Lewis S. Gannett

Good Union or Bad?

The Sweeping Victory of the Amalgamated

by George Soule

The Real French Crisis

Editorial

Fifteen Cents a Copy | Five Dollars a Year

Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1887, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

58

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1921 No. 2918

Contents

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR
ASSOCIATE EDITORS
LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN
ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR — CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

BRAVE and wise was the stand Premier Briand took in putting the brakes upon French imperialism and foregoing the invasion of the Ruhr. As always happens when a leader intrenches himself upon the right and unqualifiedly adheres to it, he won a shining victory in the Chamber of Deputies, and put an end to the nonsense that he would fall if he did not press Germany by further force. We care not what the reasons were: whether it was American financiers who showed him the economic error of his ways, or whether it was a belief that the sword of Damocles is more effective in suspense than when used, or whether it was English pressure. We wish, of course, that the real motive might have been the truth of a certain saying: "And the nation to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge," and an appreciation of the fact that generosity even to a hated enemy pays better than bayonets. But the fact is that the outlook in Europe is brighter today than for many months and that at last the French politicians appear to be coming to their senses. In Silesia, too, the French seem to have cooled down; all now depends upon the effect of the arrival of the fresh British troops. The balm of the billion now paid down by Germany in accord with her pledge, and the assurance of the British Solicitor General, Sir Ernest Pollock, that the war trials now going on at Leipzig are being ably and fairly conducted ought still further to calm the French mind and aid in a juster judgment of the whole situation. For the further acts of war it has escaped Europe and all of us may be devoutly thankful.

IT'S a merry, merry time they are having in Balkanized Asia Minor. Having sold out the Greeks by making a secret treaty with Mustapha Kemal and the Turkish Nationalists, the French had hoped to cart away the spoils at their leisure. But the Turks will not stay bought. They are so set up over their successes against the Greeks that, according to a dispatch to the Chicago *Tribune*, they have raised their price to the French and are demanding the port of Alexandretta and equal rights with the French in the sector of the Bagdad railway in Cilicia. The French have therefore rushed Franklin-Bouillon to Angora with the news that Constantine, with the connivance of the British, is planning to seize Constantinople for the Greeks. The Turks are thus delicately advised to expend their energies in the neighborhood of the Bosphorus. Asia Minor has seen some devious diplomacy in her day, but probably never such a sequence of double-dealing as she has witnessed in the actions of the Allies since the armistice of 1918.

APPARENTLY it was a tentative, not an ultimate, "ultimatum" that George T. Summerlin was instructed to take back to Mexico City. Indeed, a half-hearted and partial denial was made by the Department of State on the heels of the Associated Press dispatch announcing the "ultimatum." Since then nothing further has been heard of the alleged demands, the first of which was that in order to gain our recognition President Obregon must set aside his country's constitution in relation to the nationalization of subsoil rights (i.e., the control of oil). But words are less important than intentions in this issue, and it is of sinister significance that, at this moment when British oil interests are more or less accepting the situation in Mexico, our companies are pressing hard for terms that if accepted will mean the overthrow of Obregon, and if refused will give an excuse for intervention. Meanwhile, the oil propagandists are preparing a gullible public for an invasion which will be necessary to "save Mexico" and "safeguard civilization." Of course, the apex of moral turpitude nowadays is to be "radical." Hence, that is how Mexico must be blackened, or, if you will, reddened, in order that we may shoot her up with a benediction from Bishop Manning and his ilk. Thus the New York *Times* for May 29 prints an article by Stephen Bonsal on the "Red Flag in Mexico," urging us to rescue the "honest" and "law-abiding" Mexicans from bolshevism and the fate of Russia. President Obregon might well send an ultimatum to Mr. Harding demanding that he remake our Constitution to the extent of taking away the rights in subsoil publicity now enjoyed by our oil interests, and some others.

DARING and quickness of wit—in these the Irish far excel their oppressors, and it is largely for that reason that the British military forces are making no headway whatever in Ireland. Daring and quickness of wit explain, too, the astounding destruction of the Dublin Customs House, the fiscal headquarters of the Crown in Ireland, right under the eyes of Dublin Castle. It is not only a terrific financial loss to the Government—it brings the British close to the point when the world will begin to laugh at them, and the day upon which that happens will, paradoxically, be a serious one indeed for Lloyd George. Meanwhile, this added proof of how ready Irishmen are to die for their cause ought to show Westminster once more the utter folly

of the Lloyd George-Greenwood policy. On both sides men perish needlessly every hour because these two men will not admit failure. They have had it set forth in the public press, as many times as the fall of the Soviets has been announced, that the "murder gang" was at the end of its rope, that peace was about to be restored. They are making of Ireland a wilderness, but they are making no peace. They are driving the Irish more and more to desperation and to acts like the latest Dublin occurrence. One of their own officers, General Crozier, is out with testimony as to the atrocities of Black and Tan officers still in the service—charging theft and attempted murder of prisoners in two cases.

AN election carried on under the auspices of murder and riot necessarily loses much of its significance, so that the Unionist successes reported from Ulster are less impressive than they should be. The result is also complicated by the fact that the voters exhibited a tendency in several cases to mark the first name appearing on the ballot, and as the names were printed in alphabetical order this upset several definite predictions. (Since some voters were reported to be approximately two years old this tendency is easy to understand and sympathize with!) But allowing for these difficulties it is plain that Ulster went to the Unionists by a considerable majority. The question is, now that the Unionists have the six counties, What are they going to do with them? What sort of a government can they establish in a section of country hopelessly divided into violent opposing factions and dependent economically and in every other way on the rest of the country—which is solidly republican? The southern parliament will not sit—the people being thoroughly satisfied with their own Dail Eireann—and Ireland will be as far from peace as ever.

EGYPTIAN Nationalists are even more violently opposed to the Milner proposals for home rule than are British conservatives—and with more reason. They believe that these proposals rob Egypt of its birthright of complete freedom and perpetuate a system of British tutelage if not of downright control. Consequently the moderate Egyptian mission appointed to discuss the projected reform in England with British officials has aroused resentment among the Nationalists and their leader, Zaghlul Pasha. The riots in Alexandria doubtless sprang from a variety of causes, but this resentment was at the bottom of them, coupled with a desire to discredit ahead of time the efforts of the mission. Such methods, however, are likely to result only in tightening the noose around Egypt's neck. The British are not to be frightened by a show of force; already the press is beginning to compare the present disorders with the outbreak forty years ago that led to the original British occupation. The cause of liberty in Egypt is strong, but the people of Egypt are weak. They should keep their cause before the eyes of the world by a steady display of self-control.

THE proposed constitutional amendment, introduced in the Senate May 2 (by request) by Senator Jones of Washington, will, if enacted into law, prevent the present widespread misrepresentation in Congress, in the electoral college, and in political conventions. It provides that representation in Congress shall be based upon the actual vote cast at the preceding presidential election. This would prevent Mississippi's having eight representatives in the House when in 1920 it cast but 82,492 votes, while Rhode Island, with only three representatives, polled 167,386 votes. The actual voting strength of Mississippi, if exercised, would be 786,613; of Rhode Island, 358,517. What can be done to bring out the possible vote? Senator Jones's proposed amendment would tend in a measure to do it though no breaking down race prejudices. Our country should not endure upon its present non-representative basis. If representation were provided for in the present Congress according to votes actually cast, Mississippi would have but one member in the House, while Rhode Island would continue with its three. In the electoral college Mississippi would have three members instead of ten, but Rhode Island would continue to have five. In political conventions there would be a similar much needed reduction.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL HAYS deserves all praise for his granting of second-class mailing privileges to the *Liberator* and for the sound principles he laid down in so doing. It seems like a step backward into a long-lost America to have him reciting principles enunciated by our greatest men, such as that the liberty of the press is cheap at the price of some license and that its liberty must be preserved, but it is a profoundly gratifying call to real Americanism. It will always be one of the curious facts in our Alice-in-Wonderland politics that it was the great liberal and revolutionary reformer, Woodrow Wilson, who struck such blows at the press and chose such low-grade mentalities as those of Burleson and Lamar to do the work, and that it was the reactionary Republicans who at least began the undoing of the injuries inflicted by Mr. Wilson. As we go to press comes the good news that Mr. Hays has also granted to the New York *Call* and the Milwaukee *Leader* those mailing privileges of which they should never have been deprived. These are wise steps forward, most heartily to be acclaimed.

HAVING accustomed ourselves to deporting aliens merely because we do not agree with them, it is not unnatural that some should wish to apply the principle within our own borders and, by a kind of local option, enable each city to select its inhabitants. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What is fair for the alien is fair for the citizen. What the nation may do, the city is also privileged to undertake. So doubtless reasons the mayor of Portland, Maine, who has ordered that all "non-resident" marine strikers leave the city or be arrested as "suspicious characters." Well, why not? If law and liberty and elementary human rights are to be flouted, why not go the whole hog? Why not be a 100 per cent czar while one is about it? As to the Seamen's Union, it ought also to be 100 per cent. It ought to defy this mayor as flatly as he is defying the Constitutional provision that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States," even though they are so depraved as to be "non-resident." And if this mayor finds any court to support him, the Seamen's Union ought to rush its members to Portland on every train until the granite quarries of the State are exhausted in the construction of jails to hold them all.

FRIENDS of disarmament must work incessantly if they are to get any results from the present Administration other than sounding brass. Senator Borah's success in getting the Senate to accept his provision in the Navy Appropriation Bill asking the President to call a British-

Japanese-American disarmament conference is only a beginning. Although the Senate accepted the Borah proviso with the understanding that Mr. Harding had withdrawn his objection to it, the New York *Tribune* reports that the President has returned to his opposition and that the measure will therefore be resisted in the House. Meanwhile, let the country speak! The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has just adopted a wholehearted disarmament resolution, and even the National Security League is advocating a good program, except for its insistence on compulsory military training for our young men.

EVIDENCE continues to accumulate both in Chicago and New York of the Gargantuan system of graft and price-fixing that has ruled in the house-building industry and the enormous tribute that the public is paying to it in high rents. Samuel Untermyer, as counsel for the Lockwood Committee in New York, recently brought out that the rules of the Association of Architectural Iron Workers, an employers' association, provided that its members were to charge $144 a week for the services of a finisher and a helper for which they paid $47—an advance of more than 200 per cent. But the sequel of the inquiry is taking the usual course. Grafting labor unionists have been sent to jail—and rightly—but employers convicted of violating the State's anti-trust statute are getting off with fines. Mr. Untermyer, who had been giving his services in the prosecution of these cases, has therefore withdrawn. Fines are worse than useless, as the violator of the law not only goes scot free but adds the amount of the fine to the already outrageous production costs—and passes it on to the defenseless public.

TO undue publicity and to the psychology of playing to a gallery of the whole world Francis Ouimet lays the defeat of our American golfers in England. The "mental hazards" of the game, he says, put an early end to their efforts to capture the British amateur championship. But, curiously enough, this same psychology affected the tried British veterans one after another until they, too, all succumbed and the prize went to an unknown golfer, Willie Hunter, of Deal, who carried it off by the amazing score in the last match of 12 up and 11 to play. All of which throws into startling contrast once more the difference between the amateur's mental attitude and that of the professional. The professionals play better in the lime light than ever; the size of the gallery makes no difference and reversals of form are rare. Of course, we were not of those who expected an American victory at Hoy Lake. We have been playing golf for three decades, the British for centuries. They have an easy way of keeping in good golf form while active in other fields that we have no more acquired than have our 'varsity crews learned the English art of training without subordinating everything else to it, of rowing for the pleasure of it even when one prepares for a four-miler. Yet, both on the water and on the links, American adaptability and nervous skill do wonders and some day we shall have a team to turn the tables—perhaps when there is not the "complete golf atmosphere" of which Mr. Ouimet complains.

ONE of the most remarkable archaeological discoveries of the century has been made in Mexico City, which now, thanks to the curiosity of Francisco Gamoneda, chief clerk of the ayuntamiento (city council), boasts a series of archives of the municipality running back to January, 1524. Long buried in a sealed cellar under the palacio municipal, the lost documents seem nevertheless to be in an excellent state of preservation, and will probably stimulate the city to found a museum with them as a nucleus. While a full description of these precious materials is not yet available, the facts already made public must excite historians everywhere. What would Irving or Prescott not have given for a sight of the plans of the city as laid out by Cortez himself, or of that great volume "nearly three feet square and six inches thick, containing colored drawings of the costumes of the Aztecs, as observed by some Spanish artist in the train of the Conquistadores"?

PERHAPS it would be just as well if the conditions of the Pulitzer awards for literature were not stressed too much when the announcements come to be made. Consider the situation this year with regard to the prize for the best novel of 1920. That it goes to "The Age of Innocence" will arouse argument among those who think "Main Street" more powerful, "Moon-Calf" more beautiful, "Miss Lulu Bett" more dexterous, but no one can help smiling a little at the news that Mrs. Wharton's brilliant knife-edged satire upon the little New York of the seventies receives the prize because it best presents "the wholesome atmosphere of American life and the highest standard of American manners and manhood." And there is "Miss Lulu Bett," which, failing to win first honor among novels, has a second chance and wins honor by its dramatic form—because it best represents "the educational value and power of the stage in raising the standard of good morals, good taste, and good manners." We suspect that the late Mr. Pulitzer had in mind something very different than that his prizes should go to art which holds the mirror up to nature with such devastating results. But though these awards are odd in view of the terms which condition them, they are encouraging in view of the indication that satire runs as good a risk as sugar in this annual race. There is, however, a great deal more sugar than satire in "The Americanization of Edward Bok," adjudged the best biography. As to the best book of American history, we speculate with interest upon the question who did most to make "The Victory at Sea" great, Admiral Sims, or his collaborator, Mr. Burton J. Hendrick.

"Shakespeare would have delighted in Charlie Chaplin, declares George Bernard Shaw, in giving his support to a scheme for using the Shakespeare Memorial Theater at Stratford-on-Avon for cinema performances"—London dispatch.

SHAKESPEARE in his cool Valhalla hears a clatter;
Summons Dogberry and asks him what's the matter.

"Wits contending," says the tipstaff, "jay and raven,
Whether movies shall invade the sacred Avon."

"Gosse says: 'Vulgar—very, very, very, very!'
'Paul's Cathedral will come next,' snaps George Saintsbury.

"Sidney Lee——" Says Shakespeare: "Never mind the others—
Amiable men, no doubt, but not my brothers."

"Bernard Shaw?" The tipstaff brandishes his saplin':
"Why, he says you surely would like Charlie Chaplin."

Shakespeare settles back and orders mellow liquor:
"Leave the snarl to G. B. S. He is my vicar."

The Real Crisis in France

FOR over a year now France has said to Germany and the rest of the world: "If Allied diplomats won't make Germany pay, French soldiers will." She meant it. Although exhausted, she mobilized two military classes. France is war-mad on the subject of reparations. More than one Frenchman declares, in answer to the suggestion that shooting Germans will not produce money: "If Germany doesn't pay and our soldiers go in and ruin her, so much the better." Why this wrath? French apologists in our press explain that France has not recovered her moral balance, that she gravely needs funds to restore her devastated regions, that she is resolved, alone if necessary, to execute the Treaty of Versailles. These explanations are plausible; but there is another motive stronger than them all. It is—fear of bankruptcy.

Unless Germany pays, France faces financial collapse. Those who would really understand the European wrangle over reparations should take a look at French public accounts. They show that France is heading straight for a financial crisis. Even granting that Germany does pay—and few students of the problem will admit that—it is inconceivable that she will pay soon enough to forestall impending events. The greatest misfortune of the French people today is not the failure of Germany to pay but that France is helpless if Germany does default. The French people believed their politicians when they said that Germany would pay, and elected them. Whereupon the politicians spent the money before it was received. Thus, France, victorious, now faces the "great illusion." Now we are assured regularly of the "remarkable spirit of recovery" in France, and, in connection with the new $100,000,000 loan in this country, of the rapid decrease of her foreign debt. What are the facts?

There are no audited figures of French public finances since six years ago. It is necessary, therefore, to use the official figures published in the *Journal Officiel* and in the budgetary documents printed for the use of members of Parliament by the Finance Commission. If we take the figures for 1920, since they are now fairly complete and since the budgetary estimates for the present year are, in the main, the same, the total expenditures for last year appear to be 56 billion francs. They were met by 20 billions of taxes and 36 billions secured by various forms of loans. Let us glance at the receipt, and then the expenditure, side of this balance sheet.

First, the loans. Long-term loans provided 21,450 millions and short-term loans and borrowings from the Bank of France provided 14,527 millions of the total of 36 billions. This means that 40 per cent of the borrowings of last year were an addition to the floating debt. Now 96 per cent of these short-term borrowings were sales of National Defense bonds which run from one to twelve months and are sold at the rate of about one billion a month. As they are brought in for redemption they are renewed instead of being paid off. These bonds were outstanding in April to the extent of over 47 billion francs. So plentiful are they that they are used for making ordinary payments. They are known in France as "interest-bearing money." In so far as they are used as money they add to the fiduciary inflation. The 5 and 6 per cent *rentes* sold in the two popular loans of last year comprise most of the long-dated indebtedness incurred. They were used also, to some extent, by the Government for making "cash" payments.

By an arrangement with the *Rente* Section of the Bourse and the Government no French *rentes* can be sold legally except through the Bourse. But the prices of the various *rentes* are "pegged" and kept so high that few buyers are attracted, and a very large quantity of them is therefore constantly overhanging the market. Some sales are effected outside the Bourse at lower prices, but the risks involved discourage large dealings. The difficulties of longer continuing loans like these are obvious.

