The Nation

Vol. CXII, No. 2920 FOUNDED 1865 Wednesday, June 22, 1921

Bullying Mexico

Editorial

Anti-Semitism

The Visa System and Immigration

by Reuben Fink

Good News From California

by George P. West

Summer Book Supplement

Reviews and Articles by

Henry Seidel Canby, Robert Dell, Glen Mullin, Edward Sapir
Robert Livingston Schuyler, Raymond M. Weaver
George Soule, Gregory Zilboorg

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 22, 1921 No. 2920

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.

MARTIAL law in all its rigor has again been clapped on Haiti. But what was not given out in the Navy Department's lengthy justificatory statement to the press in connection with Colonel Russell's order was the accompanying verbal command to each of the Haitian newspapers that not only no part of the recently issued Memoir of the Union Patriotique d'Haïti could be reprinted, but that even *quotations from American newspaper comment on the Memoir* were forbidden. The proclamation is naturally garbed in the nauseating hypocrisy with which imperialism cloaks its deeds. The new repression, it is stated, is merely to "curb libel" and will affect only a "few agitators" and will apply chiefly to articles and speeches "which will reflect adversely upon the American forces in Haiti." This means that every dastardly assault by a ruffian who happens to wear an American uniform, and there have been not a few of these in Haiti, every act of brutality and oppression by an alien invader is thus made immune from even a retailing of its facts. And, of course, this new order, we are carefully informed, has the "entire approval of President Dartiguenave," a neat piece of camouflage for those who do not know that Dartiguenave is the creature of the American Military Occupation and that he was virtually forced on the Haitian people to establish the sham of a "Haitian government." The really tragic aspect of this latest order does not concern Haiti so much as it does the United States. The Haitian people have undergone every sort of suffering, cruelty, and ignominy which ruthless military conquest under cover of a strict censorship can inflict. When Mr. Harding made the Haitian and Santo Domingan scandal a campaign issue the censorship which had existed for five years in Haiti was lifted. That it is now reapplied would seem to indicate that the Republicans in their attitude toward this defenseless little nation will be guilty of the same immorality, the same cynical indecency, the same violation of all that is precious in American tradition as were the Democrats.

FIRST Harvey, then Sims, and soon Nicholas Murray Butler! Accustomed as we are to misrepresentation abroad we confess that this staggers us. True, it now appears that the news President Butler so hastily gave to the press was an error—he was not asked to speak to the conference of Imperial Premiers; even the Anglo-American dinner he was first scheduled to speak at was canceled, but another occasion is to be found. How the Imperial Premiers will survive the disappointment we cannot quite see. As for Sims, he has been a gallant officer and some times his refusal to wear the army or naval officer's muzzle has stood the country in good stead. But his abuse of the Irish in America is as tactless as it was base, and for that he should have a reckoning. If he had to touch upon this subject he might well have dwelt upon the natural sympathy the American Irish must feel for their sorely embattled kin. He might have expressed some understanding of what it means to millions of our fellow-countrymen to behold each arrival of the postman with fear and trembling lest he bring the news of death by violence of relative or friend in Ireland. We are glad that Senator McCormick, Secretary Denby and Congress acted promptly.

TO the English people everybody's sympathy ought to go out. Their difficulties multiply even though it begins to look as if the coal strike were gradually nearing its end. The cotton strike has thrown 50,000 people out of work, while conditions in the woolen industry are so bad that the workers are earning only one-third of their pre-war wage because of a partial shut-down and their employers are losing money at a really alarming rate. There is now the menace of an engineers' strike which would throw 1,500,000 men out of work—a catastrophe the Government is working hard to prevent. The ship-stewards' strike is not yet over though nearly defeated and, as we recorded last week, the general conditions in the shipping industry are such that there are more seamen out of work than ever before and the biggest shipyards are beginning to shut down. On top of all that, the Government is planning to give up its control of agriculture with the resultant guaranteed prices for wheat and oats and the fixed minimum wage for agricultural laborers. This would immediately precipitate wage disputes affecting another 400,000 persons. Naturally the budget is shot to pieces, not only because of the enormous

unemployment doles which the Government is paying, but because of the general falling off in business. In May there was so startling a decline in imports and exports, due in large degree to the coal strike doubtless, as at least to give reason for Lloyd George to decide against going into another war against Turkey even in order to head off Bolshevist penetration of that country. Ireland meanwhile would seem to furnish war and waste enough. It is not surprising that Lloyd George has had to stand up to two smashing defeats in bye-elections in what were supposed to be absolutely safe Coalition districts.

SIR PHILIP GIBBS is another who is making the original discovery that it is not always the victors who win a war. He has been revisiting Berlin and is very much puzzled to find it apparently humming with industry and the determination to overcome all obstacles to the payment of debts and the rehabilitation of the country. "I see," he writes in the New York *Herald*, "a people braced and energized by defeat, whereas the victor nations, like England, have slackened into listlessness. . . . There is a new spirit in Germany. It is economic enthusiasm, with peace and labor as its conditions. They will show the world what German genius can do in industry." But one thing profoundly perplexes him and that is this: Since Germany can pay her indemnities only by enormously increased exports, if those exports go to the Allied countries they must inevitably ruin the industries of the Allies to the extent of those exports. "It is," he philosophizes, "a devilish dilemma, for which as yet I can see no solution." Yet he might have talked this over, to his enlightenment, free of charge, with Mr. Keynes, or Mr. John A. Hobson, a long time ago. What puzzles Sir Philip still more is that he finds horrible overcrowding and much suffering among the poorer classes in Berlin coupled with tremendous attendance at beer-gardens and amusement parks.

IN an interesting parallel the New York *World*, which has been conducting a vigorous and a highly creditable fight for disarmament, points out that the cost of American preparedness is almost the exact equivalent of the German reparation burden. The total amount of the indemnity to Germany—for the war which she lost—is $33,000,000,000. At the rate of present preparation provided in the Army and Navy Bills the United States will pay approximately the same sum in the corresponding period of time—for armament which will be useless unless there is another war and probably in large part useless even in such an eventuality. The *World* correctly concludes that "both these huge sums are indemnities, whether devoted to reparation or to preparation," and points out that while for Germany the indemnity is probably unescapable, the people of the United States can avoid their burden if only they have the will to do so.

IT is evident already that the new immigration law is going to be difficult to enforce. The legislation not only restricts immigrants from a given country to 3 per cent annually of the natives of that country that were in the United States at the time of the 1910 census, but it also provides that not more than 20 per cent of the entire quota shall enter in any one month. It was announced from Washington on June 6 that the quota of Italians for the first month had been exceeded by 1,367, or about 40 per cent; while the number from Luxemburg, which is seven, was admitted in New York on the first day, and Ellis Island, telegraphing that it had "one Luxemburger in excess of quota," asked for an increased allotment. What is to be done? The law was put into effect so soon after its passage that complaints are numerous, and justified, that there w. no adequate opportunity to conform to it. The steamship companies are held responsible for returning excess immigrants, but in some cases they may prefer to maintain the aliens on board until another month. Obviously coordination among dozens of different lines in keeping within the various quotas is going to be most difficult. The tragedy of those who have broken up their homes and spent their all only to be rejected is pitiable. It has been suggested that the monthly quota be abolished, but this might lead to frightful congestion early in the year and make the puzzle more complicated when the final moment of restriction arrived.

EVERY rent-payer in New York City should pay without delay his yearly dues of one dollar which will entitle him to membership in the Citizens' Protective Housing League, headed by Nathan Hirsch and Samuel Untermyer. Instead of the 300,000 members without which Mr. Hirsch says the league cannot begin operations, there should be many more than that number, and the plan should be adopted in every city in the country. With expert counsel at his service almost gratis, with boards of arbitration and mediation in continual session, with a constant attempt to promote the enactment of legislation calculated to relieve the housing shortage and to increase building, every tenant should be protected and every landlord should receive rightful compensation for the leasing of his prop erty. Mr. Hirsch's statement that the league will be non money-making and non-political, and that "if any officer becomes a candidate for or accepts any public office his resignation becomes automatic" removes the likelihood of graft. And the plan of paying the league's lawyers a proper salary for their services protects the tenant or landlord from careless and indifferent legal advice. For the poor rent-payer to whom counsel fees have been so prohibitive as to make him pay his landlord's demand almost without question, the rent-paying millennium will seem to have arrived. All these things ought to happen; whether 300,000 persons or 3,000 can be drawn together in any such enterprise is, of course, another matter.

OUR lively, adventurous, and admirable contemporary *The Dial* in its June number makes an announcement which deserves, and we do not doubt will get, the widest publicity: "On January the first of each year it will acknowledge the service to letters of some one of those who have, during the twelvemonth, contributed to its pages by the payment to him of two thousand dollars." This is not to be a prize, and no indications are given as to the particular qualities which *The Dial* aims to recognize, but we assume that the money will go to some writer who needs it and who will justify the donation. We are glad the amount is to be offered; we hope whoever gets it will use the leisure it will buy to the best advantage; we wish there were a hundred such bonuses—or whatever they should be called for such services.

IN our allusion to the Pennsylvania Railroad last week it should have been said that the company had recently reduced its dividend, not passed it.

THE late unlamented Postmaster General while still engaged in making his office a jest and a byword among decent citizens ruled that Dr. Marie Stopes's "Married ove," a work originally published in England and by the est English authorities considered among the best of its sort, is too obscene for the chaste society of the United States mails, and so banned it. Of course, prosecutions followed; Dr. William J. Robinson, the publisher, has been fined and the treatise totally suppressed. If the book were as bad as the law which has been invoked, it would be bad indeed and would deserve some fell fate; but the book is not bad in any eyes but those of this particular squint-eyed law and those who preposterously approve it. Dr. Stopes, in a language which we can object to only because of a tincture of sentimentalism in it, has tried to help married people to be happy by pointing out certain difficulties which must continue to arise so long as the principal equipment of bride and groom is ignorance regarding the biology, physiology, and psychology of marriage. Her offense is that she has put into print what all enlightened people know.

THE Institute for Public Service points out that of the 308 students graduating from Princeton this month only seven intend to enter the profession of teaching. "Four years of constant association with Princeton's faculty and only 1 in 44 wants to be a faculty member!" exclaims the Institute for Public Service in just horror. What an outrage! When one thinks of how the Princeton faculty battled to make the world safe for democracy (while rigidly excluding the black brother), how it denounced everything pertaining to the Hun, and with what speed it turned itself to a field artillery camp, such undergraduate ingratitude is beyond characterization. No one outdid the Princeton faculty in one hundred per centism; no college can, of course, outdo it in scholarship or intellectual achievement, nor, indeed, in all the advantages of a charming country club. And still only 1 out of every 44 students wishes to be a faculty member!

FOUR years ago, with fasting and with prayer, the authorities of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University allowed the first women candidates for medical degrees to begin their labors. It is on record that their classmates of the opposite sex enjoyed at their expense many a merry jest similar to the one of dropping nice cold wriggly worms into the timid little girl's hand. Now the first class has just been graduated and the five intrepid damsels who took the Hippocratic oath this year have had an ample revenge. Bearing their blushing honors lightly upon them, three of them graduated first, third, and fifth in their class, with the other two safely and substantially placed further down the line. What a triumph is that! There remains only one citadel to conquer at Columbia; the law school still barricades its doors against the weaker sex. Are not lawyers as brave as doctors?

SAID Admiral Sims to Ambassador Harvey:
"The hornets are napping; let's stir up the larvae."
. . . . . .
.id Ambassador Harvey to Admiral Sims:
"I'm afraid we have started too much by our whims."
. . . . . .
To Harvey and Sims said Oom Warren Gamaliel:
"When I get you boys home I shall horribly flail ye all."

On Truthing It

"DON'T you think," writes an ardent friend of *The Nation*, "that you might follow Lucretia Mott's saying more closely about 'truthing it in love'? It is my only criticism." Well, we wish we might, if only because we are elated that a subscriber has only *one* criticism of us when we have so many of ourselves. But that brings up a serious question as to the tactics of a militant journal. Lucretia Mott usually liked *The Liberator*, one of the most sledge-hammer journals that ever existed, and rejoiced in its blows. It is hard to draw the line, for if one truths it too softly one loses power and effectiveness. To strike too hard may be like calling wolf too often, but of the two we would not be of those who deprecate easily and sweetly. We would rather have to be reminded often of Lucretia Mott's saying than to share that fading philosophy of one of our contemporaries which declares that all is for the best, that everything will soon be well in the best of worlds and the Republican Party. Without setting up to be holier than anybody else, we yet prefer to plead guilty, if we must, to being too ready to find fault and too eager to go to the rescue of the distressed.

But what we would convey more often to our readers than we do is our cheerfulness while we truth it as best we know how. There *are* very dark skies above us. Our practical men of affairs have got the world in a mess and know not how to get us out. Their sacred order is slowly collapsing before their eyes. Poor, stumbling humanity seems to learn nothing from its recent disaster, but goes on preparing for the next. And yet to us there is still much blue sky and bright sunshine. We do not need to quote the hackneyed "darkest before dawn" phrase to fortify forlornly our spirits. For in many lands men's hearts are nerved and their minds stirred. Who can look upon India, see the miracle of this great nation's awakening, and be discouraged? Who can look upon seething Egypt, supposed to be safely drugged by some pellets of good government administered by foreign physicians, and not rejoice? From Africa and the Far East come similar tales; the black and the yellow have begun to think and to coalesce. In darkest Spain the ferment is deep; for corrupt officialdom, medieval clergy, tottering royalty, and base exploiters of the masses the handwriting is on the wall. Truly those journalists who record the real factual truths of the world today have no cause to lose hope or faith. They are compelled to take note of light in endless hitherto dark quarters.

We have no fear that out of all this there is to come nothing constructive, nothing better. Humanity doesn't progress that way. This ferment will not pass without leaving a residuum of new social truths and doctrines. Even from the Bolsheviki the world has learned and will learn much even though they collapse and soon. Already men see in increasing numbers that there is no magic in political government, and the eyes of many will open month by month to realize that neither politics, nor tariffs, nor Chinese Walls against new ideas, nor special privileges are even palliatives, much less cures. Love even for those who block progress and deny truth we hope to have; hate for them certainly we have not. Yet while our pens move they must be unsparing. That is because they seek to serve the truth and it is truth itself that is ever harsh and uncompromising.

Bullying Mexico

WATCHFUL waiting has been succeeded by bumptious bullying as a policy toward Mexico. The first course was never notably successful, but the second is considerably more inflammable. At this writing it is understood that President Obregon will try to meet the demands made by Secretary Hughes as the price of our recognition. These have not been made public, but they are embodied in a proposed treaty the pith of which, according to Mr. Hughes, "is the safeguarding of property rights against confiscation." More explicitly, the purpose is that the Mexican constitution of 1917, which asserts national ownership of subsoil wealth, shall not be enforced retroactively so as to invalidate the titles to oil lands acquired by Americans before that date. Article 27 of this constitution (which has become as famous as Article X of the covenant of the League of Nations) says: "In the nation is vested direct ownership of . . . petroleum and other hydrocarbons—solid, liquid, or gaseous." There is nothing in the constitution itself which makes this provision retroactive, and President Obregon has said that there was no intention so to interpret it. This should be sufficient. To demand treaty guaranties of ordinary good faith is a humiliation to Mexico, while to qualify her constitution is impossible without going through the regular legal steps of amendment. Nevertheless, it may be worth the price if thereby Mexico can assure herself of our friendship and gain the opportunity of economic rehabilitation.

The question is, Can she? This is gravely to be doubted. Secretary Hughes may be honest in his intentions, but the necessities of the oil interests lie deeper than mere assurance that the Mexican constitution will not be enforced retroactively against them. They want to exploit their lands at the greatest possible profit to themselves and the least possible return to Mexico. The ownership of property in Mexico, as in various other countries and some of our own States, does not carry with it the right to minerals in the earth, for which a government concession must be obtained; but up to about ten years ago oil was not considered of any consequence, and under the old mining codes it was excluded from those substances over which the nation maintained control. The question of government or private control of oil is not as important as it sounds, however. The assertion of government ownership does not mean ejection of the American companies but merely a demand for rent. In lieu of rent, equivalent sums may be obtained by taxation, of which President Obregon has given a sharp reminder by raising the export tax on oil 25 per cent within the last few days. This has produced an immediate outcry from the oil interests, and it is evident that any attempt to levy on them in this way will be as much resented as if it were exacted as rent for a concession. It is their profits, not their rights, that the oil companies are bent upon maintaining. The oil interests will be satisfied for the moment if the American Government puts its foot in. After that it will be easy to demand that the flag shall not be hauled down. The Harding policy appears not to be a pathway of peace, but a lane of many turnings of intrigue and aggression.

In his statement announcing the Administration's action Mr. Hughes declaims against what he is pleased to call a "confiscatory policy" on the part of Mexico. What is confiscation? That must always be a question of opinion and a matter of degree. All taxation is confiscation in part. The English land taxes devised by Lloyd George in his early political career and our own income taxes in the upper schedules are highly and intentionally confiscatory. Confiscation is a bogy brought forth by vested and property interests whenever they see themselves likely to be shorn. There is nothing about present Mexican law that is unduly oppressive toward private property, but let us face the issue frankly and admit that Mexico has an unquestionable right to adopt a "confiscatory policy" if she chooses. It is not for us to make her laws or dictate her form of government. According to long-established international polity we have just one right in the premises: to demand that Americans receive equal treatment before the law. Subject only to the protection that they be not discriminated against, our citizens who go to foreign countries must take their chances with natives and with other aliens. The new policy of industrial imperialism, which requires government to act as a catspaw for business and involves the coercion of small nations by bigger ones, means constant embroilment and has been the cause of much modern war. It leads government into injustice and tyranny, of which we have an immediate and tragic example in our aggression in Haiti and Santo Domingo.

We are fearful, therefore, of the consequences of a policy of bumptious bullying in our relations with Mexico. Granting inherent uprightness to Mr. Hughes, we distrust his formalism and obstinacy in subsequent negotiations, and are without confidence in the pliable and two-faced mentality of President Harding, beside whom stands Secretary Fall frank in his hostility toward Mexico. Hope lies in so informing public opinion that it will not tolerate seeing America committed to the support of a few thousand oil operators to the point where 105,000,000 people may be drawn into intervention and war. There are numerous Americans with other than oil interests in Mexico whose business would be completely upset by war. Let them speak, if possible as a body. Let all those interested in South American trade, to whom aggression in Mexico would be paralyzing, speak too. The ear of the present Administration is especially attentive to the voice of business.

Above all, let the poor benighted man in the street, whose son will be conscripted and whose earnings will be absorbed in case of war by the "confiscatory policy" (of taxation) which Mr. Hughes so deplores—let him be on guard against the flood of buncombe and balderdash by which the American people will be asked to believe that intervention in Mexico is necessary in order to "preserve civilization" and "protect the American home." A campaign has already been begun to show that the Mexicans are Bolshevists and that therefore an attack upon them would be a "holy war." They have not yet been charged with nationalization of women or cutting babies' throats, but they will be whenever that is necessary. War will not come overnight. The danger of bumptious bullying is that it will lead finally to a situation where the dispatch of a "protective force" across the border, or the "temporary occupation" of certain territory will be held to be "necessary" and "inevitable"; that it will develop a state of mind that cannot distinguish between hokum and humanity.

No War With England

X. Conclusion

TO present cold facts without sentiment has been the object of this series. It is impossible, however, to conclude it without some warmth of expression, because it is impossible to consider an armed conflict between the United States and Great Britain without profound emotion. What has been set forth in the preceding articles shows only too clearly how dangerously contrary to one another the economic currents of the two countries are running—since this series began the split between the English and American oil producers in Mexico has steadily widened, while the Irish ulcer grows deeper and more virulent. We are aware, of course, of the widespread belief—recently voiced by the New York *Evening Post*—that war is so unthinkable as to make discussion of it utterly needless. They are not only superficial thinkers who write thus—they are grossly ignorant of our history of twenty-five years ago. Then it was the *Evening Post* which with *The Nation* fought unceasingly for justice to Great Britain when a single, totally unexpected message of President Cleveland literally brought the two countries to the very verge of war.

Had this country at that time tasted blood as it later did in Cuba and had not the English statesmen borne themselves with extraordinary forbearance and readily consented to arbitration there must have been a conflict. It is a historic fact that one day we were dreaming least of all of trouble with England over a Venezuelan boundary dispute and that the next day every jingo, imperialistic, and super-patriotic editor in America was howling for war. The *Evening Post* itself said at that time that Mr. Cleveland's message left "only to consider whether or not we will take up arms in behalf of Venezuela." What one President can do over night another can also. And it is a peculiar fact that unknown to the American public events are so shaping themselves in the race for oil that a Venezuelan boundary dispute may again furnish the spark for an international conflagration. Venezuela and Colombia face each other today virtually with daggers drawn over disputed oil lands, with England in the background as the supporter of Venezuela, while the progress of American oil prospectors in Colombia, coupled with our recent $25,000,000 payment to that country, foreshadows clearly the side on which the United States is likely to be.

But if we are, perhaps, in view of the World War's comradeship, in less danger of such a sudden outburst of temper, there remains the truth that our economic rivalries wax steadily and are being brought to a sharp and pressing issue at three points—the merchant marine, navy, and oil. Our great public, too widely disgusted with all politics, does not realize that the great competing industrial and financial interests are pulling the strings and jockeying for advantage at the very moment that their public speakers arise at banquets and denounce the Irish for disturbing the cordial relations between the two countries. Few Americans understand, for instance, the significance of the decision of the Lloyd George Government and its pliable Parliament to abandon the historic principle of free trade, under which England has waxed great, rich, and powerful, for a system of thinly disguised protection, under the excuse of protecting itself from "dumping." Here again England moves against the United States, not consciously, since this legislation is aimed at the Central Powers, but it will none the less have its effect. It is, moreover, an entering wedge, and the history of all protective legislation in all countries is that once the protected interests get a foothold they inevitably demand more and more. If these two great countries bar out each other's goods no one can question that there will be a still further increase in the political friction between them.

Now as to the remedies. Fortunately, there are a number of them. The most important lies in England's hands—a just solution of the Irish problem. It is unthinkable that England or any country can continue to govern a province seething with revolution and dissatisfaction. When that issue is settled the whole aspect of our relationship will change. Next, open diplomacy is what we sorely need. Our Department of State conducts negotiations and writes notes, and sometimes it tells us about them afterwards and sometimes it does not. The danger exists that we shall suddenly have sprung upon us a correspondence over Mexican or Mesopotamian or Venezuelan oil wells which will cause great popular excitement. That the personal contacts between citizens of the two countries should be increased is obvious. There should be a far greater interchange of students and professors, yes, of editors, and labor leaders, and business men. Loath as we are to suggest any new organization, we do pray for some alliance between the liberals of the *Manchester Guardian*-London *Nation* school with those of our own country and, indeed, of France, Germany, and other nations. In their cooperation—they are freest of any groups from prejudice or entangling economic alliances—lies hope because they realize best of all that the danger of war cannot be camouflaged by hands-across-the-sea or blood-is-thicker-than-water sentiments—every blessed editor of the New York *Sun* and *Tribune* forgot them on reading Mr. Cleveland's fiery outburst.

Beyond that lie the great economic issues of the time. With free trade everywhere, with balanced systems of production and distribution, with the workers and not the exploiters managing industry in largest degree, with the uncontrolled exporting of capital for overseas adventure—such as the forcing of the Six Power Loan on China against its will—at an end, with use rather than profit the chief aim in industry, the dangers of any war would vastly decrease. These remedies lie in the more distant future. They can only be brought about by vast economic changes. But they can be furthered, and the dangers of the existing business rivalries exposed, by pitiless publicity than which no more pressing duty rests upon the liberal press.

Finally, there is an immediate and drastic remedy so close at hand that it is impossible to conceive how President Harding can lose a single day in grasping it—disarmament on sea and land, and thereafter the establishment of a true and democratic league of nations. The abolition of our fleets alone would mean the banishing of fear of a sudden overnight clash in defiance of the excellent arbitration treaty which binds the two nations together. Then the limiting of our army to police-force size would send peace stock beyond par. How can any one hesitate? If England and the United States come to blows with the new "scientific" warfare, every sane man will despair of civilization.

Summer Reading

WHAT are we going to read during our vacation if we are lucky enough to have one? One friend reminds us, a little reproachfully, that we have not yet read Wells's "Outline of History"; another earnestly commends to our attention Spengler's "Untergang des Abendlandes." No, gentlemen, we shall not burden ourselves with these heavy tomes or the frantic visions they arouse, whether of progress or of downfall. A vacation should be a vacation.

It is doubtful, in truth, whether vacation reading should be anything but re-reading. It should include recollection and self-recollection and aim at tranquillity. The busy years have raced by and we have not re-read Boswell or the delectable letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu or sundry volumes of Voltaire that once seemed as clear as well water and as heady as wine. Gibbon will serve us instead of Wells. The truth of history is a shaky one at best. And you do not even have to read the "Decline and Fall." Open the volume and mark the legend that heads the page and you can follow in fancy—thus saving your eyes—that grandiose and momentous pageantry. Montaigne's essays can be had in snug volumes and Goethe's letters in exquisite selections. Hazlitt is perhaps too intoxicating for a summer sojourn. But we could do very well re-reading the sane and spiritually frugal volumes—there are enough to last for weeks—of Leslie Stephen's "Studies of a Biographer" or the "Miscellanies" of John Morley. And some day, during mellow afternoons, it would be pleasant to follow again the velvety cadences of "Marius the Epicurean."

But these are imperfect plans and counsels. All prose is second best and scarred by the business of the world. Only the poetry we choose should not be a poetry of deliberate evasion. Through all the languorous beauty of Morris's "Earthly Paradise" sounds the thin but troubling echo of his own unavailing contest with an imperfect world. No, the wish of Ronsard strikes the deep, quiet, and harmonious note:

> Je veux lire en trois jours l'Iliade d'Homère.

That is a brave feat denied us. But we should wish, on long summer days to read the "Æneid" through again until the hills melt into the skies, "suadentque cadentia sidera somnos." A high and heroic kind of peace arises from the Vergilian hexameters, and the poet's sense of the tears in all mortal things is too remote and universal to trouble us at all. There are verses we have only glanced at and always planned to read that would fill many days with a beauty not keen or close enough to arouse or wound. Some day we shall read Ariosto's poem through and "Britannia's Pastorals" and all the verses—not only the famous things—of Drayton and the "well-languaged" Daniel and, on such rain-swept mornings as must come, all the satires of Donne and all the poems of Swift—there are three volumes full in the Aldine reprints—and Addison's "Essay on Medals" which, Macaulay assures us, shows his unrivaled knowledge of Latin poetry. A fine savor of learning clings to these books, which would add a grateful sense of elegant utility to the reading of our all too rare drowsy days.

An itch for something livelier might come upon us before the cooler winds of late August begin to blow. But Horace would be within reach, and Martial, and Ronsard with his matchless counsel for fair and easy hours:

> Verson ces roses pres ce vin,
> Pres ce vin verson ces roses,
> Et boivon l'un à l'autre, à fin
> Qu'au coeur nos tristesses encloses
> Prennent en boivant quelque fin.

There is your true vacation spirit to put some end to t sadnesses hidden in our hearts. How Ronsard would have smiled at a generation of men that has divorced the roses from the wine and can no longer see the beaded bubbles of the slim glass that stands beside the page. We had almost forgotten that! Our vacations are dry, and Horace will seem ironical, Rabelais fill us with mere envy, and so hackneyed a song as Jonson's "Drink to me only with thine eyes" only remind us that, nowadays, the lady has indeed no choice. We begin almost to doubt not the charm and wisdom, but the practicalness of our plans for a summer's reading. Having dispensed with those delights that seemed normal and necessary throughout time even to the austerest poets and the greatest sages, we may find that grave and beautiful and melodious old books have not enough edge and immediacy for our unsoothed and hungry nerves. Perhaps our friends were right; perhaps we shall be forced to take refuge with Wells and Spengler after all and fight our battles over again when we should rather toss roses down beside the wine and hear Æneas renew the story of his once unspeakable but now softened because perished woe.

Better News From California

ELSEWHERE in this issue Mr. George P. West tells an inspiring story which the forces of liberalism and t Americanism—as contrasted with the spurious hundr per cent Americanism—are winning in California. A the news is even better than when Mr. West wrote. For word comes as we go to press that the conduct of the Los Angeles public schools along the lines favored by the Better America Federation reactionaries has been decisively repudiated by the voters. A new school board has been elected, a successful ticket being put into the field by the same High School Teachers' Association that lodged formal protest against the removal of *The Nation* and the *New Republic* from the school library. Despite the fact that with the one honorable exception of the *Record*, a Scripps paper, the fight was waged without newspaper assistance—as the Federation is still a sacred cow in Los Angeles journalism —the liberals led by Dr. John R. Haynes, and supported by a fine group of representative men and women, ousted President C. J. McCormick, Melville Dozier, and Mrs. Grace M. Ashley. The last named became known as "Mrs. Closed Incident Ashley," her arbitrariness contributing to the victory which carries with it a demand for the participation of the teachers in shaping school policies.

Simultaneously comes the gratifying news from Butte, Montana, that progressive trustees known as "The Independents" have by an overwhelming majority gained control of their district. They are sending out word that they wish to replace the former superintendent with a

> man who believes in the right of the people to control th own public schools and who will not be subject to any influer or pressure which may be brought to bear upon him in su organizations as Rotary Clubs, Chambers of Commerce, Bus.- ness Men's Associations, or any political parties or political strappers; who believes that the sole purpose of public schools is to provide instruction for the children.

Good News From California

By GEORGE P. WEST

CALIFORNIA is celebrating the return of its sanity and its sense of humor by making life miserable for the men who conduct the Better America Federation. But perhaps that is assuming too much. Perhaps they are not miserable. A certain legendary cow-puncher had to be thrown out of a dance-hall three separate times before he picked himself up from the sidewalk with the dawning realization that they didn't want him in there. And it may take even more punishment to convince California's professional extirpators of bolshevism either that the State is ungrateful or that it is their own mental processes and not the times that are out of joint. To date they merely have been whipped decisively by the State legislature; denounced by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; branded as libelers by the president of the State Housing and Immigration Commission; had their "literature" barred from the schools by the State Board of Education; and finally, have brought buzzing angrily about their ears the women of the Y. W. C. A., the churches, and the clubs of Los Angeles, their home city and erstwhile stronghold.

These bewildered pillars of society must by now be nursing the melancholy suspicion that the business community itself is tainted with bolshevism to the point where it no longer responds to the call for action on behalf of red-blooded Americanism. They must look back sadly on the stirring days when, as leaders of the American Protective eague, they commanded swarms of zealous spies and fear- ess intimidators with no one to say them nay, or to the later days, less than two years ago, when their "drive leaders" dragooned no less than $800,000 from the business men of Los Angeles to be spent at the rate of $160,000 a year for five years in protecting the government, the churches, and the schools against socialist contagion.

The Better America Federation (with headquarters in Los Angeles and branches in thirty-four California counties, and working in close cooperation with similar bodies the country over) has been unique only in its superior stupidity and its superior frankness. There was the question of the eight-hour day. Alarmed by the action of the Protestant and Catholic churches and the Y. W. C. A. in indorsing this and other heresies, the Better America Federation flooded the State with a neat little pamphlet leading off with the statement that "these organizations are well-meaning, but ill-advised." As for the eight-hour day:

> An investigation made in the large manufacturing districts in the East as to the manner in which the greater leisure operated, developed the fact that it was detrimental to the morals, efficiency, and general morale, and was productive of the usual results of idle hours. Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do, and not merely mischief, but unquestionably, evil.

Also,

> To deny them [women] the right to do so [work nights] is n abrogation of their fundamental right, and a denial of quality of opportunity"!

This pamphlet, later discontinued as impolitic, is one of many supplementing a weekly news bulletin mailed to contributors and consisting largely of lurid accounts of radical doings calculated to make the hair of the harassed shopkeeper stand on end. Again, the Federation tried to place in the hands of every school-teacher, and did circulate widely, a volume by Leslie M. Shaw, once Governor of Iowa and later Secretary of the Treasury, entitled "Vanishing Landmarks." Mr. Shaw is not a feminist. In "Vanishing Landmarks" he brushes aside all that nonsense, telling us that

> woman wants to be loved, and, incidentally, let me say, needs to be told that she is, in the tenderest way, and more than once. If told sufficiently often, she is even proud to be a slave to the man who loves her, and sometimes so without even receiving a single post-nuptial word of endearment. Woman does not get her happiness from her creatorships or sovereignties. The normal woman prefers that her husband be the sovereign and she his queen.

The founder and president of the Better America Federation is Harry M. Haldeman, proud possessor of a gold watch bestowed on him last winter by the business men's associations of Los Angeles as the city's most useful citizen during the year 1920. Starting in Indiana as a wagoner, Mr. Haldeman became a successful seller of plumbers' supplies, left the Crane Company in 1910 to go to Los Angeles and start in business for himself, and there crowned his career by creating the Better America Federation. His public work began during the war, when he led drive after drive. Los Angeles was exactly the field for his talents, just as Los Angeles has been the last to repudiate him in California's return to common sense. For in that city the business men had long been organized in the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association and had learned to jump at the crack of the M. & M. whip. Most of them jumped gladly enough as the price to be paid for low-wage scales and a labor movement kept feeble by spies, black-listing, and a police and court system friendly to the open shop. For years no business house in Los Angeles has dared to sign an agreement with a union unless it dared also to be denounced by Secretary Zeehandelaar of the M. & M. as indifferent and disloyal to the best interests of the city, and to feel the organized displeasure of the entire business community.

Settling down and winning success in a city long notorious for the tightness of its open-shop control and its organized intimidation of liberal business men, Mr. Haldeman must have found it easy to believe in the supreme authority of his ideas. And he was further deceived by his war-time experience. His form-letters demanding that laggers "come through" with their subscriptions to this or that patriotic fund never failed of their purpose, and it became generally agreed that Haldeman was a "go-getter," a "he-man," a "red-blooded 100 per cent American." He undoubtedly thought so himself. In a very complete file of documents issued by the Better America Federation I have looked in vain for an account of the birth of the idea. But one can imagine the let-down that must have come to Mr. Haldeman after the armistice. To return from commanding an army of patriotic office-chair dragoons to the selling of plumbers' supplies must have irked him. He probably missed the old thrill in landing an order for even a car-load of pipe. One might even speculate on the possibility that

Mr. Haldeman had a dream and saw an angel appearing to him with a flaming sword. But this is unlikely.