Now as to taxes. Much is made by the French of the fact that their tax returns for 1920 were four times greater than before the war. But since the franc today, because of inflation, averages about a third of its value before the war, it is obvious that the revenues collected in 1920, measured in pre-war, or gold, francs, are less than one and one-half times, and not four times, greater than before the war. With a debt burden increased some four or five times (calculated on the basis of gold francs) and the interest charges on this debt absorbing more than two-thirds of all revenues received, the French tax burden is not even doubled. Why? For one thing there is a special difficulty in the way of French tax reform: France, before the war, resorted almost altogether to indirect taxes for revenue. Efforts to impose an income tax always raised a storm of protest. This gave rise to that cruel jest to the effect that a Frenchman will give his sons to his country but not his money for taxes. The desperate needs of peace have not been able to overcome this prejudice against the income tax. More than three-fourths of the taxes collected in France last year were indirect, or consumption, taxes, which fall heaviest upon the masses of the people. The income tax collected in France last year was *less than 4 per cent of the total return.* Instead of a rigorous effort to increase this latter category of taxes, there has been recently an active political campaign to have them reduced or eliminated! The new "business turn-over" or sales-tax instituted with high hopes last summer has been so largely evaded that returns from it have fallen lower and lower until the return for last March was only 35 per cent of the budgetary estimate.

Another outstanding financial disappointment in France last year was the failure of the Government to keep its convention with the Bank of France to repay some two and a half billions of its borrowings from that institution by the end of the year. As a consequence, the currency note issue of the Bank of France stood in April last more than a billion francs higher than the same month last year. The French Government argues that the two popular loans of last year not only enabled France to "balance" her budget, but funded some 15 billions of short-term indebtedness into long-term safe obligations. Conversions effected by these loans did, it is true, change some 12 per cent of the total short-term debt into long-term debt. This is in itself, in days such as these, a magnificent effort; but the futility of it lies in the fact that during the same year the floating debt was increased by exactly the same amount through the continued sale of National Defense bonds. Finally, French exchange is depressed by speculation and intrigue and by extravagance resulting in inflation at home.

As to expenditures in 1920. It is impossible to secure an exact statement of what France spent last year; the Finance Commission declared that it didn't know; and the Finance Minister himself told Parliament he was unable to give them the figures. He admitted the charge of the Commission's chairman that "the French Government has no bookkeeping." The Finance Ministry knows how much it received. None of it was left; therefore it must have spent it! In this fashion it accounted for 48 billions of expenditures. Besides this it is known that at least seven other billions were spent for deficiency budgets and for semi-secret budgets such as the "Special Treasury Services."

Since the armistice France has been each year and is yet this year spending considerably more than twice her revenue. The deficit for 1919 was 36 billion francs; for 1920 it was about the same; and this year, the third year of peace, it bids fair to be even more. These vast shortages piled on top of the war debt have created a total public debt for France of nearly a third of a trillion francs. Can France, without drastic financial reorganization, conceivably handle any such debt as that?

No War With England

VIII. Ireland and British Imperial Policy

TO draw a parallel between the German invasion of Belgium and the British military occupation of Ireland is not accurate in its application to other peoples and the effect upon international relations. The sudden German violation of the treaty was not like England's long holding of a conquered people and the devious postponement and ultimate abrogation of the home-rule measure. From Belgium we heard chiefly of the atrocities practiced by the army of occupation on the people and little of the other side, if there was one. From Ireland come reports of both sides; the resistance of the people is far more desperate in the face of apparently insuperable odds. They will not yield and they go on apparently with absolute readiness to die to the last man.

The German invasion of Belgium was more a reason than a cause for our entrance into the recent war. Other and more fundamental causes being present, it gave us an additional moral vindication, an emotional impetus. The Allied propagandists made full use of it, and without it the path of those who willed the war would have been infinitely more difficult. British oppression of Ireland is today fraught with greater mischief to the relations between the United States and Great Britain than anything else. If the Irish issue gets actively into American politics, it may readily go like wild-fire, as the Cuban issue did after the explosion of the Maine. Already resolutions recognizing the Irish Republic have been introduced into State legislatures and Congress. American ammunition has been found in Ireland, while President Harding has taken a more important step than he realized in advocating American relief for stricken Erin. What if the Democratic Party should seize upon Free Ireland as a burning issue to retrieve its fortunes in 1924, if the Irish have not won their battle by that time? Who can say after our fighting Germany in France and Russia at Archangel that Ireland is further from our doors in 1921 than Cuba was in 1898? As a matter of fact there is a considerable parallel in the incidents of the Irish invasion to those of the Belgian, even though an Edith Cavell is still lacking. From the deep storehouse of ill-will which it has furnished could be brought forth explosive material enough to set the nation ablaze with anger.

Most of the current differences between Great Britain and the United States are still not in the dangerous stage, but they concern important economic tendencies and political policies which will require much delicate handling in the years to come and a generous patience and confidence. If we want to avoid the development of serious cross-purposes and understand how to do so, we can probably accomplish our end. But if at every turn and crisis we have to meet an embittered and determined hostility to everything British on the part of a considerable portion of the American population, it will be immensely more difficult to make the necessary adjustments along the way. Take the matter of imported British manufactures as an instance. If Great Britain is to pay us the interest on her debt, she must sooner or later increase considerably her exports to us of manufactured articles. But there is a well-organized boycott by the Irish against British services and goods which, it is said, has already had a serious effect. And the movement to erect tariff barriers which will have a similar result, although it originates with quite a different group of our citizens and one outwardly pro-English, will probably be supported by the Irish sympathizers when they see that its passage will harass the British. If it proves to be impossible or unduly dangerous for us to insist on full payment of the British debt, the Irish sympathizers will be certain to oppose its reduction by one penny.

It is worth noting that the very American interests which support most strongly movements for high tariffs, large navies, full payment of the debt, a large merchant marine, and other policies likely to embarrass the British are in general those which are most adulatory of British imperialists and conservatives, most vociferous in expressions of Anglo-Saxon solidarity, and most bitter in their denunciation of Sinn Fein. When it comes to economic matters, Englishmen would do well not to place their trust in this element of American society. In the long run it will be bad policy to do so. At the moment these lords of finance and industry happen to be in the saddle, but they never have been and never will be popular with the majority of Americans. The fact that they are now the most indefatigable and outspoken friends of England is likely to create much unwarranted anti-British prejudice among the rest of us. And it is the rest of us upon whom Englishmen must count, in a pinch, to support reasonable and conciliatory policies against the greed of the profiteers and the aggression of the industrial chauvinists. The place of Americans of Irish descent should be normally with the liberal forces in our political life, and these liberal forces will be robbed of much of their effectiveness if in matters affecting directly or indirectly Anglo-American relations the Irish sympathizers are forced into an unnatural alliance with the American imperialists.

It would be a mistake, moreover, to think of the reaction of Americans to the Irish problem purely in terms of the activities of the Irish sympathizers. The outstanding fact

with regard to the relations of Great Britain and the United States is that they are now the leading financial, commercial, and manufacturing nations—far ahead of any others. Their natural tendency is not only to become increasingly competitive, but to engage in a rivalry for mutually exclusive dominance. If this tendency is to be curbed, under the present economic order, it must be curbed by comprehensive understandings between the two peoples—understandings so comprehensive as to amount almost to an alliance. There must be a substantial harmony between them in international affairs if their purposes are not increasingly to cross each other. But such harmony presupposes a broad basis of confidence.

There are two possible conceptions of the British Empire, one of which arouses friendliness in the ordinary American, and the other of which does not. The first is the conception of a world-wide commonwealth of self-governing peoples, equal to each other in pride and power, and held together voluntarily by their mutual advantage. It is a vision of a group of liberal nations, open to the enterprise of all on equal terms. If Americans could feel toward the whole British Empire as they usually feel toward Canada, Australia, New Zealand, they would have little hesitancy in associating their purposes closely with it. But there are enough discordant elements in the British Empire to evoke occasionally the other picture. It is a picture of a group of Tories, insensitive, bullying, persistent, shrewd and often hypocritical, who through their enormous wealth and political power, backed by great navies and armies, contrive to hold large areas of the world in involuntary subjection.. There is in England's historic development basis for both of these conceptions. The latter was the England we saw when we began, and when we emerged from, our Revolution. It took nearly a century to begin to see the other England at all, and some cannot see it yet.

The amazing thing is that the Lloyd George Government does not realize that the martyrization of Ireland is much too costly merely from the point of view of relations with the United States. Just as long as that horror goes on, as long as the Irish are denied that self-determination which was one of the objects of the United States in the war, the danger will remain of sudden and tempestuous outbursts of public feeling in this country against the mother country, for some day the American public will realize that men who are willing to suffer and die like the Irish today are afflicted with intolerable grievances. When that day comes American public sentiment will swing, as it historically always has, to those who are fighting for liberty. Foremost Englishmen, like Mr. A. G. Gardiner, lately editor of the *Daily News*, and Lord Northcliffe himself, have recently stated that there were three parties to the Irish controversy, Ireland, England, and the United States, and it is useless for our Tories to assert that it is Britain's affair. While the fathers, brothers and sons, yes, the mothers and sisters, of Americans are the victims of brutality and murder overseas, such vaporing is worse than futile. The call of blood—of spilt blood—will drown out all else. What a pity it is that the American Anglophile societies cannot realize this and use their great influence with Lloyd George for an immediate solution of the problem, lest there be a repetition of the history of 1898 and America again go to the rescue of suffering islanders—at a frightful cost. There are thousands of Irish in America who are today doing their best to bring this very thing about.

Propitiation and Art

THE error that art should be cheerful is a tenacious one. It is held everywhere by persons of a certain cast of mind. But in America it slips even into the lower sorts of criticism, seeking to veil its real character under such words as "depressing," "painful," "unnecessary." It has, in fact, nothing to do with any exercise of the critical faculty, but is related to that coil of ancient propitiatory superstitions which caused the Greeks to call the furies "gentle creatures" and impels even civilized people in their weaker moments to knock on wood. Its genuine though carefully screened significance is: *Absit omen!* The presence of tragedy in literature or art inspires the primitive-minded with a direct and personal fear. They have an obscure notion that misfortune is "catching," like mumps or measles; that to contemplate it is to be somehow in danger of incurring it. They are convinced that the proverbial ostrich actually became invisible. From that conviction there have arisen in America, as everyone knows, powerful and wide-spread religious cults. To substitute bland and rosy concepts for harsh and troublesome realities seems to many thousands of people an effectual way of guarding themselves from contact with a world which they believe in their hearts to be a jumble of accidents, wherein lightning can be averted not by a rod but by a formula.

The wonder, things being as they are, is not that popular plays, stories, pictures, and tunes are fatuously cheerful, but that any other sort of art is tolerated at all. Most minds nurse a residuum of the superstition that things can be mastered not by comprehension but by magic, and all desire to avert evil from themselves. It is for this reason, not for any aesthetic one which, by comparison, is negligible, that the success of certain recent books and plays among us has been so heartening a symptom. To seek to control life through a knowledge of it is the first sign of a civilized temper. To be dissatisfied with glamorous catchwords and glossy surfaces and easy ways to health and happiness is the beginning of wisdom. And in order to control life it must be raised into an object of the reflective consciousness through art. Whether such art be idealistic or naturalistic in method matters little. "Medea" and "Lear" are as veracious as "Mme. Bovary" or "Esther Waters." The only art which is futile is that which, whatever its form, tampers with the essential character of man and his world, substituting accident for causality and deliberate cheerfulness for the sober tones of truth.

The humblest critic, moreover, tempted to yield to the propitiatory superstition he shares with the public, should be given pause by even such slight knowledge of the history of literature and art as he may be supposed to possess. Upon no cosmic theory does man travel toward a conventionally cheerful goal. Homer's great hero amid the shades envies the wretched hind in his master's field; Paradise is lost in Milton's poem; Faust's ultimate salvation was achieved through no earthly happiness and brought him no mortal content. There is no smile on the countenance of Michelangelo's Moses or Rodin's Adam; Beethoven passes from gloom and tumult to a solemn serenity. He never touches cheerfulness upon that path. To understand the circumstances of mortality, to know what such a being as man can expect, and then to contemplate such knowledge —that is as near as art can get to any steadiness of joy.

Alsatian Alsace

By LEWIS S. GANNETT

I. Alsace and Lorraine

ALSACE is not French; nor is it German; it is Alsatian. That is a fact which the Germans never got through their heads, and which the French are neglecting. Alsace is a border country with a long tradition of its own, with customs and habits and drinks of its own, with a speech of its own which is a dialect of German but is distinctively Alsatian. The Alsatians never thought or spoke of themselves as Germans when under German rule; they do not think or speak of themselves as French today; they distinguish themselves as "Alsatians" from the "French"—who prefer to call themselves "français de l'intérieur." They wanted to return to France but not to become French; they expected, under French rule, more local freedom and autonomy; and they are disappointed in finding that they have less local self-government, and that the French want to root out a tongue which they have spoken for near a thousand years. They do not want to return to Germany; far from it. Few of them even want independence; they want self-government, preservation of their local speech, customs, and laws, within the French Republic.

In all this I speak of Alsace, not of Alsace-Lorraine. Alsace-Lorraine is a compound word of German origin; it names the territories annexed by Germany in 1871, which are not a homogeneous unit. For whereas Alsace is a geographic and historic entity, speaking, except for a few small valleys, a common tongue, Lorraine is a fragment and a compound. The boundaries of Alsace are clear; but Lorraine is a vague term. The Germans annexed only a part of Lorraine; old Lorraine had its capital at Nancy, on the French side of the 1871 frontier. Today Lorraine students refuse to be attracted by the University of Strasbourg, and prefer to go to their own Lorraine university at Nancy even though its faculties be less lustrous. Annexed Lorraine was a series of valleys and plateaus geographically related less to Alsace than to the Lorraine which continued French, and the tremendous industrial development of the iron fields on both sides of the frontier has made the two Lorraines more than ever an economic unit. Alsace is separated from the rest of France by a mountain-range and a language. Lorraine has no mountain-range to bar it, and the linguistic frontier is well within the 1871 line. A third of annexed Lorraine always spoke French. A large part of German-speaking Lorraine is today a great industrial scar, a series of smoky coal-and-iron cities, a sort of Pittsburgh region in more senses than one. Nearly a hundred thousand immigrant Italians work there; nearly half as many Poles. The Germans who form the bulk of the industrial population are not native to the region, but are immigrants, too, with no roots in the soil, men who have deserted their homes to seek their fortunes in a strange country. The problem of their assimilation to France is like our American problem of assimilation of the alien and often transient immigrant; difficult enough, but utterly different from the problem with an old people such as the Alsatians who still live on their own soil amid their own traditions. Neither Alsatians nor Lorrainers think or talk of "Alsace-Lorraine"; they think and talk of Alsace or of Lorraine. I shall here confine myself to Alsace.

II. A Bit of History

It is perhaps worth while to recapitulate a little of the unadvertised history of the first half of November, 1918—the half before the French entered Strasbourg. Alsace had its revolution, just as did the rest of Germany. The workers and the soldiers—the soldiers, chiefly—proclaimed the workers' republic on November 9, and formed a Council of Workers and Soldiers which very effectively preserved order and prevented plunder while the returning German soldiers were pouring homeward across Alsace. They flew the red flag from the cathedral tower. German officers, if they ventured on the streets of Strasbourg in those days, did so in civilian clothes; otherwise they were subject to attack. In Metz, Colmar, Haguenau, Mulhouse, and other cities similar councils were formed. At the last moment the German Government in Berlin tried to make the over-long delayed concession and grant Alsace-Lorraine full local autonomy within the German Empire. The mayor of Strasbourg, Dr. Schwander, and the leader of the Alsatian Centrum Party, Karl Hauss, tried to form a government on this basis, but in vain. Dr. Schwander left Alsace on November 13; Hauss retired to his printing-shop. Instead the elected members of the lower house of the Alsatian Landtag met and selected from among their number a ministry—called a "provisional executive committee"—in which the Socialists and the strongly pro-French interests were heavily represented. They proclaimed themselves a National Council on November 12, and declared it to be "the urgent duty of all officials to remain at their posts and continue their business as previously" and asserted that "the protection of the law will continue to be accorded to all circles of the population without distinction." Announcement was made to Berlin of the formation of this council, and Ebert and Haase replied for the imperial Government wishing the council success. Meanwhile the Strasbourg Municipal Council had reorganized, had elected the Socialist Peirotes mayor, and had voted to cooperate with the Council of Workers and Soldiers in maintaining order. The soldiers objected to the display of the French tricolor; a compromise was reached whereby the soldiers took the red flag down from the cathedral tower and the municipality decided not to fly the tricolor. The municipal council confirmed a declaration of the National Council that officials who remained at their posts would be retained and well treated—a promise later most grievously broken.

On November 15 the French entered Mulhouse; on the 16th, Colmar; on the 17th, Metz; on November 22 General Gouraud entered Strasbourg. It was a tremendous occasion. The people of Strasbourg were ready to celebrate, and the French helped. Yards of blue, white, and red bunting were imported (from Frankfurt, much of it!), Alsatian costumes were brought in (mostly from Paris), the streets were decorated, Strasbourg had white bread for the first time in years, the weather was perfect, the military display gorgeous. The enthusiasm was real; those who regretted the change were so assured of it that they decorated too in self-protection. Had the French had the political sagacity to take a plebiscite at once, the result would have been an almost unanimous vote for attachment to France,

and the plebiscite question would have been settled once for all. Fête followed fête. On November 25 Marshal Pétain entered Strasbourg; on November 27 Marshal Foch; on December 9 President Poincaré.

Meanwhile the Government was taking a new form. The Soldiers' Council had vanished with the last German troops on November 18; the Workers' Council, as unwelcome to the new rulers, soon followed it. The National Council, on December 5, issued this proclamation welcoming the French:

> The elected deputies of Alsace and of Lorraine, who have constituted a National Assembly, cordially welcome the return of Alsace and of Lorraine, after a long and cruel separation, to France. Our provinces will be proud to owe to their restored mother country a new era of freedom, of growth, and of happiness, as well as the protection of their institutions, their faith, and their economic interests, which has been solemnly guaranteed to them by the leaders of the victorious armies. . . . The return of Alsace and of Lorraine and their reunion with France is final and independent of any negotiation

The reference to the promises of the French generals, made when the French first entered Alsace in 1914, is significant. Much of the recent fight against the policy of "Francisation" is based upon Marshal Joffre's promise to respect the traditions and institutions of Alsace. There were members of the National Council so intensely French that they wanted to omit the reference to that promise, but they were voted down. But the vote of the National Council made little difference; the council, after all, was itself suspect as a revolutionary product without legal standing. The French ignored it, and it soon died of inanition. Alsace, under French rule, has no elected representative body of its own; it is governed by French officials even more completely than it was by German officials. In French eyes the history of the previous forty-eight years in Alsace was a horrid blot, to be forgotten; in Alsatian eyes it was an uncomfortable period of Alsatian development, to be built upon. The Alsatians had fought long to win their representative parliament from Germany; it was abolished. The government for a time was put in charge of three commissioners, one for Lorraine, one for Upper, and one for Lower Alsace, the Strasbourg commissioner having an ill-defined authority over the others and being in turn responsible to a ministerial secretary in Paris. A "Superior Council" formed about half and half of Alsatians and Frenchmen, appointed by the Government, was established as a transitory measure. This was later expanded into a Consultative Council including also the Alsace and Lorraine deputies and a few members indirectly elected by the departmental councils which had been elected in December, 1919, but it still has only consultative powers. The arrival of M. Millerand as General Commissar in March, 1919, brought a certain centralization of administrative control in Strasbourg and a corresponding gain in administrative efficiency. His successor, M. Alapetite, is still in office. Alsace is still governed by Parisians, aided chiefiy by "revenants"—the Alsatians who had lived for fifty years in exile. However fine may have been the gesture of their departure, they are not looked upon as heroes in Alsace today, or even as men in touch with present-day needs and developments—rather as slackers.

III. Grievances

Government from Paris does not necessarily mean oppression; but it is very likely to involve mistakes and misunderstandings. The difficulty of including Alsace and Lorraine within the administrative system of France should not be overlooked. France is not, like Germany, a federal state; it is one of the most highly centralized states of Europe. Here were provinces which were henceforth to be a part of France. They had a different legal code, a different railroad system, different administrative methods, a different relation of church and state, a different school system. Throughout the length and breadth of France all these things are uniform. It used to be the proud boast of a Minister of Public Instruction that at any given hour he could tell just what the pupils were studying in every school in France. The various "departments" of France have almost no local self-government; their governors, called "préfets," are named from Paris. Now there is in France a "regionalist" movement which would like to see this system changed, to have the departments grouped together in larger units with a certain historic and economic unity, and to give these regions a degree of self-government which would relieve France of some of the burden of bureaucratic centralization in Paris. The regionalists saw in the return of Alsace and of Lorraine an opportunity for initiation, if only locally, of their dream. The Alsatians and Lorrainers naturally welcomed the idea, although they wanted two departments instead of one. Routine officialdom naturally opposed the plan. The result has been a temporary compromise which satisfies no one. As regards the administration of the schools, the railroads, the law courts, the civil service, there is an undertone of profound discontent. The Alsatians say of themselves that they are stubborn squareheads, accustomed to centuries of fighting against all manner of rulers; and some Frenchmen say that they have so got the habit of opposition during fifty years of German rule that it may take them another fifty years to recover. But the Alsatians also consider themselves superior to either French or Germans; they believe that they have German administrative efficiency without German stiffness and gracelessness. They say that the German law code in vogue in Alsace is more modern than the French, that their civil-service regulations are more satisfactory, that their social insurance system is preferable to the French lack of system, and that in these matters France would do better to learn from Alsace rather than attempt to force Alsace back to 1871 methods. They disliked many of the Germans, but they believe in German system, and they insist that many of the administrative changes introduced in Alsace since 1871 have been Alsatian, not Prussian, in origin. "A little more order, a little less liberty" is a common phrase in Alsace today.

Of course the Alsatians, like every other people in the world, blame many of their troubles which are really universal phenomena of the world crisis upon their present rulers. But the local language question, and the clerical question with which, in Alsace, it is inextricably involved, are themost significant and most festering of their problems.

The currency question was naturally the first problem to be attacked. The Alsatians had their money in marks, and the mark, normally worth 1.25 francs, had sunk to a value of .81⅓ francs in the month before the armistice and to about .70 a month after. By a decree of November 26, 1919, the French Government announced that all Alsatians and Lorrainers should report the amount of money they had on hand within ten days, that banks should announce their balances as of the end of the month, and that in the week from December 15 to 23 this German money would be changed into French at the normal exchange rate of 1.25 francs to the mark, after which the German money would be legally invalid. The operation cost the French Government more than two billion francs; it was extremely generous, and politically wise, although far more costly than had been anticipated. Some details of the valorization of German papers held by Alsatians are still unsettled, and many Alsatians who could not return until after the general valorization had their difficulties with bureaucratic stupidity. A writer in the New York *World* recently charged that in this valorization Germans and German sympathizers were discriminated against. I investigated this charge with some care. It was, naturally, not the intention of the French Government to give German citizens the benefit of such an artificial and generous exchange rate; and the cases of Alsatians who did not return from Germany until after December 15 were examined with what must have seemed unnecessary punctilio. But Alsatians of intense German sympathies with whom I talked assured me that there had been no discrimination against pro-German Alsatians as such; on the contrary they told me that a great many Germans took advantage of the French Government and induced Alsatian friends to change their money for them! I believe the *World's* charge to be quite unjustified.

Under German rule Alsatians were systematically kept in the lower administrative posts; all the high posts were held by Germans. Under French rule, Alsatians charge, the system is little changed. The French now hold the high posts; the Alsatians are kept down. This is one of the most universal complaints. All the school inspectors, almost the entire faculty of the University of Strasbourg (except the theological staff), all except the lowest ranks of judges, all the higher postal and railroad officials are "French of the interior." From the French point of view this is inevitable. The Alsatians who might be advanced have been trained in German methods; many of them do not speak French easily; and the immediate necessity is to swing Alsace over into the French system. As soon as Alsatians become thoroughly trained in French methods, the French say, they can be advanced. I think the French are perfectly sincere in this, and have no desire to dominate; the trouble is fundamentally that many Alsatians are not ready to accept the supposed necessity of immediate Francisation, and believe that in Alsace today ability to speak German is more important than knowledge of French. They resent, too, the fact that French officials are, or until recently have been, better paid than Alsatians of the same rank. French civil officials going to Alsace were at first paid, in addition to their salary, a "metropolitan indemnity" such as is paid to officials in the colonies as compensation for the supposed necessity of maintaining two establishments. This is no longer paid to new officials coming from France, but those who came early still profit by it. The German civil servants, too, had excellent civil-service regulations; they had a fixity of tenure, a regular system of promotion and of pensions which has seemed to risk destruction in the process of amalgamation. As regards the insurance system, at least, the ideal solution is almost on the point of realization; a bill extending the Alsatian system of social insurance to the rest of France is being sponsored by the French Government! And, as rising prices have added more serious grievances to those which distinguished them, French and Alsatian civil servants have found their wants essentially common, and after two years of bitter fighting each other they have joined forces to fight the Government. The complaint has lost its local character.

Space lacks to tell the stories of other grievances—the difficulties in applying French law; the opposition of the railroad workers to the attempt of the French Government to sell the Alsatian state line to a private French company which the workers rightly regard as a less efficiently operated concern; the long fight of the French port interests against the port of Strasbourg which claimed and won the right to import goods via Antwerp without paying the special taxes provided for ocean-carried goods entering France by other than a French port; the labor troubles between German-speaking workmen and French-speaking foremen; infinite other difficulties which have flamed resentfully in Alsatian breasts and in the Alsatian press, which have left their unpleasant mark, but which are not of lasting import. The language question persists and will long persist; and the deportations, while of less political importance, are perhaps the greatest stain on French rule in Alsace.

[To be continued.]

Good Union or Bad?

By GEORGE SOULE

ON the face of it the victory of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in the New York market does not look like a victory for revolution. Last fall the union and the manufacturers, operating under the usual impartial machinery which provides for peaceful adjustment of all disputes, began to negotiate about wages, piece work, and such matters. After many conferences a settlement seemed in sight when the manufacturers suddenly issued an ultimatum containing demands which no union could accept—including individual bargaining. The union did not accept them, whereupon the manufacturers refused to negotiate further, broke up the arbitration machinery, locked out their employees, and entered upon an attempt to destroy the union. Now, after six months, the few irreconcilables have resigned from the manufacturers' association, and the rest have capitulated. What is the result? Does the union march in with red flags and take possession of the factories? Does it throw bombs into the City Hall? No, it simply restores constitutional government in the clothing industry, and proceeds to negotiate at exactly the same point where it left off six months ago. There will be a reasonable settlement, arrived at in view of the facts, about wages, piece work, production standards, and so on.

But Senator Lusk tells us that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America is a very, very bad union. It is industrial. It is radical. It is revolutionary. The New York manufacturers, when they precipitated the recent struggle, told us the same thing. They did not really care much about lowering wages, increasing profits, and all that sort of thing. They were fighting for a principle. They were protecting Americanism against the encroachment of "sovietism." They even entered a suit for dissolution against the union, asking at the same time for damages of half a million dollars, on the ground that it was a conspiracy to seize their property and destroy their business. In view of the events which led up to the trouble this would seem like an unwarranted assertion. It would seem as if the class

of employers were quarreling with the class of employees about the processes and proceeds of industry, and as if the class of employers had said, We insist on our own absolute rule in this matter, and as if the employees had said, We insist on the preservation of an industrial government which gives us a voice. Nevertheless, the manufacturers pointed, not to what the union had done, but to what it had said. First of all, they pointed to the preamble of its constitution. This preamble begins with a few general statements.

The economic organization of labor has been called into existence by the capitalist system of production, under which the division between the ruling class and the ruled class is based upon the ownership of the means of production. The class owning those means is the one that is ruling, the class that possesses nothing but its labor power, which is always on the market as a commodity, is the one that is being ruled.

A constant and unceasing struggle is being waged between these two classes. In this struggle the economic organization of labor, the union, is a natural weapon of offense and defense in the hands of the working class.

So far one would almost suspect that the action of the employers had been carefully designed to demonstrate to the backsliding members of the union the truth of their preamble. The union had been acting as if the struggle between the two classes were not "constant and unceasing." It had been doing its best to perpetuate a peaceful means of settling disputes. But the employers would have none of that. Labor being "on the market as a commodity," and the supply of that commodity being in excess of the demand, the employers had deliberately renewed the struggle, intrenched as they were in "ownership of the means of production," and resolved as they were to rule. This action led the workers to use their union as a natural weapon of defense. It proves out like a problem in geometry.

The preamble then goes on to point out that, in order to be effective, unions must have a structure corresponding to the structure of industrial organization, that modern industrial methods have largely wiped out demarcations between crafts, and that unions must therefore be organized by industries rather than by crafts. That seems like a reasonable inference. And recent events would also tend to support the following statement: "The same forces that have been making for industrial unionism are likewise making for a closer inter-industrial alliance of the working class." Then comes the paragraph at which the employers raise their hands in horror.

The industrial and inter-industrial organization, built upon the solid rock of clear knowledge and class consciousness, will put the organized working class in actual control of the system of production, and the working class will then be ready to take possession of it.

Just what does that paragraph mean? The employers, through their counsel, said it means that the members of the Amalgamated have associated themselves together in a conspiracy, plotting at some time in the future to seize their factories. Justice Bijur of the New York Supreme Court, denying the motion for injunction and dissolution, dismissed the sentence as little more than a verbal flourish.

I think the phrases quoted are quite innocuous. They express some ideal which it is hoped may at some time be achieved. But even if we do violence to its plain intendment and endeavor to read into the literal words a suggestion that it is hoped that the working class shall be put into actual control and possession of the instrumentalities of production rather than of merely the "system" of production, as actually expressed, there is still absent any statement or even implication that this is to be accomplished by forcible or other unlawful means.

So far as the legal implications of the matter go, Justice Bijur is undoubtedly right. But we shall not understand the Amalgamated and its activities, or any similar union, unless we go a little deeper. There is a real difference between most of the labor organizations which Senator Lusk would ignorantly denounce and the old-fashioned unions which by contrast he approves. It is a difference perhaps not in kind, but in degree of self-consciousness, in maturity. What is it that kept the clothing workers struggling year after year against seemingly impossible odds until they finally were able to build a great industrial union which raised them out of the sweatshops and introduced some kind of order into the former industrial chaos of their lives? What is it that has made them stand by this union and render it victorious in a bitter struggle such as the one just ended? For surely no union ever went to battle under more unfavorable conditions and came through with so few casualties. For months before the trouble broke out there had been a severe depression in the industry, and at the moment of the breach there were not only thousands of unemployed, but those who had work had eaten up most of their savings. The vigorous open-shop campaign led the employers to make a determined attack. And to the conflict on the industrial field was added a shower of injunctions, arrests, and suits against the union for sums aggregating millions of dollars. The lockout lasted nearly six months, including the coldest weeks of winter. Yet there were no desertions of consequence from the ranks of the strikers; in spite of all, the employers could not operate their factories. The quality of courage and determination that is required among thousands of workers to endure a long and heart-breaking test of this nature implies something more than the kind of emotion which would be aroused by a quarrel over a few dollars more or less a week. It implies a superb morale, the sort of morale which can exist in an army only through the consciousness of a great cause. There must be here one of those imponderables which give life to patriotism or religion.

At the basis of this morale is an aspiration for a more just social order, which can grow only from a more just government of industry. Like the American colonists of 1776, the clothing workers object to autocratic rule. They recognize the class conflict in their preamble, not because they like it, but because they dislike it and intend to do away with it. They know they can never do away with it by submitting unconditionally. The form of collective adjustment which they have won is like a constitution wrested by a people from a ruling class. To preserve this constitution they are willing to undergo untold sacrifices. As long as they can preserve their constitution, they intend to use it for progressive improvement of the industry which they feel by right is theirs.

It is stupidity of the crudest sort to believe that a deep motive of this sort is destructive and can in the long run injure the people or the culture of America. On the contrary, it leads to trouble only when it is thwarted. Given a chance to grow and function, endowed with recognition and responsibility, it will flower in a higher technique in industry, in a finer spirit in society. It is infinitely more hopeful than the trading instinct, the demand for a few dollars more and a few hours less, to which, according to our Luskers, "good" unions must confine themselves.

In the Driftway

RAILROAD officials say that a standard minimum wage for their workers is contrary to the ideas "on which American institutions and American progress have been founded and maintained." But there is no objection on their part to a standard minimum wage for capital, such as the 6 per cent provided for holders of railroad stock by the Esch-Cummins law.

* * * * *

THE Drifter culls the following from a letter to him from Lewis Gannett who is traveling abroad for *The Nation*. Having dabbled in journalism in his day the Drifter believes that many a reporter would do well to clip the appended litany and carry it in his wallet or watch-case or wherever else reporters carry precious mementos.

"Alsace cud be made lots more sensational if one had no devotion to truth; more interesting, too. In fact, mulling over the accursed thing yesterday, my thots ran—or stumbled—together into a litany, somewhat thus:

I serve a cold God,
A He-God,
Without Love.
Other Gods are She-Gods,
Warm Gods,
Loving Gods;
They caress those who serve them.
My God resents swelling sound,
radiant color,
fragrant incense.
He is without voluptuousness.
I hate my God.
My God is Truth.

"So much for the state of mind of a second-rate journalist returned to the company of artists and flaneurs in Paris from Alsace and Germany."

* * * * *

MR. EDISON, of course, is only one of many to make unkind remarks about the young men of our colleges. Criticism comes almost wholly from without, however, and it is the failure of the young men themselves to admit, resent, or in any way to react to such strictures that most justifies the things said. Therefore, one notes with cheer the publication of a "Harvard Credo" in the *Proletarian*, a student weekly. In this contribution at least one campus satirist reveals himself and suggests the presence of a "boring from within" that is reassuring. Here are some of the things which a Harvard student is said to believe:

That Calvin Coolidge saved Boston.
That there is a gun base under the Germanic Museum.
That the American Revolution was rather a mistake.
That the supreme experience is kissing a chorus girl.
That, except when used by auctioneers and the Harvard Corporation, the red flag is sacrilegious.
That anarchy is a state of things where one can come to Harvard having gone neither to Groton nor St. Paul's.
That S. Gompers is a distinguished Bolshevist.
That there is a difference between Princeton snobbishness and Harvard aloofness.
That Brother Gamaliel is an island entirely surrounded with best minds.
That Socialists always try to marry money.
That keeping Debs in jail protects Americans.
That free speech, verse, and love are just about the same.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

A Hymn of Hate

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The reason you will lose me as one of your subscribers is *The Nation's* attitude on the Black Outrage in Germany.

I just finished reading, and in part rereading, Lewis S. Gannett's article in the May 15 issue of *The Nation*.

I charge that Mr. Gannett's article and the printing of it on the part of the editors of *The Nation* is an attempt to *whitewash* one of the blackest crimes of all history.

I care not for your motives—whether they be evil or good. We want the truth.