At any rate Mr. Haldeman acted, and there is the gold watch at least to show for it. He got up a board of directors of like-minded men, employed a lawyer named Woodworth Clum to act as director, and rented an entire floor in a Los Angeles office building. For two years he has had things his own way in Los Angeles, and even now only one Los Angeles newspaper cares to speak unkindly of the Federation. Mr. Clum is a lawyer belonging to a rather numerous class who profit by exploiting the vanity of a few leaders and the fear of the rank and file among ignorant business men. They are professional agitators on the side of privilege, and one of the most valuable assets of revotionary radicalism in the country. For if they are to be believed, the revolution is just around the corner. Mr. Clum's weekly news bulletins are transparent in their purpose of keeping the subscribing shopkeeper properly scared, properly grateful for the vigilance and intrepidity of Messrs. Haldeman and Clum, and so in the mood to continue his subscriptions. Mr. Clum is obviously proud of the Federation's espionage service, and his bulletins contain sly hints of mysterious sources of information. His agents make notes at churches, in schools, and colleges, and Mr. Clum is quick to report to the members such startling bits as that "Professor Ira T. Cross, of the Department of Economics, University of California, is a member in good standing of the San Francisco Building Trades Council." Mr. Clum wrote a pamphlet entitled "Making Socialists Out of College Students," in which he makes much of a photo-static copy of a private letter from the files of a radical professor. It was written by Professor Arthur W. Calhoun, then of Ohio State University, to his friend Professor W. E. Zeuch, then of the University of Minnesota, and discloses Professor Calhoun's preference for the left wing of the Socialist Party. Mr. Clum boasts that Calhoun "was relieved all the way round and is now at Pittsburgh helping conduct a co-operative association." As for Professor Zeuch, he is now at Cornell, and Mr. Clum prints his letter telling Clum:

> When you drive a Socialist out of the university you throw him into the radical movement. Instead of having an audience of a few students, he reaches hundreds through the platform and thousands through the press and pamphlets. . . . Schools for workers are springing up in our cities and are being taught by these fired professors. They are educating the labor leadership. . . . The more of them you get fired, the better. Keep up the good work!

But a regent of the State University of California does not agree with Mr. Clum. Chester Rowell of Fresno, a distinguished editor, a successful publisher, a member of the State Railroad Commission as well as a regent, is quoted as saying that "The University of California should hold both radical and conservative views on economic questions, in order to establish a balanced viewpoint." And Mr. Clum in his weekly bulletin for March 2 says:

> We are compelled to take issue with Mr. Rowell, and we submit to thinking men and women of this State our position—that it is very wrong to expect students in college to correctly balance their viewpoints, for their minds are still plastic. Mature judgment and the ability to correctly weigh opposing arguments does (*sic*) not come until the later years. The promise of Utopia and of millennium on earth is bound to appeal strongly to the average school mind. If the conservative and radical views are both laid before the student bodies and the students permitted to choose as between the two, we submit that the tendency is bound to be toward Utopia, and it may take a good many years for the student to discover that Utopia is impossible of achievement in this human world. The danger, therefore, to our body politic is considerable if Mr. Rowell's ideas are shared by the other regents of th University of California.

We submit that Mr. Clum (who, it should be said in justice to California, learned to split his infinitives at Western Reserve and not at Berkeley) has demonstrated that his mind, at least, is not plastic, but as solid and substantial as a billiard ball. He undertook, for Mr. Haldeman, to put it at the service of the public schools, and to that end wrote a pamphlet entitled "America is Calling," addressed "To the students in her high schools and colleges." It consisted of a partisan appeal based on the special advantages of high-school and college students. (In another pamphlet the Federation had opposed compulsory education for children of more than 14 years of age.) It was a partisan appeal against socialism and public ownership, and it warned them that

> if these groups of freethinkers or liberals in America succeed in materially changing our Constitution or substituting some other kind of government, there will be no profits to worry about in business. Maintenance of the Constitution of the United States is the highest form of business insurance. Without it you will not need much of an education.

The pamphlet ends:

> If anyone—man, woman, boy or girl—asks you to read radical books or magazines; if they tell you that the honest acquirement of wealth is a crime; if they endeavor to poison your mind with class hatred, repudiate them with all the courage of a true American. That is your job. Will you do it?

Copies of this masterpiece in Americanism were to distributed to every high-school and college student in th State. Up rose then a Bolshevist named Will C. Wood, who (perhaps with the aid of Russian gold?) had got himself appointed as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Mr. Wood received a letter from the City Superintendent of San Diego asking for light. San Diego is not far from Los Angeles, and well within the 100 per cent belt dominated by real estate speculators, hotel-keepers, and various others interested in maintaining a soothing atmosphere in southern California for senile retired Iowa farmers and senile retired Chicago capitalists. But the City Superintendent at San Diego had his doubts. He wrote Mr. Wood, and Mr. Wood, after reading "America Is Calling" and various other emanations of the Better America Federation, went before the State Board of Education and obtained a ruling that barred Mr. Clum's pamphlet from every public school in the State. He characterized certain Federation arguments as "against human progress," and when the Federation attacked him he replied publicly that

> too many splendid men have been inveigled in the organization because they feared some dire calamity impending. These men have been used . . . When they find that they have been misused, when they discover the real principles for which the Better America Federation stands, I believe they will not support it in its move to misuse the schools of the State.

Mr. Haldeman tried again last April, and again the Sta Board of Education voted to exclude the pamphlet from t schools. Meanwhile Mr. Haldeman had begun an attack the State Immigration and Housing Commission, intim ing that it was sympathetic with the I. W. W. Challenged, he produced a rabid pamphlet written by one Francis Welsh of Philadelphia, a stock broker who is apparently

a little crazy on the subject of radicalism and whose attacks lumping W. G. McAdoo and Newton D. Baker with all the reds there are have from time to time added to the gaiety of nations. How Mr. Welsh's indignation went so ar afield is a mystery. But it did, and the result was a pamphlet bristling with grotesque misstatements. The commission is an eminently respectable body, which once employed the late Carleton H. Parker as its secretary. It has done excellent work in cleaning up migratory labor camps and helping immigrants. Its members, all hold-overs from the Hiram Johnson administration, included the Catholic archbishop of San Francisco, Dr. McBride, a wealthy retired physician of Pasadena; Mrs. Frank A. Gibson, of Los Angeles, whose son has been retained by Mr. Hughes as Minister to Poland; Simon J. Lubin, son of the late David Lubin of Rome and one of the heads of the largest department store in Sacramento; and Paul Scharrenburg, secretary of the State Federation of Labor. Mr. Haldeman's attack brought a sharp reply from Mr. Lubin, in which he specified fourteen "lies" in the pamphlet that Haldeman had indorsed as reliable. One consequence of this sortie was a denunciation of the Better America Federation in the Catholic press.

But Mr. Haldeman is a glutton for punishment. He still held Los Angeles, and in the Los Angeles delegation to the legislature he could count off a majority who owed their election to the Better America Federation. There began in January Mr. Haldeman's legislative campaign which ended in April after a series of crushing defeats. A bill jeopardizing the certificate of any teacher who advocated a change in the Constitution; an attempt to block legisla- ion requiring banks, insurance companies, and public utility orporations to pay their share of the taxes; a bill providing for indeterminate franchises that would have hindered or prevented municipal ownership of utilities; an amendment to the initiative law requiring 25 per cent of signatures before a tax-reform measure could be placed on the ballot (this to dispose of single tax)—these were among the enterprises supported by the Better America legislators from Los Angeles that met decisive defeat. Fortunately the decrepit mind that dominates the Los Angeles business community was not the mind of California. In spite of his boasted thirty-four branches in other counties, Mr. Haldeman had been turned down flatly by the business men of San Francisco and had gained only tentative support in Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno, and other communities where the California spirit does still retain something of the liberality and tolerance of pioneer days. Senator Inman of Sacramento led the State Administration fight for the King bill to increase the taxes of corporations. In a final appeal on the floor of the Senate he bitterly denounced the Better America Federation and Mr. Haldeman by name, charging that they planned the capture of the next legislature and the election of a Governor in order to "reopen the doors of the Capitol to special privilege. They simply want big business to be free to engage in unregulated and unbridled exploitation of the people. The greedy advantage of the few, as against the many, is their religion."

Smarting under their whipping at Sacramento, Mr. Haldeman and his agents returned to Los Angeles and there, at last, scored a temporary victory. Their friends on the purchase and supply committee of the Board of Education struck *The Nation* and the *New Republic* from the list of publications permitted to be purchased for the school libraries! No reasons were given. There was no discussion. The High School Teachers Association, a responsible, regular, strictly representative body, met and adopted resolutions declaring that

> WHEREAS, We regard *The Nation* and the *New Republic* as of the highest reliability and purpose, and
>
> WHEREAS, We would, therefore, regard their exclusion from the school libraries as a distinct loss to the educational facilities of the schools, . . . therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Board of Education be asked to rescind immediately its order.

Thus far the Board has taken no action. But the incident is not closed. The Better America Federation in a recent news bulletin notes with disapproval the action of the high-school teachers in thus indorsing "two magazines that are undermining the economic principles of America." It then, weirdly enough, for it is an open-shop organization, quotes Mr. Gompers as supporting this opinion. In the same bulletin it again attacks State Superintendent Wood. It also points out the shocking things that happen when a Socialist gets elected to a school board. It seems that one did, in the little town of Claremont, and a week later the children were given Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" to read. Wasn't it "The Jungle" that brought Mr. Sinclair an enthusiastic invitation to break bread with President Roosevelt at the White House?

By constituting itself a monstrous caricature of the organized stupidity and malice prevalent during and since the war, the Better America Federation has done California a real service. The word "bolshevism" has lost its power to terrify citizens into docile submission to injustice. Atrocious bullies can no longer carry things with a high hand by wrapping themselves in the flag they have disgraced. In time, the good people of California may even begin to wonder whether those men behind the bars in San Quentin as I. W. W.'s or Communist Labor Party members are as ferocious and dangerous as they were painted by men whose privileges they attacked. Just now prosecutions are proceeding in Los Angeles. What is not doubtful is that the State of California has decisively repudiated the Better America Federation. Even in Los Angeles it is now actively opposed by clubwomen, church people, Y. W. C. A. promoters, and a growing number of the more intelligent business men. Its fight on the local branch of the Y. W. C. A. will be worth watching. Within the past month one of its leaders has again threatened to prevent the collection of funds for a new building unless the local board publicly repudiates the "Social Creed of the Churches" as adopted at last year's Cleveland Convention. There is every indication that it is in for a licking in its own home town—the amazing town hailed by the late General Otis as "the home of industrial freedom" because working men there are perfectly free to labor ten or twelve hours a day for as little as the boss cares to pay them.

Much derogatory to the spirit of Los Angeles has necessarily been said and implied here. I should not stop without registering the fact that no city has a keener, abler, more militant minority of clubwomen, school-teachers, wage-earners. They may emerge at any time as a majority. There is even a chance that as a result of the present reaction the business community of Los Angeles itself will finally throw off the iron discipline of the bitter reactionaries who have bullied it so long in the name of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

Visas, Immigration, and Official Anti-Semitism

By REUBEN FINK

THE passport and visa system is one of the evil heritages of the Great War. It emerged as a natural corollary of war logic. In this country it had its birth on May 22, 1918, through the adoption by Congress of the so-called Passport Control Act. It provided that no one should leave the United States without a passport or a permit from the Department of State, or enter this country without a passport properly visaed by the American consul or other accredited representatives abroad. The term of this act was to expire with the declaration of peace.

On August 22, 1919, Secretary Lansing, believing apparently that peace was approaching, addressed a communication to the President in which he urged the continuation of the act. However, Mr. Lansing did "not wish to be understood as holding that the visa system could or should supplant the existing immigration law." It was intended merely to serve the purpose "for some time" of preventing the admission into the United States of all "agitators and other dangerous persons." Acting upon this suggestion President Wilson, three days later, sent a communication to both houses of Congress pleading for the continuance of the Passport Control Act for one year after the declaration of peace. It was understood, however, that this measure would exclude only those "whose admission to the United States would be dangerous or contrary to public policy."

At the hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Relations in October, 1919, the State Department submitted reasons for the extension of the visa system, producing recommendations made by various American diplomatic and consular representatives abroad in favor of its permanent adoption. To the student of government technique, this is not at all surprising. These representatives, having built up a visa machinery and acquired added power and importance, were naturally loath to relinquish this power and to scrap their organization.

Testifying on October 7, 1919, before the House Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Lansing responded to Chairman Porter's inquiry, "What would be the scheme by which visas would be granted or withheld?" by saying that "So far as the Department of State is concerned it would determine, if possible, the character of the individual and whether he was the proper one to admit to entry into this country." Elucidating, he added, "If I were considering an Anarchist it would be his political character, or if I were considering a criminal it would be his personal character." Mr. Lansing emphatically promised not to control immigration under any condition. He assured the committee that he would not use the Passport Control Act to choke off immigration at any time; that he would always be guided by the immigration rules of Congress; again, that he would "not at all try to regulate the rise and fall of the immigration tide through the medium of this act." So sweeping was the assurance and apparently so thorough the understanding of the non-interference of this act with the immigration policy of the United States that even the friends of the immigrants offered no opposition. Mr. Louis Marshall, of the American Jewish Committee, was called by Representative Siegel to offer possible opposition, but instead telegraphed his approval of this proposed legislation. He did this because of the tacit understanding that the State Department under the terms of the act would under no conditions interfere with the admission into this country of "wives, children, parents, brothers, and sisters."

Thus the present visa system came into being. There was not the slightest doubt as to its meaning, and its intentions were well known and accepted by everyone. In the light of experience, however, since the passage of this act, all this sounds like fiction. The visa section, originally an insignificant adjunct of the Passport Control Division, has become an independent office of the State Department. Into its care was intrusted the execution of the act. An investigation into its methods, activities, and decisions would undoubtedly disclose a vivid example of government bureaucracy pitted against representative democracy. This new office, which was intrusted with certain well-defined duties and functions, has arrogated unto itself rights and prerogatives which were never dreamed of by many who had had some connection with the passage of the Passport Control Act. Contrary to all expectations, the Visa Office has assumed virtual control of immigration. It has practically supplanted the Immigration Bureau of the Department of Labor, as is well known by nearly everyone with relatives abroad. The powers of the chief of the Visa Office are almost unlimited, and appeal against his decision is practically impossible. The merest underling at that office frequently holds in his hand the fate of a near and dear relative abroad and does not deem it proper to give reasons for refusing a visa. The office policy is to keep its rules and regulations secret. Should you apply for information as to what classes of persons may be favored by its visas and which not, in order to discover the status of a would-be immigrant, you will be bluntly informed that this is a policy which may not be revealed, nor may the reason for such secrecy be revealed. To all intents and purposes the immigration policy of the United States, the rise and fall of the immigration tide, is now controlled by the Visa Office at Washington and by its consular representatives abroad. Its secret and confidential regulations have supplanted all immigration legislation by Congress.

From the very nature of these developments it is of course not possible to reproduce either these secret regulations or the confidential orders and instructions to the American representatives abroad to whom emigrants apply for visas. I am prepared, however, to make the assertion, without fear of honest contradiction, that such secret and confidential rules and regulations are in existence in the hands of the chief of the Visa Office and his subordinates; that these regulations have been sent to all the American representatives abroad for their guidance in visa matters, and that, furthermore, most of these secret ukases are absolutely contrary to the letter, spirit, and intention of the visa act as passed by Congress and as urged by President Wilson and Secretary Lansing.

It may perhaps be interesting to cite here just a few of these regulations which are now commonly known. The consuls abroad are instructed not to visa passports of anyone except wives and minor children of declarants or citizens and parents over sixty years of age. They would not visa any other passports; for instance, those of brothers, sisters, or other relatives. Furthermore, even wives and children and old parents must apply with their passports to the American representatives in the country to which they owe allegiance and in no other country. In general, the Visa Office has decided that a Polish passport, for instance, may not be visaed in any other country but Poland, and similarly this order applies to Rumanian and other passports.

It occurs very frequently that the State Department refuses to take any action at all on a case unless it is first initiated by the consul abroad; while the consul insists that the matter be initiated by the State Department. The poor emigrant is meanwhile left between the devil and the deep sea. His case is lost through lack of action on either side. I have in my possession a letter from the State Department, dated May of this year, advising a relative in this country to instruct his brother, a native of Lithuania, now in Mexico, to return to his native country for the sole purpose of applying for his visa—before any consideration can even be given to his application.

It is of course very difficult, if not impossible, to prove conclusively the charge of official anti-Semitism. But if there is anything of which many Jews in America or at least many American Jews who have relatives abroad are convinced, it is that the Visa Office has shown clear and unmistakable prejudice against the Jewish immigrant. Slowly but surely its regulations have been so maneuvered as to affect practically and only the Jewish immigrant. The Jews, although not under that name, are classed as suspicious characters. An analysis of some of the Visa Office regulations will lead to that conclusion. The consuls are informed, for instance, that all those who have passports from states that were formerly parts of Russia (except Poland) are per se suspicious and should be scrutinized with particular care. Thus, one who is in possession of a Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, or Russian passport would necessarily be an object of special investigation. His case would practically always have to be submitted by the consul to the State Department and in most cases would of course be acted upon unfavorably. The immigrant meanwhile would be obliged to wait from three to twelve months and consume all his scant earthly possessions. Furthermore, the consul is instructed to look with suspicion upon anyone who presents a passport of a government of any country other than the one of which he is a subject or citizen.

Upon analysis one will readily see that these rules apply virtually to Jewish immigrants only. The majority of immigrants from the former Russian states are Jews, as are most of those in Europe who are not residents of their native country. The Jews are driven from land to land, so that a Lithuanian Jew may find himself in Rumania, a Rumanian Jew in France, a Polish Jew in England. Upon presentation of his passport he would be looked upon with suspicion, no matter who he is. It may be taken as a practical certainty that such passport would be refused. Thus the Ukrainian refugees in Rumania are in the most pitiful condition on account of their Ukrainian passports. It is futile to argue with the consuls or the Visa Office that it is impossible to present a Ukrainian passport to an American representative in Ukrainia, for the obvious reason that we have no such representative in that section.

Until several months ago the only bright spot for the Jewish emigrant was Poland, where the regulations were less severe. But since the advent of Mr. Harry McBride into the position of chief of the Visa Office new regulations have been promulgated which partly exclude Polish Jews also. He has utilized his experience as former Consul-General at Warsaw to advantage. In Poland the applicant for a visa is given a so-called "red ticket" with a "number" on it. This number signifies the postponement of the applicant for the visa for from three to twelve months. In other words, his visa will be decided only at the expiration of that term. It is quite evident, and it was admitted to some confidants, that this was intended simply to put off the Jewish immigrants until the time when the new immigration bill would come into force and thus preclude their entry into the United States. This now has actually become fact. It is hardly an exaggeration to state that to the Jewish emigrants in Europe the American Consulate has become a great terror, and to their relatives in America the Visa Office has become a seat of arbitrariness and injustice. I have been told by eye-witnesses that the American consul in Warsaw, where the greatest number of Jews have applied for visas, has actually torn up affidavits obtained after months of toil and waiting, and even passports of Jewish immigrants, that he has actually beaten many of the latter and treated even women and children in a most brutal manner. If the consulate is to serve as a symbol of America to foreigners the prestige of this country in Europe has been woefully lowered. There is hardly anyone returning from Poland who has any other appellation than "Anti-Semites" for the three consular assistants in the Warsaw office. "Graft" is not uncommon in some of the consulates. I have in my possession cables stating that not less than such and such a sum was required to make a given consul "see the light." The Jewish newspaper offices have been receiving frequent reports and complaints against despotic acts of the American consuls abroad. I have also been informed by a number of non-Jews, substantial and respected citizens, senators and representatives among them, who have had dealings with the Visa Office, that they have been openly told by the officials at that office that their regulations have been promulgated primarily against Jewish immigrants.

Now the question arises, Was the Passport Control Act intended to exclude the classes mentioned above? Was it meant to work such hardship against the Jews? Is it fair that the Danish subject in Canada must return to Copenhagen before applying for the visa of his passport? Is it just to put off visa applicants in Poland until February, 1922? One must indeed marvel at the testimony of Mr. Harry McBride, former American Consul-General in Warsaw and now chief of the Visa Office, before the Senate Immigration Committee, that American consuls have no right to refuse visas except to Anarchists or enemy aliens. Similar statements were made on the floor of the House by Mr. Rogers of the Committee on Foreign Relations, namely, that "The State Department has always taken the view that there was no right to use the passport law as an adjunct to the enforcement of the immigration law" and that "the State Department holds that it has no right to enforce the immigration laws under existing law and that the visa cannot be refused the applicant on that ground. Visas are refused on the ground that an applicant if admitted to the United States would be a dangerous element to our political institutions. I think that is the only ground upon which visas are now refused."

Yet bitter opposition to immigration is in evidence at the visa and consular offices. In the last few months members of Congress who have taken up visa matters with the State Department have received letters from the chief of the Visa Office in which it has been hinted that it is not good policy to help in the obtaining of a visa for any immigrant. Thus, the Visa Office has assumed the duty of propaganda in favor of restriction of immigration. It is not, of course, openly stated in these letters, but Congressmen and Senators have been informed orally on various occasions that Jewish immigrants are undesirable. It is clearly evident even to the casual observer and student of this question that Anti-Semitism is rampant at the Visa Office (although it is not confined to that office at the State Department) and at most of the American consulates abroad.

Chairman Albert Johnson of the House Immigration Committee, when in need of material for his anti-immigration bill, naturally applied for it at the Consular Bureau of the State Department. This was in the morning of the day when the third session of the last Congress convened, December 4, 1920, and within several hours Director Wilbur J. Carr supplied his needs effectively.

The Commissioner at Vienna states that "65 per cent of the present emigrants are of the Jewish race" and the conclusion is evident. The commissioner at Berlin is less specific in naming the Jews, but his intentions are evident. "The Poles, Austrians, and nationals of the different new Russian states who apply for visas are as a rule of the most undesirable type of emigrant. They are usually traders, and only increase the number of middlemen, or if they work, easily go into sweatshops."

The consul at Warsaw claims that "90 per cent may be regarded as a low estimate of the proportion representing the Jewish race among emigrants to America from Poland," and that they are "physically and mentally deficient and economically and socially undesirable." In his opinion "20 per cent is a round and generous estimate of productive laborers among them. This estimate is meant to include workers or those who may be expected to become workers from both sexes. The remaining percentage may be expected to be a drain on the resources of America for years." He goes on further to explain that "the productive labor, small percentage as it is, will be found in America in the sweatshops." Then this anti-Jewish consul enters into the sphere of patriotism—and conjecture—and estimates that "85 to 90 per cent lack any conception of patriotic or national spirit, and the majority of this percentage is mentally incapable of acquiring it." Also that "95 per cent of these persons are of the very lowest classes of the country and are considered to be thoroughly undesirable" and, therefore, "to permit large numbers of such persons with such characteristics to enter the United States is believed to be a dangerous policy." In a later statement the same consul claims that "five million Polish Jews would attempt to emigrate to America during the next three years" and, this notwithstanding the fact that this figure is 50 per cent above the total number of Jews in Poland.

The Bucharest consul affirms that "90 per cent of the applicants" are "petty merchants and middlemen"; the London consul that the applicants at his office are chiefly Poles and Polish Jews, "who are an undesirable class of immigrants."

All these reports were submitted in December, 1920. On April 16, 1921, the State Department, at the further request of Mr. Johnson, in preparation for his new bill which has recently been enacted into law, furnished some more reports, which were forwarded to the chairman of the Immigration Committee of the House by Secretary Hughes and not by Director Carr, as was done last year. The latter reports bear similar ear-marks and their anti-Semitic contents have, for some time, caused some sensation in the press. The Rumanian consul asserts that "they are as a class economic parasites, tailors, small salesmen, butchers, etc.," having reference to the Jews. The Tiflis consul states that "the great bulk of immigrants to the United States in this district are highly undesirable as material for future American citizens. Our restrictions on immigration should be so rigid that it will be impossible for most of these people to enter the United States. Reference is especially made to Armenians, Jews, Persians, and Russians of the ordinary classes, all of whom have been drifting hither and thither since 1914, that they cannot be regarded as desirable population for any country."

It would be quite interesting to deduce the exact mathematical formula with which to calculate the chances of a Jewish applicant in his efforts to obtain a visa from any one of these American consuls, so openly imbued with anti-Semitism and saturated with Jewish hatred. The Jews who apparently do filter through the scrutiny of these consuls must be ingenious and fortunate indeed.

During the discussion of the Johnson bill in the last as well as the current session of Congress it was openly charged (by Huddleston, Siegel, Chandler, and others) that one of its chief purposes was anti-Semitic. Mr. Huddleston said, "It has been charged that this bill is an anti-Semitic bill, that it is aimed particularly at the Jews" and, later, proving this point, argued against such policy. The State Department was accused on various occasions, on the floor of the House, of working contrary to law and in clear violation of the Passport Control Act.

It was hoped by many American Jews that with Secretary Hughes's advent into the State Department this atmosphere would be purified. So far these hopes have been in vain.

Now, for thousands of Jews to whom all these conditions have been matters of common knowledge, who found in America for the first time religious and political liberty, the erection of a barrier for their kin overseas has been fraught with personal tragedy. But the individual suffering is comparatively unimportant. More serious, and of concern to all Americans, is the abolition of the old America as the haven of refuge for the oppressed of all lands, free from the poison of Old-World castes, hates, prejudices. Coupled with this tragic destruction is the creation of a thoroughly un-American bureaucracy, autocratically and clandestinely nullifying the will of the people of the United States as expressed through their representatives in Congress. And though Jews in this instance appear as the immediate sufferers, the issue is fundamentally an American issue, and as such demands the attention of those whose Americanism is real and deep-seated.

Contributors to This Issue

REUBEN FINK, an American journalist, is the author of "American War Congress and Zionism" and editor of the forthcoming Jewish-American "Who's Who."

GEORGE P. WEST is a well-known contributor to the liberal press.

Alsatian Alsace

By LEWIS S. GANNETT

V. The Germans

A CORRESPONDENT of the New York *World* recently declared that "the most conservative figures" indicated that the French had expelled between 140,000 and 150,000 Germans from Alsace. The correspondent exaggerated grievously. The deportations of Germans from Alsace compose a disgraceful story; but they do not total a third of the figure set by the *World's* correspondent. Like the *World's* correspondent, I was unable to persuade the French authorities to give me exact figures on these deportations; but unlike him I was able to cross into Germany and to get precise German figures. Up to March 1, 1921, the German records show a total of 118,099 Germans leaving Alsace and Lorraine, but this includes those who left voluntarily. There is no official record available to show the proportion actually expelled; German officials charged with caring for the refugees estimated it at one-third of the total. Probably, then, some 40,000 Germans have been expelled by the French; some 80,000 have left more or less voluntarily, some of them very reluctantly when life in Alsace had become intolerable for them; about 150,000 remain.

Men were arrested at their homes in the middle of the night or at their work in the daytime, and led away without a chance to pack a bag or say goodby to their wives. Especially in the early days the espionage and denunciation were disgraceful. It was not always the French who were to blame. Alsatians who were none too sure of their own records sometimes tried to set themselves right by denouncing those who they feared might denounce them; men, and whole families, were deported for the most trivial reasons, allowed to take with them only such baggage as they could carry in their hands or on their backs. Today, deportees are given five days' notice. And since January 10, 1920, when the peace treaty came into force, it is only Germans who are deported. Prior to that date, when the fact of Alsatian birth or Alsatian parentage or marriage became sufficient to establish French nationality, many Alsatians were deported with the Germans for the single reason that someone with a grudge had denounced them as objectionable.

Some deportations were probably necessary. There were Germans who had acted as pure Junkers and would have continued to do so. There were "professional Germans" who could only stir up trouble. Some of these, however, would have left of their own free will. The mass of the expulsions, and their manner, was certainly excessive. German professors of the University of Strasbourg were among the first to be led, bag in hand, to the bridge of Kehl, and, while a jeering crowd watched, were sent on foot across to Germany. Some of the refugees were shoved into Germany clad only in trousers and a nightshirt. During a strike in the potash mines German workers who refused to "scab" were expelled. During a strike in a Lorraine factory the German foremen were all deported. The deportations often served special interests. It is charged that some Alsatian civil servants denounced their superiors in office in the hope of being promoted, and were grievously disappointed when Frenchmen were brought from the interior to fill the vacancies.

The deportees are usually sent across the bridge of Kehl to Offenburg. There the stream is divided; those who have friends or relatives in North Germany are sent to Frankfurt; those with south German connections to Freiburg. In the first half of 1919 Frankfurt received an average of nearly 10,000 a month; in the second half of that year about 4,000 per month; throughout 1920 about 500 per month; and in the first three months of 1921 the average was only 72. In April, apparently in connection with the aggravation of the reparations question, the number rose again; in four weeks 86 expelled Germans and 53 voluntary exiles arrived at Frankfurt, and a smaller number at Freiburg.

Some of these exiles were former government officials; most of these have found new positions in Germany. All but six of the exiled professors of the University of Strasbourg have been taken in at other German universities; the railway and postal officials were readily placed; about half of the other civil servants have found their own kind of work. The greatest difficulty has been in placing the peasants and workers. The exodus was very like the exodus of French refugees from northern France in 1914 and in 1918; people came with what they could carry, with no expectation of ever seeing again what they had left behind. There were fewer refugees than in France, but the Alsatian exodus was more permanent. They had no hope of ever returning. There is the same right to indemnification by the Government for loss suffered, and much the same delay in receiving it. (In 1920 Germany made such indemnity payments totaling 136,855,256 paper marks, but as the expulsions have usually been of the influential and relatively prosperous Germans, it is obvious that this is only the barest fraction of the sums due.) Since mid-November, 1919, when Germany paid France 25,000,000 francs as a deposit, German-owned furniture may be shipped out of Alsace into Germany; but the process is slow, and in some cases where the houses had stood empty and unguarded for many months the goods have disappeared. France is now liquidating the real property left behind by these Germans and will probably realize a sum reaching into billions of paper francs; Germany is responsible to her nationals for these sums. What France makes by such sequestration sales is clear gain for France, credited to the German indemnity. The German Government has not yet decided whether to pay the Alsatians the pre-war value of their Alsatian homes in paper marks or the present exchange equivalent of their present sale value in francs, which would be far heavier.

The mere problem of housing these refugees was staggering. Frankfurt alone at one time had 10,000 of them, lodged in old army barracks, in condemned houses, in requisitioned hotels, whole families in a room, anywhere. They were passed on the old British officers' prisoner camp at Hanover, to other prisoner camps at Essen, Münster, and elsewhere. Gradually relatives and friends have taken care of most of them. While the French have been refusing German aid in rebuilding their ruins, German labor at home has been building homes for these refugees. There is a little village near Hanau built for them, with flourishing hand industries such as jewelry-making. One of Frankfurt's suburbs has thirty new houses built especially

for Alsatians too old to begin life again. Freiburg, Mannheim, Constance, Carlsruhe, almost all the cities of Baden, have built suburb colonies for the Alsatians. To me the most interesting refugee settlement, however, was the twin villages of Lettgenbrunn and Villbach, up in the Hessian mountains. The Prussian army, feeling the need of a larger practice-ground, ordered these two villages evacuated in 1912, and empty they had stood ever since the war sent the officers then lodged there to the front. The roofs were falling in, and the houses were in such condition as soldiers leave houses, when a Lorrainer named Brenner heard of them. Brenner was of peasant stock, but had been foreman in a Lorraine steel mill. During a strike with which he had nothing to do he was arrested at two o'clock in the morning, was forced to leave his sick wife and two children behind, and was walked, half-clad and baggageless, sixteen kilometers through the night, then expelled. His wife followed him when she could; they have never been able to trace their furniture. For ten months they lived uncomfortably in a hotel bedroom in Frankfurt. Brenner heard of Lettgenbrunn, and with a group of other expelled peasants became determined that those vacant houses should be filled. The Government was uncertain; finally, with the aid of a friendly Prussian official and of the generous English Quakers, thirty families loaded themselves into auto-trucks at Frankfurt and a few hours later unloaded themselves at Lettgenbrunn and started to clean up. They rebuilt the houses, opened the old drainage ditches, dug new wells, made gardens, began to live. The Quakers lent them horses and cows (lent, so that the Reparation Commission could not seize the animals), gave them money to start a cooperative store, made it possible to buy some farm machinery and a few wagons, and today Lettgenbrunn is one of the busiest villages in Germany; and Brenner's face beams with pride as he points to the perfectly plowed acres, the new roofs, the village blacksmith shop, the carpentry shop, the cooperative store, the town business office, where the income tax records are filed, each of these refugees paying 10 per cent income tax even in the days when their sole income was the government relief of 150 marks per month. The town is full of stories worth telling; the school-teacher, half-Prussian half-Lorrainer, was left in a German hospital when the war ended, and notified of his expulsion ten days before he expected to leave the hospital to return home. For two years he lived with his wife and two children on a pittance of 150 marks (about $3) per month, and they all show it in their thin, pale faces. Now with a house and a salary which amounts to $7.20 (450 marks) a month, he is content. In the heart of the village, near the birch pole they were setting up to celebrate the first anniversary of the Alsatian village, is a house set back from the road; it is the home of Herr Baron. Herr Baron and the Frau Baronin are refugees of another kind, of the old Teutonic nobility of the Baltic provinces. They once had three chateaus and 84 horses; they now act as agents of the German Red Cross at Lettgenbrunn, eight miles from a railroad station, and when they take a train they have to walk to it. Frau Baronin is a slip of a girl in dainty high-heeled slippers, strangely out of place in that rough village; she spent the first two and a half years of the war in a Russian prison camp, then escaped, walked afoot across Russia, was captured by Ukrainian bandits, escaped again during a battle with Red Guards, got across the German lines—then was shut up in a German prison for a month as a suspected spy; finally she returned home, was married, and three months later was a refugee again, fleeing the bolshevik invasion of Latvia.

Of such stories is Europe, 1921, made up. They are romantic in the telling; any refugee tale may seem wistful at a distance. At first hand the taste is bitter, doubly bitter among the Alsatian German refugees because they suffer from a peace-time harshness, unnecessary even under the cruel assumptions of war ethics. But the Alsatian story has one relieving facet. These refugees are not looking forward to any eventual return or plotting any revenge against those who drove them out. The Germans, those who lived in Alsace and the others, have so many worse woes that they have no strength left to dream of revenge or of reconquest. There is no third factor in the Alsatian question today; it will be settled between the French and the Alsatians. That the restoration to the *mère patrie* has not inaugurated the era of good feeling and brought the satisfaction in self-government which the Alsatians hoped is a tragedy, but a minor tragedy. Political convulsions, and still less wars, seldom realize the Utopias of their prophets. And Alsace, with all its language and its clerical and administrative disputes and abuses and with the shadow of the deportations upon it, is yet, as Europe goes today, a relatively happy land. The world will hear more than it has yet heard of French mistakes there, but Alsace has ceased to be one of the festering sores that make Europe a nest of future wars.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter was lunching in an automatic eatery—one of those places with little cubbyholes around the walls like boxes in a safe deposit vault; but instead of putting into these recesses bonds and deeds and other precious papers, you insert nickels, and out pop sandwiches and salads and such. Well, the Drifter was lunching in such a place, when against that part of the wall where one pulls out various colors of ice creams he espied the following notice:

> Patrons purchasing ice cream, except to be eaten as part of a meal, must deposit in the box below 1c (government tax) for each 10c or fraction thereof. Severe penalties are imposed by law for evasion of tax.

Now there was obviously nobody in the place to notice whether one ate ice cream as part of a meal, or otherwise; and nobody to care if he happened to observe. It was left entirely to individual inclination. Hence, the Drifter was interested to learn if the box contained any pennies. He went near to it. Caramba! It was loaded with them.