God pity France in the next war—and *England!*

Bogota, N. J., May 23 F. P. WILHELM

[We fear that Mr. Wilhelm, who is District Superintendent of Home Missions of the Atlantic District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, is not displaying a Christian spirit. We suspect that he does not want the truth, and that he has digested some of the mass of propaganda coming out of Germany concerning the "Black Horror on the Rhine." Mr. Gannett made a first-hand investigation; but long before that *The Nation* was in correspondence with mayors of cities and other Germans of standing in the Rhineland in an endeavor to learn the truth. That the quartering of troops—regardless of color—works great hardships on the civilian population is undoubted, and *The Nation* has repeatedly so stated; but the facts in relation to the black troops do not warrant the propaganda campaign being waged, with especial vigor in this country. If the Germans and German-Americans wish to agitate against the injustices which they feel are being inflicted on the German people by the conquerors—forgetting the great responsibility of Germany's former rulers for the situation—they can find ample and valid issues in the move to take away Silesia, in the threatened occupation of the Ruhr, in the attempt to enslave Germany economically for generations. Some prefer to stir up hate over the one issue involved in the location of some divisions of colored troops in the Rhineland, counting on America's well-known color psychosis. This is as mistaken as it is futile. A great many who have been carried into this movement are sincere, but they have been grievously misled by their Vierecks and their Von Machs.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Natural and Unnatural History

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You cite the inscription on the European bison in the Museum of Natural History, "Described by Caesar, hunted by Charlemagne, and exterminated by the Bolsheviki." That it was hunted by Charlemagne I don't doubt; whether it has now been exterminated, and by whom, are questions on which I am content to keep an open mind for the moment; but somebody ought to hurry to the Museum to tell the curator that it was never described by Caesar. There were in ancient and medieval Europe two big wild beasts of ox kind: the smaller, a short-horned creature known in Anglo-Saxon as *wesend*, in Old High German as *wisunt*, which name the Romans borrowed in the form *bison*, and this name clings to the beast to this day; and the larger, the long-horned beast known to all branches of our Teutonic forefathers as *ur*, described by Caesar under the Latinized form of that name, with mention of its "amplitudo cornuum" and its "magnitudo paulo infra elephantos." Since the wesend survived after the ur became extinct, people began to interpret the ancient mentions of the ur as meaning the wesend; the name "aurochs," the modern form of "ur," was for a while a fully recognized name of the bison; then pedants did the only thing that could further be done to increase the confusion, by starting a movement to restore the

name of aurochs to the old-time ur. It would be Utopian to expect the public to keep the story straight; but specialists, like those at the Museum, ought to know which was which of two such notable beasts.

The trouble is not at an end with the confusion between the beasts. The old Germans were so rash as to form the compound "ur-ochs" (whence the "aurochs" of today), and sundry modern scholars have made haste to mistake the syllable *ur* in this name for the well-known German prefix meaning "primitive," forgetful of the fact that the form *urochs* was used only while the beast was still extant and while, therefore, nobody would think of calling it as Professor Briggs does in his commentary on Psalms, "yore-ox"; when it passed into the limbo of history and began really to be a yore-ox, its name was no longer *urochs* but *auerochs*. I suppose it is to this confusion that the beast owes its modern Latin name, *Bos primigenius*.

But if Professor Briggs has mistaken the meaning of *ur*, at least he has got the right animal, and is so far better than Professor Haupt, who in his Polychrome Bible argues that the Hebrew *reem*, the "unicorn" of the familiar English Bible, cannot be the ur because the *reem* was a long-horned creature and the bison is short-horned.

Ballard Vale, Mass., May 11 STEVEN T. BYINGTON

Educators, Not Militarists, Needed

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am glad that you called the attention of your readers to the fact that New York State has abandoned compulsory military training. I was one of three who attended the Senate Military Affairs Committee's public hearing to favor Senator Mullan's bill for repealing the Compulsory Military Training Law. I sat for over two hours listening to the speeches of old men, young men, and boys, waiting to make my plea that the education of the youth of our State should be in the hands of educators and not of military men. During this time I got many interesting sidelights on why military training is popular with some people. A number of the speakers looked like the "anyone who can govern by military rule."

There are two points which I should like to see given greater publicity. First, everyone who favored compulsory military training seemed to have a direct or indirect financial interest arising out of it; second, Senator Mullan said, in his introductory remarks, he had been in favor of military training until he saw what it did to his own boy.

New York, April 27 MARGARET LORING THOMAS

Let Us Be Fair to Russia

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Considerable rhetoric has been expended of late to convince the American people that just so long as citizens of this country are imprisoned in Soviet Russia all pleas from Moscow for recognition will be ignored. It is not the purpose of the writer to justify the incarceration of fellow-Americans by Soviet authorities. But all Americans who value human freedom as the most sacred of all rights must remember with a feeling of shame and humiliation that men and women of Russian birth who left the land of their fathers to settle in the republic across the sea have been brutalized, beaten, and jailed in the country which they had been told was a haven of hospitality and goodwill to the lowly and oppressed. Who of us forgets that thousands of American soldier lads were sent into the bleak, windswept steppes of northern Russia to do battle with a long-suffering people against whom no American true to the traditions of '76 and '61 had any grievance?

Would it not be best for us as Americans to confess in all candor our own shortcomings ere we attempt to silence the hopes and aspirations of 180,000,000 Russians who look to us as leaders in the onward march to civilization?

Dorchester, Mass., May 20 VICTOR GERTLIN

Oil and Mexico

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the issue of *The Nation* of April 27 there appeared an article by Mr. Paul Hanna on Mexico's relations with the United States, the first part of which is in regard to the oil situation. Being assured, as I am, that *The Nation's* policy is to fight fairly and not to permit the public to be misled by any articles appearing in its columns, I ask your attention to the following statements made by Mr. Hanna and to the following comments concerning them. The main point in his bitter arraignment of the American oil companies is perhaps the following:

> It has been carefully concealed from the American people that land ownership in Mexico has never, since the Spaniards came there, carried with it any title to the sub-soil deposits or any right to exploit them. . . . Owners of grazing or agricultural lands have always had to recognize the state's ownership of everything under the surface; and the Constitution of 1917 reaffirms that principle.

In my article which you published October 5, 1918, I quote the exact language of the law of the Mexican Mining Code of 1884, established sixteen years before the commercial development of the petroleum industry commenced in Mexico. May I requote a part of Section 10 as follows:

> Art. 10. The following substances are the *exclusive property* of the owner of the land, who may, therefore, develop and enjoy them without the formality of denouncement or special adjudication: . . .
>
> IV. Salts found on the surface, fresh and salt water, whether surface or subterranean; *petroleum* and gaseous springs, or springs of warm or medicinal waters.

Mr. Hanna had apparently not thought it worth while to even glance at this statute, but was willing to be regarded as stating in the most unqualified manner that owners of lands "always had to recognize the state's ownership of everything under the surface."

The most effective comment upon his statements is to point to the statute above quoted, and say nothing further.

In the next place, eight years afterwards, in 1892, another law was passed which in different language affirms the same identical principle. I quote from it as follows:

> Art. 4. The owner of the land may freely work, without a special franchise in any case whatsoever, the following mineral substances: *mineral fuels, oils,* and mineral waters.
>
> Art. 5. All mining property legally acquired and such as hereafter may be acquired in pursuance of this law shall be irrevocable and perpetual, etc.

In 1909 another mining code was passed which likewise maintains precisely the same principle. It says:

> Art. 2. The following substances are the exclusive property of the owner of the soil:
>
> I. Ore bodies or deposits of *mineral fuels,* of whatever form or variety.
>
> II. Ore bodies or deposits of *bituminous* substances.

From the foregoing it therefore appears, not as a matter of argument, but of positive demonstration that at no time between 1884 and 1917, when the Queretaro Constitution was adopted, did the nation of Mexico claim to be the owner of petroleum underneath the surface, and, on the contrary, that that nation expressly and at all times had declared that the owner of the land owned the petroleum beneath the surface of the land.

It seems to me that a great deal of trouble would be saved—it certainly is so as to the Mexican petroleum situation—if those who purport to write upon a given subject which involves a study of any particular law would take the trouble to firs read the language of the law.

If space permitted I could readily show you how the principle embodied in these three laws was not merely controlling during the period of 1884 to 1917, but was, as a matter of fact, controlling ever since the days of the dominance of the Spanish Crown; for an analysis of the various somewhat conflicting decrees issued by the Spanish kings will show that even in those days clear distinctions were drawn between metalliferous minerals and non-metalliferous minerals, the former belonging to the patrimony of the Crown and the latter being exempt therefrom.

Since Mr. Hanna's entire attack upon the American petroleum companies is based upon the theory that the Constitution of 1917 "reaffirms" the principle which he supposes to exist, to the effect that the nation always owned petroleum, it is evident that the demolition of his major premise is fatal to his conclusion.

In the same column he refers to "the invading capitalists," stating that:

> Ten years of revolution, moreover, gave them both pretext and opportunity to flout the laws and decrees of successive administrations or to denounce them before the world as the looting devices of adventurous upstarts.

The language is, one may say, somewhat spirited; but the facts are that no American capitalists have ever flouted any law or decree of any Mexican administration except in the sense that they have strenuously fought, and always will continue to fight, the alleged laws which purport to take from them the property which they bought and paid for in the best of good faith and pursuant to the terms of the mining codes which I have quoted above verbatim.

If these men were "invading capitalists," it is certainly true that the invading was done at the express invitation of the laws of the country that was "invaded." Shortly after the phrase just quoted, Mr. Hanna says:

> The retroactive application of that clause (i.e., Article 27 of the Constitution of 1917) decreed by Carranza and still in effect, has been especially attacked by the oil interests as a just cause for military intervention by the United States.

I am much interested to see that Mr. Hanna himself characterizes this article of the Constitution as applying *retroactively*. This seems at first thought to indicate that Mr. Hanna possibly knew a little more about the laws of 1884, 1892, and 1909 than he might be given credit for knowing; because if, as he says below, land owners "have always had to recognize the state's ownership of everything under the surface," manifestly the Constitution of 1917 was not retroactive, and the fact that he uses the word "retroactive" in that connection would seem to be inconsistent with any other theory than that he knew that, as a matter of fact, petroleum belonged, under the laws of 1884, 1892, and 1909 to the owners of the surface.

The last phrase of the sentence just quoted accuses the "oil interests" of urging "military intervention by the United States." This statement is an easy one to make and it has been easily made by hundreds of the upholders of the Carranza confiscatory program.

No person has ever stated any facts from which any such conclusion could be properly drawn, and there are no facts which can be thus stated, for the American petroleum companies are not and have not been interventionists and have always believed and still believe that if the situation is handled in a dignified and firm manner by the United States Government, no intervention will be necessary.

There is a very simple way of testing the sincerity of this statement, and that is if the Obregon Administration will immediately take steps to do away with the confiscatory provisions of Mexico's Constitution and laws as well as with the acts committed under those provisions.

The next sentence contains the bold statement:

> I doubt if that [i.e., the annulment of the retroactive application of Article 27] will satisfy them [i.e., the American oil interests], since their real desire is for a right of way to the still undisclosed oil deposits and not a simple acknowledgment of title to their present rich holdings.

A statement of this sort has no place, it seems to me, in the columns of a journal of the standing of *The Nation.* Not a word or an act on the part of any American petroleum company can be cited in support of such a conclusion. The statement has no basis in fact or in intention, and is simply a demonstration of a vindictive and hostile attitude on the part of a man who seeks to be considered as an authority upon a subject of very great national and real importance, but who either has not read the laws which lie at the foundation of the entire situation or who, if he has read them, has deliberately misquoted them.

I shall await your reply with the greatest interest and shall hope that no reason exists why the American petroleum producers should not be accorded the same privileges at the present time as those which you were so good as to extend to them in 1918.

New York, May 3 FREDERIC R. KELLOGG

MR. HANNA'S REPLY

Mr. Kellogg demands authority for my statement that landowners in Mexico "always had to recognize the state's ownership of everything under the surface." My authority is the Spanish common law and the Mexican Constitution of 1857, which was first violated by Porfirio Diaz when he gave the oil interests the fiat code of 1884, behind which Mr. Kellogg takes refuge. In the days of Porfirio Diaz there was no constitutional lawyer of higher repute in Mexico than Señor Manuel Calero. In discussing the third special Diaz dispensation, that of 1909, Señor Calero said:

> According to our juridical traditions in mining matters, all the mineral deposits and *inorganic substances* of the country's subsoil first belonged to the Spanish kingdom. . . . The system was perpetuated during our independent period, and the *Mining Code of 1884 is the* FIRST *Mexican legislation that brought about really important innovations which were expressly forbidden in Article 72 of the Constitution* (1857) *of the Republic.*

As proved by their wording, and the fact of their enactment, the three laws cited by Mr. Kellogg were intended solely to tear a hole in the "juridical traditions" which gave the state exclusive title to subsoil deposits. Therefore, as stated by Chief Counsel de la Peña, of the Mexican Department of Industry, "The Constitution of 1917, instead of reforming the Constitution of 1857, when it proclaimed the nation's dominion over the minerals and hydrocarbons, merely preserved the rights of the nation in the same manner in which they were safeguarded by the Constitution of 1857."

Article 72 of the Constitution of 1857 defines the scope of congressional jurisdiction, and in conformity to the common law specifically fails to give the Congress any right to meddle in mining. On December 14, 1883, Diaz jammed through an amendment to Section 10, upon which amendment Mr. Kellogg's law of the following year is based. All good Mexican lawyers knew and said it smashed the old principle, but few or none of them admitted its constitutionality, and it was never tested in the supreme court.

As the whole world knows, Porfirio Diaz tore up the Constitution of 1857 and remained in office more than thirty years, despite Article 78 of the Constitution, which stated: "The President and Vice-President shall enter upon their duties on the first day of December, shall serve six years, and shall never be reelected." The Revolution of 1910-1920, described and summarized in my articles, was a struggle by the Mexican people to destroy Diazism and recover their traditional freedom and control. When I wrote of what had never been constitutionally done in Mexico I certainly did not refer to acts under the *100 per cent unconstitutional regime of Porfirio Diaz.*

Mr. Kellogg says, "No American capitalists have ever flouted any law or decree of any Mexican administration. . . ." Let us see. Mr. Kellogg is general counsel, I believe, for the Huasteca Petroleum Company, owned by Mr. E. L. Doheny. All of that company's concessions in Mexico contain the following clause:

> The concessionnaire company shall be considered as Mexican, being subject, both as to the company itself and as to foreigners who have part in its business in the character of stockholders,

employees, or in whatever other character, to the laws and courts of the Republic. Never can it allege in respect to the property and business of the enterprise any right of extra-territoriality, under whatever pretext, and it shall have solely the right and means of making them valid which the laws of the Republic concede to Mexicans. *It shall consequently not be able to make appeal under the said business to foreign diplomatic agents.*

After Mr. Kellogg's company, and every other of its kind, have signed that pledge in order to obtain rich concessions, are they flouting Mexican law when they stuff the American State Department with war-making protests and charges against the Mexican Government?

Mr. Kellogg next points to my statement that Carranza attempted a retroactive application of Article 27 of the Constitution of 1917, and then proceeds by use of innuendo to indict my sincerity. I see nothing in that attempt to warrant a reply. Mr. Kellogg then mentions my statement that the oil interests have favored military intervention by the United States, and replies that "no person has ever stated any facts from which such a conclusion could be drawn." Again, let us see. I have before me a copy of the Mexico City newspaper *El Universal*. It contains a letter submitted by Mr. J. Salter Hansen on April 26, 1921. Mr. Kellogg will remember Mr. Hansen as the gentleman who prevented an invasion of Mexico sixteen months ago by suddenly depositing bail for the release of the famous "kidnapped" consul, Jenkins. Discussing Mr. Doheny's professed friendship for Mexico, Mr. Hansen writes in *El Universal:*

Mr. F. R. Kellogg, general counsel for the Huasteca Petroleum Company, made to me verbatim the following statement: "WE SHALL USE THE ARMY AND NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST MEXICO IF THEY DON'T SATISFY OUR DEMANDS. NOW REMEMBER THAT, MR. HANSEN!" The statement was made on or about January 10, 1919, in the office of the Standard Oil Company, 26 Broadway, New York City, in the presence of Mr. C. O. Swain and Mr. Burton Wilson. I knew, of course, that the Constitution of the United States of America does not give the power of using the army and navy of the U. S. A. to a private citizen, but I did not know at the time that Mr. Kellogg was the personal representative of Mr. Doheny and the accoucheur of his policy toward Mexican Governments—with the result that I became furiously angry.

While discussing Article 27 with Mr. Amos T. Beatty, president of the Texas Co., he said to me as follows: "As a boy I was a farmer in Iowa and I can assure you that every farmer in Iowa is ready to sacrifice his life for the sacred rights of our properties in Mexico." As I could not go to Iowa to interview every farmer in that State I was unable to confirm his statement, but I shall not contradict him, as Mr. Amos T. Beatty of the Texas Co. is an expert in the psychology of Iowa farmers.

About two years ago, during a short chat with Mr. Thomas Cochran, a partner of Messrs. J. P. Morgan and Co. and the gentleman in charge of the matter of the Mexican debt, he inspired me with the following remark: "WE ARE GOING TO KICK OUT CARRANZA AND WE ARE GOING TO KICK OUT WOODROW WILSON, AND THEN WE WILL HANDLE MEXICO AS WE DAMN PLEASE."

At one of my conferences with Mr. Chester O. Swain, general counsel of the Standard Oil Company of New York and chairman of the executive committee of the oil men in Mexico, I tried to induce the oil men to change their propaganda and put an end to their policy of trying to arouse hatred against Mexico in the United States. I urged him to speak kindly to and even to flatter Mexico. This is his verbatim answer: "WE WILL DO NOTHING OF THE KIND, HANSEN. THE MEXICANS ARE LIKE DOGS AND THE MORE YOU KICK THEM THE BETTER THEY LIKE IT."