* * * * *

THE voice of Conscience, said the Drifter. There speaks the conscience of the American people. Then he thought a moment—and revised his judgment. No, he said; it is not the voice of Conscience but the voice of Authority—that accursed voice of Authority which the American people have accustomed themselves to bow down before and serve unthinkingly, unquestioningly, wherever it speaks sufficiently loudly, imperiously, and impolitely. For we, too, have learned the goose step; only we have developed it in our own way. Germany developed it by exalting political and military power; we produced it by the worship of material and industrial power. The European learns to jump at the word of any man in military uniform. We are led around by the nose by any man in civilian uniform—any symbol of our great business corporations or other economic overlords. We step lively at the command of the street-car conductor, we cower before a cross word from an elevator operator, we tremble in the presence of the blue jeans of the apartment-house janitor. The presence in recent years of a vast number of uninformed and defenseless immigrants has facilitated the fitting of the economic strait-jacket that is squeezing out the pioneer characteristics of independence and individuality.

* * * * *

AH, yes, it is too true. America, once the land of independence, has become the slave of Authority. Our newspapers are fond of referring to what they call "the authorities." They write: "The authorities have ordered this" and "the authorities have decided that," or "So-and-so was taken into custody by the authorities"; meaning thereby a legitimate or illegitimate assumption of power by any public employee, from a village pound-keeper to the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. This term "the authorities" is a vague, blanket classification which well illustrates our tendency not to question or even define the voice that orders us about.

* * * * *

THEODORE ROOSEVELT was a great preacher (not always a great practicer) of obedience to law. It is a good preachment, although even obedience to law can be overdone. Law is not immutable, or invariably superior to individual conscience. As Justice Pound of the New York Court of Appeals well said in the rent-law decision: "The law of each age is ultimately what that age thinks should be the law"—in other words, crystallized public opinion. Generally speaking, however, obedience to law is a great desideratum, the cultivation of which is particularly needed in the United States. But obedience to law and obedience to Authority are not the same; indeed they are frequently diametrically opposed. One should think long before questioning the law (to the extent, that is, of disobeying it). *One should always question Authority.* It should invariably be made to show its credentials, its warrant, and the law behind it—particularly the latter.

* * * * *

THERE is a saying one hears from the mouths of many: "What's the use of kickin'? It don't get you nowhere." It does. It is the only thing that can get any of us in any direction worth going out of the present morass. America needs nothing so much as kickers; not men who let their bosses bully them and go home and vent their spleen on their wife's cooking, but men who kick to the right people in the right way, who raise everlasting hob at the invasion of their individual and collective rights. The modern American cult of good nature, regularity, and "not kicking" is the path toward the enthronement of every would-be tyrant, little and big, in the country. We need a revival of the ancient and honorable American art of raising the roof when our toes are stepped on.

* * * * *

THE Drifter is out for the observance of a "Kicker's Week." He is suggesting as a new national slogan: "A kick a day keeps the Kaiser away."

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Big Business vs. the Church

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the fact that Wm. Frew Long, secretary of the Pittsburgh Employers' Association, (a) sent out on January 8, 1921, a letter to employers suggesting a boycott of the Y. W. C. A. on account of its social creed, (b) on March 2, 1921, a second letter to the secretaries of other associations of employers rejoicing that the former letter had very seriously interfered with the Y. W. C. A. campaign for funds and suggesting that the Federal Council of Churches be also boycotted, (c) and on March 19, 1921, an open letter to the editor of the *Christian Work*, New York, insisting on all religious organizations confining their utterances on industrial questions to a so-called "zone of agreement," the two important religious associations of clergy known as the Ministerial Union of Pittsburgh and the Clericus of the Protestant Episcopal Church both took action at their respective meetings held on the same day in different parts of the city, June 6, 1921, a few hours apart and passed the same resolution condemning the utterances of the Employers' Association made through their secretary.

I herewith send you the resolution which I had the honor of presenting to both religious bodies of ministers representing the Protestant clergy of Pittsburgh.

Pittsburgh, Pa., June 8 F. ORR JOHNSON

THE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The secretary of the Pittsburgh Employers' Association has issued a series of communications with the purpose of dissuading men from furnishing financial support to certain Christian Organizations because they have not limited their message to a so-called "neutral zone," prescribed by those whom said secretary represents, and

WHEREAS, This involves as a principle and as a purpose the dictation to religious bodies as to what fields of thought and human service they may enter; and as to what constitutes the gospel of the Kingdom, and

WHEREAS, The Church throughout all its history, when true to its mission, has zealously guarded its absolute freedom to proclaim the full Gospel of Jesus Christ without dictation from any outside parties or any external authority, and

WHEREAS, The Pittsburgh Employers' Association, through its secretary, represents itself as speaking for the employing group—an assumption which we are convinced is contrary to fact particularly in relation to many high-type Christian employers—and

WHEREAS, We fully recognize that in the industrial and economic fields there is room for a proper diversity of opinion, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Pittsburgh Ministerial Union, resent this attempt of a commercial organization to prescribe limits within which alone the Church and other religious organizations may move; that we reaffirm the historic right and duty of the Church to proclaim the whole truth in Christ as revealed in the Scriptures and as applied under the Holy Spirit to every relationship in life; that we deny to any political, commercial, industrial, or any other group or agency, the right to set any restrictions on the freedom of the Christian Church or its agencies to apply the spirit and standards of the Kingdom of God to the whole of life; and that we declare it our solemn duty and purpose to defend this liberty of the Gospel.

In the Clinic City

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am sure you will enjoy the following experience. I was spending some time in Rochester, Minn. I had missed the last number of *The Nation* and the *New Republic* which I am accustomed to read. I entered a bookshop to purchase them and inquired if the proprietor carried them. "No," was the prompt reply, "I don't carry such rotten stuff; but here's a copy of the *Police Gazette* if you want it." 'Nuf said.

San Francisco, June 7 MARTIN A. MEYER

From an American Naval Officer

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The principal merit of the attached paper is that the ideas advanced will be declared impractical by the so-called common-sense men of affairs who in every age have opposed any innovation in the field of science, invention, art, or government.

Louis H. Roddis
Lt.-Comdr. M-C., U. S. N.

United States Ship Aroostook, Pacific Fleet, May 2

MATERIALS FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IN REGARD TO THE METHOD OF DECLARING WAR, AND DESIGNED TO LESSEN THE INCIDENCE OF WARS.

1. Abolish the secret code in all diplomatic correspondence.

2. All correspondence between the state departments of governments to be direct, the ambassadors to receive copies.

3. Each government to maintain an official column in leading newspapers where important diplomatic messages are to be published and in case of so-called strained relations *all* messages must be published.

4. Make it an offense punishable by fine and imprisonment for owners or publishers of the press to make false or misleading statements in regard to the points at issue which may lead to war.

5. When attempts to adjust an internal difficulty have failed it is to be referred to an arbitration committee. If either nation refuses to arbitrate or to accept the decision of the arbitrators and it is believed that war is the only remaining alternative, the state department of the nation shall review in an official bulletin the events leading to the decision. This official communication shall be signed by the members of the government who prepared it and they shall be held responsible by the nation for the truth of their statements. The charge under which they shall be impeached and tried for making false or misleading statements or suppressing arguments or facts presented by the country with which the strained relations existed shall be high treason.

6. Lay emphasis on the fact that the common people of one country do not have any quarrel with the common people of another country, but that it is the so-called statesmen, diplomats, an ignorant or prejudiced press, and great industrial groups reaching greedily for the coal-fields, gold-fields, oil-fields, or diamond mines of other lands who are responsible for 90 per cent of wars. Also that it is not the people of a country as a whole who benefit by the conquered coal-fields or oil-fields, but only a few of the less pleasing people of a country who are benefited.

7. Provide that except in cases of actual invasion the declaration of war will be dependent on a vote of the people. Men between twenty-one and forty years of age who vote in favor of war automatically draft themselves for service in the military forces. Men physically unfit and men between the ages of forty and fifty-five years who vote for war, automatically pledge themselves to the expenditure of 25 per cent of their incomes for the purchase of war bonds. Women possessing property or independent incomes and who vote for war make the same pledges as men physically unfit or over age for military service, except that service in the Female Nurse Corps or other service in noncombatant branch of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps will be construed as military service and will excuse them from the financial pledge.

8. Provide for the appointment of a committee of two senators, two representatives, one Navy and one Military expert to confer with the governments of the proper Powers to reduce armaments by an international agreement along the following or similar lines:

(A) Navies. (a) Stop all building programs. (b) Place out of commission 15 per cent of the strength of each Navy every year for five years. Personnel reduced in proportion. Officers and men with five years' service or more to receive 2½ per cent of their pay per year of service. Thus an officer or man with 30 years' service would be retired on three-quarters pay. An officer or man with 10 years', on 25 per cent of pay. Men with less than 5 years' service to receive a cash gratuity of four months' pay on discharge.

(B) Army to be reduced in the same manner as naval personnel, except that the reduction of field and coast artillery air service and engineers will be for two years only (70 per cent of these arms retained) and other reductions to continue for five years (25 per cent retained). Staff Corps reduction to be made so as to retain the proper proportion to the line. Thus if the allowance of medical officers is seven per thousand and the army at the end of five years had 60,000 men there would be 420 medical officers.

Disarmament

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Why not a parade in New York for international disarmament, with special emphasis on the American navy?

The Senate, House, and the Executive are busily engaged in dickering and wire-pulling as to who shall move next in this all-important matter, and when. The American people are for a drastic reduction of armaments. They want action, not political scheming and orating. The best thing to bring the Washington muddle to a conclusion is to let it be known emphatically that the men and women of America mean business in this matter and that business means speed, not promises.

There can be only one time to move for disarmament, and that is immediately. The peoples of the civilized world want it. Let them inform their governors and each other of this fact in unmistakable language. I believe that New York could muster a monster parade for disarmament. If only America had the intelligence to make possible such a parade in every city and hamlet in the land, and on Independence Day.

Spuyten Duyvil, June 7 Edwin S. Smith

Misleading Phraseology?

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Apropos of the second instalment of No War With England, is it not about time we abandoned the childish and misleading phraseology, smacking of grade-school geography texts, "our trade with South America," "the United States and Great Britain are rivals in the foreign markets," etc.? In plain language, what have "we," "South America," "the United States," or "Great Britain" to do with it? Are not all matters of export and import the world over in the hands of industrial and trade magnates, the least nationalistic as well as internationalistic because the most intensely individualistic, people on earth? *The Nation* gives its readers no keener satisfaction than that of the enjoyment of its clearness and directness of thought and term. Long outworn, if ever applicable, phraseology cannot be tolerated in its Doric columns! If "our" trade rivalry, then also "our" war?

St. Paul, April 27 Aldena Carlson

Woodrow Wilson and Panama

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Homer nodded in your article on the Panama Canal tolls in your issue of May 18 when you spoke of the "honorable insistence of President Wilson" as being responsible for the repeal of the exemption of American ships in 1914. Surely you have not forgotten how he first stood (as did that jumble of undemocratic foolishness, the Baltimore platform) for the exemption and made a speech to farmers in New Jersey supporting it, how he later wobbled, and how, being firmly seated in the Presidential office, he finally joined in asking for the righteous and honorable thing? He helped, yes, but I believe the fight would have been won without him. Didn't he see the honest thing in 1912?

Richmond, Va., June 7 J. L. S.

The Late Abbott H. Thayer

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am expecting to publish Mr. Thayer's letters and reproductions of his pictures, and I shall be grateful to any persons who may have letters from him and who will allow me to examine them or copies of them for publication. Letters sent to me will, of course, be carefully returned.

Monadnock, N. H., June 8 Emma B. Thayer
(Mrs. Abbott H. Thayer)

International Relations Section

The Mandate for South-West Africa

THE terms of the mandate for the German protectorate of South-West Africa, as printed below, were published by the British Government.

The Council of the League of Nations:

Whereas, By Article 119 of the Treaty of Peace with Germany signed at Versailles on the 28th June, 1919, Germany renounced in favor of the principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights over her overseas possessions, including therein German South-West Africa; and

Whereas, The principal Allied and Associated Powers agreed that, in accordance with Article 22, part I (Covenant of the League of Nations), of the said treaty, a mandate should be conferred upon His Britannic Majesty, to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa, to administer the territory aforementioned, and have proposed that the mandate should be formulated in the following terms; and

Whereas, His Britannic Majesty, for and on behalf of the Government of the Union of South Africa, has agreed to accept the mandate in respect of the said territory and has undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in accordance with the following provisions; and

Whereas, By the aforementioned Article 22, paragraph 8, it is provided that the degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory, not having been previously agreed upon by the members of the League, shall be explicitly defined by the Council of the League of Nations:

Confirming the said mandate, defines its terms as follows:

Article 1. The territory over which a mandate is conferred upon His Britannic Majesty for and on behalf of the Government of the Union of South Africa (hereinafter called the mandatory) comprises the territory which formerly constituted the German Protectorate of South-West Africa.

Art. 2. The mandatory shall have full power of administration and legislation over the territory subject to the present mandate as an integral portion of the Union of South Africa, and may apply the laws of the Union of South Africa to the territory, subject to such local modifications as circumstances may require.

The mandatory shall promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory subject to the present mandate.

Art. 3. The mandatory shall see that the slave trade is prohibited, and that no forced labor is permitted, except for essential public works and services, and then only for adequate remuneration.

The mandatory shall also see that the traffic in arms and ammunition is controlled in accordance with principles analogous to those laid down in the convention relating to the control of the arms traffic, signed on the 10th September, 1919, or in any convention amending the same.

The supply of intoxicating spirits and beverages to the natives shall be prohibited.

Art. 4. The military training of the natives, otherwise than for purposes of internal police and the local defense of the territory, shall be prohibited. Furthermore, no military or naval bases shall be established or fortifications erected in the territory.

Art. 5. Subject to the provisions of any local law for the maintenance of public order and public morals, the mandatory shall insure in the territory freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, and shall allow all missionaries, nationals of any state member of the League of Nations, to enter into, travel, and reside in the territory for the purpose of prosecuting their calling.

Art. 6. The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report to the satisfaction of the Council, containing full information with regard to the territory, and indicating the measures taken to carry out the obligations assumed under articles 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Art. 7. The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of the present mandate.

The mandatory agrees that, if any dispute whatever should arise between the mandatory and another member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the application of the provisions of the mandate, such dispute, if it cannot be settled by negotiation, 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 declaration shall be deposited in the archives of the League of Nations. Certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all Powers signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Germany.

Made at Geneva the 17th day of December, 1920.

South Africa's New Province

WE print below the Final Report of the Commission appointed by the South African Government to inquire into the question of the future form of government in South-West Africa, together with certain reservations and memoranda presented separately by two of its members. It is interesting to note that in the majority report the commission contemplates that the Union shall "remain permanently responsible" for the territory in question, which is to be administered under the laws of the Union "as an integral portion of its territory." It will also be observed that, although the former German colony is three-fourths the size of the whole Union of South Africa and possesses a white population no more than one-tenth of the white population of the smallest province of the Union, the native question is entirely ignored as beside the subject of inquiry.

Majority Report

On the 11th November last your Commission submitted an Interim Report dealing with the form of government which should be instituted in the South-West Africa Protectorate upon the repeal of martial law.

Your Commission has now considered the further questions raised in the terms of reference, viz., "what should be the future form of government of that territory, and in how far it can be governed as a province of the Union, and when and in how far representation should be given to its population both locally and in the Union Parliament," and your Commission has the honor to submit the following recommendations thereanent:

1. It has been suggested to your Commission in evidence that the form of government recommended in the Interim Report, i.e., government by an administrator assisted by an advisory council, should be followed by one or more phases in which representation, increasing by degrees, was granted to the population before the final form of full representative government as a province of the Union was reached. But in view of the fact that the Protectorate, under the terms of the peace treaty, has in any event to be governed as an integral portion of the Union and under the laws of the Union, your Commission is of opinion that such intermediate phases of government would serve no useful purpose, but would tend to foster the aspiration, entertained by a considerable section of the European population of the Protectorate, to develop into a state entirely independent of the Union.

2. This aspiration is based on what your Commission considers to be an entire misconception of the position of the German residents in the Protectorate regarded as mandated territory. It is contended that the South-West Africa Protectorate should be dealt with as indicated in the fourth paragraph of Article 22 of the Peace Treaty, which reads as follows:

"Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory."

In this class of mandate the mandatory is placed in the position of a guardian only until such time as the people over whom the mandate is granted is able to stand alone. For the reasons set out below it is very clear to your Commission that this view is erroneous.

3. The fifth and sixth paragraphs of Article 22 relate to African territories, and a clear distinction is drawn between these and the class of territories referred to in the fourth paragraph of that article. In the latter an old civilization has at one time or another existed under its own system of government and it is expected that they will, under a temporary tutelage, again develop into autonomous states. In the former, however, no indigenous civilization has ever existed. They are still in a state of semi-barbarism, and no eventual self-government by the native races is indicated in the paragraphs referred to. On the contrary, it is rather contemplated that the mandatory Powers must remain permanently responsible for the good government of these territories with their backward peoples. As regards South-West Africa, it is explicitly mentioned by name as a territory to be administered under the laws of the mandatory power as an integral portion of its territory.

4. The erroneous view referred to above seems to be based on the fact that there is actually residing in the territory in question a civilized European community consisting of the subjects of the Power which, by Article 119 of the Peace Treaty, renounced in favor of the principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and title over that territory.

5. That this fact in no way affects the status of that territory under the mandate is made quite clear by Article 122, which reads as follows:

"The Government exercising authority over such territory may make such provisions as it thinks fit with reference to the repatriation from them of German nationals and to the conditions upon which German subjects of European origin shall, or shall not, be allowed to reside, hold property, trade, or exercise a profession in them."

Had the mandatory Power availed itself of the right conferred by this article and repatriated every German national from the territory in question, it is obvious that the contention referred to above, in paragraph 3, could not have been put forward, because there would not have been a German national left in that territory to put it forward.

6. While your Commission wholly approves of the magnanimity and political wisdom shown by your Government in not exercising the right conferred upon it by Article 122, it is quite clear that the fact of your Government not having exercised that right does not affect the character of the mandate under which South-West Africa has to be administered. Your Commission is of opinion that there is no other way in which aliens residing in the mandated territory can acquire the right to take part in the administration of the country in which they have made their home than by becoming citizens of the state which, under the mandate, is charged with the administration of that country as an integral part of that state's own territory.

7. Your Commission, therefore, recommends that the form of government for the Protectorate, outlined in the Interim Report, should be succeeded without any intermediate phases, by the form of government at present prevailing in the four provinces of the Union, giving the population full representation in a Provincial Council and in the Union Parliament. When that stage has been reached, the Protectorate will be administered as a fifth Province of the Union, with a system of government similar in principle to that of the other parts of the Union, but subject always to the conditions of the mandate.

8. In view, however, of the peculiar circumstances prevailing in the Protectorate, where the white population does not at present number more than one-tenth of the white population of the smallest Union Province and is spread over an area equaling about three-fourths of the whole Union, it may be found desirable at first to modify somewhat the provincial form of government in regard to the delegation of powers by the Union Parliament to the new Provincial Administration, and also in regard to the continued representation of the Union Government by the Administrator in matters reserved to the Union.

9. But in regard to this matter, as also in regard to the period to elapse before this form of government is instituted in the Protectorate, it is at present impossible to make any definite recommendations. A great deal will depend upon the manner in which the country develops, upon the rate at which the population increases, and upon the attitude adopted by the older section of the present white inhabitants. Your Commission is, however, of opinion that the final form of government outlined above should not be instituted in the Protectorate until the population includes at least 10,000 adult male British subjects of European descent, but that it should be instituted as soon as practicable after that figure has been reached.

10. A very important question which will have to be decided before a representative form of government can be instituted in the Protectorate is the question of franchise.

11. Your Commission is of opinion that only such residents of the Protectorate as would be British subjects if residing in the Union should have the right to elect representatives in the future Provincial Council and in the Union Parliament. At the same time it should be borne in mind that at least one-half of the present white population of the Protectorate, consisting for the greater part of useful citizens who have been domiciled there for many years, are not as yet British subjects.

12. It is clearly desirable that such an important section of the population and one which has done so much to develop the country in which it has made its permanent home should be encouraged to take a full part in molding the destiny of that country under the changed conditions brought about by the peace treaty and in conformity with its provisions. The obvious difficulty is the natural reluctance (a legacy of the war) of a considerable proportion of that section to fulfil the indispensable condition of exercising full political rights within the Union by becoming British subjects. There is also the legal difficulty that persons domiciled in the Protectorate who are not British subjects cannot acquire British nationality within the Union in the ordinary way by applying for naturalization. The Union Naturalization Act (No. 4 of 1910) does not apply to them.

13. While recognizing this very natural sentiment on the part of many German residents in the Protectorate it is clear to your Commission that it is impossible to permit persons who do not owe allegiance to the Union to participate in shaping the political affairs of a territory which is to be administered by the Union as an integral part thereof. The utmost that can be done, in the opinion of your Commission, to recognize and to some extent to mitigate the effect of this sentiment, is to frame special legislation for the acquisition of the necessary citizenship by the German inhabitants of the Protectorate, which in its mode of operation will place the least practicable difficulty in the way of late enemy subjects who have made the country their home and who wish to participate in its political government.

14. In such legislation one of two methods could be followed. According to the one method, British citizenship could be granted individually to every adult male person who was domiciled in the Protectorate on, say, the 1st August, 1914, who signed before a magistrate or some other prescribed officer within a period of, say, one year after the promulgation of the statute in question, a form expressing the desire to become a British subject of the Union. According to the other method, every adult male German domiciled in the Protectorate on the date of the promulgation of the statute in question could, by enactment, be declared to be a British subject, unless he signed, say, within one year after the promulgation of the statute, before a magistrate or other prescribed officer, a declaration expressing the desire not to become a British subject.

15. The first method commends itself by the fact that it would afford an accurate return of the number of aliens who had become British subjects by their own deliberate act, but at the same time it is possible that a large proportion of the German population would not avail themselves of this opportunity of becoming British subjects. A change of nationality is at all times a serious matter, and even persons who have no objection to acquire British nationality by an act of their own may be deterred from doing so by various considerations. Under the present circumstances it might be possible for one man of standing and influence to induce a large number of others to refrain from voluntarily renouncing their former allegiance, even if they were inclined to do so.

16. The second method, i.e., automatic naturalization by statute, will, in your Commission's opinion, meet the difficulty referred to, and in view of the considerations expressed in paragraph 12, your Commission recommends that this automatic form of naturalization by the statute be adopted.

17. If this course is followed, special provision will have to be made for Germans who were domiciled in the Protectorate at the outbreak of the war, but who will not be residents of that territory when the naturalizing statute comes into force. If such Germans be permitted to return to the Protectorate, say, within five years after the promulgation of the naturalizing statute, they should be enabled to acquire British citizenship within the Union during, say, one year after their return to the protectorate in the manner indicated in the first part of paragraph 14. This provision is recommended mainly with a view to a number of persons who have been deported from the Protectorate, but who may, in the interests of that territory, be permitted to return thereto. . . .

19. Representations were also made to your Commission on various other questions which do not, however, fall within the terms of reference and on which your Commission, therefore, does not wish to express an opinion.

(Signed) N. J. De Wet, Chairman.
J. J. Byron (with reservations).
W. R. Burch.
F. H. P. Creswell.

A. A. Schoch, Secretary.

Cape Town, 11th March, 1921.

Addendum by the Honorable J. J. Byron

I have signed the Report of the Commission with the following reservation:

I am unable to agree to the recommendation that every adult male German domiciled in the Protectorate should, under a statute to be enacted for the purpose, be declared and become a British subject unless he signs an official disclaimer of such naturalization within one year. It should be noted that refusal of British nationality would involve no penalty, such as expulsion from the country, etc., as in the case of the inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein after the war of 1864, those of Alsace-Lorraine after the Franco-German war of 1871, or as in the more recent provisions of the Peace Treaty, Articles 136 and 137, providing that German nationals declining Belgian citizenship must leave that country.

Paragraph 15 of the Report states: "A change of nationality is at all times a serious matter." I agree. It would appear to follow that when such a change is made it should be a deliberate overt act of the individual, based on his own free will and choice as influenced by all the circumstances.

In "Outlines of International Law," by Admiral Stockton, U.S.N., naturalization is defined as "the reception of an alien into the citizenship of a state through a formal act on application of the favored individual." "The customary rule in international law that the inhabitants of conquered and ceded territory lose one nationality and acquire another by the annexation of the territory to that of the conquering state" cannot be applied in this case, as the South-West Protectorate most emphatically is not annexed to the Union.

Apart from the doubtful legality of the method recommended in the Report—that is to say viewed from an international standpoint—it does not seem desirable to adopt any form of compulsion as to change of nationality if such can be avoided.

It is without doubt the desire of the mandatory Power—the people of the Union—to exercise the utmost magnanimity possible, but to inaugurate the Protectorate's sharing in the government of the Union by a statute savoring of compulsory change of nationality would not be the best method of conciliating a population whose pride in their fatherland is one of their outstanding traits. This honorable characteristic should be fully respected.

The argument in paragraph 15 "that under the present circumstances it might be possible for one man of standing and influence to induce a large number of them to refrain from voluntarily renouncing their former allegiance" may equally be applied to the other alternative. An agitation or a movement with the object of inducing Germans to sign a declaration expressing the desire not to become British subjects is just as conceivable. In all precedents that I have been able to trace, the principle has been laid down that the leaving of or adhering to the old allegiance should be the fulfilment of the wish of the person in question, and that it is desirable that clear evidence of such intention be forthcoming. The best evidence, naturally, would be the wish originated and expressed by the person concerned and vouched for by his duly witnessed signature. This would obviously be more definite and conclusive than the negative and unsatisfactory evidence of failure to renounce a citizenship imposed by statute, the existence of which law the interested party possibly could plead was unknown to him.

The legal position of Germans now domiciled in the Protectorate as to their citizenship seems to be in need of clear definition. By Article 119 of the Peace Treaty Germany has renounced all sovereignty over her former colony of South-West Africa. The dominion of that territory is vested in the principal Allied and Associated Powers, who, in turn, have mandated the possession to the Union.

According to Chief Justice Abbott, U.S.A.: "A relinquishment of the government of a territory is a relinquishment of authority over the inhabitants of that territory"; and consequently it would appear—from the same authority—"the people comprising that state shall no longer be considered as subjects of the sovereign by which such a declaration was made."

Westlake, on "Private International Law," states (paragraph 298): "The cession of a British territory or the acknowledgment of its independence causes the loss of their British nationality by all persons domiciled within it at the date of cession."

If these authorities be accepted it would follow that Germans domiciled in South-West Africa owe no allegiance to and can claim no protection from Germany. In effect they are without a country whilst so domiciled. . . .

Article 22 of the Peace Treaty prescribes that South-West Africa can best be administered under the Union laws as an integral portion thereof.

In my judgment, this means that in the case of Germans domiciled in South-West Africa the existing laws of the Union governing naturalization should be applied, subject only to such

minor modification of details as the special circumstances demand. The grave departure from the ordinary law, recommended in the Report, does not appear to be justified by the reasons advanced therein.

I am of opinion too that all aliens should be treated alike with respect to naturalization, and that it is not sound politics, international or domestic, to discriminate between aliens as to their admission to Union citizenship.

The foregoing outlines the main reasons why I consider the acquisition of Union citizenship by Germans domiciled in South-West Africa should be by personal application, as indicated in paragraph 14 of the Report (and in paragraph 15 referred to as "the first method").

(Signed) J. J. BYRON.

MEMORANDUM BY MR. C. T. M. WILCOCKS

IN a memorandum signed on December 4, 1920, Mr. Wilcocks, a member of the Commission, put forward certain interpretations of the duty of a mandatory toward the territory under its control and toward the League of Nations. Only the more important sections are here included.

8. With regard to the consideration of the further questions referred to your Commission, it appeared to me from the outset that there existed a fundamental difference between my view and the view held by the other members of the Commission of the relationship of the Union of South Africa as mandatory toward South-West Africa as mandated territory.

9. This difference of opinion was so marked during our discussions and manifested itself so pointedly in paragraph 3 of the Chairman's (Majority) Report, that I came to the conclusion that I could best fulfil my task by submitting to Your Royal Highness my own exposition of the matter.

10. In his address on matters concerning South-West Africa General the Right Honorable J. C. Smuts, the Prime Minister, said during the 1919 session of Parliament:

"The mandate had been intrusted to South Africa. It had been given in a formal resolution of the Supreme Council. The Government of South-West was intrusted to the Union of South Africa as expressed in the resolution.

"Now the question was, What were the terms of the trust under which they were to administer the country? There, again, there was no doubt, because the *general* terms were settled in Section 22 of the Peace Treaty. . . .

"But the formal document, setting out the authority of the Union in detail, had not been received. There was a hitch. But it did not touch South Africa. The definition had not for some reason or other been made by the Council of the League of Nations."

11. From this it appears:

(*a*) That the mandate over South-West Africa had been awarded to the Union of South Africa by a formal resolution of the Supreme Council of the League of Nations.

(*b*) That the Council had failed to issue any further directions in regard to the mandate and that, therefore, the only provisions in connection therewith were those contained in Article 22 of the Treaty of Peace.

(*c*) That even the formal document, containing the award of the mandate to the Union, had not been received.

12. However, the mandate was accepted by the Union Government in 1919, and an act (No. 49 of 1919) was passed for carrying into effect, in so far as concerns the Union of South Africa, the treaty of peace between His Majesty the King and certain other Powers, and for carrying into effect any mandate issued in pursuance of the treaty to the Union of South Africa with reference to the territory of South-West Africa, lately under the sovereignty of Germany. . . .

14. Subject to the provisions of the treaty of peace, the League of Nations is still at liberty to make conditions and limitations concerning the mandate powers, and regulations concerning the mandated territory of South-West Africa.

15. What has, however, been definitely settled in connection with the mandated territory is that "Germany relinquishes in favor of the Allied and Associated Powers all rights and title over her overseas possessions" (Article 119 of the Treaty o Peace), but that at the same time Article 22 of the Treaty o Peace provides:

(*a*) (Paragraph 1). That to those colonies and territories which, as a consequence of the late war, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the states which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves . . . there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization, and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

(*b*) (Paragraph 2). That the best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be intrusted to advanced nations, who, by reasons of their resources, their experience, or geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage be exercised by them as mandatories on behalf of the League of Nations. . . .

(*d*) (Paragraph 6). That there are territories such as South-West Africa, etc., which, owing to the sparseness of their population or their remoteness from the center of civilization or their small size or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the mandatory, and other circumstances, can best be administered under the laws of the mandatory as integral portions of its territory. . . .

16. So that the relationship of the Union of South Africa as mandatory towards South-West Africa as mandated territory is that of a guardian toward his ward. This view is clearly confirmed by Article 22 of the Treaty of Peace; more particularly by the second paragraph of the said article. . .

18. I consider it my duty to lay stress upon this, because feel constrained to express my disapproval of the view whi some people seem to hold, namely, that the mandate which ha been granted to the Union is in fact nothing but a euphemism or camouflage for "annexation."

21. The question as to what should be the future form of government of South-West Africa as a mandated territory which can best be governed as an integral portion of the Union under the laws of the Union gives rise to a difficulty, viz.:

In the first place, because the League of Nations, from whom the mandate emanates, has up to the present time not said a word concerning the future government of the said or any other mandated territory; and secondly, because, so it appears to me, South-West Africa, with its inhabitants, is considered to be a minor, and not yet to possess the right to dispose of its own affairs.

22. In the case of communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire (Article 22, paragraph 4) the period for administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory is limited "until such time as they are able to stand alone." In this connection reference is even made to the wishes of the communities in the choice of their mandatory.

23. In that case the time of coming of age and the wishes of the mandated territory are rightly taken into consideration.

24. I conclude that it is contemplated that the time will arrive when South-West Africa will also have a say in regard to such an important question as the form of government for that territory.

25. Bearing in mind all the provisions of Article 22 of the Treaty of Peace concerning the territory which has been mandated by nothing more than a formal resolution, and fully appreciating that the German section of the population in Soutl West Africa have passed through a valley of the most painfu humiliation, I am of opinion that it would be wise to follow a policy of the utmost patience, tact, discretion, and sympathy in the present and future administration of the mandated territory. . . .

(Signed) C. T. M. WILCOCKS

Summer Book Supplement

The Progress of Poetry: England

By MARK VAN DOREN

A GOOD many Americans assume that contemporary English poetry is represented best, or even altogether, by the four volumes of "Georgian Poetry" which have appeared in London since November, 1912. Those volumes have youth and beauty and importance, but their covers inclose selections from less than a fourth of the living poets who are original and strong. While they have performed a remarkable service in their decade by advertising poetry in general and by drawing into their focus many diverse talents, they have achieved after all only a moderate diversity, and they have managed to miss a large number of the geniuses, who of course are not being drawn anywhere. The best poets in England, today as always, are individuals.

Four of the freshest are very old men. Thomas Hardy at 81 has really no rival alive. His five volumes of brief, entrapping lyrics, tales, and reveries from Wessex sun and gloom, together with his Napoleonic drama in three volumes, "The Dynasts," exhibit a vision of the deep earth and the wide sky which is neither old nor new, but profound. Profundity, a rare thing in English poetry, is not to be met with today in England outside of Mr. Hardy's honest, gnarled technique and luminous idiom. Drummer Hodge, a poem of the Boer War, will do for an example:

> They throw in Drummer Hodge, to rest
> Uncoffined—just as found:
> His landmark is a kopje-crest
> That breaks the veldt around:
> And foreign constellations west
> Each night above his mound.
>
> Young Hodge the Drummer never knew—
> Fresh from his Wessex home—
> The meaning of the broad Karoo,
> The Bush, the dusty loam,
> And why uprose to nightly view
> Strange stars amid the gloam.
>
> Yet portion of that unknown plain
> Will Hodge for ever be;
> His homely Northern breast and brain
> Grow to some Southern tree,
> And strange-eyed constellations reign
> His stars eternally.

Robert Bridges, poet-laureate, 77, is not great in any respect, but he is all pure poet, keeping himself busier at his own kind than at the official kind of verse. He has gained the respect of his juniors by a studious devotion to metrics and the art of language, while he has prepared for posterity a number of lyrics as cool and perfect as the present generation knows. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, 81, is an admirable specimen of his race. A country gentleman, a sportsman, an irreconcilable independent in politics and art, he has pursued an intermittent career in poetry which, though he calls it amateur, must be called by the soundest judges eminently intelligent and powerful. A rugged, straightforward humanness in his narratives and sonnet-sequences will increasingly recommend them. Charles M. Doughty, 78, is a literary curiosity of whom the younger English writers are fantastically proud. A famous traveler and writer on Arabia, at 63 he published in six volumes a blank-verse epic, "The Dawn in Britain," reconstructing, without sentiment and without charm, the Gaul and Britain of the first few centuries A. D.; and at intervals since he has put forth other poems of enormous, unreadable length. His un-Tennysonian style, so carefully archaic and bald and stiff, has a chance to be interesting long after the prettier trifles of the day are fallen into dust; his figure probably will prove unique.

These four men with their druidical age and authority are perhaps the priests, at any rate the pillars, of that modern world of poetry in which Tennysonianism and Swinburnianism have become impossible. Other men, younger by a generation, survive and represent the several fruitful movements of twenty years ago. William Butler Yeats and "Æ" still are supreme in Ireland; Arthur Symons in England continues the melancholy aestheticism of the 1890's; A. E. Housman, twenty-five years after the publication of his immensely influential little volume of pessimistic pastorals, "A Shropshire Lad," meditates a successor to it; and Rudyard Kipling, with Sir Henry Newbolt not far off, perpetrates patriotic balladry.