To my statement that the oil interests covet a right of way to the still undisclosed oil deposits of Mexico, Mr. Kellogg replies that "no word or act on the part of any American petroleum company can be cited in support of such a conclusion." Perhaps my conclusion is not sound, but the facts as I understand them are these. Mr. Doheny claims title to some 4,000,000 acres of Mexican land. The law of 1881 requires that all landlords shall file a record of their titles at a public land office. Is it not true that Mr. Doheny refuses to register his title to more than some 550,000 acres of the land he claims? Why does he leave in a state of legal twilight seven-eighths of the territory he aims to exploit?

P. H.

Books

Franco-German Alliance

Les Drapeaux. By Paul Reboux. Paris: E. Flammarion.

WITH France on tiptoe to invade the Ruhr, with England and France at loggerheads over Silesia, and with Germany reduced to a condition of sullen submission, one would think the present an inopportune time to consider a Franco-German rapprochement. Nevertheless the movement appears to be gaining ground in both countries, and particularly in France. There have been various significant signs and portents, and, undeterred by a Chauvinist press and a majority in the French legislature which would willingly see a French army march to Berlin, certain prominent Frenchmen and Germans have been striving for another and better settlement: that is, a Franco-German entente, or better still, a Franco-German alliance.

One of the noteworthy indications of the tendency is the publication recently in a Paris newspaper, in feuilleton form, of a novel which has created a greater sensation and more discussion than any book which has appeared since the armistice. "Les Drapeaux" is by an author calling himself Paul Reboux, who, after unfolding his thesis in romantic guise and filling his readers with a horror of war and its results, argues that the only alternative to another and still more terrible war than the last is a Franco-German alliance, and that on such an alliance the future peace of Europe and of the world depends.

The principal character in "Les Drapeaux" is one Jacques Real, a celebrated French dramatist and publicist, who is on the road to be "crowned" by the Academy. He has served in useful capacities during the war, having been corporal in a hospital to a famous surgeon who since the war has devoted himself to restoring the faces and forms of mutilated soldiers. Jacques Real visits these men in their hospital and finds them terribly neglected. He compares their state with that of the rich profiteers with whom he happened to dine the previous evening, and writes an article describing their condition. He takes it to the famous journal with which he is associated, but it is declined as too depressing.

Real reflects and discusses the position of France with several friends. From one he learns that the Government and the newspapers are controlled by the big banks, that the governor of the Banque de France is virtually governor of France, sharing his power with the Credit Foncier, which so far from being a democratic institution, as many imagine, is feudal in its constitution and methods. In this connection remarkable revelations are made, and the names of such men as Poincaré, Millerand, Viviani, and others are freely mentioned. The exact amounts paid to *Le Matin*, *Le Journal*, *Le Figaro*, and *Le Petit Parisien* in return for their support of a Turkish loan shortly before the war are also given. Real finds there are serious men who believe that it would have been better to avoid war with Germany than to fight her, and that the banks and prominent public men are now, for selfish financial reasons, busily persuading the people that undying hatred of Germany was a sacred duty. Incidentally, the financial origin of all wars, especially from the Spanish-American war down to that of 1914, is clearly and categorically demonstrated.

In his researches into the truth, Real discovers how greatly the public was misled during the war by such writers as Lavedan, Barrès, Clemenceau, and others of similar rank, and many of the gross fables which appeared in the press are exposed. A distinguished soldier friend of Real calls on him and declares he is sickened with so-called glory and army life by the abuses he witnessed during the war. A holder of many decorations and two palms, he testifies to the brutality and cowardice of modern warfare, and at the same time foretells that the next war will be even more brutal and horrible than the last, that there will be no more guns and bayonets, but simply bombs and bacilli, poisons and gases, and that millions will perish where thousands perished before. He contends, moreover, that it is fear of the Germans today which oppresses the French, while it is fear of the French which causes the bitter hostility of the Germans.

A great factory owner, who shares his profits with his workmen, declares to Real that it would have been better for France not to oppose the Germans than to lose a million and a half of her sons, the flower of the nation, with two millions mutilated besides, as well as hundreds of cities and towns ruined; and that had the Germans established themselves in France they would have done so only to the same extent as in America, where they have conduced to the progress and prosperity of the country. Real goes into the country districts, and arrives definitely at the conclusion that patriotism, like love, is a passion which is likely to develop into a vice, rendering men fearful, jealous, quarrelsome, and hateful, and impeaching sane judgment, and that governments are to blame for making natural affection for one's country excessive and insane to the verge of war.

Ultimately Real visits Switzerland and Germany and realizes the hate which is being sedulously fostered between France and Germany. He recognizes that his own country's population is falling because of the selfish Malthusianism of the people, that Germany's population will be double that of France in ten years. He is also able to note the superior industry, ingenuity, and organization of the Germans, which give a guaranty of their future prosperity. He is thus compelled to realize that the only hope for future peace and progress lies in the cooperation and alliance of the two nations.

Incidentally, the question of the German atrocities is ventilated in "Les Drapeaux," and the author rebuts some of the charges, and demonstrates that such things are the inevitable accompaniment of war, instancing the atrocities of the French troops under Napoleon, and the treatment of the Boers by the British, the concentration camps in South Africa being compared with the deportations by the Germans. Reboux seeks to show that had France been advancing into Germany, and had her generals believed their movements were being overlooked from points of vantage, her troops would no more have spared Cologne Cathedral than the Germans spared Rheims, and moreover that the French themselves actually bombarded the collegiate church of St. Quentin. The conclusion arrived at by Real, who, because of his views, has lost his chance of a seat in the Academy and has had to fight a duel, is that between another war, one much more devastating than the last, and a Franco-German Alliance, he prefers the latter, and that his great ideal is a European League, with France and Germany as its most important factors.

JEROME HART

Benedetto Croce

Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille. By Benedetto Croce. Translated by Douglas Ainslee. Henry Holt and Company.
Goethe. Con una Scelta delle Liriche nuovamente tradotte. Bari: Gius. Laterza e Figli.

THE writings of Benedetto Croce are a constant and welcome reminder that criticism is neither research nor reviewing, neither a branch of scholarship nor a mere empiric art. It is philosophy—a reaction through the particular to the sum of things, a vision of totality applied to the concrete. A good deal of such philosophizing is, very properly and naturally, unconscious or unformulated. It remains true that every significant critic works with some Weltanschauung which, expressed in his individual judgments and opinions and in his very style, is his ultimate and real contribution to literature, thought, and life. In Signor Croce the process is a highly conscious one. He started out, it is evident enough, as both a philological research scholar and a student of metaphysics. His mind was cradled in Germany, nursed by the portentous methodology of research and the metaphysics of Hegel. At some point in his development a sharp reaction took place. Signor Croce saw that nine-tenths of the research scholars in all countries are dull dogs, that literary influences and source-mongering have a habit of quietly dropping the aesthetic fact by the roadside, and that hence the whole study of literature was in danger of turning into the manufacture of degree and dissertation fodder. He attached himself passionately to aesthetic philosophy. He left even Hegel behind him in his fiery flight. He built an aesthetic and a new criticism around a single central and controlling thought.

A few crucial passages will give us access to that thought. "The true material of art," he writes, "is not things, but the sentiments of the poet which determine and explain one another, why and for what reason he turns to certain things, to these things rather than to others." And each of these sentiments, though "it has really been experienced, is plucked from its practical and realistic soil the moment it is raised to the sphere of poetry and is made the motive of composition for a world of dreams." In that world "it is useless to seek any longer the reality of that sentiment." Experience in the practical world, in other words, undergoes when aesthetically expressed a fundamental change, a change in its very mode of being. Hence it is useless, according to Croce, and even vicious, to seek the sources of aesthetic phenomena in the lives of poets. Poetry is, indeed, expression, pure expression. But it is the expression of some innate devotion to the rhythm of the universe, some general sense of life, some a priori ideal of sublimity and moral dignity. The idea of art as imitation, whether in the stiff Aristotelian sense or in some later and more flexible one, is wholly repudiated. The aesthetic fact is stringently, almost violently isolated and referred wholly to the air- and watertight subjectivity of the poetic mind.

It is clear that such an aesthetic theory is metaphysically grounded. The fact soon appears that Signor Croce is a pure idealist. The world is his creation; causality is not a cosmic law but a function of the mind. And as the idealist builds his conceptual domes of many-colored glass by following what seem to him the necessary laws of thought, so the poet builds up his universe by the independent and unfertilized propagation of aesthetic sentiments. "As though things existed outside the spirit!" Signor Croce exclaims. As though Shakespeare is "either in accordance or disaccordance with external reality!" Like every poet "he has nothing to do with it, being intent upon the creation of his own spiritual reality." There is, one sees at once, an inner contradiction here. If nothing exists outside the spirit, why this eager distinction between an external reality and a spiritual one? Why anxiously isolate the aesthetic fact? How can it be contaminated in a universe conceived as a projection of the mind? These questions are easily answered so soon as we assume, as we must, all that the Crocean aesthetic denies out of existence. Signor Croce's criticism, which is the sum of his aesthetic facts, is the result, like all aesthetic facts, of a very human, very practical passion in his own soul. "There is nothing," Longinus told us long ago, "so eloquent as real passion." "How could Shakespeare," Signor Croce cries, "be truly loved and really felt in an age which buried dialectic and idealism beneath naturalism and positivism . . . an age in which the consciousness of the distinction between liberty and passion, good and evil, nobility and vileness, fineness and sensuality, between the lofty and the base in man became obscured!" The eternal cry of age to youth, of the passing to the coming epoch; the cry of glorified memories, of the fallacy of the golden past. Yet here his real passion speaks and his real secret escapes. A tender mind repudiates what seems to him an ugly, soulless, scientific world. His sensibilities have been rasped and his soul wounded. He isolates the aesthetic world and thus establishes for himself a refuge and a dwelling-place.

What he omits in his dislike of science and his fear of a mechanistic universe is nothing less than the entire psychology of the creative process. Even Shelley admitted the "influence

of nature and society" on the poet's mind and work; even Hegel speaks of the transformation of a genuine external reality "upon which the poet imprints the seal of his own spirit." Whence come these Crocean "sentiments of the poet which determine and explain one another"? They come from the impact between the poet and his world, from conflict or union, from that practical life of his in which, as Hazlitt said, "natural impressions of objects or events excite an involuntary movement of imagination or passion." And as Signor Croce leaves out the poet's world, so he leaves out his will. Schopenhauer was right when he defined the pleasure of aesthetic absorption as consisting in the elimination of the will from consciousness. And as he who enjoys art yields his will, so the poet appeases his through the creative act. That will demands a freer, more impassioned, more intoxicating, and more harmonious world than reality affords. Thus in his pain he either analyzes and represents the troubling, insufficient world, or else he shatters it and rebuilds it nearer to the heart's desire. In either case he substitutes expression for experience and beauty for beautiful action. The genetic starting-point of art is not art but life. Art is, in the cumbrous but exact terminology of the new psychologists, a compensation mechanism. It is not therefore ignoble. The poet as one who cannot endure a vision of moral chaos and is driven to justify the ways of God to man, or as one pierced by the sufferings of his fellows and impelled to refashion a cruel world through reason and beauty, or as one whose high passions no mortal love or adventure can assuage, is a far more splendid and significant spectacle than the Crocean poet of anterior aesthetic sentiments who drifts from the moorings of his human life out upon some unseen ocean of cosmic harmonies.

By his severe and just strictures on the excesses of the philologists, by giving the death-blow to the classification of unique aesthetic facts, by insisting upon the philosophical nature and function of criticism, Signor Croce has cleared the air and stimulated aesthetic thinking. His positive theory is vitiated by a lack of content, by ignoring fundamental facts of experience concerning which even a small poet, if he were sincere and theoretically articulate, could have instructed him. To ask a critic or aesthetician who is judging a poem or a poet, Could you have done better? is the last conceivable stupidity. It is not too much to ask that he who seeks to explain and judge the creators of art should have felt often enough and powerfully enough their passion and their need to know from within those motives and aims of the creative process which, beneath an infinite variety of substance and of form, are as constant as the nature of man itself.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Russia Still in the Shadows

What I Saw in Russia. By George Lansbury. Boni and Liveright.
Bolshevik Russia. By C. E. Raine and E. Luboff. London: Nisbet & Co.
Sketches of Soviet Russia. By John Varney. N. L. Brown.
The Groping Giant. By William Adams Brown, Jr. Yale University Press.

THE Russian situation remains an unsolved problem over which clash the most violent political passions and economic biases. The quiet and parliamentarian Malone D'Estrange was converted to communism; the radical and half communistic Bertrand Russell came back from Russia an opponent of the Soviets and their methods of force. At times it seems that agreement with or opposition to bolshevism is largely a matter of political temperament.

One great trouble with the Russian problem is that most foreigners who have visited Russia have been neither scholars nor detached serious thinkers, but merely traveling reporters who liked the adventure of getting in and getting out of that strange land. They have had their sympathies and antipathies previously fixed according to their temperament or the editorial policy of the newspapers they represented. That is why there are so few reliable and illuminating reports of what people saw in Russia. With the exception of H. N. Brailsford, Arthur Ransome, Bertrand Russell, and Clare Sheridan, almost all visitors to Russia have failed to grasp both the human side and the historical scope of the bolshevist revolution. The only incontestable gainer in this world-wide bloody controversy is the publisher.

Consequently, too many books on Russia are written, and too few of them are worth reading. Their titles are hardly more significant than newspaper headlines, their contents hardly more than superficial accounts of superficial observers written for superficial readers.

The Russian Revolution was unfortunate enough to have been born at a moment when the rest of the world was enmeshed in political and social reaction. The chauvinistic and alarmist governing groups of the world in their attempt to crush Russia drowned the true Russian issues in the mud of slander and the slime of propaganda. The European or American intellectual who was conscious of the moral breakdown of the governments of the world was inclined to espouse the bolshevist cause, not because he knew how it actually worked, but because he saw in it an expression of protest; on the other hand, the less stable intellectual, being opposed to Russian extremism, let himself be thrown to the other extreme and in turning from bolshevism espoused the cause of Mitchell Palmer, Kolchak, and Wrangel.

George Lansbury would seem more accurate had he entitled his book "What I Did Not See In Russia." He went there not so much to see what there was to see as to find out that women were not nationalized, that human beings are human beings even when they are Bolsheviks. In fact, this entire booklet is filled with direct and indirect refutations of what was headlined by the Kolchak press as "authentic or first-hand facts." He describes the economic plight of Russia, trying to show the atrocious results of the blockade and interventions. One cannot expect a thoroughgoing analysis in so small a volume as that of Mr. Lansbury's, but it is regrettable that he did not try to survey the internal factors which were instrumental in Russia's economic collapse independently of the blockade. He was in Russia after the cooperatives were practically dispersed and yet says nothing about this enormous mistake of the Soviets. One would expect a more clear-sighted survey from Mr. Lansbury. Dittmann, for instance, the German Independent, who was a delegate at the Third International, brought home a more impartial account. The German liberals and radicals in general have proved to understand the Russian situation better than their English-speaking friends.

As to "Bolshevik Russia," it is one of the many propaganda writings prepared by unknown writers, strangers in the field of politics and economics but brought to the surface by the continuous demand for "Russian stuff." Despite the many quotations and the abundance of statistics the work is not convincing. One does not need musty statistical data twenty years old to know that Russia is economically ruined. To ascribe this ruin to bolshevism alone is an old method of propaganda. Austria is not bolshevist, and is ruined. Poland is the beloved anti-bolshevist friend of France, and is ruined. Hungary is most respectable under the dictatorship of Horthy, and is ruined. The border states of the Baltic are in a hardly better condition. To ascribe all the ills of Russia to Lenin is nothing else than to attempt to escape the responsibility that burdens the shoulders of the imperialistic and reactionary players of the European game.

More important and more interesting from one point of view are Mr. Varney's "Sketches of Soviet Russia" and Mr. Brown's "The Groping Giant." Both are books by young Americans who as Y. M. C. A. secretaries had the opportunity to travel extensively in Russia. Both men write in a sympathetic, benignant, and somewhat indulgent way, and both possess the characteristic naivite of all foreigners who are startled by how different Russian is from the rest of the world. Mr. Varney's sketches are without pretention. This book is a simple good-hearted diary, which would make interesting recitation if its author should read it to his friends at some tea party. Almost three-quarters of a century ago Turgenev gave a more comprehensive series of sketches of the Russian peasant's mind. For more than half a century Tolstoy did it still better. The English-speaking reader will easily find these writings on the shelves of almost all American libraries. Mr. Varney failed to discover anything new and his descriptions seem like the soliloquies of a somewhat dazed observer.

As to "The Groping Giant" of Mr. Brown, one would hardly have anything to add if it were not for the fact that it is published by the Yale University Press and has a subtitle "Revolutionary Russia as Seen by an American Democrat." These appearances should be justified by the content, but they are not. First, one fails to find anything particularly scholarly in this book. It is a half-lyrical half-meditative series of impressions combined with "historical facts" apparently based largely on hearsay. Mr. Brown knew little or nothing about Russia before he went there nor did he become acquainted with the "intelligentsia" whom he discusses in two special chapters. If before writing on the intelligentsia and their influence upon the revolution and on the influence of the revolution upon them, he had made himself familiar with the writings of Lavrov, Mikhailovski, Plekhanov, he might have produced an interesting essay without even going to Russia, where it just happened that he met none of those who may be called the intelligentsia. Instead he seems to confound the intelligentsia with lawyers, men of free professions in general, and ladies who have read a few books and talk politics. As a matter of fact the Russian intelligentsia has not changed since the revolutions. Both their weaknesses and strong points have only been emphasized during the last few years. Mr. Brown has contributed hardly more than a piece of conscientious journalism. This is a great achievement in an age of a corrupt press, but it is a moral rather than an academic achievement.

GREGORY ZILBOORG

Books in Brief

FOR France, during the European War, some of the nation's most precious architecture was destroyed; for America it was created. For one person who knew of the cathedral of Rheims before 1914, it is a reality to at least a score since its bombardment by the German army. So with other cathedrals of northern France; it is their tragedy that like certain human lives they are known and appreciated only after they are gone. "How France Built Her Cathedrals" (Harper), by Elizabeth Boyle O'Reilly, comes opportunely to meet a quickened interest in these great monuments of the Middle Ages. Both research and affection have gone into this story of the rise in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the Gothic out of the Romanesque. "A clear comprehension of Gothic is impossible unless the fact be grasped that architecture is nothing if not structural, and that no decoration can avail a faulty skeleton," says the author; and again: "The Gothic master-of-works was right when he said that nothing which was inherently needed could be ugly." To the Abbot Suger is attributed the honor of building at St. Denis the first definitely Gothic structure, dedicated in 1144, from which grew the great craftsmanship that culminated in "the four master cathedrals of France"—Notre Dame de Paris, Chartres, Rheims, and Amiens. In opposition to those who regard the façade of the cathedral of Rheims as the flower of Gothic art, the author prefers the west front of Notre Dame de Paris, "true to its epoch in its appeal to the intellect rather than to the emotions." Of entering the doors of Amiens it is said: "The emotion felt has the efficacy of a prayer." But like many others the author dwells with special affection on the airy yet stupendous monument that lifts itself above the hill of Chartres out of the golden and bronze grain fields of Beauce. "Virile, virginal, aerial, majestic, venerable in youth and youthful in its venerable age, the *clocher vieux* of Chartres is one of the supreme things of the national art." It is well to ponder this age of transcendent handiwork in our own era, when craftsmanship is ignored; when the worker is trained only to produce profits, and must dissipate his energies fighting over the conditions of employment—or for the bare opportunity of employment. Pen drawings by A. Paul de Leslie add to the interest and clarity of the book.

A NEW edition of Shakespeare in what will probably be the customary forty volumes, edited for the Cambridge University press by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and Mr. John Dover Wilson, begins now with "The Tempest" (Macmillan). If future volumes follow the lead of this, the edition as a whole will prove agreeable and convenient but not indispensable. Whatever contribution it makes to Shakespeare literature will be credited to Mr. Wilson rather than to Sir Arthur, whose introductions will be eloquent, unoriginal, and sentimental. The value of Mr. Wilson's carefully pondered text will be decreased somewhat by certain compromises which he feels compelled to make between the mere scholar and the mere reader. His urge is toward the primitive text, but his business, he believes, is to be generally effective, so that while he omits the traditional division into acts and scenes he produces a number of unnecessary stage directions from his private imagination, and while he professes reverence for Shakespeare's copy he modernizes the spelling. Perhaps he will be most commended for his punctuation, based on the investigations ten years ago of Mr. Percy Simpson; though here, too, he has been a compromiser.

"FONTES Historiae Religionis Persicae" (Bonn: Marcus und Weber) is the first of a projected series of small volumes, under the general editorship of Karl Clemen, in which it is intended to publish in as reliable and compact form as possible the passages found in Greek and Roman authors which throw light on the history of the great religions of the world. The authors are arranged as nearly as possible in chronological order, with exclusion of those who wrote in the later Middle Ages or who could make no independent contribution to the subject. In the present volume, compiled by Professor Clemen and concerned with the Persian religion, the first writer who is quoted is Xanthus (fifth century B.C.) and the last is Nicephorus Callisti, who wrote about 1320 A.D. The material obtained from inscriptions and from papyri is not included in the volumes of the series. The text of the significant passages is given in full, in each case, with enough of the context to make the connection clear. The best available editions are used, and a critical apparatus at the foot of the page adds variant readings derived from other editions, from manuscripts, and from conjecture. An index of the authors quoted, 138 in number, is given at the end. The result is an admirable little volume, very useful to students who happen to be concerning themselves with the religious beliefs and customs of the Persians. The next booklet in the series, "Fontes Religionis Aegyptiacae," by Dr. Hopfner, will be awaited with interest.

IN his searching little volume, "The Sword or the Cross" (Chicago: Christian Century Press), Mr. Kirby Page presents with force and truth the extreme position against war which must in our opinion be taken by everybody who would be a sincere and loyal follower of the teachings of Jesus. Undoubtedly this book would not have been allowed to circulate during the war, which is but another proof of the fact that all wars constitute in themselves a denial of Jesus and everything that he stood for. Mr. Page does not hesitate to accept the logical consequences of his position. Thus he declares in answer to the question whether war is justifiable as a means of preserving political liberty that "the following of Jesus Christ is infinitely more important than the maintenance of political

liberty." Had the Bolshevists but had the wisdom to see this at Brest-Litovsk, had they but refused to fight and also to sign the shameless German demands, and thus to resist the German evil, their whole status in the world, and probably their future, would be entirely different. We wish for Mr. Page's little volume what is, alas, an impossible wish, that it be placed in the hands of every school child in this allegedly Christian nation. It would do a world of good and be a powerful weapon in the fight which is now on to save humanity from being exterminated by the very science of warfare which it has lately devised, it being today a problem whether war shall go or civilization perish. Not the least of Mr. Page's service is his final disposition of those phrases of Jesus which, together with the episode of the money-changers in the temple, are so blasphemously cited by the believers in mass-murder to make it appear that Jesus condoned what would have made of all his teachings merely ghastly hypocrisy.

Music

Italy's New Music-Drama

THE musical melodrama, that anachronism of eighteenth-century romanticism which has dominated Italy for nearly two hundred years, has at last fallen a victim to its own absurdities. Rekindled for a moment into a brief but fierce flare by the hot-blooded realism of Mascagni's "Cavalleria," it has finally simmered down into a pallid, feeble glow under the pale passionalism and perfumed phrases of Puccini. In bitter reaction against the degradation and disrepute into which Italian music has thus been brought, there has sprung up in Italy a revolt and an ideal—a revolt against that slipshod and irregular relationship between the text and the score in which the voice alone is supreme, and which is ever ready to sacrifice dramatic action and musical continuity to an "effective" recitative and aria; against, too, those arid wastes of Wagnerian declamation which, in the end, leave one thirsting for a lyrical oasis. And simultaneously with this revolt has come a desire for a more perfect marriage, a more spiritual union between the verbality and the music, a union that will reveal rather than obscure the action.

This ideal fusion of words and voice and instruments has long been the goal of Italy's two most gifted composers, Ildebrando Pizzetti and G. Francesco Malipiero. But while each has made the dramatic element the protagonist, each has approached it differently. With Pizzetti, it is purely psychological, the conventional development of character through plot. With Malipiero, it is the *choque dramatique*—the meeting of two or more antagonistic forces, of opposing elements that can be symbolized by "persons or things, passions or lights," or "the contrary motion of masses."

Pizzetti, for instance, has allowed the words to remain the chief factor. The orchestra furnishes the background, occasionally describing by some well-defined theme an emotional crisis of one of the characters, while the purely lyrical element is used merely to vitalize the poetry, without disturbing its rhythms or its accents. Thus "Fédra" is almost a model of melodic declamation, in which the lyrical flow is unbroken by either recitative or parlando, or the orchestral development by isolated symphonic episodes of programmatic character. There is not a scene that has not its dramatic significance. Even the great chorus of the third act has its dramatic justification aside from its classical perfection.

This elimination of non-essentials, of everything that could clog the action or mar the unity of the component factors, has been carried to even greater extreme by Malipiero, who confesses that, fascinated by the purely lyrical side of the music-drama but repelled by "the absurdity of 'sung words' in the midst of a realistic scene," and equally bored by the ever long Wagnerian declamation, his music-drama "was conceived with the object of removing the recitative by the creation of subjects where the musical element is part and life of the plot and subject." "In my theater," he continues, "there are three elements: (1) The Song, indispensable and necessary, even if one were to represent the subject without music, as a comedy; (2) the Stage, the visible element, which explains the subject without any need of conventional mimicry; (3) the Orchestra, which creates the dramatico-musical atmosphere. The importance of each of these three elements is equal, although, from a purely bureaucratic point of view, it is the orchestra that takes the larger share of the labor."[1]

Malipiero's first and greatest reaction, "Pantea," in which a dancer is the protagonist, is too much of a mimodrama to be discussed under this heading. We have to wait for his "Sette Canzoni" to find a fuller realization of his ideals. These "Seven Songs," to which he has given the sub-title of "Dramatic Expressions," are seven unrelated episodes of contrasting moods, of which the orchestra is the sole connecting link. They could, however, follow each other with great rapidity, as that enlightened critic Guido M. Gatti has suggested, because they could be staged according to Gordon Craig's idea of neutral-tinted screens of uniform height, the variety of atmosphere and color being supplied by lights circulating from above. A later work, "Orpheo," has been treated as an eighth "Canzone," and these two works, to be preceded by a third, "La Morte delle Maschera" (as yet unfinished), Malipiero has designed as together forming three component parts of a uniform idea. This amazing three-act fantasy, with its marvelously woven texture, its incessant play of emotional lights and shadows, is the most boldly conceived musical form that the Italy of today has yet given us. After all, Debussy's "Pelléas" set a certain precedent for Pizzetti's "Fédra," but the "Sette Canzoni" and their companions have no parallel.

A third innovation is being made by the youthful Castelnuovo-Tedesco, who, in his setting to Machiavelli's "Il Mandragola," is trying to revive the classical humor of his native Florence. So far, he has succeeded in bringing back the comic spirit and the biting satire of the Renaissance with a freshness that is almost new, and one looks forward with interest to the outcome of his labors. It is impossible at present to give an analysis of the work, as only the first act is completed; but it promises to take an important place in Italy's musical evolution. It is, indeed, of peculiar significance that Italy should once more be experimenting in the music-drama, for that, after all, is the natural and legitimate expression of a people so supremely endowed by nature with the gift of voice and of mimetic gesture.

HENRIETTA STRAUS

[1] This somewhat lengthy explanatory passage from Malipiero is not taken from any of his writings, but has been especially dictated by him for this article.—H. S.

International Relations Section

The China Consortium—II

THE INTER-GROUP CONFERENCE AT PARIS AND JAPAN'S RESERVATIONS

FOLLOWING the preliminary exchange of notes between the governments participating in the consortium negotiations, the most important of which were printed in last week's issue of the International Relations Section, the banking groups of the four countries concerned met at Paris on May 11 and May 12, 1919, and adopted minutes and a draft agreement to be made the basis of further discussion. On June 18 the Japanese Government issued two statements relating to certain reservations upon which it felt bound to insist before the Japanese group should enter into any final agreement. The nature of the reservations and the position of the American banking group, the British group, and the British Government will be indicated in the following notes:

American Group to Japanese Group

June 23, 1919

DEAR SIR:

I have before me your letter of the 18th June, delivered to me at London and communicating to me, for the information of the American group, the instructions which you have received from Tokio as to "the rights and options held by Japan in the regions of Manchuria and Mongolia where Japan has special interests." You have, as I understand it, sent a letter in a similar sense to Sir Charles Addis, of the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, for the British group, and M. [illegible]mon, of the Banque de l'Indo-Chine, for the French group.

For your information I beg to state that I have conferred informally with both the British and French groups, and our views of the matter that you bring us are in accord. We cannot but believe that there is some misunderstanding upon the part of your principals in the matter, for if they were to make such an attitude final the effect upon the relation of Japan to the new consortium would be obvious. Mongolia and Manchuria are important parts of China, and any attempt to exclude them from the scope of the consortium must be inadmissible. The "special interests" to which you allude have, in our opinion, never had to do with economic matters.

The whole question that you bring up is one of such grave import that we feel that it is beyond the immediate competence of the financial groups to discuss, and I am therefore bringing the matter to the attention of the Department of State at Washington. I presume that the other groups will take similar action with respect to their own Foreign Offices.

I have noted your reference to the declaration made by Mr. Takeuchi on behalf of the Japanese banking group and recorded in the minutes of the conference on the 18th June, 1912, at meeting of six banking groups held in Paris on that date. For your information I beg to recall to you that at the same time there was recorded in the minutes of the conference the following declaration: "The British, German, French, and American groups stated that they were unable to accept or consider either of these declarations upon the ground that they were not competent to deal with political questions." This declaration was accepted in conformity with the statement made by the Japanese Ambassador to Mr. Addis in London on the 11th June, 1912.

T. W. LAMONT

Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation to British Foreign Office

9 Gracechurch Street, June 21, 1919

I have received from the Yokohama Specie Bank (Limited) copies of two letters handed by Mr. Odagiri to Mr. Lamont on the 18th instant.

I inclose copies, from which you will see that the Japanese group has informed their London representatives that all the rights and options held by Japan in the regions of Manchuria and Mongolia should be excluded from the arrangement for pooling provided for in the proposed new consortium agreement.

Attention is drawn to the minutes of the Inter-Group Conference held at Paris on the 18th June, 1912, where it is recorded that:

"The Japanese Bank declared that it takes part in the (Reorganization) Loan on the understanding that nothing connected with the projected loan should operate to the prejudice of the special rights and interests of Japan in the regions of South Manchuria and the eastern portion of Inner Mongolia adjacent to South Manchuria."

It is true that we did not object to this statement at the time, but our contention is that the international position has been fundamentally changed by the Peace Conference in Paris, and that any former claims to spheres of interest or spheres of influence are no longer admissible.

The Japanese base their claim to exclude Manchuria and Mongolia on a note dated the 2nd November, 1917, from the Secretary of State to their Ambassador at Washington, in which it is stated that:

"The Governments of the United States and Japan recognize that territorial propinquity creates special relations between countries, and, consequently, the Government of the United States recognizes that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous."

The contention of the British group is that the statement does not support the interpretation placed upon it by the Japanese. The British group view the admission of special interests in China generally as excluding the claim to special interests in any particular portion of it. *Expressio unius exclusio alterius.*

The contention of the British group is borne out by the further statement in the same note, which opposes " . . . the acquisition by any government of any special rights or privileges that would affect the independence or territorial integrity of China, or that would deny to the subjects or citizens of any country the free enjoyment of equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China."

I have pointed out to the representatives in London of the Japanese group that the effect of admitting their claim might be to provoke the revival of similar claims on the part of other nations—the French in southwestern China, our own in the Yang-tze Valley—thus stirring up just such difficulties as the new consortium is designed to obviate.

The main object of the American Government's proposals is to eliminate special claims in particular spheres of interest, and to throw open the whole of China without reserve to the combined activities of an international group.

This can hardly be done unless the parties concerned agree to sacrifice all claims to enjoy any industrial preference within the boundaries of any political spheres of influence, and to accept the position that a new start is to be made with a clean slate.

C. S. ADDIS

British Foreign Office to Japanese Ambassador

On the 22nd of last month Earl Curzon of Kedleston had the honor to address to the Japanese Ambassador a note on the subject of the British participation in the international consortium for providing loans to China. This note will have made it clear to Viscount Chinda that, with the exception of the condition concerning exclusive official support to the British group—a point which has been satisfactorily settled by the adoption of the American formula defining the measure of support to be accorded by the governments concerned to their respective national groups—His Majesty's Government have accepted in their entirety the original proposals of the American Government for the formation of the international consortium as set

out in a note addressed by Lord Curzon to the Japanese Chargé d'Affaires on the 22d March last. This scheme, as Viscount Chinda is doubtless aware, comprises the pooling by the groups of all their existing and future options in China, except such concessions as may already be in operation.

His Excellency has probably also had occasion to study the minutes of the inter-group meeting held in Paris on the 11th and 12th May last, at which resolutions were unanimously adopted, subject of course to the approval of the governments concerned, providing for the pooling by the groups of all their existing loan agreements and options involving a public issue and even pledging the groups to use their best endeavors to induce other parties who may possess or control any such agreements or options to surrender the same to the consortium.

At the present moment the British, American, and French Governments have all informed their respective groups of their approval of these minutes, subject always to the American definition of the measure of official support to be accorded to them, but so far as Lord Curzon is aware no such approval has as yet been intimated by the Japanese Government, with the result that the urgent work of organizing the consortium has been brought to a standstill.

His Majesty's Government have heard, with the utmost regret, that the Japanese financial delegates in Paris, acting under instructions from their principals, have informed their colleagues that "all the rights and options held by Japan in the regions of Manchuria and Mongolia, where Japan has special interests, should be excluded from the arrangements for pooling provided for in the proposed agreement" because of "the very special relations which Japan enjoys geographically and historically with the regions referred to and which have been recognized by Great Britain, the United States, France, and Russia on many occasions."

His Majesty's Government are further informed that the position taken up by the British, American, and French groups toward this claim of the Japanese group was that any attempt to exclude Manchuria and Mongolia from the scope of the consortium would be inadmissible, but that the whole question raised was one of such grave importance that it was felt to be beyond the immediate competence of the groups to discuss and must therefore be referred to the decision of the Governments.

In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government feel justified in bringing this matter to the notice of the Japanese Government—as they hear has already been done by the American Government—and requesting them to direct the Japanese group to modify their attitude on this all-important point.

One of the fundamental objects of the American proposals, as accepted by the British, Japanese, and French Governments, is to eliminate special claims in particular spheres of interest and to throw open the whole of China without reserve to the combined activities of an international consortium. This object cannot be achieved unless all the parties to the scheme agree to sacrifice all claim to enjoy any industrial preference within the boundaries of any political sphere of influence. Manchuria and Mongolia are important provinces of China and any attempt to exclude them from the scope of the consortium would constitute a direct negation of the principle on which the consortium is based, would provoke the revival of similar claims on the part of other nations and thus perpetuate the very difficulties which the consortium is designed to obviate. Moreover, as all other parties to the arrangement except the Japanese group have agreed to pool their rights and options without other reservation than that contained in the terms of the agreement itself, it is only equitable that the same rule should apply to all alike.