In 1912 all of these poets were virtually as venerable as they are now, and few new ones had risen to individual prominence. T. Sturge Moore since 1899 had been securing some attention with a steady succession of excellent though quiet pieces in a soberly ratiocinative, idyllic Greek manner, and Alfred Noyes had bled to exhaustion a promising narrative vein; there were no others. But a race of younger energetics was coming on, and Rupert Brooke, one of the youngest, suggested an anthology which should render the best of them better known and give proof of a renaissance. This became "Georgian Poetry, 1911-1912."

The really remarkable writers among those who since 1912 have been caught on the rise of their popularity by "Georgian Poetry" and made canonical can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Lascelles Abercrombie's dramatic blank verse is the most vivid and gorgeous of the century, a definite advance over the dilutions of Stephen Phillips. Gordon Bottomley's romantic tragedies have less color in their separate lines but more atmosphere around their wholes. They are beautifully pondered fragments of far-off, long-gone life. John Masefield has gone unrepresented in the "Georgian" volumes by any of those furiously rapid narrative pieces which have done more than anything else today to arouse wide interest in poetry, but his rich, rather rank lyricism has been done justice. Perhaps the most certain poet of them all is William H. Davies, that strange vagabond whose difficult life so little explains the perfection and the simplicity of his muse. It is somewhat less than fair to call him the Herrick of our day; for while he is as clean and sure a poet as he of the "Hesperides," he is also as original. Only in Thomas Hardy now do figures occur so naturally and so finally, is idiom used so unaccountably well, is observation so inimitable.

Sweet Stay-at-Home, sweet Well-content,
Thou knowest of no strange continent:
Thou hast not felt thy bosom keep
A gentle motion with the deep;
Thou hast not sailed in Indian seas,
Where scent comes forth in every breeze.
Thou hast not seen the rich grape grow
For miles, as far as eyes can go;
Thou hast not seen a summer's night
When maids could sew by a worm's light;
Nor the North Sea in spring send out
Bright hues that like birds flit about
In solid cages of white ice—
Sweet Stay-at-Home, sweet Love-one-place.
Thou hast not seen black fingers pick
White cotton when the bloom is thick,
Nor heard black throats in harmony;
Nor hast thou sat on stones that lie
Flat on the earth, that once did rise
To hide proud kings from common eyes;
Thou hast not seen plains full of bloom
Where green things had such little room
They pleased the eye like fairer flowers—
Sweet Stay-at-Home, all these long hours.
Sweet Well-content, sweet Love-one-place,
Sweet, simple maid, bless thy dear face;
For thou hast made more homely stuff
Nurture thy gentle self enough;
I love thee for a heart that's kind—
Not for the knowledge in thy mind.

Rupert Brooke was bold and facile; Walter De La Mare, in two or three pieces like The Linnet, but not in his glib remainder, achieves a beautiful, decent clarity; Ralph Hodgson, in The Bull, has enchanting energy; the rest of the Georgians, with the possible exception of James Stephens of sprightly Irish fame, can be done without. Wilfrid Wilson Gibson is prosaic, while John Drinkwater, Harold Monro, and J. C. Squire only practice and perpetuate what has come to be too well known as the Georgian manner—lucid, competent, trivial. The last two volumes of the series have lost by ignoring the delicate work of Edward Thomas, friend and follower of Robert Frost.

To be specific, the Georgian story of contemporary verse leaves out of account four whole departments: the women poets, the translators, the imagists, and the satirists.

Among women poets, now that Mary Coleridge and Michael Field are dead, Alice Meynell, author of The Shepherdess and other matchless songs, probably stands highest. Mrs. Meynell is older than Margaret L. Woods, and less sumptuous, but fresher and more unmistakable. In the new generation Anna Wickham is notable for "muscular, clean, fierce precision," and Charlotte Mew for a unique style in monologue, concentrated, fascinating, irregular, intense. Charlotte Mew's one book, "The Farmer's Bride" (1916), containing seventeen irreducible poems, has recently been reprinted with eleven other poems as "Saturday Market," and may be expected, even without further additions, to make a place for itself in that precious domain of literature occupied by Emily Brontë and Emily Dickinson.

Translation, so important for the food it furnishes to growing poetry, is at its most useful today less in Gilbert Murray, whose famous versions of Euripides run on with an eloquence like Swinburne's, than in a number of persons who work with less-known, perhaps minor material, with the brief, perfect poems of classical China and Japan and of ancient Greece. It is not to Gilbert Murray's heroic couplets that the subtlest poets are going to school, but to the finely cadenced prose or free verse of Arthur Waley's translations from the Chinese and Japanese, E. Powys Mathers's from the Chinese, Japanese, Sanskrit, Afghan, Hindustan, Burmese, Persian, Turkish, Arabic, and Kurdish, of Edward Storer's and Richard Aldington's from Sappho and the Greek Anthology, of "H. D.'s" from the choruses of Euripides, of F. S. Flint's and Ezra Pound's from the modern French, and of Ezra Pound's from the Chinese and the Provençal. If it be objected that this is the raw material of poetry rather than poetry itself in finished form, the answer is—an American, Ezra Pound, has made it most brilliantly—that raw material is precisely the needed thing today. The Tennysonians and Swinburnians have all the finish that can be desired, and little else. Translators like those who have been named scrape the varnish and discover the grain. It is salutary for any generation of poets to learn that poetry has meaning as well as form, stuff as well as style. Ezra Pound goes so far as to imply that poetry is never good when it loses by translation. This may be partly false, since it proves Milton poor, but it is also partly true. It explains why William H. Davies is a better poet than Walter De La Mare, and why Thomas Hardy is the best of all; it reminds how necessary it is for literature to meet the eye and the intelligence no less than the custom-loving ear.

It often has been remarked that a good deal of imagist poetry reads like translation, and indeed the connection is close, for several notable translators in the past decade have also been notable imagists—Richard Aldington, the American "H. D." (now a resident of England), F. S. Flint, and Ezra Pound. Ezra Pound, who in 1912 managed to agree on certain poetic principles with "H. D." and Richard Aldington, and who with F. S. Flint in 1913 contributed to the Chicago magazine, *Poetry*, a classical list of "don'ts" for careful poets, is usually spoken of as the father of the imagist school in England. He is not that, although his has been the wittiest and most influential intelligence supporting the cause of concentration, concreteness, directness, visuality, rhythmical freedom—in a word, raw material—in poetry. F. S. Flint in 1915 demonstrated that the school was really in formation as far back as 1908, before Ezra Pound left America for England, when Mr. Flint was in the habit of meeting with Edward Storer, T. E. Hulme, and others to discuss French poetry and common sense. T. E. Hulme was by all accounts a suggestive talker, but he left only five poems, one of which, called The Embankment, "the fantasia of a fallen gentleman on a cold, bitter night," deserves quotation for a keenness quite characteristic of the school at its best:

Once, in finesse of fiddles found I ecstasy,
In the flash of gold heels on the hard pavement.
Now see I
That warmth's the very stuff of poesy.
Oh, God, make small
The old star-eaten blanket of the sky,
That I may fold it round me and in comfort lie.

The school, one regrets to say, has not often been at its best, or even at its rather good. It has professed an aversion to unnecessary rhetoric and dim diction, but F. S. Flint has frequently split hairs, Richard Aldington been elegiac or eloquent, D. H. Lawrence sprawled, and Ford Madox Hueffer, on the whole an admirable poet, rambled. All of these have written memorable free verse, yet none has been so consistently compact or efficient as "H. D." (Hilda Doolittle, wife of Richard Aldington). "H. D." never has a word too many. With two or three severe phrases, in the tiniest pinprick of a poem, she can spread out a boundless froth of sea-coast:

Whirl up, sea—
Whirl your pointed pines,
Splash your great pines
On our rocks,
Hurl your green over us,
Cover us with your pools of fir.

The school, as a school, refusing contact as it does with the fund of allusion which tradition furnishes, is limited, and may have short life. But it has done much clean and necessary work of a kind which the "Georgian" books have inadequately recognized; it has hated pretty nonsense with the thoroughness of the brighter satirical times.

Without any doubt there is a future for satire in English poetry, and it cannot be safely denied that the more or less immediate future will be predominantly satirical. Ezra Pound is an imagist, but he is more particularly a satirist, and another American poet living in England, T. S. Eliot, is all but purely a satirist-diabolist. If these two men, with their insistent reminders of France and Greece, are further-reaching as critics than as poets—they are perhaps the two most stimulating critics now practicing in London—yet they have made much effective fun in verse (witness The Garden, The Hippopotamus, Sunday Morning Service, Mr. Apollinax, The Boston *Evening Transcript*, or those darker deviltries, Portrait of a Lady and The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock), and signs can be found that their humor is catching on. Is not Aldous Huxley's "Leda," with what Dr. Johnson would have called its metaphysical wit, the most rousing book of verse, if at places the most nauseous, in months, and are not the best portions of it riotously critical: Jonah, the four Philosopher's Songs, Frascati's, and that cross-section of the contemporary futilitarian mind, Soles Occidere et Redire Possunt? "Wheels," the annual shocker-anthology in which Aldous Huxley has been appearing since 1917, has in no sense produced him, for most of its other contributors—the Sitwell family, for instance—have been dreary. Only his own intelligence, representative, it may be hoped, of a general intelligence which waits in the air, needing nothing save to be liberated and improved for wider audiences, is responsible for a phenomenon like the First Philosopher's Song:

A poor degenerate from the ape,
Whose hands are four, whose tail's a limb,
I contemplate my flaccid shape
And know I may not rival him,

Save with my mind—a nimbler beast
Possessing a thousand sinewy tails,
A thousand hands, with which it scales,
Greedy of luscious truth, the greased

Poles and the coco palms of thought,
Thrids easily through the mangrove maze
Of metaphysics, walks the taut
Frail dangerous liana ways

That link across wide gulfs remote
Analogies between tree and tree;
Outruns the hare, outhops the goat;
Mind fabulous, mind sublime and free!

But oh, the sound of simian mirth!
Mind, issued from the monkey's womb,
Is still umbilical to earth,
Earth its home and earth its tomb.

The Race of Reviewers

By HENRY SEIDEL CANBY

As a reviewer of books, my experience has been lengthy rather than considerable. It is, indeed, precisely twenty-two years since I wrote my first review, which ended, naturally, with the words "a good book to read of a winter evening before a roaring fire." I remember them because the publishers, who are lovers of platitudes, quoted them, to my deep gratification, and perhaps because I had seen them before. Since then I have reviewed at least twice as many books as there are years in this record—about as many, I suppose, as a book-page war-horse in racing trim could do in a month, or a week. My credentials are not impressive in this category, but perhaps they will suffice.

As an author, my claim to enter upon this self-contained symposium which I am about to present is somewhat stronger. Authors, of course, read all the reviews of their books, even that common American variety which runs like the telegraphic alphabet: quote—summarize—quote—quote—summarize—quote, and so on up to five dollars worth, space rates. I have read all the reviews of my books except those which clipping bureaus seeking a subscription or kind friends wishing to chastise vicariously have neglected to send me. As an author I can speak with mingled feelings, but widely, of reviews.

Editorially my experience has been equally poignant. For ten years I have read reviews, revised and unrevised, in proof and out of it. I have cut reviews that needed cutting and meekly endured the curses of the reviewer. I have printed conscientiously reviews that had better been left unwritten, and held my head bloody but unbowed up to the buffets of the infuriated authors. As an editor I may say that I am at home, though not always happy, with reviewing and reviewers.

And now, when in one of those rare moments of meditation which even New York permits I ask myself why does every man or woman with the least stir of literature in them wish to review books, my trinitarian self—critic, author, editor—holds high debate. For a long time I have desired to fight it out, and find, if it can be found, the answer.

As an author, I have a strong distaste for reviewing. In the creative mood of composition, or in weary relaxation, reviewing seems the most ungrateful of tasks. Nothing comes whole to a reviewer. Half of every book must elude him, and the other half he must compress into snappy phrases. I watch him working upon that corpus, which so lately was a thing of life and movement—my book—and see that he cannot lift it; that he must have some hand-hold to grip it by—my style or my supposed interest in the Socialist Party, or the fact that I am a professor or a Roman Catholic. Unless he can get some phrase that will explain the characters of my women, the length of my sentences, and the moral I so carefully hid in the last chapter, he is helpless. Sometimes I find him running for a column without finding a gate to my mind, and then giving it up in mid-paragraph. Sometimes he gets inside, but dashes for the

exit sign and is out before I know what he thinks. Sometimes he finds an idea to his liking, wraps up in it, and goes to sleep.

I recognize his usefulness. I take his hard raps meekly and even remember them when next I begin to write. I do not hate him much when he tells the public not to read me. There is always the chance that he is right for *his* public; not, thank heavens, for mine. I am furious only when it is clear that he has not read me himself. But I cannot envy him. It is so much more agreeable to make points than to find them. It is so much easier, if you have a little talent, to build some kind of an engine that will run than to explain what precise fault prevents it from being the best. When I am writing a book I cannot understand the mania for criticism that seems to infect the majority of the literary kind.

As a reviewer I must again confess, although as an editor I may bitterly regret the confession, that the passion for reviewing is almost inexplicable. Reviewing has the primal curse of hard labor upon it. You must do two kinds of work at once, and be adequately rewarded for neither. First you must digest another man's conception, assimilate his ideas, absorb his imagination. It is like eating a cold dinner on a full stomach. And then when you have eaten and digested, you must tell how you feel about it—briefly, cogently, and in words that cannot be misunderstood. Furthermore, your feelings must be typical, must represent what a thousand stomachs will feel, or should feel, or could feel if they felt at all, or instead of being hailed as a critic you will be accused of dyspepsia.

The mere mental labor of picking up the contents of a book as you proceed with your criticism, and tucking them in here and there where they fit, is so great that, speaking as a reviewer, I should give up reviewing if there were no more compelling reasons than requests to write criticism. There are, there must be; and still speaking as a reviewer I begin to glimpse one or two of them. Revenge is not one. Critics have written for revenge, quoting gleefully "O that mine enemy would write a book!" Pope is our classic example. But publishers have made that form of literary vendetta unprofitable nowadays, and I am glad they have done so. Much wit, but little criticism, has been inspired by revenge. Furthermore, I notice in my own case, and my editorial self confirms the belief, that the reviewer craves books to extol, not books to condemn. He is happiest when his author is sympathetic to his own temperament. Antipathetic books must be forced upon him.

Which leads me to the further conclusion that the prime motive for reviewing is the creative instinct. We all of us have it, all of the literary folk who make up a most surprising proportion of every community in the United States. It works on us constantly. Sometimes it comes to a head and then we do a story or a poem, an essay or a book; but in the meantime it is constantly alive down below, drawn toward every sympathetic manifestation without, craving self-expression and, in default of that, expression by others. If a book is in us we write; if it is not, we seize upon another man's child, adopt it as ours, talk of it, learn to understand it, let it go reluctantly with our blessing, and depart vicariously satisfied. That is the hope, the ever-renewed hope, with which the besotted reviewer takes up reviewing.

The creative instinct indeed is sexed, like the human that possesses it. It seeks a mystical union with the imaginings of others. The poet, the novelist, the essayist, seek the mind of the reader; the critic seeks the mind of the writer. That we get so much bad reviewing is due to incompatibility of temperament or gross discrepancy in the mating intellects. Yet reviewers (and authors), like lovers, hope ever for the perfect match.

I know one critic who tore his review in pieces because it revealed the charlatanism of his beloved author. I know an author who burnt his manuscript because his friend and critic had misunderstood him. I see a thousand reviews (and have written several of them) where book and reviewer muddle along together like the partners of everyday marriages. But next time, one always hopes, it will be different.

As an editor, I confess that I view all this effusion with some distrust. One plain fact stands high and dry above the discussion: books are being published daily, and someone must tell the busy and none too discriminating public what they are worth—not to mention the librarians who are so engaged in making out triple cards and bibliographies and fitting titles to vague recollections that they have no time left to read. Furthermore, if reviewing is a chore at worst, and at best a desire to gratify a craving for the unappeasable, editing reviews is still more chorelike, and seeking the unobtainable—a good review for every good book—is quite as soul-exhausting as the creative instinct.

And, again as an editor, the perfect marriage of well attuned minds is well enough as an ideal, but as a practicable achievement I find myself more often drawn toward what I should call the liaison function of a reviewer. The desire to be useful (since we have excluded the desire to make money as a major motive) is, I believe, an impulse which very often moves the reviewer. The instinct to teach, to reform, to explain, to improve lies close to the heart of nine out of ten of us. It is commoner than the creative instinct. When it combines with it, one gets a potential reviewer.

The reviewer as a liaison officer is a homelier description than soul affinity or intellectual mate, but it is quite as honorable. Books (to the editor) represent, each one of them, so much experience, so much thought, so much imagination differently compounded in story, poem, tractate on science, history, or play. Each is a man's most luminous self in words, ready for others. Who wants it? Who can make use of it? Who will be dulled by it? Who exalted? It is the reviewer's task to say. He grasps the book, estimates it, calculates its audience. Then he makes the liaison. He explains, he interprets, and in so doing necessarily criticizes, abstracts, appreciates. The service is inestimable, when properly rendered. It is essential for that growing literature of knowledge which science and the work of specialists in all fields have given us. Few readers can face alone and unaided a shelf of books on radio-activity, evolution, psychology, or sociology with any hope of selecting without guidance the best, or with any assurance that they dare reject as worthless what they do not understand. The house of the interpreter has become the literary journal, and its usefulness will increase.

A liaison of a different kind is quite as needful in works of sheer imagination. Here the content is human, the subject the heart, or life as one sees it. But reading, like writing, is a fine art that few master. Only the most sensitive, whose minds are as quick as their emotions are responsive, can go to the heart of a poem or a story. They need an interpreter, a tactful interpreter, who will give them the key and let them find their own chamber. Or who will wave them away from the door, or advise a brief sojourn.

To an editor such an interpreter is an ideal reviewer. He will desire to be useful, and passionately attempt it. He will feel his responsibility first to art and next to the public, and then to his author, and last (as an editor I whisper it) to the publisher. Reviewers forget the author and the public. Their mandate comes from art (whose representative in the flesh is, or should be, the editor). But their highest service is to make a liaison between the reader and his book.

And the conclusion of this debate is, I think, a simple one. Reviewing is a major sport, fascinating precisely because of its difficulty, compelling precisely because it appeals to strong instincts. For most of us it satisfies that desire to work for some end which we ourselves approve, regardless of costs. The editor, sardonically aware of a world that refuses to pay much for what men do to please themselves or to reform others, sees here his salvation, and is thankful.

Canopus

By CLEMENT WOOD

UP from the smooth dust of the road they turned.
The shivery spider cables spread a net
Across the climbing path that teased and burned
Their faces, which the dew-sprayed leaves left wet;
Defenseless cheeks were clawed by trespassing bramble
And vagabonding sumach. Their fingers met,
Anchors to steady each unsteady scramble.

Their nervous feet struck stones, that toppled over
The terraced outcrop, and, at last let loose,
Clattered to rest against stray tufts of clover.
Boughs broke off in their grasp, and were no use,
And underneath the brittle twigs snapped shrill.
At length the firmer sassafras and spruce
Gave hand-holds as they met the steeper hill.

"We'll rest." He wiped an arm across a brow
Fouled with the twitching spider-web, and leant
Against a low dead stump, steadying now
Her passage toward him, much as though he meant
To hold the pressure till her breathless face
Encountered his; then, suddenly continent,
He loosed her hand. She poised in the dark place,

Her heart pounding, gasping as though distressed.
She smoothed a dampened, restless strand of hair.
A smile colored her echoing words: "We'll rest.
It *is* steep." Then they sniffed the thinner air,
Sharply brought closer, as the conquered rise
Made clear that they at length had mounted where
There were no more of censoring city eyes.

The isolation was a sudden thrust
Cleaving them, like a whispered word of warning.
He brushed ahead; a startled smoke of dust
Trailed like a widening curtain. Quickly scorning
The stiff precipitous way, she followed higher
Through crushing shadow and jutting branch, adorning
This path that pointed toward an unseen fire.

Partly to dull two fires—the one that charred
Her cheeks, the one still deeper—she called out:
"You think we'll see it?" He was climbing hard,
So far ahead, his answer was a shout.
"I think we may." He waited, eyes uncertain,
Until her sky-lit face came near, to rout
The dark, as daybreak tears night's shadowy curtain.

He guided to the summit. Fingers tingled
Uneasily, driven thoughts clung and caressed;
The sharp throbs of their breathing met and mingled.
She sank in a grass cushion on the crest,
Content to forget far fire and its far arc.
She settled into a tender bladed nest,
His body lengthened upward in the dark,

Or so it seemed to her. "It's nearly ten;
An hour, and it should clear the horizon haze,
Squatting right above Sand Mountain. Then
It's ours, if the cloudy August heaven plays
No tricks." He held a tree-trunk close, instead
Of something longed for; she leaned in a daze,
Smoothing her knee as if it had been a head.

"A visitor," he thought aloud, "who takes
One burning, scornful look, and never more.
He leaves to flutter over Andean lakes,
To halve the sky of some lost, jungled shore,
To flame with the Southern Cross and Sirius,
Raining hot madness on lush midnight brakes,
Gilding chill seas, frigid, unamorous."

She pondered. "You have seen him?" "Once," he said,
"As I saw Mercury once, a golden bubble
Poised just above the dawn's disheveled bed,
For one pale glimpse." Her fingers clutched the stubble
Lying beneath them, clawed it from its home;
She held her voice level with much trouble.
"What are the stars but flecks of fiery foam—"

"What are the stars but sources of that flame
That burns and scorches in the stifling sun,
That flares in us—" His gesturing fingers came
Across hers suddenly, trembled, as if to run
In panic from a long suspected danger,
Then calmed into a hot oblivion,
Clasping her own, knowing her hand no stranger.

The night's mysterious wings pulsed through the dark,
The night's mysterious noises cracked and shivered,
And where their fingers met a visible spark
Seemed to leap forth at them, and pulsed and quivered
Throughout them both. Their thickened tongues were dumb,
The pretty words of star-lore undelivered,
The pretty words that found no breath could come.

He sank into the stubble by her side,
Leaving a blankness in the upper night;
His lips leant in their urgency of pride
Towards her eyes, that made the blackness bright.
His lips spoke only to the reddened cheek,
And settled to a long-denied delight
Upon the goal they had not dared to seek.

There was a gasping silence on the crest,
While the wind whined and the thin stars passed over;

There was a gasping rapture in each breast,
And her will bent as wind bends low the clover.
And a flame rose to its magnificent noon,
And a flame vanished. Each exalted lover
Felt the mad ecstasy and the piercing tune

Of love higher than hills that brush the sky,
Of love fiercer than suns that whiten space,
Die in their high magnificence, yet die
To a still radiance in the friendly place
That seemed to promise higher ecstasy
Forever stamped on each beloved's face,
Telling them: "This is immortality."

Unseen, while love's proud beacon flared and swept
Across their hearts, a sudden sullen glow
Had lifted over the hill beyond, and crept,
Diminishing yet brightening, in slow
And stately curving path so high, and then
Bent back toward the dimness, slid below
The unlit bulk of the huge hills again.

Without a word they knew it. His face burning,
"We can return"; but they knew, at his word,
That there are paths that do not know returning;
And as their downward-stumbling footsteps stirred
The stony steep, the roadway dust, the gray
And morning hush, each rustle made or heard
Sang to them they had found the starrier way.

Prohibition Ditties

By L. L.

I

I cannot get a cocktail
Anywhere I go.
Are the clouds going to drop on me
That hang so low?

They're shooting men in Hungary,
Ireland's bright with blood,
Red hell comes streaming from the war
That was to do us good.

Love's at the world's end.
How shall a man get
A little bit of ecstasy
To make his soul forget?

II

We used to drink the red wine
At a little inn.
Now we sip at ginger-ale;
Drinking wine is sin.

The world is stale. We common folks
Have much more work than fun.
I think I'll slit your throat, my dear,
To see the red blood run.

The sixth article in The Contemporary American Novelists series will be on James Branch Cabell and will appear in next week's issue.

Books

Myth, Historian, and Psychologist

The Mythology of All Races. Vol. XI. Latin-American. By Hartley Burr Alexander. Marshall Jones Company.

THIS handsome and well-illustrated book is a companion volume to Professor Alexander's work on American mythology north of Mexico, which appeared in the same series a number of years ago. It covers the whole of Mexico, Central America, and South America in ten readable chapters, all carefully documented. Nowhere can one obtain so connected and so dependable a survey of the religious beliefs and practices and of the more important myths of aboriginal Latin America. The author has not trusted himself to elaborate theories of diffusion or of psychological genesis. He is satisfied with a sober, summary record of the facts to be gleaned from the old Spanish writers and from the more recent ethnological sources. Here and there he indulges in a bit of psychological or ethical inference—a little naively perhaps, as when a Fuegian taboo against the killing of young ducks is thus commented on: "Primitive as they are, here are moral ideas—whether one explain, reconditely, the sparing of the young of game as an instinctive conservation of the food supply, or, simply, as due to a natural and chivalrous pity for the helpless young." I doubt if what we know of the nature and history of irrational beliefs lends color to such rationalizing interpretations as these.

The general public will be particularly thankful to Mr. Alexander for his ethnological backgrounds. Thus, in treating of the gods and myths of old Mexico, he is careful to give us an idea of the somber setting of human sacrifice and of the complicated calendric reckoning, here, as elsewhere, closely associated with the course of ceremonial observances. The book might almost be called an introduction to the native culture of Latin America through the gateway of mythology. It would be too much to expect infallible accuracy of the author. Not marshaling the evidence at first hand, he necessarily falls at times into over-statement or under-statement. In speaking, for instance, of the Piman group of languages, spoken in southern Arizona and in the northern half of Mexico, he remarks that "it forms a possible connexion between the Shoshonean to the north and the Nahuatlan nations of the Aztec world." The "possible" is rather discomforting at this late day. It has been quite conclusively demonstrated not merely that Piman is a linguistic link between Shoshonean and Aztec but that definite phonetic laws may be formulated connecting Aztec with the outermost Shoshonean dialects of Idaho and Wyoming, laws that operate with the same tyrannical exactness as we look for in a comparison of Latin and Sanskrit. However, environing ethnological and linguistic details are of lesser moment in a volume of this sort.

The psychoanalysts latterly have pushed myth, primitive taboo, and other spiritual vagaries of the folk into the foreground of attention. This is therefore as good an opportunity as any of touching upon some of the fundamental points at issue. What shall we make of all these myths? Are these plumed serpents, swallowing monsters, virginal births, and deluges of no other than casual significance? Why do so many of these conceptions persist with an almost obsessive tenacity and why are so many of them world-wide in their distribution?

There are two methods of approach, the psychological and the historical. The psychologist takes a given myth pretty much for granted as a reasonably self-consistent psychic formation. It does not readily occur to him, for instance, to question whether character and incident have always been associated or whether the grouping of incidents is not a cumulative growth, a pastiche of elements that originally existed in independent form. If once he allowed himself to entertain destructive notions of this sort, he would gradually have his data slipping from under his hand. His psychological formulas of interpretation might be ever so

relevant, but they would be helpless salt for the tails of mythic birds. Just as biblical mythology fitted into a neat exegetical frame until the advent of a higher criticism, so the successful application of these psychological formulas, Wundtian or Freudian, to any myth structure tacitly depends on the withholding of a preliminary historical critique. We can only begin to interpret when we have come to the end of our analysis.

The historical student of myth insists on destructive analysis. He is not content to take a myth as it is. He finds that it is generally a synthesis of several elements, each of which has its own historical antecedents, its independent affiliations. The same element may occur in the most diverse settings, pointing to mutually irreconcilable significances. Over and above, or rather beneath, the geographical distribution of myths as such he can work out the more pervasive distribution of the elements, the materials that are assembled into an endless variety of myth patterns. To the interpretative psychologist he can always put the question: How do you know that this myth or even this fragmentary episode is in any true sense a single psychic creation? How can you establish a psychic sequence underlying the myth when the association of its elements is historically fortuitous?

The crux is not sharp because historian and psychologist fall somewhat foul of each other. Obviously, history and psychology are not born enemies, they are such only in action. They could come to terms if they came truly to grips instead of scolding at each other over a barrier of misunderstanding. The historian too often believes that he has exhausted the significance of a phenomenon when he has established its place in a sequence, worked out its external relations, and indicated its lease of life. He dismisses the psychologist's fancies as irrelevant to the historical process, though he may enjoy them as projections of an imaginative mind. To the charge that his history gives no ultimate explanation of the rise and development of a myth or of any other socialized notion or institution, he is likely to answer that it is none of history's business to ferret out the buried psychological determinants of the significant elements of a culture, that these determinants are at last analysis highly variable phenomena of individual psychology, that it is hopeless to disentangle them at a remove of hundreds or thousands of years.

All this does not and should not silence the psychologist who looks for a specifically psychological motivation and content in mythology. Before he fastens upon these, however, he should more clearly apprehend the difficulties in his way. Two problems in particular must be faced. At what point in the analysis of a myth does the psychological mode of interpretation become possible or even hopeful? And, secondly, how can we advance from the known psychology of the individual to that diffused psychological content that inheres or seems to inhere in the myth as a socially transmitted entity? What, precisely, does it mean that certain myths, historical growths of the "folk mind," exhibit analogies to individual dreams or to the deranged fancies of abnormal minds? Have they—as history, as institutions—necessarily the same unconscious psychic significance that they may possess as dream or as psychotic symptom? Does the history of the cross as an art motif run strictly parallel to the history of the cross as a religious symbol? Does either history fully contain or explain the other, or are they not rather independent, though intertwined? And is the psychic significance of the cross the same to all minds, even to all believing minds? To ask these parallel questions is, I believe, to see the psychology of myth in a fresher and more fruitful light.

The psychologist is right to seek psychology in myth, but his interpretations may be none the less misleading because of his historical naivete. The truth would seem to be that there is not one psychology of mythology but that there are at least two such psychologies. One of these is concerned with the ultimate psychic determinants of cultural form. This is at bottom the same selective and creative psychology as operates in the history of art. Myths are not isolated formations. They differ characteristically for different times and places largely because they tend to conform to certain typical patterns. To assume that these characteristic differences are directly due to deep-seated differences of psychology of the myth-making folk is too naive for serious consideration. The cumulative psychology of myth as a particular social pattern is the kind of psychology that the historian of myth would most need to know about, yet it is the one that the psychologist is least able to render an account of. It is the psychology which will some day underlie the study of all culture-history, for it manifests itself across the generations in a persistent striving for and perfecting of form, eventually in the disintegration and replacement of this form. To capture the very citadel of the psychoanalysts, we may say that the first requisite of a psychological understanding of mythology—of other phases of culture as well—is the discovery of a social psychology of "form-libido." Psychology is still too weak to know how to go about the task. In the beginning a science is qualitative, almost exclusively concerned with subject matter; only later does it envisage its problems mathematically and apprehend quantities, direction, form.

The second psychology of myth deals with the psychic significance, conscious or unconscious, of the single elements of mythology. Now if the history of culture teaches us anything, it is that while forms tend to persist, the psychic significance of these forms varies tremendously from age to age and from individual to individual. There is no permanency of psychic content. This content may diminish or increase in intensity or it may become completely transformed. It may be transferred from one form to another, and it is the psychoanalysts who should know this best of all. I believe that to reason from the "latent psychic content" of certain dreams or neurotic symptoms to the psychic motivation of formally analogous myths is loose thinking. Symbols, like other accepted forms, are ready to receive whatever psychic content the individual psychology or the social psychology of a given time and place is prepared to put into them. Myths may or may not have been motivated by certain unconscious psychic trends, but it is difficult to understand how they could indefinitely keep their significance as symbols of these trends. It seems much more reasonable to suppose that there is in myth no such constancy of symbolic significance as many of the psychoanalytic school assume but that the history of myth can be chiefiy understood from the standpoint of the more general psychology of form-trends. Sexual or other symbolisms are likely, of course, to arise as secondary interpretations or unconscious contributory potencies in the mind of an individual or, by suggestion, of a society. Origin is not to be lightly inferred from the mere fact of unconscious association.

EDWARD SAPIR

The Most Eminent Victorian

Queen Victoria. By Lytton Strachey. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

HAVING achieved an instant literary success with his "Eminent Victorians," published three years ago, Mr. Lytton Strachey has now undertaken to portray the most eminent of them all. The result is a book that everyone in England is reading.

Its vogue is evidence both of the popular interest in Victoria—as well as in Mr. Strachey's manner of writing biography—and of the fact that the Victorian Age has wholly passed away. England was ready for a detached, an un-Victorian life of the Queen, and Mr. Strachey has produced it. All her previous biographers, the courtly Martin, the scholarly Lee, and the rest, wrote in the shadow of Victoria's sovereignty. To them Her Majesty was a part of the scheme of things. Mr. Strachey moves in another world. Victoria, could she return to life, would by no means approve of his book; she would probably try to suppress it, as she tried to suppress the indiscreet "Greville Memoirs." It has little in common with the Bishop of Chester's

"Exposition of the Gospel of St. Matthew," which she, in her girlhood, pronounced "a very fine book indeed . . . just plain and comprehensible and full of truth and good feeling," and beyond which her literary appreciation never advanced; and of this biographer's indiscreetness she would have no doubt.

Mr. Strachey is not concerned with the individual as a product of "social forces" or a manifestation of the Zeitgeist. His dominant interest is in human personality for itself, and he is gifted in remarkable degree with the dramatic sense of the self-revealing in word and deed. By a masterly manipulation of the calcium lights he permits Victoria, in her progress through life, to show us what manner of person he conceives her to have been.

He presents to us a woman of peculiar sincerity and constant goodness. That quality of absolute truthfulness which the Baroness Lehzen discovered in her five-year-old charge remained Victoria's through life. It is apparent throughout the journal in which, from childhood, she recorded her daily doings. It was largely responsible for those breaches of constitutional etiquette of which she was guilty more than once. She never acquired that faculty of concealing her personal feelings and opinions on questions of state which the ideal constitutional monarch must possess. She was too sincere to play a part of any kind. Forthright in all her dealings and astonishingly outspoken, "she moved through life with the imposing certitude of one to whom concealment was impossible." When, a child of twelve, she was informed of the exalted destiny in store for her, she said "I will be good," and she kept her word. Perhaps early in her reign, under the spell of Lord Melbourne's personality, there was a season of hesitation. Mr. Strachey thinks so. "Humanity and fallibility are infectious things; was it possible that Lehzen's prim pupil had caught them? That she was beginning to listen to siren voices? That the secret impulses of self-expression, of self-indulgence even, were mastering her life? For a moment the child of a new age looked back, and wavered towards the eighteenth century. It was the most critical moment of her career." But if the eighteenth century did indeed beckon to her, she was rescued from its lures by Albert and the solid joys of domesticity. There was no more wavering; Victoria and moral excellence became synonymous. And fortunate was this for the cause of royalty in England, for the insane George III, the disreputable George IV, and the preposterous William IV had put the monarchical sentiment of the English people to a severe test.