His Majesty's Government have every reason to believe that the Japanese Government will share these views and will cause the Japanese group to withdraw their claim to the exclusion of Manchuria and Mongolia from the scope of the consortium.

Foreign Office, August 11, 1919

Following this exchange of notes, however, the Japanese Government on September 1, 1919, reaffirmed its position in the following memorandum:

The Japanese Government accept and confirm the resolutions adopted at the meetings of the representatives of the bankers' groups of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan at Paris on the 11th and 12th May, 1919, for the purpose of organizing an international consortium for financial business in China; provided, however, that the acceptance and confirmation of the said resolutions shall not be held or construed to operate to the prejudice of the special rights and interests possessed by Japan in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia.

The British reply was in the form of a memorandum dated at the Foreign Office on November 19, 1919.

On the 1st September his Excellency the Japanese Ambassador communicated to Earl Curzon of Kedleston the following memorandum: [quoting foregoing memorandum].

At a subsequent interview with Lord Curzon, Viscount Chinda, in accordance with instructions received from his Government, defined what was meant by South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia.

His Majesty's Government have now, after the most careful consideration of the Japanese contention, been forced to the conclusion that they could not justifiably accept the claim for the exclusion of Southern Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia from the sphere of activity of the consortium if it were intended as a territorial claim.

As was pointed out to the Japanese Ambassador in the memorandum communicated to his Excellency on the 11th August, the admission of such a claim to a monopoly of commercial interests in a large geographical area of China would be a direct infringement of the fundamental idea underlying the creation of the consortium, which was to abolish spheres of interest and throw open the whole of China to the activities of an international financial combination.

Lord Curzon, however, cannot help thinking that the Japanese Government must be laboring under a misapprehension as to the scope and purpose of the consortium. It is not and never has been intended that under the guise of the consortium vested interests should be encroached upon. Article 1 of the inter-group agreement of the 11th May last specifically lays down that agreements and options relating to industrial undertakings (including railways), upon which substantial progress has been made, need not be pooled. Indeed, the sphere of the new consortium is definitely limited to the financing of future undertakings in China and was never meant to extend to established industrial enterprises.

So far as Southern Manchuria is concerned, Lord Curzon recognizes that there are in that province important railways and other industrial enterprises which have been developed or are in course of development by Japanese enterprise and which are clearly not within the sphere of the consortium. Such is not, however, the case in Eastern Inner Mongolia where, although options for railways have been granted to Japan, no work has yet been begun. Indeed, such a claim as is put forward by the Japanese Government in regard to Eastern Inner Mongolia, amounting to the reservation of an exclusive interest in a large area whose southern boundaries practically envelop Peking and encroach upon the province of Chihli, cannot be reconciled with the maintenance of the independence and territorial integrity of China which Japan has so often pledged herself to observe.

It is confidently hoped, therefore, that, when the question is viewed in this light, the Japanese Government will see no objection to modify their present attitude as regards both South Manchuria and Inner Mongolia and will authorize the Japanese banking groups to enter into the new consortium on the same basis as the other groups, that is, without any special reservations.

The Japanese Government will also, no doubt, recognize the urgent need of promptitude in dealing with the situation, in view of the disastrous situation on the verge of which China appears now to find herself.

Further Negotiations with Japan

On March 16, in the following memorandum to the British Government, the Japanese Government defined more exactly the nature of the special interests it sought to protect.

The Japanese Government have given their serious consideration to the British Government's note of the 19th November last relative to the formation of a new consortium. The British Government appear to be under the impression that the proposal of the Japanese Government in regard to South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia amounts either to the assertion of a monopoly of economic interests in that region or to the establishment of a so-called sphere of interest there, and further, that such a proposal cannot be reconciled with the principle of independence and territorial integrity of China.

The Japanese Government desire to set forth once again their views frankly on the purpose of their proposal and invite further consideration on the part of the British Government on this subject.

From the nature of the case the regions of South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, which are contiguous to our territory of Korea, stand in very close and special relations to Japan's national defense and her economic existence. Enterprises launched forth in these regions, therefore, often involve interests vital to the safety of our country. This is why Japan has special interests in these regions and has established there special rights of various kinds. The Japanese Government are under no misapprehension or misgiving as to the purpose of the organization of the consortium, and are glad to cooperate under such an arrangement with the Powers concerned for the promotion of the general welfare of China. But, as is suggested in the proposed consortium merely out of business considerations, to throw open to the common activities of an international financial combination even those enterprises in the regions of South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia which vitally affect the economic existence and national defense of Japan would be no safe way of providing for the national peace and security, and for this reason it would hardly meet with the approval of the public opinion in Japan. These considerations were fully set forth by Viscount Chinda in his interview with Lord Curzon on the 1st September last year.

Furthermore, the recent development of the Russian situation, exercising as it does an unwholesome influence upon the Far East, is a matter of grave concern to Japan; in fact, the conditions in Siberia, which have been developing with such alarming precipitancy of late, are by no means far from giving rise to a most serious situation, which may at any time take a turn threatening the safety of Japan and the peace of the Far East, and ultimately place the entire Eastern Asia at the mercy of the dangerous activities of extremist forces. Having regard to these signals of the imminent character of the situation, the Japanese Government all the more keenly feel the need of adopting measures calculated to avert any such danger in the interest of the Far East as well as of Japan. Now, South Manchuria and Mongolia are the gate by which this direful influence may effect its penetration into Japan and the Far East to the instant menace of their security. The Japanese Government are convinced that, having regard to the vital interests which Japan, as distinct from the other Powers, has in the regions of South Manchuria and Mongolia, the British Government will appreciate the circumstances which compelled the Japanese Government to make a special and legitimate reservation indispensable to the existence of the state and its people. . . .

Lord Curzon invited Viscount Chinda—if there is any fear that any project launched under the ægis of the consortium might threaten the strategic security of Japan—to guard against this danger by proposing a formula to meet the case. It is a cause of gratification to know that the British Government thus share the apprehensions entertained by the Japanese Government. In view of the foregoing considerations, the Japanese Government, while authorizing the Japanese bankers' group to enter the proposed consortium on the same footing as the bankers' groups of the other Powers concerned, venture to propose to achieve the settlement of the question at issue by exchanging between the governments concerned a note embodying the sense of the formula hereto attached.

Formula

The Japanese Government accept and confirm the resolutions passed at the conference of the representatives of the banking groups of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan which met at Paris on the 11th and 12th May, 1919, for the purpose of organizing a new consortium. In matters, however, relating to loans affecting South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, which in their opinion are calculated to create a serious impediment to the security of the economic life and national defense of Japan, the Japanese Government reserve the right to take the necessary steps to guarantee such security.

March 16, 1920

1. The South Manchurian Railway and its branches, together with the mines, which are subsidiary to the railway, are unaffected by the loans to be made. Hence they do not come within the scope of the common activities of the new consortium.

2. The construction of the Kirin-Changchun Railway, Sinminfu-Mukden Railway, and Ssupingkai-Chengchiatun Railway has been completed and their operation has already been commenced. They fall, therefore, within the category of those enterprises which, according to Article 2 of the proposed inter-group agreement, have already made substantial progress, and are outside the scope of the common activities of the new consortium.

3. The Kirin-Huening Railway, the Chengchiatun-Taonan-fu Railway, Changchun-Taonan-fu Railway, the Kaiyuan-Kirin Railway, and the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway and the railway connecting a point on the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway with a seaport are branch or feeding lines of the South Manchurian Railway. Moreover, having regard to the fact that, as set forth in the memorandum dated the 16th March, 1920, these lines, together with the South Manchurian Railway, not only bear the most important relation to the national defense of Japan, but also constitute a powerful factor in the maintenance of peace and order in the Far East, it is expected that they will be placed outside the scope of the common activities of the new consortium. Both the British and the American Governments have already agreed to the exclusion of most of these lines. It is not unlikely, however, that in case of any loan being floated in future in connection with these railways the European and American markets will be invited to subscribe to it.

A similar memorandum previously addressed to the United States Government was answered on March 16 thus:

The Government of the United States has received and carefully considered the memorandum under date of the 2nd March, 1920, in which the Japanese Ambassador set forth the views of his Government as to the formation of the proposed International Consortium for loans to China, and it is happy to record the hearty gratification with which it has noted the disavowal by Japan of any claim to exclusive economic or political rights with respect to South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia. The American Government cannot but acknowledge, however, its grave disappointment that the formula proffered by the Japanese Government is in terms so exceedingly ambiguous and in character so irrevocable that it might be held to indicate a continued desire on the part of the Japanese Government to exclude the American, British, and French banking groups from participation in the development, for the benefit of China, of important parts of that republic, a construction which could not be reconciled with the principle of the independence and territorial integrity of China.

The Government of the United States is not unsympathetic with the professed objects of the principle embodied in the Japanese formula. It considers, on the other hand, first, that the right of national self-preservation is one of universal acceptance in the relations between states, and therefore would not require specific formula as to its application in any particular instance;

and, second, that the recognition of that principle is implied in the terms of the notes exchanged between Secretary Lansing and Viscount Ishii on the 2d November, 1917. This Government therefore considers that by reason of the particular relationships of understanding thus existing between the United States and Japan, and those which, it is understood, similarly exist between Japan and the other Powers proposed to be associated with it in the consortium, there would appear to be no occasion to apprehend on the part of the consortium any activities directed against the economic life or national defense of Japan. It is therefore felt that Japan could, with entire assurance, rely upon the good faith of the United States and of the other two Powers associated in the consortium to refuse their countenance to any operation inimical to the vital interests of Japan, and that Japan's insistence that the other three Powers join with it in the proposed formula as a condition precedent would only create misapprehension. It is felt, moreover, that such a formula would not only be unnecessary, but would lend itself to misconstruction for the reason that it apparently differentiates between the status of South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia and that of other Chinese territory. The mere fact of differentiation would, it is apprehended, give rise to questions which would tend still further to unsettle the already complex situation in China. This Government is therefore hopeful that the Japanese Government may, in view of its several existing relationships of understanding with the United States and the other two Powers, be persuaded to rely upon their good faith in this matter and forego its proposal to require explicit guaranties, the mere statement of which opens the way for possible misconstruction and misapprehension in the future.

The Government of the United States has furthermore been happy to note the readiness of the Japanese Government to enumerate the specific vested interests of its nationals, in Manchuria and Mongolia, which it would propose to exclude from the scope of operations of the proposed consortium; although it finds it is difficult to believe that in order to meet the necessities of Japanese economic or political security it is essential for Japan alone to construct and control a railway line of such a character as the one projected from Taonan-fu to Jehol, and thence to the sea coast.

It is hoped that the discussions now in progress in Tokio between Mr. Lamont, on behalf of the American group, and the representative of the Japanese banking interests may result in such a complete understanding on the question of the specific enterprises in Manchuria and Mongolia which it may be found mutually satisfactory to exclude from the operation of the consortium as would enable the Japanese Government to accord to that understanding its unqualified approval.

In conclusion, the Government of the United States takes pleasure in the fact that the frank interchanges of views which have thus far taken place appear to have resulted in a basis of mutual understanding which justified the belief that a speedy completion of the organization of the consortium is now possible.

The Japanese memorandum of March 16 to the British Government and its inclosed formula resulted in a lengthy exchange of notes between the Governments of Japan and Great Britain.

I. *Great Britain to Japan*

His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, having carefully studied the memorandum and formula communicated by his Excellency the Japanese Ambassador on the 16th March relative to the position of South Manchuria and East Inner Mongolia under the proposed consortium, has the honor to make the following observations:

In the memorandum handed to Viscount Chinda on the 20th November last, Lord Curzon clearly enunciated the objections felt by His Majesty's Government to the Japanese claim to exclude from the sphere of the consortium a large geographical area of China, and he is now regretfully forced to the conclusion that little or no modification of this original attitude is to be found in the wording of the formula suggested. The phrase which runs:

"In matters relating to loans affecting South Manchuria and East Inner Mongolia, which in their opinion are calculated to create a serious impediment to the security of the economic life and national defense of Japan, the Japanese Government reserve the right to take the necessary steps to guarantee such security," is so ambiguous and general in character that it might be held to indicate on the part of the Japanese Government a continued desire to exclude the cooperation of the other three banking groups from participating in the development, for China's benefit, of important parts of the Chinese Republic, and therefore creates the impression that the Japanese reservation cannot be reconciled with the principle of the independence and the realization of the integrity of China.

While His Majesty's Government clearly recognize the legitimate desire of the Japanese nation to be assured of the supplies of food and raw material necessary to her economic life and her justifiable wish strategically to protect and maintain the Korean frontier, they find it impossible to believe that, in order to meet such needs, it is essential for Japan alone to construct and control, for instance, the three railway lines mentioned in the third reservation lying to the west of the South Manchurian Railway.

In order, however, to meet as far as possible the wishes of the Japanese Government and at the same time to avoid the mention of specific areas, which rightly or wrongly might give rise to the impression that a special sphere of interest was being officially recognized, His Majesty's Government would be prepared to subscribe to a written assurance to the effect that the Japanese Government need have no reason to apprehend that the consortium would direct any activities affecting the security of the economic life and national defense of Japan, and they can firmly rely on the good faith of the Powers concerned to refuse to countenance any operations inimical to such interests.

Foreign Office, March 19, 1920

II. *Japan's Two Propositions*

The Japanese Government have received the memorandum of the British Government dated the 19th March, 1920, giving frank expression to their views again upon the proposal of Japan relative to the organization of a new consortium for loans to China and have taken it into their careful consideration. . . .

. . . After deliberate consideration, the Japanese Government, relying upon the promise of the British Government to give them a written assurance to the effect that they fully recognize the fundamental principle of safeguarding the integrity of the national defense and the economic existence of Japan as proposed by Japan, so that the Japanese Government have no occasion to apprehend that the new consortium would embark upon any activities affecting the national defense and the economic existence of Japan and so that the Powers concerned would refuse their countenance to any enterprise inimical to such Japanese interests, have come to the decision to accept most willingly the suggestion of the British Government and to forego their demand for the acceptance of the proposed formula on the part of the other interested Powers on condition that these Powers agree to the above understanding as formulated by the British Government.

As to the railway and other enterprises which Japan naturally expects will be excluded from the scope of the common activities of the new consortium, the British Government express a doubt as to whether it is essential for Japan alone to construct and control the three railway lines running west of the South Manchurian Railway. The Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway, and the lines connecting a point thereon with a seaport, were projected with the strategic object of making it a means of common defense on the part of China and Japan against foreign invasion coming from the direction of Urga, quite apart from the further object of facilitating development of the districts through which these lines run. It is therefore a matter of great regret and surprise to the Japanese Government that there exists the misunderstanding that these railways will eventually prove a menace to Peking. It is confidently hoped that Japan's position in this connection may be fully appreciated by the British Government. The Japanese Government, mindful as they are of the common interests of the Powers, have no objection to a scheme of making these two railways a joint enterprise of the new consortium; but, having regard to the particular relation in which Japan stands to these railways, it is hoped that the British Government will lend their full support to the following two propositions:

1. In the event of the new consortium projecting in future a scheme of extending the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway to the north with a view to connecting them with the Eastern Chinese Railway, the assent of the Japanese Government thereto must be obtained beforehand, through the Japanese group, inasmuch as such an extension—being tantamount to a renewal of the so-called Chinchou-Aigun Railway scheme, against which a protest was lodged by Japan when the question was mooted some years ago—is calculated to have a serious effect upon the South Manchurian Railway.

2. In consideration of the particular desire of Japan that these two lines should be built as speedily as possible, the Japanese group, after due consultation with the other groups, may be permitted to undertake their construction singlehanded in the event of the other three Powers associated in the new consortium being reluctant to finance it. In that case, having regard to the fact that these railways must cross the Peking-Mukden Railway at a certain point, the British Government will use their best endeavors towards bringing to a happy conclusion the negotiations which the Japanese financiers may enter upon with their British colleagues with a view to perfecting the junction of these lines.

As regards concrete questions as to which of the options that Japan possesses at present in Manchuria and Mongolia in respect to railways is to be excluded, in accordance with the understanding reached between the Governments of Great Britain and Japan, from the scope of the common activities of the new consortium, it is believed that a satisfactory settlement will be reached through the discussions now proceeding in Tokio, with the cognizance of the American and Japanese Governments, between Mr. Lamont, who, besides being the representative of the American group, is understood to have certain definite understandings on the subject with both the British and French groups, and the representatives of the Japanese banking group. The Japanese Government will therefore authorize the Japanese group to proceed with the discussion with Mr. Lamont for the purpose of arriving at a conclusive settlement of questions of this nature.

Japanese Embassy, London, April 14, 1920

III. *The British Reply*

His Majesty's Government have received the further memorandum of the Imperial Japanese Government of the 14th April, and after having given it their careful consideration, have the honor to reply as follows:

His Majesty's Government are much gratified to learn that the Japanese Government are prepared to accept the written assurance to which Lord Curzon declared his willingness to subscribe in his note to Viscount Chinda of the 19th March, and that provided the other Powers agree to give a similar assurance, the Imperial Government are willing to forego the request which they had made in their note of the 16th March that the Powers interested should accept the formula, the wording of which had appeared somewhat ambiguous in character.

As regards the two propositions mentioned in the Japanese Government's memorandum under reply, His Majesty's Government much regret that the Imperial Government should have raised these questions at a moment when it was hoped that the four Powers interested were about to reach an agreement on the basis of a compromise which Mr. Lamont, the representative of the American banking group, appeared to have reached in Tokio with the representatives of the Japanese group. His Majesty's Government fear that if the discussion of these propositions is insisted upon it will merely delay matters, and in the interests of all parties concerned they sincerely trust that the Imperial Government will be willing to withdraw them and to be satisfied with the general assurance to which His Majesty's Government have already offered to subscribe, and which the Imperial Government have just expressed their readiness to accept.