Mr. Strachey throws Victoria's intellectual limitations into strong relief. Unlike the Prince Consort she had no taste for learning, and she stood quite apart from the intellectual currents of her reign. Her style of writing was naively vigorous, but Mr. Strachey does not exaggerate in calling it "utterly unliterary." One of the bits of new information that he has gathered from private sources is that it was Gladstone's custom to open meetings of his Cabinet by reading aloud the letters he had received from the Queen on questions of the moment. "The assembly sat in absolute silence while, one after another, the royal missives, with their emphases, their ejaculations, and their grammatical peculiarities, boomed forth in all the deep solemnity of Mr. Gladstone's utterance." If Victoria took any interest in the profound industrial transformation of her time, it was merely a reflex of Albert's intelligent appreciation of it. She enjoyed theatrical performances, but her preference was for plays of a farcical character. She relished the funny and the grotesque—"she had been one of the very few persons who had always been able to appreciate the Prince Consort's jokes"—but she was totally devoid of a sense of humor. Of this the unremitting seriousness with which she took herself and the prodigious amount of her unproductive exertion in affairs of state are abundant evidence.

The Prince Consort plays inevitably a leading role in Mr. Strachey's drama, and the representation of him is very striking. Albert on the eve of his marriage, sustained by a stern sense of duty to endure the high fate that awaits him, is a masterpiece of that irony in which Mr. Strachey excels. Albert's industry was more productive than Victoria's; during the years when he was uncrowned king the personal authority of the sovereign was greater than it had been since the first part of the reign of George III or than it ever has been since. Mr. Strachey has some suggestive reflections to make on what might have been had the Prince lived to old age.

All of the characters that are introduced are brilliantly drawn. Lord Melbourne, the "autumn rose" of the eighteenth century, more liberal in his private life than in his politics, with his strange taste for theology, and his mysterious past, is a triumph in the delineation of personality. So is Lord Palmerston, with his dyed whiskers and queer metallic laugh reminiscent of Pitt and the Congress of Vienna, the bane of Victoria and Albert's existence, the enfant terrible of all the continental chancelleries. Disraeli is unforgettable—the adventurer and charlatan, applying to the "Faery" his outrageous flatteries with a trowel that "seemed to assume the qualities of some lofty masonic symbol." Even the lesser dramatis personae are all characters, not mere names.

Mr. Strachey has spared himself no pains to make himself master of his subject, as his bibliography and footnotes show. The use of parts of the unpublished manuscript of the "Greville Memoirs" in the British Museum and private information have enabled him to present some hitherto unknown facts and to throw some fresh light on incidents in the Queen's career. But it is as a study in human personalities that his book will be judged by the public. How far it is history let scholars contend.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER

A New Individualism

Le Nouveau Contrat Social ou L'Organisation de la Démocratie individualiste. Par Henri Lambert. Brussels: Maurice Lamertin. Paris: Félix Alcan.

THE fact that capitalist property has assumed a monopolist form—pointed out more than seventy years ago by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the Communist Manifesto—is fully recognized by the author of a remarkable book just published, which will provide Liberals, if they will avail themselves of the opportunity, with the principles and the program that they lack. It is the first attempt that has been made to formulate a scheme for the reorganization of society on an individualist basis. And that is what Liberals have to do if they wish to justify their existence. If they are merely to be defenders of the existing social order, there is nothing to distinguish them from conservatives. If, on the other hand, they do not defend the existing social order, they cannot become socialists unless they have an alternative system of social reorganization to propose. M. Henri Lambert, the author of the book, has already made valuable contributions to the study of economic questions. He is a Belgian "captain of industry" and it is his pride to describe himself as "Maître de Verreries à Charleroi." It is, then, a capitalist and employer of labor who proposes this drastic and radical reform of the existing capitalist system.

M. Lambert is as convinced as any socialist that the existing system is indefensible, and he believes that, unless it is speedily changed, it will lead to social revolution as inevitably as it has led to war. "Privileges and monopolies," he says, "have impregnated it with an inevitable tendency to antagonisms, not to say brigandages." He sees that the existing social organization is primarily financial, rather than capitalist or industrial. He fully accepts Marx's economic interpretation of history, although he rejects the Marxist economic theory. While he agrees with socialists in aiming at the destruction of monopolist property, he does not agree with them either as to the cause of monopoly or as to the means of getting rid of it. The three political parties are, in M. Lambert's opinion, all mistaken. The conservatives base society on authority, which he rejects altogether. The liberals base it on liberty, which is inadequate by itself. The socialists base it on solidarity and, as he thinks,

neglect liberty and personal responsibility. Moreover, solidarity, which springs from natural causes, should be voluntary, not forced. The three principles on which society should be based are liberty, responsibility, and solidarity. Personal liberty carries with it a corresponding personal responsibility, and solidarity is necessary to progress. Individualism in the sense of individual isolation is, in fact, giving place to "association-ism." M. Lambert believes that the encouragement of this tendency by complete freedom of association accompanied by complete individual responsibility will eventually put an end to the wage system and that the society of the future will be "an aggregate of cooperative associations, free and private, absorbing all activities and enterprises, government and justice excepted."

Recognizing that the parliamentary system is breaking down and that political democracy as we know it does not work, M. Lambert proposes a new method of universal suffrage. Parliaments are to be divided into three groups of equal number consisting respectively of representatives of knowledge, capital, and manual labor. The first category is to include the teaching and all other "liberal" professions and all non-manual workers, including government servants. Each constituency is to have three representatives—or a multiple of three—and candidates are to be nominated by each category of electors from among themselves. There is to be, however, no distinction among the electors when it comes to voting; each elector will have the right to vote for one candidate in each category, if there are three seats, for two if there are six seats, three if there are nine, and so on. The competition will, therefore, be only among candidates belonging to the same category. This is, in my opinion, much the least happy of all M. Lambert's proposals. The manual workers would hardly accept a system which would restrict the representatives of their class to a third of the legislative body, however large a majority they might be among the electors, even though they had—as they would have—the deciding voice in the choice of the representatives of the other classes. Moreover, the system would intensify class divisions and stereotype the class system. Further, it does not touch what seems to me the inherent vice of the parliamentary system—the "omnicompetence" of Parliament, to use the expression of Mr. G. D. H. Cole. I agree with Mr. Cole that "the human being as an individual is fundamentally incapable of being represented" and should be called upon "not to choose someone to represent him as a man or a citizen in all the aspects of citizenship, but only to choose someone to represent his point of view in relation to some particular purpose or group of purposes; in other words, some particular function." There are many other objections to M. Lambert's system which, indeed, would be no better than any existing parliamentary system, in my opinion, and perhaps even worse. Much more radical changes are needed.

But I hope that this somewhat fanciful proposal will not prejudice anybody against M. Lambert's economic suggestions which, although they do not entirely satisfy me and although I doubt very much whether they would have all the results that he claims for them, are nevertheless extremely interesting and are probably the only alternative to socialism. M. Lambert lays down as a first principle that the earth and all its natural resources—the "natural monopolies"—belong to all humanity and should not be monopolized by any individual or nation. The economic rent should, therefore, be appropriated by the community in the form of the "single tax." This is really a logical deduction from the principles of Manchester Liberalism. For land is a natural monopoly and, according to liberal principles, there should be no private monopoly. Further, since no nation has the right to monopolize raw products such as oil or minerals, there should, M. Lambert holds, be universal free exchange, without any sort of restriction or duty on imports or exports, and perfectly free communications, so that every individual can move freely from one place to another all over the world and settle where he pleases with no restriction other than that of the obligation to submit to the local laws and usages. That is to say, M. Lambert proposes the suppression of economic and political frontiers, which is an essential condition of peace no less than of personal liberty. There will never be permanent peace so long as the sovereign state exists and the boundaries between one administrative area and another are made into artificial barriers separating men from one another. Internationalism is the first step toward permanent peace and all other measures for preventing war will be futile until that step has been taken. Nationalism, as M. Lambert says, is contrary to nature, and no social order will be satisfactory that is not based on principles derived from the "observation of natural and primordial moral relations." For that reason the term "internationalism" is not really accurate: what is meant by it is the extension to the world of the conditions already existing, for example, within the United States, where there is no restriction on exchange or communications between one state and another, and there are boundaries but no frontiers.

The "new social contract" of which M. Lambert speaks in the title of his book is the most original of his proposals. He holds that the cause of the monopolist development of modern capitalism—or financialism—is the system of limited liability, which has destroyed individual responsibility. It is impossible to set forth within brief limits the reasons that he gives for this view, for which the reader must be referred to the book itself. Although they have not convinced me that limited liability is the only cause of monopolization, they have convinced me that it has been a much more important factor in it than economists have hitherto suspected. I am not convinced that M. Lambert's proposal to abolish limited liability entirely would solve the social problem, as he thinks it would, but I am quite sure that it would greatly diminish the evils of capitalism and the power of finance. Limited liability companies are to be replaced by a system of "association by contract" with complete personal responsibility of the contractors for all the acts and liabilities of the association. No association is to be formed for a longer period than ten years, but the contract may be renewed indefinitely for periods of ten years at a time. The object of this provision is to make perpetual foundations and endowments impossible and to prevent the existence of corporations with a "moral personality" distinct from that of the persons composing it. With this sole restriction, every association will be exactly what its members choose to make it by the contract creating it; they will decide in what form its property is to be held, whether the members shall or shall not have the right to sell their shares, and every other question. Every association will be obliged to go into liquidation every ten years (or more often, according to the contract) unless all its members wish to renew the contract; that is to say, any member will be free to withdraw at the end of the agreed period with his share of the property of the association.

M. Lambert anticipates that the abolition of limited liability will leave capitalists with no alternative but that of lending money at a fixed rate of interest, unless they themselves actively engage in production. The consequence, he believes, will be that cooperative associations of workers—manual and non-manual—will be formed for production and will be able to obtain capital, since the capitalists can make no other use of it. Ultimately, in his opinion, such associations will absorb the whole of production and the wage system will thus disappear. As I have said, I am not convinced of this, but it seems likely that M. Lambert's proposed system would greatly facilitate cooperative production. The end at which he aims is, in fact, syndicalism—with a difference. According to the syndicalist theory, all capital—all the means of production, that is to say, except land—would belong to the associations of workers. In M. Lambert's social order the capitalist would still exist, but with a much attenuated function. Possibly, if M. Lambert's proposals actually had the consequences that he claims for them, the ultimate result would be the disappearance of the private capi-

talist. For if production eventually passed into the hands of associations of workers, they might eventually do without the capitalist. It is even probable that they would refuse to go on paying interest. However that may be, M. Lambert's book deserves the careful attention of all who object to the various socialist systems and, in particular, of all liberals. For, whether we like it or not, the signs are many that the present capitalist system cannot last. Those that defend it and refuse to entertain the idea of radical changes are fighting against inexorable economic causes and will in the end precipitate social revolution.

ROBERT DELL

Morozov's "Christ"

Christ. By Nicholas Morozov. Unpublished.

FRANCIS BACON once said that no matter what form of government or state there may be, science will always be free and independent. He might have changed his mind had he witnessed the behavior of many contemporary bearers of scientific thought. They seem to be indifferent to the general disintegration of this scientific thought and do so little for its recovery. The writer does not know of any serious attempt to reestablish the unity of international scientific cooperation, with the exception, perhaps, of the invitation that the London professors extended to the hungry scholars of Austria to come to England and work.

When Victor Henri, the French social scientist, suggested the reestablishment of relations between the French and Russian Academies of Science, the French "Immortals" hissed and silenced him. The scholar of our days has ordinarily, for some reason or other, proved less curious, less searching, less dynamic than the diplomat, the intelligence agent, the business man, or the reporter. At a time when Russia, for instance, is living through an exceedingly interesting and momentous period, you will find near and within her gates an intelligence officer gathering information ex officio and incidentally getting ready for lectures in America; you will find a reporter eager to "get the truth"; you will find Clare Sheridan, who came to model busts in Moscow, or Washington D. Vanderlip, who came to make money; but you will hardly find a single scholar who has gone there to see and study things and to exchange the fruits of learning with Russian scholars. Nobody, for instance, seems to be interested in the fact that the well-known psycho-neurologist Narbut has lately accomplished much with the problem of the sexual education of children; or that a Russian astronomer has discovered a new planet; or that in September, 1920, at the annual convention of Russian astronomers in Moscow, a Russian scientist submitted for discussion one of the most daring and original works of our century. That work is not a paper, not even a single volume; it is a huge work, the result of a lifetime of research, under the title "Christ." The name of the scholar is Nicholas Morozov, astronomer, chemist, and philologist.

For many years Morozov has been interested in the study of constellations from the historical point of view. Some fifteen years ago he published his book "Revelations in Storm and Tempest," in which he tried to establish the time when the Apocalypse was written. Studying the description of the constellations as given in the Apocalypse, and comparing it with many analogous descriptions in half a dozen ancient tongues, including Hebrew, Chaldean, and Sanskrit, he believed himself able to calculate exactly the time and the place when and wherefrom the described constellations were seen and thus to find the exact time and place of composition. Then Morozov went further into the study of the early years of the Hebrew and Christian religions and of the history of the Old and New Testament. Using a combination of mathematical, astronomical, and philological calculations, comparing different texts from the Scriptures, he made up a series of celestial maps and came to certain startling conclusions.

We must confine ourselves to mentioning only the outstanding contentions of this remarkable work. Morozov thinks: (1) That the New Testament was written approximately at the same time as the Old, namely between the fourth and fifth centuries of our era; (2) that the Christian teaching appeared before the appearance of Christ himself; (3) that a man by the name of Jesus (Christ) really lived in the fourth century A.D. He was the son of an architect, a remarkable orator, and a person of magnetic mystical power who became the leader of the Christians; (4) he really was crucified on March 21, 368.

Morozov went minutely through the extant material regarding the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries of our era, his attention being drawn to that period as the most important and active in shaping the scriptures and legends upon which modern religions are based. He thinks that the book of Ezekiel was written in its final form in the second half of the fifth century A.D., because he finds there a description of the constellations that corresponds to the sky map for January 23, 453. The planet described by Isaiah, Morozov says, was the July comet of 451. Very interesting are the explanations he makes as to the origin of some of the Bible stories. The story of Samson and Dalilah, he thinks, is an echo of the sky view of March 15, 359; the story about Balaam and his ass is apparently founded on the sky view of January 6, 352, when the constellation formed a contour of an ass.

Morozov's report was naturally received with a great deal of discussion. Some scholars questioned the soundness of this combination of philology with celestial history; some challenged his formulae; but on the whole it made a decided sensation. The Government agreed to publish "Christ" at the expense of the state, but lack of paper and proper implements for the reproduction of all the formulae and maps hampers the printing of the book, and it is possible that its appearance, like the appearance of many other valuable Russian contributions to the world of knowledge, will be postponed *ad calendas graecas*.

A few words about Morozov himself. Born in Russia in a noble family late in the forties of the past century, he refused the heritage of estates, serfs, and millions of rubles, and became a revolutionist. He was one of the founders and active members of the Narodnaya Volya, a revolutionary group of the seventies. After the assassination of Alexander II Morozov was arrested and spent more than twenty-five years in solitary confinement studying the sky from a little window under the ceiling of his cell in the terrible Schlüsselburg fortress. Feigning illness, he made friends with the prison doctor and received from him, in the guise of prescriptions, various chemicals with which he succeeded in arranging a little secret laboratory in his cell. He invented a glue-like solution that allowed him to make cardboard out of the sheets of paper on which he had previously written essays, poems, and scientific papers. He later received permission from the prison authorities to get unbound volumes from the public library and to bind them in his cardboard. His friend, the famous revolutionary pioneer, Vera Figner, would be notified which of the books he had bound; she would then take them from the library, unbind them, and, using another of Morozov's solutions, would separate the sheets without injuring the ink and would prepare the manuscript for print. While in Schlüsselburg Morozov mastered about a dozen languages, ancient and modern, and discovered a new principle which introduced changes and corrections into the periodical system of the chemist Mendeleyev. He corresponded with the famous English chemist Ramsay, who agreed with Morozov's method. In 1906 Morozov, now an old man, was released from Schlüsselburg, only to be convicted to another year of solitary confinement in the Dvinsk dungeon, his new crime consisting of a poem he wrote on the occasion of coming back among his fellows. Since the revolution of 1917 he has taken no part in active politics, being overwhelmed and absorbed by his research work partly in the Institute of Lesgaft and partly in the psycho-neurological Institute in Petrograd. By a strange and sarcastic

play of fate he finds himself at the completion of his work in a world jail, as completely isolated from his fellows as when he began it many years ago in a Czarist fortress. His work cannot even be adequately published, his word is not heard by the rest of the world, because some reporters and some diplomats think it would be unwise to reestablish the Baconian republic of knowledge.

GREGORY ZILBOORG

The Noble Savage

White Shadows in the South Seas.—Mystic Isles of the South Seas. By Frederick O'Brien. The Century Company.

THE truth about the South Seas is, there is no such place. They are no more a geographical locality than is Valhalla or the land of Cockaigne. As the early Christians devised a Heaven, better to slander the world, and a soul, more bitterly to shame the flesh, so, in more secular times, man has given local habitation, in some remote corner of this planet, to a variety of earthly paradises. Most people hope in their hearts that there is no place quite so bad as home. In an age that knows so little of leisure, simplicity, security, or harmony, we have turned, in our frustration, to sentimentalize over coral islands in tropical seas, where a race of noble savages "whose bodies were as beautiful as the models for the statues the Greeks made," to quote Frederick O'Brien, the leading evangelist of the new myth, "whose hearts were generous, and whose minds were eager to learn all good things," is being exterminated by the choicest fruits of our civilization: missionaries, syphilis, and gin. We are avid for accounts of the Edenic perfection of these Mystic Isles, for descriptions of what Mr. O'Brien has called "the unrivaled beauty of the verdure, of reefs and palms, of the majestic stature of the men and the passionate charm of the women, the boundless health and simple happiness in which they dwelt, the climate, the limpid streams, the diving, swimming, games, the rarest food." It is a significant fact that the civilization which has recognized its autobiography in "Main Street" should at the same time acclaim so eagerly "White Shadows in the South Seas" and "Mystic Isles of the South Seas." Sinclair Lewis and Frederick O'Brien complement each other, and together have pictured, to a large and admiring public, one the realistic, the other the romantic side of barbarism. From the foot of Main Street, on Sundays, and after office hours, run the excursion boats, piloted by Mr. O'Brien, to the South Seas. "I would offer," writes Mr. O'Brien, in his official announcement, "an anodyne for a few hours, of transport to the other side of our sphere, where are the loveliest scenes the eye may find upon the round of the globe, the gentlest climate of all the latitudes, the most whimsical whites, and the dearest savages I have known."

When Herman Melville and his friend Toby, on a blinding day in 1842, revolted at the hideousness of the life on shipboard, and, tempted by the new and startling beauty of the Marquesas, ran away and fell into the hands of the amiable cannibals of the valley of Typee, the South Seas were first discovered by a competent literary artist. Melville's "Typee" and "Omoo" were the first, and still remain the finest, fruits of this discovery, though Melville has had a long line of literary descendants. Mr. O'Brien writes with a full knowledge of his forerunners in the South Sea manner. "What the great captains, and Loti, Melville, Becke, and Stoddard, had written," he confesses, as his boat streams to the South Seas, "had been my intense delight." On his way to the Marquesas he recalls "the boyish thrill that filled me when I pored over the pages of Melville long ago."

In his two books on the South Seas Mr. O'Brien has trod, geographically, closely in the steps of Melville. In literary manner he is more showy, more theatrical than Melville, and is characterized by a sentimentality less delicate than that of Charles Warren Stoddard. Both Melville and Mr. O'Brien wrote their first book on the Marquesas Islands, the second on Tahiti, and in each case, the first book is better than the second. Mr. O'Brien's second book, however, unlike Melville's, precedes in experience his first. We are promised a third volume "'Atolls of the Sun,' which will be the account of a visit to, and a dwelling on, the blazing coral wreaths of the Dangerous Archipelago." There, so Mr. O'Brien remarks with typical romantic exuberance, "the strange is commonplace, and the marvel is the probability of the hour."

Between Melville and Mr. O'Brien lies a span of nearly seventy years. This interim has, of course, in no degree modified the great natural beauty of the South Seas; but enormous are the changes in the human drama enacted in this changeless natural setting. When Melville discovered the Marquesas they were inhabited by tribes of practicing cannibals that throve in virulent savagery. Mr. O'Brien expresses his regret at the change of state he discovered in a rhetorical query: "Why could not this idyllic, fierce, laughter-loving people have stayed savage and strong, wicked and clean?" These astonishingly noble savages of the Marquesas, when known by Melville in their uncorrupted glory, inspired him with less intemperate enthusiasm than Mr. O'Brien's is when he studies them in their decline and sentimentalizes over the high virtues from which they are fallen. For the Marquesas, the Tahiti, the South Seas which Mr. O'Brien celebrates, have attracted to themselves the vices of both East and West. Thither have gravitated the evangelist, the derelict, the merchant, and the romantic adventurer, who have variously exploited the natives in the names of Wesley, Priapus, Trade, and the Muses, to the threatened extinction of the natives.

There is drama in this extinction of a picturesque savage civilization by the forces of a no less picturesque and far more virulent barbarism of a variety of imported brands. Mr. O'Brien is at his best in his accounts of the bizarre freaks of destiny in this island of decaying savages: in "White Shadows," the story of McHenry and his native boy; the story of Mademoiselle N——; the incident of the lady Titihuti's tattooed legs—legs to singe Sir Willowby with blushes of envy and shame; the account of the venerable Père Simeon's celebration of the anniversary of the Maid of Orleans, when the Marquesans had the same difficulty in finding virgins that the Romans had at the height of the Empire when they wanted to worship Vesta; in "Mystic Isles," the outing with the native princess to the falls of Fautaua; the accounts of the incomparable Lavaina, hostess of the Tiare Hotel—these are among the passages in which Mr. O'Brien achieves a considerable degree of distinction.

In "Mystic Isles of the South Seas" he attempts to do for Tahiti what in his first book he did for the Marquesas. The result is not so interesting, because the material is far less picturesque. It does not attain to the freshness, the verve, the rich variety of its predecessor. Fully half of the book concerns itself with an account of the town of Papeete and the neighborhood, and the life of the foreigners there—a life to be duplicated, in all essentials, nearly anywhere around the rim of civilization where life is down at the heel. And when Mr. O'Brien leaves Papeete to explore the island he rarely, if ever, succeeds in making any discovery untouched by the commonplace, the garish, or the tawdry. Tahiti, judging from his report, is at its backbone a dilapidated and degenerate Main Street. Never is there far removed from the picture the singing of Methodist hymns and American ragtime; the honking of automobiles over bad roads; the smell of absinthe, flat beer, and cigarette butts. There are motion-pictures, boot-blacks, peanut-men, prize-fights, natives dressed in pink lace and mother-hubbards, and foreigners garbed to heights of hideousness. And there is a strike of native fishermen led by an American agent of the I. W. W.—a trio of sounds which the natives transform into "I dobbebelly dobbebelly." In this sordid environment, headed to a certain doom, live the last remnants of

"a manly people, once magnificently perfect in body, masters of their seas, unexcelled in the record of humanity in beauty, vigor, and valor."

RAYMOND M. WEAVER

Albert Ryder

Albert Pinkham Ryder. By Frederick Fairchild Sherman. Privately printed.

ALBERT RYDER was as truly an exotic among our painters as was Poe among our poets. However, apart from a quality of tropical bizarrerie which isolated each from his contemporaries, they have little enough in common. Poe was a superb master of his craft; Ryder an inspired bungler working with materials which he never understood. But in spite of this technical ineptitude he frequently tortured his medium into expressing forms of bewildering beauty, so intangible and eerie in their appeal that they almost baffle analysis. His canvases evoke moods translatable in no other terms than those of paint, although literary ideas often serve as a springboard to his imagination. Ryder's imaginative flights reveal a world not unlike Poe's, but the resemblance is superficial. The same unearthly sunsets enhance the splendors of The Valley of the Many Colored Grass and The Temple of the Mind, but a friendly road jogs out of Ryder's ideal world into the world of common men. Genial, earthy Panurge might conceivably stray along that highway and feel at home, but from the swamps about Poe's Arnheim he would flee in terror.

Ryder's unique and highly original gifts have provoked scattered comment here and there from appreciative fellow-craftsmen, but it has fallen to Frederick Fairchild Sherman to attempt the most ambitious study yet made of Ryder's personality and art. The monograph is expensively printed and bound, and contains thirty-three reproductions, the frontispiece being in color. The book is excellent—if for no other reason than that it creates a vivid, human portrait. One of the most interesting of Mr. Sherman's chapters deals with the painter's experiments in verse; in another scarcely less interesting he transcribes many of Ryder's illuminating opinions about art. These two chapters are the outstanding features of the book.

The materials upon which Mr. Sherman has based his study are apparently rather scanty, but out of them he has built up an unforgettable personality. We catch a glimpse of the old recluse, bearded like "one of the early Apostles," slopping about the almost incredible Fifteenth Street studio, his bare feet incased in carpet slippers, cooking his own meals, and so oblivious of material things that he forgets for months to cash checks upon dealers who have bought his pictures. In the dust and disorder of this little Bohemian workshop he was quite happy. His creed forbade his dwelling in an ostentatious studio. He summed up the matter himself in the following: "The artist should not sacrifice his ideals to a landlord and a costly studio. A rain-tight roof, frugal living, a box of colors, and God's sunlight through clear windows keep the soul attuned and the body vigorous for one's daily work. The artist should once and forever emancipate himself from the bondage of appearance and the unpardonable sin of expending on ignoble aims the precious ointment that should serve only to nourish the lamp burning before the tabernacle of his muse."

It is not surprising that so introspective a painter as Albert Ryder should have essayed verse. He left a considerable amount of it which as poetry does not rank high. His technique in verse is as heavy-handed as in painting; his painting, however, in spite of technique is often purely and rapturously lyrical. His verse has no wings; it is top-heavy with contemplation. With such eminent poet-painters as Rossetti and Michelangelo Ryder is not to be remotely compared. It is true that he wrote better verse than Turner, but one may remark that without making a very triumphant announcement. Mr. Sherman quotes a characteristic quatrain from a long poem called Jeanne d'Arc. This quatrain he not unaptly compares with the work of Emily

Dickinson. It is one of the finest bits the painter ever wrote:

> Who knows what God knows?
> His hand he never shows,
> Yet miracles with less are wrought,
> Even with a thought.

Ryder exhibited a finer sensitiveness to the rhythms of prose than to those of verse. A paragraph quoted in the monograph in which the painter described his studio illustrates this; and even more so does the tender excerpt addressed to a young couple newly married. Like many of Ryder's small pictures, the latter seems to have been polished and enameled by much labor. The bulk of his prose apparently is in the nature of reflections upon art. These stray thoughts embody much wisdom and a philosophy of art singularly uncompromising and clear-sighted. How he detested the watchmaker's eye is revealed in his pregnant remarks upon the bane of detail, and the value of a controlling vision, "The least of a man's original emanation is better than the best of a borrowed thought" might have come straight out of Blake. No artist ever lived whose life and art-practice were more inseparably bound by idealistic principles. The following are beautiful expressions of the spirit in which he worked:

"The canvas I began ten years ago I shall perhaps complete today or tomorrow. It has been ripening under the sunlight of the years that come and go. It is not that a canvas should be worked at. It is a wise artist who knows when to cry 'halt' in his composition, but it should be pondered over in his heart and worked out with prayer and fasting."

"Art is long. The artist must buckle himself with infinite patience. His ears must be deaf to the clamor of his insistent friends who would quicken his pace. His eyes must see naught but the vision beyond. He must await the season of fruitage without haste, without worldly ambitions, without vexation of spirit. An inspiration is no more than a seed that must be planted and nourished. It gives growth as it grows to the artist, only as he watches and waits with his highest effort."

Two chapters of Mr. Sherman's book can scarcely be dismissed without a word. One is a very interesting exposition of the artist's methods and technique. His laborious and unintelligent practice of superimposing colors upon each other at unseasonable times explains the deplorable wrecks which many of his canvases are fast becoming. Besides this chapter on technique Mr. Sherman has included another which is his own critical appreciation of Ryder's art. This is done with much understanding and acumen. It is no mere florilegium. Mr. Sherman is aware of his idol's limitations and sets them forth without reservation or apology. He does not attempt to "explain" the pictures so much as to suggest the qualities of Ryder's genius which in his opinion entitle the painter to more sympathetic modes of approach than he has heretofore commanded from the wider public. Certainly our tradition of naturalism does not encourage us to attune ourselves to the spiritual achievement of an artist who in a much truer sense than Gautier could have exclaimed: "I am a man for whom the invisible world exists."

GLEN MULLIN

Romanticist and Realist in Labor

When Labor Rules. By J. H. Thomas. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Nationalization of the Mines. By Frank Hodges. Thomas Seltzer.

J. H. THOMAS once refused a place in the British Cabinet because he would not accept a portfolio under any but a Labor government. He is the president of the International Federation of Trade Unions, from which the American Federation of Labor, under the tutelage of Mr. Gompers, has withdrawn because it is so radical as to threaten direct action to prevent a new war. He favors nationalization of the coal mines and railroads, as well as of other industries. Such tendencies, were he an American, would cause him to be called a Bolshevik by most editors and even by some labor leaders; yet Mr. Thomas in England is so moderate that the radicals distrust him. When he comes to the United States he dines with financiers and big business men, who seem to think him a man of sense. One who can bridge so many gulfs is primarily a politician, and is almost fated for the Premiership. The prestige which he has lost among the more class-conscious elements of labor he has probably gained among the middle classes whose votes may sometime give the Labor Party political power.

Reading his book in this light, one cannot help comparing him, in temper, with our own President. He is the exponent of British Labor normalcy. He invariably sets out, not to shock and stir, but to soothe and reassure. He clothes the bald facts of economic analysis in comfortable phrases of public deference. He, as a political leader, is to the industrial leader like Smillie or Hodges what Mr. Harding is to Mr. Gary. His English, to be sure, is much clearer than Mr. Harding's, and on the whole he seems to have a better grasp of contemporary realities—but these advantages merely reflect the natural superiority of nurture in the Labor Party over that in the Republican.

When Labor rules it will merely be using the horse sense which it has been accumulating for years in Parliament, County Councils, and industrial boards. It will retain the King, so long as he abides by the Constitution, but will carry out popular sentiment in substituting a better chamber for the House of Lords. It will nationalize the fundamental industries, thus minimizing costly industrial strife, introducing more efficient technique, preventing unemployment, and lowering the cost of living to the middle classes. It will give special attention to housing and education; it will not abolish but will control the liquor traffic. The capitalist will still be paid interest on his money, but private ownership of wealth will gradually dwindle through death duties and public and cooperative enterprise; speculation and speculative profits, however, will be eliminated. The Empire will become a Commonwealth, imperial policy will do away with human exploitation in the crown colonies, Ireland will be allowed to choose her form of government and will choose to be a Dominion. The League of Nations will be transformed into a real League of Peoples, functioning through economic service instead of military control, and war will be abolished. In all this there is nothing but appeasement and good-will for everyone. So speaks the winning voice to which, by contrast, the British electorate may soon be glad to listen.

Frank Hodges is an utterly different type. That he is not the politician, skilled in compromise by years of office-holding and negotiation, was proved by the misunderstanding which arose out of his speech to members of Parliament which caused the break in the Triple Alliance. He is a young man, educated to straight thinking about economic facts. For those who do not have the time for the long volumes of the Sankey Commission, his "Nationalization of the Mines" can clarify the subject with admirable brevity. The economic loss in production, due to multiplicity of ownership and operation, the economic waste in consumption due to the same facts, and the human waste to the miners themselves, are irrefutably demonstrated. In face of a diminishing supply of this commodity at the basis of the nation's industries, coal is mined in such a way, due to the desire for quick profits, as to leave a large share of it unrecoverable underground. If it were to be economically used, most of it would be converted to by-products and electricity at the pit mouth, but instead of this, private enterprise insists on shipping it all over the country by rail, to be wastefully consumed in private furnaces. Even the process of distribution involves enormous loss, as is shown by the fact that the Cooperative Wholesale Society was able to save from 16 to 40 per cent for its members over the cost of distribution through private dealers. Productivity per man has been decreasing, partly on account of gradual exhaustion of the better veins, and partly on account of the dissatisfaction of the miners in toiling for others' profits. The Government itself presented figures showing that before

long the cost of production would be such as to render the industry insolvent at any economically possible price for coal. The insolvency did not arrive as soon as expected, because foreign demand for many months made possible an export price which covered the domestic loss, but now that the foreign demand has fallen off, the crisis has come.

What has the Government done? It might have fulfilled its promise by accepting the report of its own Sankey Commission, backed by the miners, which stated that nationalization is the only possible solution. It might have accepted the recommendation of the coal operators themselves that the coal underground should be publicly owned. Instead, it turned the industry back to the old wasteful system, knowing that the only possible result would be to place the burden of the deficit on the workers and to reduce their standard of living below their pre-war status. For the purpose of defending private profit at the expense of the miners, the consuming public, British industry, and generations yet unborn, it engaged in a costly struggle with the Miners' Federation. The tragedy is that in so far as it is able to win the strike, ruthless economic forces will make the nation lose.

When we read Thomas, we have the sense of the people, free to act politically, choosing a more humane civilization. When we read Hodges, we have the sense of an economic order drawing inevitably to its close, and an almost desperate appeal to lay aside prejudices and understand so that we may build anew before it is too late. Thomas is the romanticist and Hodges the realist of nationalization.

GEORGE SOULE

Drama

"Gold"

THERE is something half-hearted about this late production of Mr. Eugene O'Neill's new play at the Frazee Theater. One has the impression that it was due to Mr. O'Neill's reputation rather than to any commanding merit in the work itself. That reputation, at all events, has outstripped Mr. O'Neill's development and has even, perhaps, retarded it. He reached his highest point in certain passages of "Beyond the Horizon." "The Emperor Jones" owes its success to its imaginative and formal daring and the exotic elements in its admirable presentation more than to any inner completeness or perfection; "Diff'rent" is both structurally and psychologically violent rather than powerful. In "Gold" Mr. O'Neill returns to the sea and to seafaring people. We cannot rid ourselves of the feeling that we had heard all this before.

The crew of the Triton is stranded on an island in the Malay Archipelago. A treasure is found which the men bury But not before Captain Isaiah Bartlett has condoned, though not commanded, the murder of the ship's cook who has denied the genuineness of the treasure and is half falsely, half sincerely suspected of wanting it all for himself. Such is the substance of the very interesting first act. From that point on the play drags heavily. By a rather sentimental and theatrical ruse Captain Bartlett is prevented from sailing to recover the treasure. It becomes an obsession with him; it ends by driving him mad. Like John Gabriel Borkman he paces eternally up and down—we hear his footsteps—waiting for the ship that will never return. At last he reveals the secret of his insane suspense to his son and shows him the one bit of the treasure he has hidden and kept so long. The boy cries out, just as the ship's cook did: "It's damned brass!" And that echo gives us the only other strong and moving moment. But that moment does not come until Captain Bartlett's madness has caused a domestic tragedy which is no tragedy at all because Mr. O'Neill's women are terrible lay figures who talk as shop-girls do not talk but as they imagine they would if it were their good fortune to be involved in a sad and romantic situation.

What is finely conceived is the symbolism. The treasure is brass. Illusion is illusion. Yet the man who seeks to bring his fellows in contact with reality is killed. They spend the rest of their lives chasing the false treasure, slaying for it, maddened by it. But it remains brass—cheap though gleaming. Only, the unpleasant doubt obtrudes itself that, perhaps, Mr. O'Neill did not intend any such symbolical meaning at all. His dialogue is roughly and superficially realistic. The tone never deepens nor is anything felt that is not wholly spoken. The structure is jagged like that of a shaky and obvious scaffolding, not firm and true and hidden like that of a house.

There is something raw about Mr. O'Neill's work, as though he himself had not got to the souls of his people or touched the depths of his own fables; there is a lack of that inner grace which has nothing to do with beauty of aspect or worldly circumstance and is, in truth, found oftenest in books or plays that deal with the humblest and the least of men. It is as though we were listening to the work of an extraordinarily gifted boy who is keen and observant but does not yet share the passions and struggles of mankind sufficiently to see them from within. He remains outside his subjects, a little cold and hard and almost disdainful of a more intense preoccupation. No doubt this description is, as it stands, unjust to Mr. O'Neill. All such descriptions miss a final truth. But it may serve to convey the lack of creative intensity and of inner warmth and flexibility that we feel increasingly in his work. He remains, for all that, a remarkable figure, and second, probably, to Susan Glaspell alone among our recent dramatists. He invites criticism on the plane of his own ambitions. Viewing him there one cannot doubt that he must soften and sink far deeper his spiritual key, as well as tighten the inner economy of his fables, in order to pass from wavering promise to secure performance.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

THE TRUTH ABOUT MEXICO

Few persons realize the brave struggle Mexico has made the past five years to reestablish on a sound foundation her industrial, business and social life.

Mexico has vast natural wealth and abundant labor. Her basic laws are liberal and just. If there are cases of miscarriage of justice in the administration of her courts and government, those things are not unknown in other countries. On the whole there is honest endeavor to enforce all the laws and to protect life and property. In certain sections of Mexico, as in the Guanajuato region, there has been no interference with business throughout the entire revolutionary period. American corporations have operated there without molestation, subject only to the unfavorable exchange and the general industrial depression. The railroads are being reconstructed and the Kansas, Mexico and Orient Railroad is to be continued from Falomir in Chihuahua to Alpine, Texas. Everywhere there is new and throbbing life. From June 20 to 26 the first international trade conference will be held in the City of Mexico.

American papers usually refer to the "enormous and overwhelming unpaid debt of Mexico."

The external and internal debt of Mexico, exact figures last day of the month of December, is, in Mexican pesos, as follows:

	Principal	Interest Due
EXTERNAL DEBT	287,043,240.53	87,001,260.10
INTERNAL DEBT	136,510,387.50	42,522,269.33
STATES' DEBT	3,500,000.00	1,254,492.75
	427,053,628.03	130,778,022.18
GRAND TOTAL	557,831,650.21 Pesos	
EQUIVALENT	$278,915,825.11 U. S. Currency	

This amount of a little more than a quarter of a billion dollars is distributed among a population of sixteen millions or thereabouts. At the close of the civil war the United States, with a population two and onc-half times as great, had a total indebtedness of three billions of dollars. Canada, with a population of less than one-half that of Mexico, has a present indebtedness of two billions of dollars, and is now increasing it in order to care for its soldiers.

Mexico has always paid what she owed, and the longer her creditors have waited for her to pay, the more costly it has been to Mexico. It is estimated that the Government revenues for the present year will yield one hundred million dollars United States currency.

Thus, the total of Mexico's Public Debt is not triple the entire budget of the Republic.

Prof. Joseph E. Chamberlain of Columbia University has just declared of Mexico at a recent Chicago Congress that:

> Our southern neighbor is no longer a country of great ranches and primitive industrial and mining development. It is a 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.

Information regarding Mexican commercial, financial or statistical matters can be obtained by addressing Financial Agent of the Mexican Government, 120 Broadway, New York. Dept. A.

RUSSIA

DO you wish to relieve the suffering children of Russia? If you do, aid the New York Committee for Russian Relief, which is procuring food, clothing and medicine for them and distributing it through the American Friends (Quakers). The Friends are in Russia by permission of the Soviet Government, which permits the Committee's agents to distribute the supplies. All money contributed goes direct for relief, since the expenses of the Committee are otherwise provided for.

You can help by sending your contribution to Charles H. Sabin, Treasurer, The Guaranty Trust Company of New York, 140 Broadway, New York City. Please use the slip below.

"Contributions to this charity are deductible from both State and Federal income tax returns."

Executive Committee
Paul D. Cravath
Mrs. August Belmont
Charles C. Burlingham
Allen Wardwell
Felix M. Warburg
L. Hollingsworth Wood
and the Officers Ex-Officio

NEW YORK COMMITTEE FOR RUSSIAN RELIEF
William M. Chadbourne, *Chairman*
Charles H. Sabin, *Treasurer*
John B. Creighton, *Secretary*

CHARLES H. SABIN, Treasurer,
New York Committee for Russian Relief,
The Guaranty Trust Company,
140 Broadway, New York City

Dear Sir:
I enclose $..... as my contribution towards the relief of the suffering children in Soviet Russia. Please send acknowledgment to

Name .....

No. ..... Street.....

City .....

The Nation

Vol. CXIII, No. 2924 | Founded 1865 | Wednesday, July 20, 1921

MEXICO

Our Menace to Mexico

Is a new Pan-American Union needed to check the aggression of the United States' imperialists?

Editorial

Alvaro Obregon

and His Policy

by Dr. E. J. Dillon

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. CXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1921 No. 2924

Contents

MOMENTOUS, indeed capable of immeasurable benefits to struggling humanity, is the action at last taken by President Harding in inviting France, England, Italy, and Japan to a disarmament conference and suggesting a special meeting in regard to the problems of the Pacific with China included! Everyone will now overlook the lost months, if only this wonderful opportunity is utilized to the utmost. Never before were the possibilities so great. Eliminated is the Prussian militarism which brought the Second Hague Conference to ignoble failure; gone is much of the pre-war British desire to dominate the world by force, else the Harding proposal would not be greeted with such amazing acclaim by England's press and public men. Everywhere people are weary of the blood-letting and wearier still of the terrible strait-jacket of military expense which rigidly encases the business and industrial world and wastes priceless never-to-be-replaced treasures of the earth. Now the way opens. If Mr. Harding—who has wisely placed the conference at Washington—will but take a strong and emphatic stand he may associate his name forever gloriously with greater service to all the world than has been achieved by any other modern ruler. Pitfalls there are in sight, of course. Senator Borah may be right in regretting that the beginning is not to be with the three great fleets alone. But nothing ventured, nothing won. If only the other rulers meet the proposal with the enthusiasm and the frankness of Lloyd George in the Commons success will be certain. In any event the heavens shine brighter today over a tortured universe than for many a year because of the prospect that common sense seems to have begun to play in the matter of the elimination of the world's most dreadful scourge.

UNFORTUNATELY President Harding's call for a disarmament conference seems to have no effect upon our immediate enthusiasm for new and more deadly war devices. From Washington comes word that our ordnance experts are planning a 4,000-pound air bomb, containing 2,400 pounds of TNT—the most deadly contrivance of its sort to date—while in the Woolworth Building in New York the other day there was a demonstration of a gun which is said to presage the possibility of hurling a projectile of five tons from 200 to 300 miles. "It will make war too terrible for nations to engage in wars," says the inventor hopefully. Yes, yes; but the phrase has a reminiscent sound. We have been hearing it in regard to every more murderous device since the siege of Troy. In most minds war had become too terrible to be possible in 1914, yet the impossible happened. Meanwhile we are glad to remark that our foremost ammunition maker has been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of United States Senator Wolcott, of Delaware. This is as it should be. Who is more representative of Delaware than the man who built up its greatest industry? Only one thing is lacking. Since Lord Delaware has long been dead, and never made any powder anyway, we would suggest that the name of the State be now changed to Du Pont.

THE reinstatement by Postmaster General Hays of ten Chicago postal clerks discharged for union activities by Postmaster General Burleson marks another step in the restoration of American liberties. Mr. Burleson's idea that it was improper for postal clerks to attempt by organization to ameliorate their working conditions was just another of his odd notions which by virtue of his official capacity was unfortunately enabled to become a fact. The postal worker's job at best is no sinecure. It has been shown that at present it is not at its best, either as regards compensation or hours of employment. Public servants, no more than clothing workers or railroad firemen, are immune from exploitation by their employer, the Government. Their only defense is in union. And now comes the official statement that under the leadership of Dr. Lee K. Frankel, in charge of the welfare work in the Post Office Department, and with Mr. Hays's hearty approval, national and local councils from among the postal employees are to be formed to consider the betterment of working conditions generally. The employees are said to be enthusiastic about the plan, which would seem to indicate that this is not another paternalistic attempt to pat the worker on the back in order to keep him quiet. Certainly Mr. Hays, by one admirable act after the other, has earned the benefit of the doubt.

TO the protest of Katè Richards O'Hare to the Governor at being spirited away from Twin Falls, Idaho, scantily attired and without warning, and driven all night through the desert because certain 100 per cent Americans of that State did not wish her to deliver a lecture there, the Governor's secretary (Governor Davis himself being absent) made the following reply: "Governor Davis . . . instructs me to tell you that the State of Idaho and its peace officers always protect citizens within the State whose purposes are lawful. He also instructs me to state that it is his personal view that those who wish to rise to the ideals of good citizenship are careful not to be a party in the exciting of passions which may have the effect of disturbing the peace of any community." Although Mrs. O'Hare complained to a deputy sheriff against eleven men of Twin Falls no arrests were made. Governor Davis seems to make it plain that none will be. Run with the herd, he says, and you will be protected by its police; attempt to step outside the beaten track, even though there is no question of your being within the limits of the law, and, in Idaho at least, you take the consequences.

THE close connection between our supposedly public governments and our admittedly private financial corporations is generally recognized but rarely so clearly put in black and white as in connection with the failure of the great French institution, the Industrial Bank of China. It has come out in the parliamentary debates that Philippe Berthelot, Secretary-General of the Foreign Office and a brother of the president of the Chinese bank, committed the French Government to the support of this private institution in telegrams sent last January to the Allied Governments during the ministry of Georges Leygues. The ex-Premier denies having signed or authorized these telegrams, but they bore his name. Premier Briand has assumed responsibility for the situation and declares that the bank must be rehabilitated by a government loan. He has been upheld by a slender majority in the Chamber of Deputies, largely due to the support of General Castelnau. General Castelnau now says that in return for his support Briand promised that the Secretary-General of the Foreign Office should be dismissed; this Briand denies. The incident is characteristic of conditions in France, where business and politics are often frankly conducted in a family relation. In this country the relation is probably as actual but seldom so direct. Those optimistic persons who hope to better conditions by mere political reform would do well to ponder this shining instance of politics and finance as two fingers of one hand—the fingers crossed against the public.

THE recent sale by the English of ten former German ships to their previous German owners is one of the most striking proofs of the economic blunders and wastes of the Treaty of Versailles which have yet been afforded us. The Germans were never, never to be permitted to get those ships back under any circumstances, but so great is the depression in British shipping, due in considerable degree to the taking over of those very ships, that their resale has given rise to no other feeling than one of rejoicing that they are got rid of. Yet under the treaty Germany was compelled to send them to England and repatriate the crews that took them over. They have been out of the German service for two years and have served nobody in the meanwhile. Now they are to go back again where there is a real economic need for them. It must not be deduced from this that *The Nation* did not favor restitution to the British shipowners. On the contrary, the British owners who lost ships were of right entitled to be repaid by Germany. It was only the method that was objectionable and so characteristic of that economic short-sightedness of Paris of which Keynes and so many others complained. The Allies by their blockade of Germany and their sanctions and their cutting off of trade with Russia have done what they could to continue the unsettlement of Europe, and to make it impossible for the Germans to earn the proper indemnities, in which there should of course have been included the necessary payments for Allied ships sunk. Taking their ships away from the Germans has trebly hurt the Allies, by making Germany's industrial recovery the more dubious, by delaying restoration of normal conditions on sea and land, and by adding to the glut of Allied ships, which has filled England's ports with empty vessels and unemployed crews.

IN 1916 Edmund von Mach, an avowed and ardent pro-German, published through the Macmillan Company a book called "Official Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War" which was shortly afterward withdrawn from circulation by the publishers at the request of Sir Frederic Macmillan of the English branch of the firm. The reason alleged was that the book contained inaccuracies, as it did; it now appears, however, that the suppression was ordered by the American house before there had been time to investigate the inaccuracies charged against Mr. von Mach. The Macmillan Company was of course at liberty to refuse to fulfil its contract, but it had in that case a responsibility to the author. That responsibility not being agreed upon, Mr. von Mach brought suit, with the result that the case has just been settled out of court, an unnamed sum paid as damages due the author, and the plates returned to him so that he may reissue the book. It is perhaps an evidence of the return of sanity to our courts that the publishers in this case did not care to allow it to come to trial. Whatever might have happened in 1916, when we were still officially and legally neutral but had been lashed to fury by contending propagandas, it seemed clear in June, 1921, that the law was not such a respecter of persons as to deny a man his plain civil rights in a contract because he happened to hold unpopular opinions regarding an international matter. But how our leaders of opinion would have raged had they heard in 1916 that some German publisher had caused the suppression of a book here because it favored the Allies against the Central Empires!

FOR the moment *The Nation* is going to stop its fight for free speech, free thought, and free Haiti, and enter the lists as the champion of free hair. Several business firms, headed by the Aetna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, have announced that they will no longer employ short-haired women. Is not this an unwarrantable infringement of personal liberty? Is there a word in the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution of the United States, to justify it? A thousand times no. In fact, short hair for women, as any honest and intelligent person can see, is the shortest route to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (if not always to beauty) and the right to it is affected neither by race, color, nor any previous condition of servitude, matrimonial or otherwise. Let it not be said in this country of the free and the brave that any American woman ever missed being economically independent by a hair's breadth—or length!

THE whole community has reason to be thankful when the labor movement undertakes the education or enlightenment of itself or the public. In an informed working-class and an open-minded community lies our only hope of an ordered and intelligent progress toward social change. In the neighborhood of New York two efforts of this sort are in progress and both of them need and deserve support. The Brookwood School at Katonah aims consciously to educate labor leaders—men and women who can offer to the movement minds trained to an intelligent grasp of economic and social problems and capable of offering expert service. Every subject they study will be taken up from the point of view of its bearing on the labor movement and its graduates should be capable of a statesmanship which that movement has sorely needed. It is interesting to observe that several members of the group of far-sighted labor men who are backing the Brookwood School are also on the committee which is organizing and will manage the *Labor Age*, a monthly publication emerging from the *Socialist Review*. The new monthly, which promises to start publication in the fall, aims to become a general labor review and to present both facts and comment. It is designed to increase tolerance and clear-thinking and solidarity in the labor movement. This is a perilous time for ventures which depend upon public support for their very existence, but *The Nation* earnestly hopes that these two efforts will find in the labor movement itself and in the intelligent public enough interest to sustain them. The United States is far, far behind the other leading countries in the development of its labor movement in which there are many evils honest, wise, and trained leadership would eliminate.

THE memorial days of great men take care of themselves. Shelley will not be forgotten next year nor the centenary of Matthew Arnold neglected. There is a pathos about the lesser names which grows as their shadows fade. Yet who shall blame people for forgetting, in a troublesome world, that so frigid a gentleman as Mark Akenside was born in 1721 or even the gifted and unhappy Collins? These are quiet in their graves. But there are personalities whose abounding vitality and intense natures would seem calculated to defy forgetfulness. We have seen no reference to the fact that this year marks the bicentenary of Tobias Smollett, the tercentenary of Andrew Marvell, and the centenary of Richard Burton. Yet the rich, gay, hearty people and tales of Smollett are in a thousand minds; who that has once read them can ever forget—to name but one poem—Marvell's great lines to his coy mistress? Who has not dwelled upon the mystery and skill and courage of Burton's eastern pilgrimages? Fame has its subtle favorites and these names illustrate that favoritism. Donne is talked about and Marvell neglected; the generous Smollett is overlooked and the meanly clever Sterne celebrated. These verdicts need shaking. And the best way to shake them is to reread the poems of Marvell—virile yet sweet, subtle and clear at once—and to substitute "Humphrey Clinker" for some more bloodless and far less stirring story of today.

Ireland on the Verge of Peace?

AT probably the most solemn moment in Irish history these lines are penned. Thanks to the mediation of General Smuts and doubtless to the urging of others of the British Premiers, Mr. Lloyd George has taken the honorable course, and Mr. de Valera with exalted spirit and courage has met him half way. Consequently there is an armistice in Ireland; the terrible warfare of brethren is halted, the shedding of precious blood stayed. That the hideous struggle may never be renewed must be the prayer of humane men and women everywhere. If only now these men in whose hands lies the fate of a race may have the wisdom the past has so sorely lacked!

There is but one issue now. Will Mr. de Valera accept anything short of complete independence? In his message to the American people seeking support, the President of the Irish Republic asks America's active aid to bring about "a solution of this problem on the only basis on which it can be solved—acknowledgment that Ireland should by natural right be free." That may mean that he will continue to demand complete independence and a recognition of the Republic, or that he will stand for the freedom of Canada and Australia and South Africa. The Premiers will undoubtedly urge this upon him; but he who knows best the temper of the South of Ireland, who has seen Irishmen by the hundred cheerfully going to their death for an Irish Republic, may find himself stopped by their memories from taking anything less. We hope that this will not be the case. To win, after all these centuries, dominion status, complete fiscal autonomy, and home rule in its entirety would surely be advance enough for the present day. Ireland, thus relieved of blighting and despoiling government by London and Dublin Castle, would arise and flourish like the green bay tree. It could continue, if it wished, to develop its language and its national spirit, to plan for future independence. The alternative means more bloodshed, more death, more ruin, and eventually complete destruction.

But, we hear voices say, why should the Irish take less than a loaf when they have plainly brought England to her senses? Well, they have achieved wonders. It was only the other day that Lloyd George and Greenwood were going to make of Ireland a wilderness rather than treat with the "murder gang." Now President de Valera finds himself in a position to turn any but the wisest of heads. By consenting to the armistice *England admits to all the world that she has been dealing not with a murder gang in Ireland but with a full-fledged revolution, as much warfare as the American Revolution of 1776.* By recognizing De Valera it admits that he is the *true and chosen representative and spokesman of the great bulk of his people.* It is true that the British Government addresses him as "Mr. de Valera," but so did they address as "Mr. Washington" another rebel, a certain General Washington, Commander-in-Chief, and after all that is a trifle. It is to his credit that Lloyd George had the good sense to admit defeat—Sir Philip Gibbs incidentally avers that it is the economic boycott of Ulster and the terrible losses inflicted on her merchants and manufacturers which has made the North ready to deal with Catholic Ireland. Plainly Mr. de Valera treats with both England and Ulster on equal footing. But, remarkable as all this is, President de Valera will know just how far Ireland wishes the self-determination of her fate to go today.

Our Menace to Mexico

CONFLICT with Mexico is inevitable unless something can stay the hand of our imperialists at Washington. Yet a mere point of procedure appears to be keeping Mexico and the United States apart and increasing the tension between them. This crisis is far more serious than the public realizes; for the Hughes-Harding policy, if persisted in, will lead straight to intervention and bloodshed. Indeed, the stage is being rapidly set. At Tampico the background for possible intervention is being carefully prepared. There the great American oil companies have shut down their works in protest against the export tax imposed by the Mexican Government and demanded by our American domestic oil-producing interests. Thousands of employees are thus turned out to starve; and the minute they were locked out came intimations that there was likely to be disorder and rioting. Before the ink was dry on the reports of these rumors American warships appeared off the harbor of Tampico, quite as if dropped from the skies. Fortunately, they have now been withdrawn, but while they were there anything might have happened—witness Tampico, 1914 and Havana, 1898.

Meanwhile, the negotiations between Mexico City and Washington progress not at all. What the United States demands of President Obregon that official cannot give in the way it is asked. In the first place, it is contrary to logic and morals. In the second, Mr. Hughes is asking President Obregon to violate the Constitution of Mexico, precisely as President Vincent was asked to violate the Haitian Constitution. When the latter refused to dishonor his office as head of the Senate, the Haitian Congress was broken up by our armed marines. Today Mr. Hughes is similarly threatening the sovereignty and peace of Mexico if President Obregon does not do what he wishes. In the third place, if President Obregon should do what has been asked of him he would bring the whole Mexican situation down about his ears. He has bitter opponents seeking just such an excuse to rise against him. The crime of it is that the very best opportunity Mexico has had since the revolution began to achieve perfect peace and order is being wrecked by this policy. This is the opinion of the leading foreign correspondents in Mexico today, such as Mr. Leopold Grahame of the *London Financier*, who declares that our refusal to recognize Obregon is heading Mexico straight back to "internal anarchy and disorder."

What are the actual facts? The United States asks of the Mexican President that he shall by treaty affirm his spoken word to the effect that Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution shall not be retroactive or be made confiscatory. President Obregon has repeatedly stated that this is and will be the Mexican policy. To this the United States replies that Obregon is only Obregon; that in Mexico presidents rapidly succeed presidents, and that all the United States asks is that this pledge be affirmed definitely by treaty of the Mexican nation. Then, and not until then, is there to be recognition of General Obregon's Government. To the bulk of our superficial daily press this seems eminently praiseworthy. What could be wrong with it?

Well, what is wrong with the American position is this: It assumes that General Obregon's Government is not fit to be recognized, but is yet so excellent a government as to be quite up to negotiating a treaty. Give us a solemn, binding agreement, says Mr. Hughes to Obregon, and w shall discover that you are the very man to have the fulles support of our Government as ruler of Mexico. It is a extraordinary and unprecedented position to take. True, we have made bargains with republics to the south of us before, but never so openly and unblushingly at the behest of a portion of Big Business. It used to be the sound, as it is the proper, rule, as in the case of Servia after the murder of King Peter, to recognize even a bloody-handed regime if it was the *de facto* government. Latterly, the United States has insisted on exercising a right of censorship over the smaller American nations. Hence, Mr. Wilson's attitude toward Huerta, to cite only one case. But this is the first time that the United States has deliberately made of recognition a public matter of give and take; has insisted before the whole world that a commercial bargain be struck before recognition is accorded. The gravity of this lies in the fact that if the United States does not recognize the Obregon Government it will collapse if only because it will not be able to obtain the money and credit it needs from Wall Street to rehabilitate its country, its railroads, and its public services. Wall Street and our State Department work hand in glove: no recognition, no money; recognition, plenty of money. So one of the greatest bribes in history is being held up to President Obregon. Dr. E. J. Dillon, one of the veteran journalists of the world, sets forth elsewhere in this issue what manner of man General Obregon is and how great his character. Why should we be threatening such a man with ruin and not helping him? Why should the State Department not realiz that if General Obregon does its bidding there will inevitably be an immediate revolution in Mexico? Were these the times before the war, General Obregon could turn to European bankers for aid and be certain of recognition by other countries. This is impossible today if only because England and France have announced that they will play the role of sheep to our bellwether.

The simple fact is that if Mexico wishes to make Article 27 of the Constitution retroactive it has the right to do so provided only that in doing so it in no wise discriminates against Americans but treats Mexicans, English, French, and Americans and all the rest exactly alike. It has said that it will not so discriminate. To withhold recognition from the Mexican Government because it will not violate its own Constitution is utterly unworthy of any nation that went into the European war on behalf of liberty and of the rights of small nations. It smacks of hypocrisy, nothing more and nothing less. If this policy is persisted in it will make the "Colossus of the North" a menace to every country to the south of us. We cannot see why it should not lead to an immediate Pan-American Union, not against the United States but against the imperialists in Washington who betray the conscience and the righteousness and the nobility of the plain American people—they want no war and no intervention in Mexico at the behest of the oil interests or any other capitalist group in America. We ca not understand how South and Central America can dela a day or an hour in organizing against the imperialism o Washington. It seems their plain duty if Mexico is not to be permanently vassaled by the protagonists of Mittel-America in Wall Street and Washington.

Senator Borah at the Front

MR. MARK SULLIVAN, writing as a Washington correspondent, has made the interesting, if extremely belated, discovery that the leadership of the Senate has passed to William E. Borah of Idaho. Senator Lodge is nominally the Republican leader, but he has been little in evidence since the treaty fight ended. The long illness of Senator Penrose, and the growing indisposition of Senator Knox for sustained intellectual effort, have aided in shattering the old steering-group, of which Mr. Smoot is also a familiar figure. So the way was opened for new leadership, and Mr. Borah, whether consciously or unconsciously, has taken it. But, *pace* Mr. Sullivan, it was in 1919 and 1920 that the intellectual preeminence of the Senate passed to him, at the very time that Mr. Sullivan and the New York *Evening Post* were prophesying the complete defeat of the "irreconcilables." When the history of that remarkable legislative struggle, which seemed so hopeless at the beginning, is written, it will show that for steady driving ahead, resoluteness of purpose, remarkable strategy, and absolute determination to succeed, the palm belongs to Senator Borah.

It is this very resoluteness of purpose, coupled with incessant labor, which makes Mr. Borah so formidable. No other Senator sticks more closely to his job and declines more invitations to appear in public and to enhance his reputation. He never loses an opportunity, or a trick; his sizing up of the situation at any time is so remarkable that his prophecies are amazingly correct. Wall Street concedes that as a Constitutional lawyer he is today surpassed by none in Congress unless it is Senator Knox. He never was really spectacular; he grows less and less so. He has made no dramatic play for the spot light in the disarmament fight and no appeal to sentiment or emotion. He has just plugged away at his resolution, confident of its success, but organizing and planning steadily and quietly behind the scenes. His power reaches into the House as well; he has exerted great influence there upon the fight for a small army; and he can be relied upon to continue it until this country is freed from the burden and the abomination of a large standing army.

The disarmament campaign has been only one of Mr. Borah's varied activities this year—all requiring courage and nerve. Thus he served notice in ringing words upon the North Carolina Republicans who have been trying to drive the Negroes out of the party that he would rather leave it himself than lift one finger to aid them in their undemocratic and un-American purpose. Always fighting for free press and free speech, the Senator has recently tacked on to the latest sedition bill some proposals in the form of an amendment which he offered as a separate bill last February. They call for the automatic dismissal of any Federal official violating the right of assembly, or contravening the Constitutional rights of any individual—something that, if enacted, would stop the official lawlessness and crime which have so disgraced the country since we entered the war. Similarly, Senator Borah has been actively trying to have the obnoxious war laws abrogated. It was his same Senator, too, whose protests compelled his party and the President-elect to abandon the usual inauguration splurge, for which act Mr. Harding was so warmly praised. Just lately he has taken a strong stand upon the bonus question and has vigorously opposed the latest bill in flat defiance of the soldier vote. His proper and sound protest against the appointment of Mr. Taft as Chief Justice of the United States we commented upon last week.

Thus, because of his ability and courage and his sense of what issues the public is feeling keenly about, Mr. Borah has come to be the most effective and virile figure in the Senate. In the last few weeks he has been dangerously near a clash with the President on several issues, if only because, as he warned the Senate last winter, he "will not abdicate his judgment" and subordinate his views to anybody else's. When he takes a position he holds it and is afraid least of all of the White House. If any revolt starts in the upper house against Mr. Harding it is likely to begin near the Senator from Idaho, and no man is other than a formidable antagonist who can play so dogged, so patient a waiting game. He introduced his proposal for a disarmament conference with Japan and England on December 14 last. He ignored innumerable efforts to sidetrack it, including various hints from the White House, and saw it unanimously adopted by the Senate on March 21 and accepted by both houses June 29. There is beginning to be something of the surety of progress of a glacier about Mr. Borah's undertakings, and no President would be wise to go counter to the Senator's course without being prepared for the consequences. Today Mr. Borah is steadily winning the support of liberal groups despite their criticism of him for his anti-suffrage stand and his vote for the bogus emergency tariff. Perhaps his readiness to take a decided stand upon public issues is due to his not permitting any idea of the Presidency to affect his course.

H. R. 7456

IT is doubtful if in the history of political affairs a measure so irredeemably and universally vicious has ever been submitted to the law-making power of a civilized society as H. R. 7456.

In these words the Democratic minority of the House Ways and Means Committee records its dissent from the Republican tariff measure introduced into Congress by Representative Fordney. The language is strong and the opinion not without political bias, yet the consequences of the legislation, if enacted, may prove the description to be not greatly exaggerated. As so often happens, Congress is beginning to discuss the two most important topics before it—taxation and the tariff—at a moment when hot weather and vacation plans make it most difficult to concentrate public attention upon any abstruse topic. But the situation is doubly unfortunate this year in that, contrary to custom, the committee hearings were secret and the bill is so drawn as to make it difficult to compare its schedules with those of previous measures or to predict its detailed effect. Classifications have been altered and variable duties imposed, while most complicating of all, the basis of valuation has been changed from cost abroad to the selling price of "comparable and competitive products" in the United States. In spite of much confusion, however, the general character and inevitable consequences of the legislation are only too plain. Representative Fordney himself has said that the duties proposed average about the same as those of the notorious Payne-Aldrich Law of 1909, which split the Republican Party open and led to its overwhelming repudiation in the Presidential election of 1912.

But the present bill is far more dangerous than the Payne-Aldrich Law. That legislation was limited in its evil effects primarily to the United States. The Fordney bill possesses tremendous potentialities in connection with the rehabilitation of the entire world from its post-war prostration. To quote again the words of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee: "At the very time when extraordinary efforts are afoot to save from utter ruin great nations devastated by the late war, it is proposed by this bill to declare a savage commercial war upon the whole human family." That is the naked truth. Moreover, we cannot even contend that in declaring this economic boycott against the rest of the world we are helping ourselves—unless by ourselves we mean the profiteers who are squeezing the juices from our industrial life and throwing the lees to the general public. Representative Garner estimates that the tariff measure will cost the country about two billion dollars annually, or $100 for each family of five.

Since the historic McKinley bill of 1890, this is the fifth tariff measure to come up in Congress. In every other case a radically different situation from the present prevailed. We were formerly a country with a large output of agricultural products and raw materials, but with few manufactures. If we chose to put a tariff on foreign manufactures it mattered little to the rest of the world, and a protective policy was undoubtedly efficacious in building up home industries, although it was expensive and unjust to the people as a whole. But conditions are now entirely changed. Nobody dares any longer to ask protection for our "infant industries." Representative Fordney, realizing how ridiculous the historic pleas for a protective policy would sound in this day, is urging his measure ostensibly as a means of furnishing work to our unemployed. Pure moonshine! We are supplying most of our own needs, and have a large surplus both of manufactured articles and agricultural products that must be sold abroad if our industries are to be kept running. A primary cause of unemployment now is the collapse of our foreign trade, which fell from a value of $1,188,255,449 for July, 1920, to $527,378,825 last May. In order to sell goods abroad we must let people pay for them, and the only way possible is in their own products. In other words we should encourage, not penalize, imports. Will Representative Fordney or any other Republican in Congress tell the country how high customs duties are going to do that?

To revert once more to the minority statement from the Ways and Means Committee:

> It is false to say that the majority were commissioned by the people at the last election to revise the tariff. . . . The tariff was not an issue in the 1920 campaign. The people did not believe they were voting for a change in the tariff. It may well be admitted that in the back of the heads of the men in control of that convention at their 2:00 a. m. conference in the Blackstone Hotel there was the purpose to revise the tariff up if they got the chance, but they never avowed it to the people, and in the subsequent campaign their candidate had little or nothing to say about the tariff.

The Fordney bill will not revive business, nor cure unemployment, nor help the farmer; it will place a staggering additional load upon the consumer and impede the economic rehabilitation of the whole world. But (Hist! For this is the answer) it will enrich the little junta of profiteers, middlemen, and financial manipulators who get their profit coming and going and thrive in proportion as they can befuddle and humbug the rest of us.

Torquemada Up to Date

[William Jennings Bryan will lecture next Saturday evening on "The Menace of Darwinism in American Education and Religion." It is announced that Mr. Bryan will devote the remainder of his life to a defense of the Bible.—Press dispatch.]

In Zion City they forbid
The filmy waist and stocking,
And where the Atlantic roars they find
That human skin is shocking.

Old Mississippi claps in jail
The man who utters curses,
In Utah smoking cigarettes
Is worse than cutting purses.

Speak Dutch in Texas and a mob
Of righteous men will follow,
And they who roll you in the tar
Put breeches on Apollo.

Or if you say that peace is best
And murder is a pity,
You're held up to shame by those
Who serve the Lusk Committee.

"To mention man's mammalian ways,"
Says Comstock, "is not nice, sir,
And if you do you'll share the fate
Of Cabell and of Dreiser."

And last the great Nebraskan comes
Whom drought but makes more fiery
To trim the young idea and smite
The naughty mind's inquiry.

It has been tried before, good friends,
By mob or Inquisition,
But human nature shook itself
And sent it to perdition.

It is not love that would reduce
All men to one mean level,
And call the wants *you* do not feel
The promptings of the devil.

Man is, thank heaven, not "safe and sane"
In any age or nation,
From love or art his spirit craves
A high intoxication.

And with the search for truth to which
There are no sacred matters,
The taboos and the walls and laws
That hem us in he shatters.

And on his long, historic road
Of glory and defiance
He scarcely glances back to note
The Comstocks and the Bryans.

As when a ship with sails outspread
Leaps past the waves that under
Its keel keep brawling that in vain
It seeks a land of wonder.

Alvaro Obregon and His Policy

By E. J. DILLON

IN the course of a varied experience in most parts of the globe during the long span of time between the close of the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Peace Conference I have come into contact with most of the statesmen, rulers, and leaders of men whose deeds and endeavors have made contemporary history. The list includes Bismarck, Gambetta, Gladstone, Crispi, Chamberlain, President Kruger, the Marquis Ito, Disraeli, Roosevelt, and Venizelos, and most of the prominent public workers of the present day. And I can honestly say that none of them impressed me so powerfully or so favorably from the point of view of leadership, single-mindedness, and that elusive quality which occasionally goes by the name of grandeur as the Mexican reformer of whose existence and aims the people of the United States are only now beginning to have a vague inkling.

Alvaro Obregon is a born leader with whom love of justice is a consuming passion, and duty the highest law. A man of sterling character and of a humane and sympathetic temper, he combines the fervor of the idealist with the capacity of the organizer, and his solicitude for the well-being of the masses is the driving force of his public and private activities. His words are acts and his promise the beginning of achievement. His respect for truth in all its Protean shapes and singular surroundings is almost tantamount to worship.

Before I had the advantage of meeting Obregon I had heard much about him from eminent Americans—experts all of them on Mexican affairs—to whom the principal sources of information public and private were easily accessible. And the portrait which I drew from the data thus liberally supplied was the reverse of attractive. Later on when I came to know him as he is I perceived that the data were fabrications and the portrait a sorry caricature.

I should like, were it possible, to ascribe the circumstantial and false information volunteered to me by my informants to what Goethe termed the dangerous ease with which a great man's contemporaries usually go astray about him. "That which is uncommon in the individual bewilders them," the poet adds, "life's headstrong current distorts their angle of vision and keeps them from knowing such men and appreciating them." But it is to be feared that the true explanation lies elsewhere.

My first visit to Obregon took place while I still believed that he was one of the least reputable types of the class ridiculed in the United States as the Mexican bandit general. Primed with this idea I called on him one afternoon at his hotel in Mexico City. His ante-chamber was filled with typical representatives of the despised poverty-stricken masses with whom he was hail fellow well met. He inquired what he could do for me. I answered, "I merely wish to know how you intend to deal with the problems of recognition, of Mexico's debts, of foreign claims for losses, and kindred matters, when, as now appears certain, you will have entered upon the duties of President." "My answer is simple," he replied laughingly. "Mexico will pay all her debts and satisfy all the just claims of foreigners. As for recognition, I cannot admit that that is a Mexican problem. Foreign states will recognize the lawful government of the Republic in accordance with the law of nations. That is all. You would not suggest, would you, that any of them will make a new departure?" I arose, said that I would not trespass further on his time, thanked him for his reply, wished him good afternoon, and left.