In order to meet the wishes of the Imperial Government, His Majesty's Government are prepared to agree to the terms of the compromise proposed by Mr. Lamont in Tokio and to waive the objections which they had at one time offered to the exclusion from the consortium of the two projected railway lines from Taonan-fu to Changchun and from Taonan-fu to Chengchiatun.

As regards proposition (1), Japan practically asks for a right to veto the construction by the consortium of a line from Taonan-fu to join the Chinese Eastern Railway, on the grounds that such an extension would be tantamount to a renewal of the so-called Chinchou-Aigun railway scheme, against which Japan had lodged a protest some years ago. His Majesty's Government have no wish to do anything which would conflict with the vital interests of their ally, and the assurance to which they have declared their willingness to subscribe would appear fully to safeguard Japan's interests. It appears to His Majesty's Government that with the establishment of the consortium a new era is about to dawn in which conditions have changed, and it is now proposed that the Powers should work together in harmonious and friendly cooperation rather than in competition; and granting to any one party to the consortium the power to veto in advance the possible construction of a railway would appear to be contrary to the principles upon which the idea of the consortium is based.

In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, the contingency anticipated in proposition (2) would appear to be already provided for in Article 4 of the Inter-Group Conference at Paris of the 12th May, 1919, of which His Majesty's Government have expressed their approval. . . .

Foreign Office, April 28, 1920

IV. *Japan Offers a Concession*

The Japanese Government have received the memorandum of the British Government, dated the 28th April, in reply to their memorandum of the 14th April last, and have carefully examined it. . . .

As regards the two points made by the Japanese Government relating to the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway and the line connecting a point thereon with a seaport, the British Government seem to think that they constitute new propositions, and express regret that these questions should have been raised at a moment when it was hoped that the four Powers concerned were about to reach an agreement. In particular, the British Government appear to be of opinion that the point (1), namely, Japan's desire in regard to the extension of the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway, is tantamount to a claim for an exclusive power of veto, and is therefore contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the idea of the new consortium is based. The Japanese Government, in making the point in question, were prompted by no desire of putting forward any new condition or demand. It was simply in order to avoid further misunderstanding that the point was raised as one of the actual examples of enterprises prejudicial to Japan's vital interests which formed the subject matter of the general assurances given by the British Government. The Japanese Government feel confident that, as the question involved in this case comes within the scope of the general assurances, the governments of the Powers interested in the consortium will, in the spirit of mutual trust and friendliness, readily appreciate Japan's point of view. As to the point (2), the Japanese Government have raised it merely in order to set forth the circumstances in which they feel the need of the assistance and cooperation of the Powers concerned in the actual construction of the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway and the lines connecting a point thereon with a seaport.

In thus giving a frank expression to their hope, the Japanese Government were inspired by no other desire than to make an

appeal to the spirit of general cooperation which forms the foundation of the consortium.

The Japanese Government, holding as they do the views as above enunciated, have no intention whatever of insisting upon obtaining the explicit assurances or consent of the British Government in regard to the two points above referred to. Their idea is simply to bring the Powers concerned to an understanding of their interpretation in these respects. Relying, however, upon the friendly spirit in which the British Government were good enough to reaffirm the fact that the general assurances to which they have already offered to subscribe are adequate enough to safeguard the interests of Japan, the Japanese Government would refrain from further insisting upon the discussion of these points, and in order to facilitate the formation of the new consortium with the least possible delay, they would be satisfied at this juncture with bringing to the knowledge of the British Government their interpretation of these questions, and will be prepared to lend their support to the conclusion of an arrangement between the banking groups concerned and to give it the necessary confirmation.

Japanese Embassy, London, May 10, 1920

On May 17, 1920, the British Foreign Office expressed its gratification at the tone and substance of the Japanese memorandum of May 10 and its hope that the Japanese group would receive from the Government prompt authorization to proceed with arrangements for the consortium.

The American and Japanese Groups Reach an Agreement

The final arrangements between the American and Japanese banking groups are indicated in the following letter addressed by the London representative of the Japanese group to Sir Charles S. Addis of the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation:

7 Bishopsgate, London, May 17, 1920

Dear Sir Charles:

I have received a cablegram from my principals in Japan informing me the text of correspondence which passed in Tokio on the 11th instant between Mr. Kajiwara, president of the Yokohama Specie Bank (Limited), representing the Japanese group, and Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, representing the American group, and I have much pleasure in communicating to you the tenor of the correspondence.

The Japanese group wrote to the following effect:

"You will recall that upon the organization of the consortium at Paris on the 11th and 12th May last the representatives of the Japanese, American, British, and French banking groups attached their signatures to the resolutions and agreement subject to the approval of their respective Governments. You will further recall that, upon the instructions of the Japanese Government, our banking group addressed you a letter dated the 18th June last as regards the conditions of accepting the new consortium agreement.

"We have now the honor to inform you that certain points in the agreement and in the operations of the proposed consortium, hitherto somewhat obscure, having been cleared up to the satisfaction of our Government and ourselves, we are now able, in accordance with the instructions of the Japanese Government, to withdraw our letter dated the 18th June last, and announce that conjointly with the American, British, and French banking groups, and on like terms with them, we will accept the consortium agreement. We beg at the same time to express our hearty concurrence with the general idea and objects of the consortium in respect to China."

And the American group replied:

"We beg to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your communication of the 11th May informing us in behalf of the Japanese banking group that under the instructions of your Government you have now withdrawn your letter dated the 18th June last, and have adopted, in association with the banking groups of America, Great Britain, and France, and on like terms with them, the agreement for the establishment of a new consortium in respect to China.

"We are happy to note that certain points somewhat obscure to your group and to your Government have now been made plain, and we trust with you that the way is clear for the consortium to undertake operations.

"Inasmuch as some questions have arisen during our discussions as to the status of specific railway enterprises contemplated or actually begun in Manchuria and Mongolia, we hereby confirm that we have agreed with you as follows:

"1. That the South Manchurian Railway and its present branches, together with the mines which are subsidiary to the railway, do not come within the scope of the consortium.

"2. That the projected Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway and the projected railway connecting a point on the Taonan-fu-Jehol Railway with a seaport are to be included within the terms of the consortium agreement.

"3. That the Kirin-Huening, the Chengchiatun-Taonan-fu, the Changchun-Taonan-fu, the Kaiyuan-Kirin via Hailung, the Kirin-Changchun, the Sinmin-fu-Mukden, and the Ssupinkai-Chengchiatun railways are outside the scope of the joint activities of the consortium.

"The foregoing letter of acknowledgment, although written in behalf of the American banking group, has, we are assured, the cordial approval of the British and French banking groups, also of the Governments of the United States, of Great Britain, and of France."

I am now desired to ask that you furnish me with a letter of acknowledgment from the British group for transmission to my principals in Japan, and perhaps you will be so good as to communicate the contents of this letter to the French group with a request that they will also provide me with a letter of acknowledgment.

With many thanks in advance,

Yours faithfully,
K. Tatsumi.

China Is Notified

Just prior to the conclusion of the final consortium agreement a note from the French, Japanese, American, and British representatives in Peking was presented to the Chinese Government explaining the purposes of the consortium and inclosing copies of the documents relating to the negotiations.

The China Consortium Agreement

The final text of the consortium agreement concluded at New York on October 15, 1920, by representatives of the four banking groups and approved by the British, American, French, and Japanese Governments is as follows:

An agreement made the 15th day of October, 1920, between—

The Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, having its office at 9 Gracechurch Street, in the City of London (hereinafter called "the Hong Kong Bank") of the first part;

The Banque de l'Indo-Chine, having its office at 15*bis*, Rue Laffitte, Paris (hereinafter called "the French Bank") of the second part;

The Yokohama Specie Bank, Limited, having its office at Yokohama in Japan (hereinafter called "the Japanese Bank") of the third part; and

Messrs. J. P. Morgan and Co., Messrs. Kuhn Loeb and Co., The National City Bank of New York, Chase National Bank, New York, The Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Messrs. Lee, Higginson and Co. of Boston, and the Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank of Chicago (hereinafter called "the American Managers"), acting as to the United Kingdom by Messrs. Morgan, Grenfell and Co., of 22 Old Broad Street, in the City of London, and as to France by Messrs. Morgan Harjes and Co. of Paris, of the fourth part;

Whereas the Hong Kong Bank, the French Bank, the Japanese Bank, and the American Managers are acting for the purposes of this agreement as the representatives of the British, French, Japanese, and American groups, respectively;

And, whereas, the British, French, Japanese, and American groups were formed with the object of negotiating and carrying out Chinese loan business;

And, whereas, their respective Governments have undertaken to give their complete support to their respective national groups the parties hereto in all operations undertaken pursuant to the agreement hereinafter contained and have further undertaken that in the event of competition in the obtaining of any specific loan contract the collective support of the diplomatic representatives in Peking of the four Governments will be assured to the parties hereto for the purpose of obtaining such contract;

And, whereas, the said national groups are of the opinion that the interests of the Chinese people can in existing circumstances best be served by the cooperative action of the various banking groups representing the investment interests of their respective countries in procuring for the Chinese Government the capital necessary for a program of economic reconstruction and improved communications;

And, whereas, with these objects in view the respective national groups are prepared to participate on equal terms in such undertakings as may be calculated to assist China in the establishment of her great public utilities and to these ends to welcome the cooperation of Chinese capital,

Now it is hereby agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows:

1. Each group reserves to itself the right of increasing or reducing the number of its own members, but so that any member of a group dropping out shall remain bound by the restrictive provisions hereof and any member of a group coming in shall become subject to the restrictive provisions hereof and so that no group shall (without the consent of the others) be entitled to admit into its group a new member who is not of its nationality and domiciled in its market. The admission of any new group shall be determined by the parties hereto subject to the approval of their respective Governments.

2. This agreement relates to existing and future loan agreements which involve the issue for subscription by the public of loans to the Chinese Government or to Chinese Government departments or to provinces of China or to companies or corporations owned or controlled by or on behalf of the Chinese Government or any Chinese Provincial Government or to any party if the transaction in question is guaranteed by the Chinese Government or Chinese Provincial Government, but does not relate to agreements for loans to be floated in China. Existing agreements relating to industrial undertakings upon which it can be shown that substantial progress has been made may be omitted from the scope of this agreement.

3. The existing agreements and any future loan agreements to which this agreement relates and any business arising out of such agreements respectively shall be dealt with by the said groups in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

4. This agreement is made on the principle of complete equality in every respect between the parties hereto and each of the parties hereto shall take an equal share in all operations and sign all contracts and shall bear an equal share of all charges in connection with any business (except stamp duties and any charges of and in connection with the realization by the parties hereto in their respective markets of their shares in the operations) and the parties hereto shall conclude all contracts with equal rights and obligations as between themselves, and each party shall have the same rights, privileges, prerogatives, advantages, responsibilities, and obligations of every sort and kind. Accordingly, preliminary advances on account of or in connection with business to which this agreement relates shall be borne by each of the parties hereto in equal shares and each of the parties hereto shall be entitled to participate equally in the existing agreements and will offer to the other parties hereto an equal participation with itself in any future loan business falling within the scope of this agreement. Should one or more of the parties hereto decline a participation in the existing agreements

or any of them or in any such future loan business as aforesaid the party or parties accepting a participation therein shall be free to undertake the same but shall issue on its or their markets only.

5. All contracts shall so far as possible be made so as not to impose joint liability on the parties hereto but each of the parties hereto shall severally liquidate its own engagements or liabilities. The parties hereto will so far as possible come to an understanding with regard to the realization of the operations, but so that such realization in whatever manner this may take place shall be for the separate benefit of each of the parties hereto as regards their respective participations therein and so that each of the parties hereto shall be entitled to realize its participation in the operations only in its own market, it being understood that the issues in the respective markets are to be made at substantial parity.

6. Any one or more of the parties hereto who shall have accepted its or their participation in any business hereunder shall be entitled by notice in writing to call upon the other or others of the parties hereto who propose to issue their own respective participations to issue for the account of the party or parties giving such notice or notices either all or one-half of the amount which may constitute the participation of the party or parties giving such notice or notices and the party or parties so called upon shall issue the said amount or amounts (hereinafter called "the residuary participation") specified in such notice or notices upon and subject to the terms and conditions following, viz.:

(1.) Such notice or notices must be received by the other or others of the parties hereto before the execution of the final agreement for the issue of the loan or (in the case of an issue of a part only of the loan) of so much thereof as the parties hereto may from time to time agree to issue.

(2.) The party or parties to whom such notice or notices shall have been given shall be entitled to decide among themselves and without reference to the party or parties giving such notice or notices as to which one or more of them shall issue the residuary participation, but in default of any such decision they shall issue the same equally between them.

(3.) In issuing the residuary participation no distinction shall be made between the residuary participation and the amount or amounts issued on its or their own account by the party or parties issuing the residuary participation, which shall in all respects be subject to the conditions of the respective syndicates which may be formed for the purpose of effecting the issue.

(4.) Each of the parties issuing the residuary participation shall be entitled to decide for itself and without reference to the party or parties giving such notice or notices as to what expenses shall be incurred in relation to the issue of the total amount issued by such party.

(5.) The party or parties issuing the residuary participation shall be entitled between them to charge the party or parties giving such notice or notices with a commission of not exceeding 1½ per cent on the nominal amount of the residuary participation and also with a pro-rata share of the total expenses which the issuing party or parties may in their sole discretion incur in relation to the whole issue and being in the proportion which the residuary participation bears to the total nominal amount of the issue.

(6.) The party or parties issuing the residuary participation shall not by virtue of this agreement incur any responsibility to subscribe for the residuary participation or to cause the same to be subscribed.

(7.) Each party issuing the residuary participation shall apply all subscriptions received by it pro rata between the residuary participation issued by it and the amount issued by such party on its own account.

(8.) Each of the parties issuing the residuary participation will apply for and use its best endeavors to obtain a quotation on its market for the total amount issued by it.

(9.) No issue of the residuary participation or any part thereof shall be made by the party or parties giving such notice or notices unless mutually agreed by the parties hereto.

7. No participation shall be given by any one of the parties hereto outside its own market. Any participation given in its own market by any one of the parties hereto shall be for its own account only, or, in the event of the issue including any of the residuary participation, for the accounts pro rata of the issuing bank and the party or parties giving such notice or notices as aforesaid and in giving any such participation the party giving the same shall use its best endeavors to secure that no part of such participation shall be transferred to parties outside the market of the party giving the same. Any other participation shall be given only with the consent of all parties hereto and shall be borne in equal shares by the parties hereto.

8. This agreement shall remain in force for the period of five years from the date hereof provided nevertheless that a majority of the parties hereto may by twelve months' previous notice in writing addressed to the other parties hereto determine this agreement at any time.

For the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, on behalf of the British group: C. S. ADDIS

For the Banque de l'Indo-Chine, on behalf of the French group: TH. DE LA CHAUME

For the Yokohama Specie Bank (Limited), on behalf of the Japanese group: K. TAKEUCHI

For and on behalf of the American group: J. P. MORGAN & Co., KUHN, LOEB & Co.

The National City Bank of New York: by J. A. STILLMAN, *President*

The Guaranty Trust Company of New York: by J. R. SWAN, *Vice-President*

Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago: by JOHN JAY ABBOTT, *Vice-President.*

Chase National Bank, New York City: by A. H. WIGGIN, *Chairman;* LEE, HIGGINSON & Co.

An Open Letter to Mr. Untermyer

Mr. Samuel Untermyer,
120 Broadway,
New York City.

May 31, 1921.

My dear Mr. Untermyer:

As counsel for the Lockwood Committee, you have brought before the American public in general some startling revelations concerning the insurance business. This investigation is being conducted, for the most part, with the money of the people of New York and is now costing them thousands and thousands of dollars. It is our opinion that unless some immediate remedy is effected, the evils which you have found to exist, namely that approximately $600,000,000.00 is being paid annually to foreign insurance companies by the American people for American risks, shall still continue to exist long after the Lockwood Committee has disbanded. In view of this fact, we offer you the following constructive suggestions.

The Insurance Brokerage business has not been heretofore, so far as we know, exploited as a corporate enterprise in which the public have been invited to participate. Realizing the possibilities in a large body of co-operating and sympathetic stockholders, it was determined to give the public a chance to join in this enterprise and to acquire in this way an interest in the profits accruing from the handling of insurance upon their own risks. A large volume of immediate business is thus assured to the Company and the mutualizing idea, already successfully adopted by the Underwriters, is thus carried a step farther in the interest of the insuring public.

All American Brokers, Incorporated, had its inception during the early Spring and Summer of 1920 in the minds of a small coterie of Insurance Experts who, seeking a larger field for their endeavors, realized that a vast sum, about $600,000,000.00 was being paid yearly out of the pockets of American insurers of various classes of risks to foreign Underwriters. The amount is so stupendous as to be almost staggering.

We recognized what it would mean in the way of added prosperity at home if this large sum of money could be retained in the United States. Perceiving the opportunity thus presented for the establishment of an innovation in the conduct of the Insurance business in this country, the corporation, All American Brokers, was organized and incorporated in December, 1920, with "100% AMERICANISM" as its foundation and "American Dollars for America" as its guiding principle.

The All American Investing Company, Inc., at 19 West 44th Street, New York City, is offering the stock of the All American Brokers, Inc., at $1.50 a share. The success of the Company thus far has exceeded expectations. A large force of alert solicitors is employed and is continually being augmented with suitable talent when found. No effort will be spared to establish the business in the most commanding position in the Insurance field of America.

We shall be pleased to furnish you with any additional information you may desire. We believe our plan will meet with your approval and we invite your fullest cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ALL AMERICAN BROKERS, INC.,

By John A. Hastings, Secretary.