Next day a friend of his informed me that the General would be pleased to see me again, to have a more satisfactory talk with him, adding that he had been under the impression that I was one of the numerous callers whose aim was to ply him with futile questions and then to comment adversely on his answers. He intended to start in two days for his home in Nogales and would gladly receive me any time before his departure. I said that I would not trouble the General further now but might possibly be in Nogales myself in a few weeks when I would take the liberty to call on him. The next day I received an invitation to accompany him on his journey to Nogales and after a few hours' deliberation I accepted it.

On that journey and on our many subsequent travels I had a rare opportunity to study General Obregon in the various lights shed by adventures pleasant and unpleasant, exhilarating and depressing. I saw him in his native place surrounded by his family and his kindred. I conversed with his earliest teachers and his schoolmates. I observed him as a candidate for the Presidency and listened to over a hundred of his electoral addresses, always with a keen sense of aesthetic enjoyment and at times with admiration for his fairness and generosity as an antagonist. To my knowledge he possessed documents which if published would have debarred certain of his adversaries from ever again appearing on the public stage. But he declines to make use of them during the elections or indeed later unless the behavior of the authors should oblige him to make known their misdeeds.

Obregon is a man of the people, a proletarian of the proletariate, a lack-all who worked his way up from the lowest rung of the social ladder to the highest by dint of intense painstaking while preserving his 'scutcheon from blot or stain. Whatever he set his hand to, that he persevered in until he accomplished the task. As a simple workman he labored with might and main to the satisfaction of his employers, who soon gave him a post of trust and responsibility. As a farm hand and farmer he acquainted himself with agriculture in most of its branches until his qualifications enabled him to render a lasting service to the whole state in which he was born. Combining mechanics with agricultural industry, he invented a sowing machine which is employed today in various states of the Republic. Political conditions constraining him to abandon his peaceful existence and his ideal family life, he became a soldier and applied himself so intensely to the requirements of his new profession that he finally ended this uncongenial career with the triumph of the popular cause and the well-deserved reputation of a genial military strategist as well as a most successful organizer.

Obregon is one of the very few men I have met—Venizelos is another—on whom power and rank have no further effect than that of sharpening their sense of responsibility. In all other respects he is as he was. Kerensky the Russian lawyer whom the turn of fortune's wheel

raised to the highest post in Russia had his head turned dizzy and his estimate of values upset by the all too sudden change. In the Czar's luxurious apartments he is said to have attired himself in magnificent costumes and to have striven to add a cubit to his mental and moral stature by the aid of the cast-off finery of the former autocrat. Obregon is a man of a wholly different cast of mind and type of character. He owes everything to himself, nothing to artifice. In virtue of his unbroken military successes, his moral rectitude, and his transparent sincerity he wields an extraordinary sway over the spirits of his countrymen; and he uses this for the purpose of inculcating among them faith in the great emancipating principles of right and wrong, respect for law and individual right, and a striving after freedom with order and administration with integrity.

Those aims underlie Obregon's foreign and domestic policy, and nothing that he undertakes or achieves will be found to run counter to any of them. His fiscal measures, his political program, his attitude toward the State Department in Washington are all practical corollaries of these principles and aspirations. In this way he has imparted to the new generation of his countrymen a powerful impulse in the direction of substituting veracity and moral rectitude for old-world politics and diplomacy. He knows better than any of his contemporaries the nature and gravity of Mexico's wounds and infirmities and also the efficacious remedies which he is ready to apply. That knowledge embraces the entire problem and includes every detail. He perceives the needs of each district and their relation to those of the entire state, those of each state and their relation to the Republic, and those of the entire Republic in the frame of the community of nations. In a word, he is endowed with the gift of seeing things in true perspective, in which they are seldom, if ever, surveyed nowadays on this or any other continent.

Obregon's presence is the embodiment of unaggressive strength and quiet natural dignity. His glance is searching and is often accompanied by a mental, almost perceptible, effort to complete the impression which he is receiving from the words of his interlocutor by inspection of his motives. Optimism is usually depicted in his mien, tone, and language, but it is the optimism of the man who having struggled against vast odds and won feels himself specially favored by circumstance and inspirited by past experience. He is cautious withal by temperament, enthusiastic by reflection, persevering on principle. While preaching high ideals he rates at its just value the poverty of the soil in which he is sowing them and is prepared to content himself with a proportionate harvest. In his theories there is no room for staggering misgiving, and from his action he banishes hesitation. "Vacillation spells failure," is one of his everyday sayings. While guided by experience, he is not self-opinionated; his inquiries are broad, his mind open, and his prejudices are neither many nor insuperable.

Obregon's moral code, like that of the Japanese, is interlaced with what is known in Spanish lands as the *punto d'honor*, and for this as for that he is ready to make the supreme sacrifice. He is neither vain nor conventionally modest, simply proud with that legitimate pride which springs from consciousness of duty performed and his role well played.

As an orator he deserves high rank for qualities which are innate and are therefore often belittled by those who lack them. He discards the usual artificial aids and speaks briefly, simply, and to the point. His every discourse is a message. He has the knack of imparting to his hearers a direct interest in the matter dealt with. And however homely the subject, he views it with a mind permeated with a sense of the larger issues of which it is an integral part. Obregon knows the crowd much better than the individual. None the less he is often strikingly right in his judgment of individuals, which is mostly intuitive, but when dealing with personal friends his intuition is sometimes paralyzed. He is then blind to defects that are almost obvious.

One afternoon in Tehuacan General Obregon and I had a long talk about his plans of reconstruction and the principles that would govern them. And here is a concise note of the conversation which I jotted down immediately after for future reference:

> He is resolved to substitute morality for politics. Recognizes power only as a means to an end—the end to be the good of the community. The making of laws is easy and the belief is common that by statutes you can right every wrong. But what counts more than the wording of an act of Congress is the integrity of those who interpret and administer it. Never hesitate in a crisis. If you take a resolution carry it out with might and main. If you are dubious give it up altogether, and if convinced that it is the right thing to do tackle it even though you have no hope of achieving it and persevere even though failure should stare you in the face, for it is not only what you have actually done but also what you would do that counts.
>
> Mexico will find her right position, not through aloofness from world affairs, but rather by recognizing the essential unity of humankind and the need of developing the resources of each country for the benefit not only of the nation that owns them but also of humanity. Hatred of foreigners is a curse to the people who indulge in it, as history shows. Foreigners are the needed cooperators of Mexicans and should therefore be cordially welcomed.

Such in brief is the man who is striving to reconstruct the southern Republic today. During the few months that have elapsed since he entered upon his official duties he has accomplished much and has prepared the ground for much more. For the first time in history Mexico is now on the right road. Revolution has ceased and peace is firmly established. The factions that for years kept the country plunged in chaos are appeased. The outlook is most promising. The only lever by which the Republic can at present be thrust back into the quagmire of meaningless strife is of foreign origin. And the only apparent motive for using this fatal lever is a crazy infatuation for a hollow form.

General Obregon cannot purchase recognition by a treaty. He can and will discuss a treaty when he is recognized. To sign a political compact would be to violate the constitution and his oath, and to insist that he shall be a law-breaker and a perjurer in order to qualify himself for recognition is hardly in accordance with President Harding's public professions. President Harding said, "I want America to stop and turn its face forward not only for the achievements which we may bring ourselves, but also that we may play our part in showing the world the way to a righteous settlement."[1]

Now, there is apparently little righteousness in a demand which would make President Obregon a criminal, divorce him from his people, and establish and sanction a foreign veto on the domestic legislation of his country.

Side by side with this incitement to a breach of the constitution comes the demand of the oil interests that the State Department withhold recognition on the ground that the President is not observing the constitution as they interpret it in the matter of taxation. They contend that by levying the recent tax on oil exports he is violating their reading of that charter. Thus he is at one and the same time called upon to violate the constitution in one of its prescriptions at the demand of the State Department and to accept the oil companies' interpretation of another of its injunctions and adjust his policy to that.

In order to comply with these conflicting dictates a constitution ought to be specially framed for the behoof of foreign investors and its interpretation left to their judgment. Mexico's role would be to listen and obey.

A comment on President Obregon's telegram to the *World* attributed by the press to Mr. E. L. Doheny[2] is worth noting as indicative of the singular method of reasoning by which President Obregon's refusal to sign a treaty before recognition is assailed. What Mr. Hughes, Mr. Fall, and Mr. Doheny allege is that assurances given by Obregon that the rights of American citizens will be protected would bind only General Obregon. Therefore they are valueless. And yet Mr. Doheny in his comment says: "The question for Mr. Obregon to answer is: Do you intend to confiscate the rights of American citizens? If not, by what course of reasoning can you refuse to so state publicly and over your own signature before recognition of your Government by the United States Government?" The obvious reply is—by the simplest and most forcible method of reasoning known to the logician. If Alvaro Obregon were to make and sign that statement before recognition it would bind Alvaro Obregon and nobody else. Another reason, as Mr. Doheny knows, is that a good deal more than that simple statement has been and is being demanded by the State Department. Among other conditions President Obregon is summoned to violate the constitution and to be false to his oath.

And these conditions are unacceptable.

[1] Address to the District of Columbia Bankers' Association, April 20, 1921.

[2] *The World*, June 28, 1921.

The Truth About the American Legion

By ARTHUR WARNER

VII. Publicity, Official and Officious

COMING into existence, as it did, when propaganda had been raised to the *n*th degree, it is natural that the American Legion should have centered much of its attention upon publicity. Its chief means has been the official organ, the *American Legion Weekly*, the first number of which was dated July 4, 1919. Bellicose, blatant, and bellowing, the *Weekly* undoubtedly played a principal part at that formative period in turning the Legion from a legitimate fellowship of former service men into a heresy-hunting, business-controlled "strong arm" squad. The *Weekly* began to see red in the second number, and talked nothing but vermilion for the next six months. That second number led off with an article on Bolshevism by the now forgotten but then resplendent Ole Hanson, while left and right at the top of the editorial page were discussions of The Red Autocracy and Seeds of Discontent. From the former one culls such sentiments as: "The unbalanced temperament of virulent Slav radicalism can introduce no ideals of social conduct or government which Americans will care to accept," while of discontent we are assured: "The man who was in the service wants to better his condition, of course, and he wants to better America. But he has his own ideas—American ideas—of how this will be done." On November 14, 1919, an editorial entitled Give Them a Sea Voyage announced:

> This season of the year one recalls the voyage of the Mayflower, which brought seekers of freedom to these shores. It is time for a return trip, bearing enemies of freedom from the same shores. . . . Thousands of their ilk ran around loose during the war, and while 4,800,000 Americans were in the fighting forces and the vision of the nation was fixed on the war, they were sowing the seeds of destruction and anarchy and laying the fires which they hope may make a Russia of the United States. They are not much of a menace in view of the new Americanism. But they are a beastly nuisance. Blast the crop. Stamp out the fires which already are being lighted. Run the Reds out from the land whose flag they sully. Cleanse the country of the skulkers whose insane ambition is to wreck it.

Along with, and doubtless growing out of the pursuit of the "red," began the hounding of the alien, in which the *Weekly* led the pack. Considering that America *is* the immigrant, that our accumulated industrial prosperity and our present standard of living is the direct creation of the foreign-born, this manifestation, which spread like a yellow fog over the country and is not yet dissipated, is one of the most cruel and surprising drifts of popular hysteria in our history. The *Weekly* began with a drive against the "alien slacker"—the man who had taken out first papers toward naturalization but canceled them in order to avoid conscription—demanding that he be deported. In Oregon the Legion gave the names of such persons to their employers and to the press, and the *Weekly* gloried that thus their existence was made "uncomfortable generally." With these individuals was presently confused any alien who used the neutrality of his country as an excuse for not joining the fighting forces—as thousands of Americans in Europe did previous to our entrance into the war. Thence it was an easy step to the hue and cry against all foreigners. On October 10, 1919, an editorial entitled Oust the Aliens said:

> An official demand has been made for the names of all aliens employed by the War and Navy Departments. Congress will be asked to demand their discharge. It is time to clean the Government's books of all aliens. There is an ample supply of American citizens to conduct the United States Government in all its details, functions, and ramifications. And there are now enough intensely American Americans to see that this is done in the future.

The American Legion certainly had an indirect responsibility for stirring up the passions that led to the tragedy in Centralia, Washington, on Armistice Day, 1919. Instead of repenting, however, the Legion capitalized the occurrence in its attack on radicalism the country over, and after the verdict of the court the *American Legion Weekly* perpetrated what can hardly be regarded as anything but a deliberate incitement to violence. It will be recalled that the verdict found seven of the defendants guilty of murder *in the second degree*. In other words the jury decided that

the shooting was intentional but not premeditated; that it was the result of sudden provocation, which could have been nothing else than an actual or impending attack by the paraders on the I. W. W. hall. Second degree murder is not punishable by death. Yet on its cover-page for April 2, 1920—after the verdict had been rendered—the *Weekly* ran this caption: Unwept, Unhonored, Unhung. Below was an editorial which began:

> Those precursors of the millennium who advocate the abolition of the death penalty will find few recruits in the ranks of the American Legion as long as such brothers in good standing of the I. W. W. as John Lamb, Eugene Barnett, O. C. Bland, Ray Becker, Britt Smith, James McInery, and Bert Bland remain unhung. Four American Legion men fell before the cowardly volley these murderers delivered from ambush on the peaceful Armistice Day paraders at Centralia, Washington.

During the first half year of its existence money was shoveled lavishly on the fires of the *American Legion Weekly*. Expensive paper, many illustrations, and a colored cover were used. The money ran out in the winter of 1920, and a crash followed. For a month the *Weekly* was not published at all. Then it reappeared reduced in size, minus its colored cover, and printed on a cheap paper—in "fatigue clothes," as it explained. On August 13, 1920, it announced that it had 750,000 subscribers and was published at a slight profit. Thereafter for six months the foot of its cover-page bore the statement: "Net Paid Circulation More Than Three-quarters of a Million Copies." On March 4 of this year the statement disappeared, and no circulation figures have been printed since.

VIII. Americanization

It would seem that the attitude toward the alien taken by the *American Legion Weekly* would form about as impenetrable a barrier as possible for Americanization work. The first annual convention, in Minneapolis in November of 1919, added a few bars, however, by adopting the report of a Committee on Anti-American Propaganda, ranging from a tin-pan, flag-waving self-sufficiency which recommended legislation compelling all public and private schools to set aside ten minutes a day for "patriotic exercises," to a resolution that the Department of Justice be changed "from a passive evidence-collecting organization to a militant and active group of workers whose findings shall be forcefully acted upon by this our American Government." If this resolution meant anything, it could only be a plea for the establishment of a Russian police like that under the czars; it out-Palmered our former Attorney General himself in identifying Americanism with absolutism.

A National Americanism Commission was created soon after the Minneapolis Convention. When the first serious obstacle appeared, the Legion fell back on familiar tactics and attempted to ride roughshod over the opposition, right or wrong. It asked permission to station agents on Ellis Island who should have access to the Government's records regarding immigrants in carrying out the Legion's Americanization projects. The Assistant Secretary of Labor, Louis F. Post, refused the request on the ground that the Government had no right to turn over confidential records, which might be used for exploitation or abuse, to private hands. In response, the Legion sent a delegation to the White House to ask for Mr. Post's dismissal, basing the demand upon old and discredited charges in connection with deportation cases. To his credit, William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, stood by Mr. Post, pronouncing him "one of the truest Americans I have ever come in contact with."

The Post incident caused some backfiring in the Legion itself. There was complaint that the special committee, when ready with its findings, did not report to the existing National Executive Committee (because of known opposition there to the intention to railroad Mr. Post) and that it did not allow the issue to come before the Cleveland Convention, waiting for a new and friendly Executive Committee before it made its recommendation.

In pleasant contrast to the general attitude of the Legion toward the alien and toward Americanism, the *Stars and Stripes*, unofficial successor in this country to the War Department's newspaper of that name in France, recently printed some paragraphs under the caption What Every Veteran Knows, reading in part as follows:

> That "One Hundred Per Cent Americanism" too frequently is what I am and the fellow I don't like isn't.
>
> That the Army was full of a lot of Wops and Kikes and Russians and Finns and other low-down ignorant white trash and foreigners.
>
> That they all fought like the very devil.
>
> That a lot of wise guys whose ancestors came over on the Mayflower had good, soft jobs in the S. O. S.
>
> That the more education you had the less chance there was of getting killed.
>
> That the men who fell in France came from many racial beginnings, but they had a common ending under the same flag.
>
> That this is a good time for universal tolerance, and that the promoters of hatred and war usually begin by promoting intolerance.
>
> That "One Hundred Per Cent Americanism," if it truly means anything, means something a whole lot bigger than race, color, or previous condition. It means color of the heart, not of the hide.

Figs do not grow out of thistles nor can you make a silk purse from a sow's ear. Americanism, like charity, begins at home. Let the American Legion begin by Americanizing itself.

A fourth and concluding article next week will deal with the relation of the Legion to labor and to business, with its dwindling membership, and with its future.

The Garden-Spider's Web

By MAHLON LEONARD FISHER

A maker of fine lace the meadows know:
There where the wild brier-legions weave a hedge,
Spear-fierce, impenetrable, along their edge,
She plies her unseen needles to and fro,
Whilst I, who, hiding, watch her gray web grow,
Sudden as through a gemmed wheel-window see,
Whose architect still fingers lovingly
Its intricate tracery's tidelike ebb and flow,—
That labyrinth where myriads lose their way
(With what precise fine niceness by God-taught
And aptest airy geometrician wrought!),
A tenuous net at best for puny prey,
Whereon a dew-jewel, glist'ning, seems enorm;
Yet is it braced and stayed to stand the storm!

Waste and Labor

By STUART CHASE

WATERMELONS. Thousands of them. Large, juicy, well-nourished watermelons decorating the Potomac River from Alexandria to Indian Head. Some floating majestically down stream; some caught in the reeds and marsh grass; some high and dry on the shore. They had arrived in Washington one day last August when the watermelon market was bearish, and, five thousand strong, they had been taken out to the docks and dumped. Meanwhile it is safe to assume that the watermelon appetite of Washington had been by no means assuaged. But, Allah be praised, the market had been stabilized.

Locomotives. Thousands of them. Large, powerful, well-nourished locomotives. But with something askew. A leaky valve, a choked flue, a rickety tender. These locomotives in the year 1919 had to be shopped—hung up on cranes and tinkered with. The railroads had shops with cranes and men. But the locomotives did not go into these shops. No, not as a rule. They went to other shops, maintained by outside supply companies, leaving the men and the cranes in the home shops with nothing to do. Idle men to be sure can be fired—and they were by the hundreds. But idle shops and idle cranes cannot, alas, be fired. They can only sit eating their heads off in depreciation, taxes, interest, insurance, and overhead generally. Meanwhile the railroads paid the supply companies for repairing their locomotives on the basis of direct labor cost plus 110 per cent for overhead and profit—a whale of a price. Meanwhile they paid in addition all the overhead on their own empty shops—making the total bill for repairs almost Himalayan. All of which you will agree is an insane and improbable procedure. Not at all. Not under the rules of businesslike acumen as practiced by all far-seeing captains of industry. This was a sound strategic move on the part of the financial managers of the railroads. For observe, they could shift the high cost to the Government, which was paying them 6 per cent over and above cost on the one hand, and throw the fear of God into the shop craft unions (who were getting altogether too cocky) on the other. Thus was justice served, and private initiative vindicated. That shops and equipment were idle, and that excess effort, time, and materials were devoted to repairing the nation's locomotives was too irrelevant to merit serious consideration.

Here is a printing establishment. A union rule provides that all advertising matter coming into the shop in electrotype must be reset in type by the compositors. The union graciously sanctions the use of the electrotype, but insists that the type be set and redistributed to secure the equivalent hours of work involved in setting up the original. This folderol is sometimes solemnly enacted days after the advertisement has gone to press.

Watermelons, locomotives, and printing presses. These are but three examples picked at random from the almost universal sabotage—now great, now small—of the modern industrial system. In the sum total these practices must reach amazing figures. The waste which flows from them is incalculable. And by waste is meant idle labor or idle plant, or labor and plant devoted to the production of goods or services which satisfy no recognizable human need. Employers' associations through pools, rings, monopolies, and "gentlemen's agreements" have time and again restricted output—with the resulting idle labor and idle plant, and often spoiled or wasted raw material—in the interest of "all that the traffic will bear." Labor unions have been known to do likewise—over and beyond, be it understood, reasonable provisions for health and safety. It is probable that the sabotage of labor is small compared to the vast businesslike arrangements of captains of industry, but from the standpoint of waste as defined the hands of neither party are altogether clean. Could these practices be in some way obviated, the resulting potential increase in production would stagger the imagination; would perhaps double the standard of living!

The problem of industrial waste is beginning to thrust itself to the fore. Invention and technical processes have progressed rapidly in the past generation. Oil, coal, lumber, iron, copper, and other raw materials have been pouring down the hopper of the industrial machine by the billions of tons. Factories, mines, irrigation projects have increased tenfold. Yet the standard of living of the masses of the American people, expressed in sound food, shelter, clothing, education, and amusement, has shown only the most sluggish advance. Some statisticians assert that "real" wages have not advanced since 1900. Somewhere in the process it is obvious that there is a tremendous leakage. Somewhere the gears are clogged and the engine choked. More and more, sensible people and honest people are beginning to pry up the hood, monkey-wrench in hand. And naturally the handiest man with the monkey-wrench is the engineer—the chap who knows that "what goes up must come down"; who knows that given so much in-put and so much power, the output ought to be thus and so—with no wide variations plus or minus. The politician, the orthodox economist, the financier are fortunately not bound by any such realistic limitations. Waste means little to them provided the phrases are ringing, the profits are coming in, and the "immutable laws" are all in working order. So it is natural to expect the technician to be the first sincerely to face the problem of industrial waste in its larger aspects. We say "larger aspects" advisedly. The engineer has already introduced the cult of "efficiency" which is by way of being a sort of John the Baptist. But industrial waste is more—vastly more. "Efficiency" sits in judgment upon the individual plant, or the industrial process, seldom questioning the relationships of the output to human wants, the relationships of the labor involved to human psychology, the relationship of the plant to the industry, or the industry to the whole industrial mechanism. Thus we find "efficiency" methods in the manufacture of deleterious drugs and munitions of war, while the philosophy of waste condemns the whole output as not only unnecessary, but vicious.

More constructive have been the proceedings of the Taylor Society—a group of progressive engineers—who, out of the groundwork of the old "scientific management," are slowly evolving an approach which comes close to the fundamentals of waste.

In their recent hearings before the Railway Labor Board in Chicago the railroad workers retained engineers to study the extent of waste in the railroad industry as now con-

ducted. The finding showed that in nearly every department of railroading there were large preventable leakages, running to a total of at least a billion dollars a year. These findings furthermore were taken largely from the estimates and testimony of railroad managers themselves. Certain of the possible savings would require a considerable capital outlay; others were merely a matter of better management and administration.

Railroad executives when faced with these charges have shown a disposition to bluster, to bring counter-charges against the efficiency of labor, but very little has been said —or perhaps can be said—in respect to the findings themselves. In their hearts railway executives know that the indictment is largely true. Thus Samuel O. Dunn, next friend of the railroads and editor of the *Railway Age*, said recently in commenting on transportation wastes: "Mr. Brandeis, a few years ago, talked about a possible saving of a million dollars a day. If he said that now Mr. Brandeis would be a piker." Recall how Mr. Brandeis was heaped with abuse at that time!

The important point to grasp in the situation is this. Instead of the usual mud-slinging contest (of which large traces are still discernible, to be sure) between capital and labor, the introduction of the question of waste raises the issue to new and revolutionary grounds. The railway workers in broaching the subject of managerial efficiency have placed themselves flatly on record as having an interest in, and a responsibility for, furnishing the service of transportation to the American people. In its essence transportation is the carrying of the maximum of freight and passengers with the minimum of energy. The railway workers have recognized this basic engineering fact, and in effect have proclaimed that besides wages, hours, and working conditions they recognize the necessity of carrying a maximum load with a minimum of energy. In other words, if their engineering exhibits were made in good faith—as there is every reason to suppose they were—the workers desire a wasteless industry. And this is a very momentous fact to grasp indeed.

Most important of all the approaches to the question of waste, however, is the report of the Federation of Engineering Societies, on Elimination of Waste in Industry, which has just been made public. Under the leadership of Mr. Hoover a number of basic industries have been surveyed by competent engineers. They have defined waste broadly as the failure to utilize effectively mechanical equipment, raw material, or human resources. They have laid particular emphasis on the last factor—examining unemployment, personnel, and labor turnover. Their findings show that while labor is responsible for some 25 per cent of the total cost of waste in the industries they have examined, management is responsible for 50 per cent thereof—or twice as much. They state, however, that they are much less interested in locating responsibility for past performance than in indicating the many opportunities for eliminating waste in the future.

The full report, which includes the surveys of various individual industries, runs into some 125,000 words, and whatever its limitations, due to the comparatively short time in which the assay was made, it will form an arresting document—almost, one is tempted to say, an epoch-making one. The conception is broad and waste is defined as measurable in physical units. Here is no nonsense about profits, money, or credit, but the essence of waste—the physical stuff—*labor, raw materials, and plant.* However wavering the initial vision of the engineers who view industry from this angle, the conclusions to which they will be driven are relentless. When industry is at last analyzed from the standpoint of providing a maximum of human needs with a minimum of wear and tear, nothing less than a new industrial synthesis comes to light. It is not too much to expect that we stand on the threshold of a new view of modern industrial progress—a view profoundly illuminating and at times disastrously critical. In due time we may expect to have a sufficient body of data—of whch the Hoover report is the first authoritative contribution—to pass scientific judgment on the whole problem.

It is not too soon to suggest that the problem of waste approached in the scientific spirit is fraught with great significance to the American labor movement. The railway workers have already given a hint of what this approach may mean. Is there enough common sense in the labor movement at large to get aboard the band wagon, join hands with the engineers, and take up the challenge of industrial waste? For the financiers do not think in such terms at all, the engineers are just beginning to emerge from a Stygian night, and it is only labor in cooperation with the awakened technician—the workers of hand and brain—who can seriously face the problem and ultimately take steps toward its solution.

The main contention of the labor union hitherto has been "more pay for shorter hours." This is all very well as far as it goes; the realities of industrial growth and business-like administration hitherto have made any other course visionary and largely hopeless. But experience has proved time and again that on those rare occasions when labor has secured the whip hand, monopolistic tendencies have set in precisely similar to those of combining employers. We have seen the typesetters working on utterly useless advertising copy in order to restrict the labor output.

It should be said at this point that we are not about to break into a time-honored sob as to the necessity of union labor foregoing the few monopolistic privileges it has won. This is to be no plea for honest workmen to show their better natures, and to lie down and be good. Far from it. In the catch-as-catch-can of modern industry a union has no other choice than to fight the devil with fire. Grind or be ground, is the only realistic business ethic. But in raising the question of waste, labor has a unique and exceptional opportunity not only to advance its own position, but genuinely to serve the public interest at the same time. *On one condition—that labor extend its share of industrial responsibility.*

Instead of saying to the employer: "We will do the tasks you set us for the highest wage and in the shortest work hours we can force from you," labor will shortly have an opportunity to say: "This is an industry necessary to the public welfare; the boss and ourselves make this industry go (provided the boss is a technician and not a financier); we should both be responsible for its efficient conduct; we should both have something to say about how it should be run, for upon us both rests the solemn responsibility to keep waste at a minimum. Make this responsibility concrete by giving us as great a share in the management as our experience and our knowledge warrants."

Such a statement would mark the beginning of real industrial democracy—a condition flatly impossible while the boss maintains his emphasis on profits only and labor its emphasis on wages only. Not until both accept joint responsibility for the efficient conduct of industry can any genuine steps be taken toward the elimination of waste.

Again, there are certain broader implications of the question which, while not immediate, are of the utmost import to labor. We have said, and it is a matter susceptible of statistical proof, that the standard of living has increased but slightly in the past generation. A full half of the population still hovers about the poverty line; slums and destitution are still the heritage of every city; large sections of the rural population continue to live in abject misery. In other words, there is not enough of the right kind of stuff produced to go around. Vast quantities of production are drained away in luxuries and in harmful or unnecessary products. War, and preparations for war, take their colossal toll. But if labor as a class is ever to rise from the relative misery and poverty of its surroundings, more of the right kind of stuff—more houses, more wheat, more shoes, more schools—has got to be produced. And only through the progressive elimination of waste can production be progressively increased.

Higher wages and shorter hours under the present industrial system turn in due and regular course to a higher cost of living, and the vicious circle is complete. Certain favored unions may dig their toes in and reap a relative advantage over their fellow-workers—but by and large the standard of living stands pat, and will so stand until the end of time, unless ways and means are devised to secure more relative production per individual, and unless ways and means are devised to see that the individual gets it. For increases in "average production" are a bitter irony. Every time a millionaire orders a yacht to be built, "average production" takes a jump. Every time milady calls for rare perfumes and strange cosmetics, "average production" goes up. Production measured either in dollars or tons of goods per capita has vastly increased in the past thirty years, but the production of necessary well-made, consumable goods distributed to the individuals of the nation has shown but a slight advance. And it is only the latter figure which is really significant to the plain people.

Of course labor may use the discovery of managerial incompetence simply as a club to strengthen its own case before the public, without the slightest disposition to assist in reducing the margin of waste. But the public will soon be disillusioned with mere cries of "You're another." Labor can make its case convincing only when it shows a genuine disposition to take an active share in bringing about more efficient operation in return for a measurable degree of managerial responsibility, which carries with it some security of tenure on the job. When the public begins to realize what a frightful mess financial control has made of industry from the operating standpoint—when the myth of the all-wise captain of industry is duly and finally exploded —labor in conjunction with the engineer stands a chance to step into the vacuum with new managerial proposals which should go far toward winning genuine public interest and support. (The ambiguous and much-abused word "public" I take to mean all adult persons not involved in the industry under review.)

The analysis of waste, and its relation to watermelons, locomotives, and printing presses, promises to shed a flood of light on these fundamental matters. If labor is ever to increase measurably its standard of living it must take up the challenge which the engineer has thrown down.

In the Driftway

WHAT'S this one sees in the newspapers lately about prohibition as a cause of increasing crime? In the New York *Herald* of June 30 William B. Joyce, president of the National Surety Company, is quoted as saying that a study of the reports of thirty leading bonding and surety companies indicates that, in the metropolitan districts at least, the effect of national prohibition has been to impair rather than improve the morals of the communities. He finds that burglary claims paid in 1920 were double what they were in 1919 and ten times what they were ten years ago; he thinks prohibition has been a cause, in that it has produced a state of mind that tends toward disregard of and contempt for law. In the same issue of the same newspaper is a Boston dispatch in which the chairman of the State Parole Board reports that 2,990 persons were sent to penal institutions in Massachusetts last year, 681 more than in the previous year. Bootlegging is declared to be a factor in the increase. Along comes the New York *Times* the next day with a dispatch from Washington saying that crime in that city had increased 20 per cent in the first six months of 1921 over what it was in 1920. According to the chief clerk of the police courts, nearly 25 per cent of the arrests were for drunkenness and another 20 per cent for offenses traceable to it. The sale of synthetic and poisonous concoctions in place of real liquor is given as a reason for this state of affairs.

* * * * *

WELL, well! This does not tally at all with what we were told during the first year of prohibition. From various quarters we were assured then—and figures were given to support the contention—that jails were getting lonesome and courts would have to go out of business because of the wave of virtue induced by prohibition. Were these statistics mere "dry" propaganda; are those on the other side only "wet" publicity? What are we to believe?

* * * * *

FOR the present certainly it is advisable not to believe any theories whatever that are avowedly based on statistics. Most axioms are untrue (including this), and about the untruest of the lot is that figures never lie. Of themselves figures may not be notably mendacious, but they have to be used with an intelligence, a care, and an honesty that they rarely receive not to produce results that make Ananias seem like a piker from Piker's Peak. In the relation of prohibition to crime it is wise to look warily at statistics and rely more upon our knowledge of history and human nature. Fortunately, these are differently interpreted by every individual. Those who believe that human morals are determined by what we have or have not will find it easy to convince themselves that prohibition makes for virtue. Those who question this view will as readily prove that although prohibition may alter the direction of crime, it will not affect the sum total of it. Thus the whole question can be settled according to our prejudices; which is the ancient, honorable, and reliable method by which the world has always gone forward—or backward.

* * * * *

BY grace of the Porter joint Congressional resolution, and the signature of the President of the United States, the war is over. Over what?

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Cardinal Bourne—A Study in Facts

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It would not be going too far to say that there is nothing particularly to be objected to in Mr. Murphy's article on Cardinal Bourne in *The Nation* of March 16 except the whole! It is a study in innuendo and misunderstanding. I hold no brief for Cardinal Bourne, for whom I have often cherished unchristian feelings in the past and I cannot write a study in laudation, but as a Catholic journalist and therefore humbly subservient to the truth, I could write a study in facts. The facts which I write out of personal knowledge are in conflict with Mr. Murphy's article. At the same time I do not doubt his good faith, as a number of his statements have at times rested in my own mind until I had reason to believe otherwise. I am sure any writer of the name of Murphy would be as readily corrected in the case of a Catholic prelate as I was myself. I know what it is to have written an inaccurate article and the relief which my conscience enjoyed when it was put right.

If Mr. Murphy wishes to attack Cardinal Bourne in a political capacity, it is a perfectly Catholic and medieval practice. Catholics have slated their own cardinals as much and more than Protestants. That Mr. Murphy may prove more accurate in his criticism, I propose to point out where his aim has missed the target. I do not defend or criticize the Cardinal's covering letter to Cardinal Manning's old Pastoral, but I think there is a considerable difference between the Fenian organization condemned by Cardinal Manning and the Sinn Fein movement, which in an academic sense appeals to Cardinal Bourne himself. I note that his words do not condemn Sinn Fein. He condemns secret societies in which some Sinn Feiners are to be found today. He does not say that other Sinn Feiners are necessarily "in opposition to the laws of God and of the Catholic Church." The most into which his letter can be construed is a condemnation of the Irish Republican Army in so far as it is acting in England today. Every bishop in the world would condemn the same in parallel circumstances. I do not think the Cardinal cynical in leaving the Irish question to be dealt with "justly and promptly by Parliament." If he had said the Government, it would have been a foolish or bitter thing to say. But Parliament, though it has weakened miserably, is not the equivalent of the Government, and Parliament includes such friends of Ireland as Devlin, Kenworthy, Wedgwood Benn, and Henry Bentinck. The Cardinal's action has not been popular, but it is not susceptible of being interpreted into an attack on Ireland. The Cardinal has since given a strongly pro-Irish interview to the Chicago *Tribune* and has written to Lloyd George at the head of his bishops to request the removal of the Auxiliaries from Ireland.

As to the historical side of Mr. Murphy's article it is true that his mother, Ellen Byrne, was Irish, but he hardly had the Christlike honor of being born of poor parents. Probably he wishes he had, for it would make his rise appear the more striking. His father and grandfather held responsible posts under the civil service in the post office. His grandfather was sent to Egypt to arrange the postal system and while there in the forties received the startling intelligence that his two sons had become Catholics. Cardinal Bourne's father was one of these and his chances of promotion were not particularly exalted by this step. However his civil career was later cut short through fever developed in Egypt, where he was working in connection with the Suez Canal. He never saw his son a priest though his wife lived to see him a young bishop.

Cardinal Manning was a radical. Cardinal Vaughan was a Conservative. Cardinal Bourne perhaps inheriting the tendency of the civil service is an eclectic in politics, liberal with the Liberals and conservative with the Conservatives. If a labor government came in he would probably, as his Tory friends fear, accommodate himself to labor views, especially as he wrote the most advanced Pastoral from the social point of view during the war. Not allowing himself the luxury of partisanship he accepts the politics of the Government until the Government touches the Church. Then he fights. He fought on the Education Question and a great and non-political moment in his life was when he walked up the Albert Hall between the Duke of Norfolk and John Redmond.

He was far from being the choice of the Duke for Westminster nor could he be described as an intimate of Lord Edmund Talbot. The only lord he was intimate with was Lord Ripon, who was a member of the Liberal Government. He was intimate with Redmond, whom he trusted to safeguard the Catholic schools in England. In public address the Cardinal thanked Redmond and hailed him as the savior of the Catholic schools, both in his lifetime and over his bier. The pointed way in which he did this resulted in sharp criticism from the Duke. At no time was the Cardinal the Duke's man, and his visitation of Arundel was the least consistent with respect. His attitude to the Catholic Women's League caused the complaint that he did not properly distinguish between a duchess and a housemaid. Why should he?

The Cardinal's sympathy to Ireland was shown at least in setting apart a chapel in his cathedral to St. Patrick, where he allowed Mrs. Moore to present an altar of Irish marble. It is more probable that there was a lack of subscriptions than that they were returned to the subscribers. For three years the Gaelic League conducted a service in Irish annually. It was abandoned to the loss of all concerned, chiefly because it became frequented by bands and processions. A test was made as to whether the service was political which the Gaelic League could not accept. But for three years an Irish sermon was delivered in Westminster Cathedral.

When the Eucharistic Congress approached, the Cardinal anxious for Ireland's recognition, took a journey to Ireland for the sole purpose of informing Cardinal Logue and obtaining his presence. Cardinal Logue and Archbishop Healy represented Ireland at the Congress. If Irish laymen were not invited they felt honored in their archbishops.

However, that is a small matter compared to the grave accusation in the case of Roger Casement. Church history will record that Casement was baptized a Catholic, but was not brought up in the faith, so that he could not be said to have fallen from it. When in prison he desired instruction and reconciliation, which is a different and slower process than reception. A reprieve was being strongly urged from America by John Quinn and his friends. The danger of death was not imminent and the ecclesiastical authority made a special inquiry into his dispositions. What exactly passed is covered by the unbreakable seal. All that the historian can discover is that one day the two Irish priests attending Casement broke the Cardinal's retreat to announce his immediate execution and returned with full powers to reconcile and absolve the condemned man. The Cardinal acted automatically as any bishop would in the approach of death. If this is not the full case, let a better informed speak. It will be pleasing to Casement's friends in America to learn, if they have not learned yet, that the Cardinal sent him his blessing, which was not *de rigueur*, and on the day of his execution said Mass for his soul, which in an English prelate was of his charity.

Otherwise he refused to state what had passed between him and Casement, giving an illusion of harshness and a loophole for rumor. Certainly the Cardinal did not condemn Casement's confessor and there was no passage of rebuke between Cardinal and confessor or between Rome and Cardinal. The Cardinal has never received credit for his charity to a condemned man. If the Irish knew what he had done they would pass over the covering letter of his Pastoral. He has not sought popularity. Perhaps he feels that it is better for his soul. He is logical and matter of fact. Bishops who have condescended to a little

Irish sentiment have been able to criticize far more strongly than he. He is a good example of the Englishman who, with the best intentions in the world, has not won the Irish. He takes the strict view of his duty, which is to save the souls of Catholics in England. The perennial difficulty of an English bishop is that the majority of his flock are Irish. Irish priests have been a necessity, but it is erroneous since the war to say that "England is not producing sufficient priests for her needs." Cardinal Vaughan's policy was to employ Irish missionaries. Cardinal Bourne prefers to encourage vocations in England by means of scholarships. It is not the case that the Irish priests avoid the English mission like the plague. But a more native priesthood is being developed in England in answer to the wish of Rome that countries should be converted by priests of that country's nationality.

Finally Cardinal Bourne has seemed cold or careless to Ireland's rights and wrongs. It was rightly suspected, as the event has shown, that his policy was *reculer pour mieux sauter*. He has bided his time and weighed his words. In his American interview he has come out for Ireland as far as an English bishop could. His whole influence, long fostered with the Government, has been thrown toward the withdrawal of the Auxiliaries from Ireland. The case between him and the Irish people cannot yet be judged. If critics wish to pass judgment, they will be wise to wait till his powers and opportunities of serving Ireland are exhausted and until all the facts are disclosed. "Magna est veritas et veritas praevalebit." The truth will make Ireland free of her oppressors and the truth will free the Cardinal from his critics.

London, May 27 Shane Leslie.

MR. MURPHY'S REPLY

If, as Mr. Leslie says, he could write a study of facts, why does not he do so? I do not like to say it, but since he has characterized my article as a study in innuendo and misunderstanding, in common fairness to myself I feel I must. Mr. Leslie cannot write a study of facts in this case for the simple but sufficient reason that he does not know the facts, would not, indeed, be permitted to know them, and only becomes aware of them indirectly when persons like the writer care to lift a corner of the curtain. All Mr. Leslie has done is to give fresh currency to the threadbare and thoroughly discredited gossip of Fleet Street and the clubs.

In his Lenten Pastoral Cardinal Bourne, after having taken shelter behind the robes of the late Cardinal Manning, condemned Sinn Fein without actually mentioning the name of that organization. Mr. Leslie says the most into which this letter can be construed is a condemnation of the Irish Republican Army in so far as it is acting in England today. This, in my judgment, is a nice example of what the lawyers call special pleading. If the Cardinal had wanted to condemn certain Irishmen domiciled in London and other parts of England he was extremely unfortunate in the choice of his words, for every American newspaper that referred to the matter interpreted the Pastoral as an attack upon Sinn Fein. So did I, and so, too, among a host of others, did Mr. Jeremiah MacVeigh, M.P., who will not be accused of any leanings toward Sinn Fein. Nor does Mr. Leslie improve his case by remarking, as he does later on in the same paragraph, that since the appearance of the Lenten Pastoral—copies of which, in violation of precedent, were issued to the London press before it was read to the Catholic public from the pulpit—Cardinal Bourne has given a strongly pro-Irish interview to the Chicago *Tribune*. Mr. Leslie forgets that in between the publication of the Pastoral and the granting of the interview the Cardinal visited Rome. When in the progress of the ages my opponent learns what transpired at the Vatican on that occasion he will come to understand why the Cardinal found it necessary to explain away his Pastoral to the *Tribune* correspondent. It is worthy of note, however, that his Eminence, so far at least, has not amended his interpretation of self-determination as an "illusory phrase." Incidentally, I may remark, there is not now, nor has there ever been, an Irish Republican Army operating in England. The fact that Mr. Leslie says there is clearly indicates that he does not know what he is talking about, and what he does not know he ought not to guess. If Cardinal Bourne thinks that the Irish question will be dealt with either promptly or justly by Parliament I am sorry for him, and sorry, too, for Mr. Leslie, who in order to justify the Cardinal's use of the word Parliament in preference to that of Government solemnly declares that the one is not the equivalent of the other. Mr. Leslie may be interested to learn that three of the four names he mentions, viz., Kenworthy, Benn, and Bentinck, are rarely mentioned except in derision by Irishmen who know them.

Mr. Leslie disputes my statement that the Cardinal is the son of poor parents, and apparently pats himself on the back on his discovery that Bourne's father and grandfather held responsible posts in the British postal service. Well, the second term of my domestic equation is the daughter of one who held a Post Office appointment at least as responsible and remunerative, still he lived and died a poor man. A salary of five thousand dollars a year is practically unknown in the British postal service, and a man in receipt of ten times that amount would be poor in comparison with the late Duke of Norfolk, who was one of the wealthiest noblemen in England.

Mr. Leslie describes the Cardinal as an eclectic in politics. Did Mr. Leslie ever know the Cardinal to speak well, or even justly, of the Liberal Party when a general election was in the offing? No, Mr. Leslie, that will not do. The Cardinal was and is a dyed-in-the-wool Tory.

Whether Bourne was or was not the choice of the Duke of Norfolk for Westminster is altogether beside the point. The fact remains that the Duke and the Cardinal eventually became the closest of personal friends, and in politics were two minds with but a single thought. He was intimate with Redmond because he had to be, but if he trusted Redmond to safeguard the Catholic schools in England, why had Dillon to appeal to Rome over the head of the Cardinal on this very question? The Pope intrusted to the Irish Party the task of safeguarding Catholic education in England, but the Cardinal acted in opposition to the Irish Party, and placed his trust in the Tories.

Mr. Leslie is no better informed when he says that the subscriptions for St. Patrick's altar were returned probably because of their inadequacy. As a matter of actual fact the Cardinal refused them because he disapproved of the political views of those in charge of the movement, one of whom was Mr. Charles Diamond, editor of the *Catholic Herald*. Mr. Diamond, an Irishman, was at this time a supporter of the Irish Party. He is now, I believe, in sympathy with Sinn Fein.

The paragraph which Mr. Leslie devotes to my remarks about what happened at the Eucharistic Congress leaves the matter precisely where he found it. The fact remains that Irish laymen were completely ignored on that occasion, and since Cardinal (then Archbishop) Bourne was in complete charge of the arrangements the responsibility for the slight rests on him. At the Albert Hall meeting the only Irishman who spoke was the late Dr. Healy, Archbishop of Tuam, while Spain, if I mistake not, was represented by two members of the Spanish hierarchy.

But this, as Mr. Leslie rightly says, is a small matter compared to the grave accusation in the case of Roger Casement. I said in my article that the priest—an Irishman attached to the Cardinal's archdiocese—who received Casement back into the Church was rebuked for his action by the Cardinal, and that the Cardinal subsequently visited Rome and endeavored without success to get the Vatican to take disciplinary action against the "offending" cleric. For this high-handed and unChristian act his Eminence was censured by the authorities in Rome, and but for the intervention of the British Foreign Office he would never have been permitted to return to Westminster. My information, which, though reliable, I give with

due reserve, is that he would have been sent to Palestine instead. All that Mr. Leslie can say in defense of the Cardinal is that this matter is covered by the unbreakable seal. The only seal known to the Catholic Church is the seal of the confessional, and the events narrated above are not covered by that seal. If this, says Mr. Leslie, is not the full case let a better informed speak. Well a better informed has spoken, and if he were not better informed he would not have taken it upon himself to speak at all.

I want to make it clear that my grievance against Cardinal Bourne is not because his political views differ so widely from my own. Far be it from me to deny to any man the right to express whatever opinions he likes on public matters. What I do object to, though, and what as a Catholic I have a perfect right to object to, is his subservience to the wirepullers of the Unionist Party and the efforts he is making to turn the Catholic Church in England into an annex of the Carlton Club.

In the circumstances I think Mr. Leslie would have been better advised had he left well enough alone. In dealing the cards afresh he has given me what I have not hesitated to avail myself of, an opportunity to trump his leads.

South Beach, S. I., June 20 P. D. MURPHY

Disparaging Truth?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: How reluctant we are to hear the truth about our country when it is disparaging! Ambassador Harvey said we entered the war to save ourselves. Suppose we did. Our slogan has always been "America first." If he means the ammunition-makers and profiteers he was assuredly right. But whether we entered the war for ourselves or not we did so very reluctantly, for it even became necessary for Congress to pass a conscription act to enable us to procure volunteers.

During the war Job Hedges used to say in some of his speeches: "We never entered this war until God took us by the scruff of the neck and threw us in." If we were really prompted by patriotic motives we should have acted spontaneously, for patriotism should come from within and not be forced.

What are the facts? We entered the war three years after it started. We entered the war after Russia and Rumania had petered out and the Italian forces were driven down to Venice. We entered the war after an English commission headed by Mr. Balfour came over here and implored us to enter the war "to save ourselves."

If we entered the war to make the world safe for democracy our efforts were certainly in vain, for the world was never so unsafe for democracy, alike abroad and at home. If we went to war to abolish militarism we failed ignominiously, for we are virtually establishing the German system of military training and are spending 93 per cent of our taxes for war purposes, while the armies of all other countries, excepting only Germany, are larger than they ever were.

Nor was this a war to prevent war, for the Allies at Versailles did absolutely nothing in this regard, nothing toward disarmament, and there was nothing said about submitting the question of war to the people. The old imperialistic order of things is to be carried on just as it was under Kaiserism, with only the German Kaiser eliminated.

New York, June 20 GEORGE FENTRICK

Contributors to This Issue

E. J. DILLON, author of "The Inside Story of the Peace Conference," is one of the most distinguished of European journalists.

STUART CHASE, economist and statistician, is making a special study of industrial waste.

Not Only Roses

By JOSEPH FREEMAN

Not only roses are beautiful; not only
Islands of fire and gold floating the sky
At twilight; or the chanting of a lonely
Night-bird in the foliage; or the cry
Of stringed instruments conquering symphonies;
Or a perfumed woman sleeping quietly
With face and arms aglow. Not only these
Are perfect with a brief divinity:

There are enchanted hours that transmute
With marvel and design a crooked face;
Dust is a silver veil; a mighty flute
Exults when factories begin to scream;
A twisted city mellows in blue space,
Complete and ultimate like a painter's dream.

Books

Law and the War

International Law and the World War. By James W. Garner. Green & Company. 2 vols.

THE author of these volumes, a well-known professor of political science, has set himself the task of reviewing "the conduct of the belligerents in respect to their interpretation and application of the rules of international law . . . and wherever infractions appeared, to endeavor to determine the responsibility and to place it where it properly belonged." This task at best is no easy one; but the author labored under handicaps which to some extent deprive his work of the authoritative and judicial character with which he hoped to endow it.

The greater part of the work was written prior to the entrance of the United States into the European War and covers the principal questions of law which arose between the respective belligerents and the neutral countries, particularly the United States. The preface is dated 1920, but few events between 1917 and 1920 are recorded. The most useful service rendered by Mr. Garner is in summarizing by subject matter the legislation of the various countries and the diplomatic correspondence connected with the controversies between belligerents and neutrals arising out of the measures adopted by the respective belligerents in the prosecution of the war. This will be greatly appreciated by investigators. He has also evidenced a good sense of proportion in summing up the pre-war rules and practices, to give a background to his discussion of the measures adopted during the late war. But when, in some important chapters, he draws conclusions from the facts—and he has not always had access to disinterested or reliable sources of information—commendation must be more sparing. Obstacles to authoritative and impartial conclusions were too great to overcome—the sources of his information, aside from diplomatic correspondence, were often partial and steeped in advocacy or propaganda; the time when he wrote was not conducive to clear, impartial, and critical thinking; what was the rule of international law, if there was any, was often a debatable question; newspaper and periodical writers were inclined to look with complaisant approval or acquiescence upon the measures adopted by the country they favored, and to denounce the measures of the opposing belligerent. The author admits that for want of German material, "the German defense to many charges made against them for violating the law was not always known" to him, but consoles himself for his loss by saying that "the views of the German jurists on all questions of international law, the

rules of which the Germans were charged with disregarding, were so distorted and colored by partisanship that it may be doubted whether their inaccessibility was a loss of any real consequence." The author's handicaps are thus apparent, and while his denunciation of German violations of law is often well founded, the validity of his conclusions would have been more convincing had there been an equal disposition to test the conduct of the British and French by the same yard-stick of legality. Here, however, Mr. Garner seems occasionally to assume the role of counsel for the Allies rather than that of the impartial judge foreshadowed in the preface. No one could question the author's rigorous honesty; but his marked bias disclosed at numerous places disqualified him from assuming a judicial function.

For example, it is the reviewer's opinion and that of many lawyers who have examined the subject critically that the measures of "blockading" Germany, adopted by the British Order in Council of March 11, 1915, subjecting trade with the neutrals of Europe to Allied control, was as "illegal and indefensible" as the United States said it was; yet Mr. Garner devotes pages to defending it as a "blockade" on his assumed "admitted right of a belligerent to cut off the overseas commerce of the enemy"—an assumption which is legally erroneous, for the "admitted right" is conceded by neutrals solely on the condition of compliance with the rules of contraband and blockade, with which the Allies made no pretense of complying. Mr. Garner makes no reference to Sir Samuel Evans's stricture in the case of The Hakan that it was "not a blockade at all, except for journalistic and political purposes." That Order in Council of March 11, 1915, which violated much of the maritime law of war, was the central factor of the many measures of Allied control of neutral commerce and of that reciprocal series of reprisals which ultimately brought the United States into the war. It also induced the enlarged naval program of the United States, the future effect of which cannot yet be foreseen. In the chapter on contraband the author fails to point out the vital change effected by the British Order in Council of October 29, 1914, shifting the burden of proof from captor to shipper; the latter had to sustain the negative and practically impossible burden of proving that the cargo destined to a neutral trader would not ultimately reach the enemy. The arbitrary extension of contraband lists lost its significance by the imposition of the illegal measure of "blockade." The abolition of conditional contraband was probably a practical step. The chapter on the Transfer of Flag is one of the best in the book. As the author points out, the Declaration of London, though loosely worded, could not have been intended to invalidate the bona-fide sale to neutrals of belligerent merchantmen laid up in neutral ports. In the matter of the British seizure of the mails and the American protest, Mr. Garner says that the American position "rested merely on the narrow technical aspects of the case," and inadequately notices the real crux of the legal issue involved in the American complaint that Allied physical force compelled American owners to divert their neutral ships into British ports and there submit them to Allied jurisdiction. This position was quite independent of the controversy on the right of "visit and search."

In the chapter on armed merchantmen the author adopts standards which a lawyer will probably find some difficulty in supporting. His test of the privilege of a submarine to attack without warning an enemy merchantman lies not in the carriage of armament by the merchantman, but in the character of her orders. If the arms were carried for "self-defense," the merchantman, in his opinion, enjoys immunity. Perhaps this view of the legal relations involved induced the author to relegate to a footnote the important Note of January 18, 1916, in which Secretary Lansing proposed that submarines should be required to adhere to the customary methods of visit and search, in return for the prohibition of armament on merchant vessels, which under prevailing conditions, he said, could be explained only on the ground of a purpose to render such vessels superior in force to submarines and to prevent warning and search by them. Any armament, he added, had the character of "offensive armament." This was the high-water mark of the American legal position. The author accepts, without criticism, the subsequent Memorandum of March 25, 1916, in which the Department of State completely reversed itself, as a correct statement of the law. Such a view will not, I believe, long be entertained. The potentiality of the use of armament is the correct test of the right to attack at sight the vessel carrying it, and while the Germans were clearly wrong in contending that a merchant vessel had no privilege to carry armament, the conclusion that thereby the armed vessel forfeited its immunity from attack at sight is believed to be inescapable.

Mr. Garner insists that the introduction of the submarine could not change the existing rules as to visit and search, for no "single belligerent alone may change the law of the sea to meet his own immediate necessities," but he has no difficulty in defending the unprecedented changes embodied in the Order in Council of March 11, 1915, and the subsidiary violations of law to which it gave rise. The inapplicability of the Hague Conventions, which is pointed out in the beginning of the book, is not always clearly kept in view in testing the legality of particular conduct by the standard they set. Mr. Garner's claim that the rules of neutrality could not be changed in time of war seems to overlook the fact that it was principally in time of war that they were both made and altered. The author's recommendation that the submarine should be eliminated as a commerce destroyer runs counter to the history of war weapons; the law usually accommodates itself to the facts, and belligerents will not be likely to surrender so effective a weapon.

The last war was one in which innovations in belligerent measures and instruments outran the existing law; hence the difficulty of testing their validity by the existing standards. The result was not merely a conflict among the belligerents, but between belligerents and neutrals, respectively, bringing to its aid all the resources of economic, political, and other pressure to obtain recognition for or acquiescence in the departures from existing rules adopted by the respective sides. That diplomatic contest was also won by the Allies. The next great war, the signs and symptoms of which are already becoming visible, will probably bring into issue similar problems. The adherence of the belligerents to legal precepts in its conduct will depend upon the strength and willingness of the neutrals to restrain the belligerents and enforce impartially the rights of neutrals.

EDWIN M. BORCHARD

Priestley in America

Priestley in America (1794-1804). By Edgar F. Smith. P. Blakiston's Son and Co.

PRIESTLEY occupies something of the same place in the history of chemistry that one of the more prominent signers of the Declaration of Independence occupies in the history of the United States. The analogy may be carried even a step further, for the period in which modern chemistry was born coincides pretty closely with the period which witnessed the birth of the American Republic. Priestley's great discovery, the isolation and identification of oxygen, was made in 1774. In seeking for facts dealing with his life in America, Mr. Smith, the present president of the American Chemical Society, has succeeded in unearthing not only much of interest to the student of science, but also to the student of our history.

Had Priestley confined himself to science alone he might have lived and died in his beloved England, honored as one of Albion's worthies. His active mind, however, roved far and wide. The son of a Nonconformist, he held heterodox views on religion, and never failed to express these views in public. Like Tolstoy in our own day, Priestley considered his religious expositions all-important. Chemistry was to him little more than an agreeable pastime: he went to his laboratory in much

the same spirit that our suburbanite goes to his golf club. By profession a clergyman, by avocation a scientist, passionate lover of truth as he saw it, and ever ready to shout this truth from the housetops, he was forever coming into conflict with "law and order." In 1791 a group of Birmingham citizens decided to celebrate the fall of the Bastille, thus arousing the wrath of the majority of the community. Word was passed around that the leading spirit in this "radical" celebration was Joseph Priestley, arch-heretic and chemist; and the mob decided to mete out justice. They burned and sacked Priestley's chapel and house, and Priestley himself narrowly escaped from their clutches. He fled to London and hid himself in Hackney, then a suburb of the metropolis. At the end of three years, thoroughly disheartened and disgusted, he decided to emigrate to America in 1794, at the age of sixty-one.

To the eternal honor of this country, Priestley was regarded in a different light here. Benjamin Franklin, a keen sympathizer, spoke of him as an "honest heretic." "I do not," he writes to a friend, "call him honest by way of distinction, for I think all the heretics I have known have been virtuous men. They have the virtue of fortitude, or they would not venture to own their heresy; and they cannot afford to be deficient in any of the other virtues, or that would give advantage to their enemies. . . . Do not however mistake me. It is not to my good friend's heresy that I impute his honesty. On the contrary 'tis his honesty that has brought upon him the character of heretic."

In New York Priestley received a welcome such as a successful general might envy. The newspapers had glowing accounts of "the illustrious Dr. Priestley," and representatives of various organizations were on hand to do him honor. James Nicholson, the president of the Democratic Society of the City of New York, said in his address: "The governments of the Old World present to us one huge mass of intrigue, corruption, and despotism—most of them are now basely combined to prevent the establishment of liberty in France, and to effect the total destruction of the rights of man. Under these afflicting circumstances we rejoice that America opens her arms to receive, with fraternal affection, the friend of liberty and human happiness."

The Tammany Society, consisting, in 1794, of "a numerous body of freemen who associate to cultivate among them the love of liberty and the enjoyment of the happy republican government under which they live," were also there to do Priestley honor; they "learnt with regret and indignation the abandoned proceedings of those spoilers who destroyed your house and goods, ruined your philosophical apparatus and library, committed to the flames your manuscripts, pryed into the secrets of your private papers, and in their barbarian fury put your life itself into danger."

During his few weeks stay in New York, Priestley was a frequent guest at Governor Clinton's house, and here he met the leaders in public life. He also saw much of Samuel Latham Mitchill, professor of chemistry at Columbia, who brought him in contact with American scientists.

Two of Priestley's sons, who had preceded him to this country, prepared a home for the philosopher in Northumberland, Pennsylvania, and on his way there Priestley stopped in Philadelphia, where the members of the American Philosophical Society, headed by James Woodhouse, were on hand to outdo in welcome their neighbors of New York. Everybody showered him with attentions—in much the way that Einstein and Madame Curie have been "showered" in our own day. Yet the city itself left him cold. "I never saw a town I liked less than Philadelphia," he writes, even after some months of necessary adjustment to a new environment. Mr. Smith attributes this dislike to the town's Quaker inhabitants, who violated all their rules of the simple life by their love for gaudy display. "Nowhere," writes Priestley, "were the women so resplendent in silks, satins, velvets, and brocades, and they piled up their hair mountains high." Priestley was in many ways a clergyman of a very narrow mold. His passion for truth and justice and morality transformed itself into a dislike for anything which smacked of gaiety. Yet it was in Philadelphia that he came in contact with Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. The last two frequently attended church when Priestley occupied the pulpit. "Yours is one of the few lives precious to mankind, and for the continuance of which every thinking man is solicitous," wrote Jefferson to him.

In his home in Northumberland Priestley busied himself with writing a Church history and with carrying out experiments in support of the "phlogiston" theory of burning. Substances that burn, maintained Priestley, give out "phlogiston." "But that is absurd," replied the French chemists, "since a substance *after* burning weighs more than *before* burning"; so that burning must involve an addition to the weight of the substance, and not a subtraction. Lavoisier had shown in a series of epoch-making experiments that this addition was due to that very oxygen that was first isolated by Priestley.

For a scientist Priestley was anything but critical. In fact, on the subject of phlogiston he resembles rather the alchemist of the Middle Ages than the scientist of our day. Lavoisier's balance and the facts it revealed influenced the Englishman little: he chased after phlogiston much as Sir Oliver Lodge chases after the ether. To Priestley discoveries in science were largely a matter of chance: you did one thing and then another with no particular object in view, until some day the goddess Fortune smiled on you and you isolated a gas which supports combustion even better than does air. It would, however, be poor justice to Priestley to draw the inference that he owes his fame to "chance" alone. As a matter of fact, he possessed the inventive faculty to a high degree, and though shaky in his logic, was often remarkably quick in seizing upon essentials. This combination of the instinct of the prophet with the technique of the expert manipulator he shared with another chemist of more recent date, William Ramsay.

BENJAMIN HARROW

How to Know Authors

Emerson: How to Know Him. By Samuel McChord Crothers. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Poe: How to Know Him. By C. Alphonso Smith. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

THERE are two ways of introducing a classic to the young. The commoner one is to dwell on its immense reputation, until the new reader, out of pure shame, is constrained to admit his appreciation of its greatness. The rarer one, reversing the process, is to let the classic actually light up some aspect of the reader's experience, after which he will naturally accept without surprise the news that it has illuminated other experiences in other times and places.

Emerson preferred the latter method. "A good scholar," he says, "will find Aristophanes and Hafiz and Rabelais full of American history." Mr. Crothers finds Emerson full of the year 1921, so full that the reader puts his study of the Concord seer down feeling that if he has allowed his own copy of "Essays, First and Second Series" to collect dust on the shelves he may have been missing the shrewdest available comment on anything from the present state of religion to the Vice-President's last article in the *Delineator*.

The book consists in the main of skilfully chosen quotations from Emerson threaded with brief comment on such seemingly casual chapter headings as The Opener of Doors, This Shallow Americanism, Thou Shalt Not Preach, The Quiet Revolutionist, The Fortunes of the Poor. There is no attempt to be "scholarly" or "exhaustive." But each chapter catches from a fresh angle some aspect of Emerson's genius, until in the end a door has been opened into a world that the reader may continue to explore for himself. Is that not exactly what a volume in the How to Know the Authors series ought to achieve?

The opening chapter, The World-Author, of Professor Smith's book on Poe is a kind of artillery preparation, the shells used being quotations from the magazine of continental "criticism." "Never since Shakespeare has the English language been handled with such art." "His verse is the most magnificent which the English language possesses." "No writer of the English language has penetrated so profoundly the consciousness of the writers of all lands as has Edgar Allan Poe." And so forth. To the seasoned reader, who understands the use of the gas mask, such a bombardment may be harmless. But how about the literary raw recruits that the average readers of a "How to Know Poe" are supposed to be? Isn't this a rather strenuous baptism of fire? The fact is that Mr. Smith, exasperated by detractors of Poe (as he practically confesses in his preface), overstates his own case on the other side.

Poe may indeed have gone to the ends of the earth. So have Longfellow, Henry Ford, Charlie Chaplin, and American missionaries. Not that the cases are parallel. But the point is that criticism is concerned with merit, not with fame or literary "circulation." "This survey of Poe as an international influence," says Mr. Smith, "is not meant to anticipate your own opinion or to coerce your own judgment, but to free it." One need be no psychoanalyst to see in that sentence the author's subconscious confession that the chapter is likely to produce, on the unwary reader, precisely the effect that he disclaims.

The rest of the book is less open to objection. There is a sympathetic presentation of the most attractive side of Poe's personality, while the last four chapters make up an admirably chosen anthology, with introductory comment, comprising over a hundred pages of Poe's criticism, all the more important poems, two short stories entire, Ligeia and The Purloined Letter, and the best of the prose-poem meditations.

Yet in spite of its many merits and the author's enthusiasm for Poe the volume produces no such effect of contemporary interest as does Mr. Crothers's book on Emerson. Poe and Emerson were both extraordinary seminal influences. (Though after all can Poe boast any such progeny as Thoreau, Whitman, and Nietzsche?) But was Poe only that? Was his contribution to technique alone, and are we, with our greater interest in ideas, outgrowing him? Or are there unreaped harvests in Poe awaiting critics in touch, for instance, with the new psychology? The critic is a mediator between his author and the intellectual and spiritual experience of his time. If the mediation fail, the time is never to blame. The blame lies with either the author or the critic.

HAROLD GODDARD.

The Heart of Heloise

Heloise and Abelard. By George Moore. Privately Printed: Boni and Liveright. 2 vols.

THESE immortal lovers have had to wait long for their chronicler in England, but at length a great romancer, a great stylist, a man with most sympathetic knowledge of the depths and wanderings of the human heart, has "blown his living breath between their dead lips" and in his pages they live again. During the last few years it has been known that Mr. Moore was at work upon this story and his admirers have felt that here was a theme calculated to bring out all the finest qualities of his genius. They have not been disappointed. Some readers may find fault with the vagueness of the setting, but that is part of the book's charm, for Mr. Moore has not attempted a "Salammbo." For him the interest lies in the enduring vitality of the love story. Against the hazy background the characters move with startling and convincing truthfulness. Yet upon that background—which reminds one of some mural by Puvis de Chavannes—the novelist has expended elaborate pains. A multitude of clerics and scholars, trouveres and gleemen, lords and ladies, monks and nuns move to and fro through perilous woods or flowery fields or beside pleasant rivers or through the streets of Paris or Blois. A multicolored series of individual episodes passes before our eyes, yet each separate scene is blended and harmonized into the total composition and each scene is softly veiled, as by gauze curtains, from any crude or gross realism. We get repeated glimpses of the life of the gleemen—their aubades, their serventes, their musical instruments, their poverty, and their happiness. Very noteworthy is the scene (a sort of genre piece in the manner of Walter Pater) when a company of these wandering minstrels give a performance in the quadrangle of the convent of Argenteuil before the abbess and the nuns. Another such episode is that in the inn at Saint-Jean-de-Braie when Abelard and Heloise, fleeing from the wrath of her uncle Fulbert, listen to the patter of the peddler who sells knives and combs and girdles and rings and neckerchiefs, and presently to the baser cozening of the pardoner who offers a piece of the sail of Saint Peter's boat and a feather from the tail of the cock that crew on the morning that Peter denied Christ. The placid, industrious monotony of the convent life at Argenteuil, where Heloise with her boy awaits her lover, is pictured with minute fidelity, as is the earlier virginal time when before the coming of Abelard she lives with her uncle the canon of Notre Dame. From a hundred lovely fleeting scenes it is impossible to make a selection for comment and one must be content to note the description of the three-part song given at the beginning of chapter ten—a quite wonderful rendition of the effect of one art in terms of another, recalling the paragraph in A Prince of Court Painters where Pater turns into prose the delicate artificial grace of one of Watteau's courtly groups of ladies and their lovers.

But all this elaborate quiet beauty is merely background; human love and human tragedy make up the stuff of the piece. Several personages of the romance are triumphs of characterization. Astrolabe, the little son of Abelard and Heloise, is not altogether convincingly drawn. Inheriting his father's talents for music, he is a bit too precocious, a bit literary, just a little too like the children in Shakespeare. In Madelon, too, the old Breton servant, there is perhaps too much of the flavor of literary reminiscence; she plays the part of the Nurse to this Juliet, of Martha to this Gretchen. But many of the minor characters (the old Abbess of Argenteuil, for example, dreaming of her long-dead husband) stand out with sharp verisimilitude against the misty vista of long centuries, true distinct portraits. Canon Fulbert is drawn with very remarkable psychological insight—his scholarship and pride, his sensuality and selfishness. Long after she had left his house Heloise recalled an amusing incident that disclosed his selfishness. "He always asked her if she liked the leg of the chicken or the wing, and she answered: the leg, so that he might have all the breast to himself; but one day, to disclose his selfishness, she said: I will take a wing, and he gave her the wing, but with a cry that would have been childish in a child." By a multitude of such small touches Mr. Moore prepares the way for the atrocious revenge wreaked upon Abelard by Fulbert; and here attention may be called to the grave, controlled manner in which allusion to this revenge is introduced.

The two sides of Abelard's nature are harmonized yet kept distinct: on the one hand the trouvere, wandering over France, joining bands of fellow gleemen, composing songs for competitions before the Courts of Love; on the other the illustrious dialectician, pressed upon by crowds of pupils, quelling foolhardy opponents with ferocious words, stirring up first the distrust and at length the persecuting zeal of the authorities of the Church. Both sides of this virile, masterful, passionate nature are drawn to Heloise in whom he finds at once his aptest pupil and his most adoring follower. Reaching back across eight hundred years this chronicler of the twentieth century has seen into the very heart of Heloise: her scholarship, her dignity, her bravery, her utter devotion, her willingness to sacrifice reputation and salvation for her lover's glory, her patient fidelity during the nine years' waiting for Abelard, her final near approach to a feminine and natural despair, when she is sustained only by the courage and firmness of Abelard. To attempt to indicate even the essentials of Mr. Moore's analysis of her character is

beyond the scope of a review of no more than the present dimensions.

Somewhere in "Avowals" Mr. Moore tells of a conversation with Pater in which he told Pater that "Marius" was the one romance in the English language in which unity of tone is preserved from beginning to end. There is a similar unity in "Heloise and Abelard." It is limpid, lucid, sinuous, neither hurrying nor dragging, spreading before us an ample canvas upon which to portray the great lovers. The author himself never appears upon the surface of the book; there is an absolute suppression of personal opinion and prepossession. In various critical remarks upon the novel, in "Avowals" and elsewhere, Mr. Moore has emphasized the importance and difficulty of reproducing the dialogue of real life; he has specially praised Jane Austen for her mastery of "patter." There is a like mastery of patter and chatter here, shown, one may remark, by the fact that nowhere are quotation-marks employed. As one reads, the very modulations of various voices, the changes from baritone to soprano and from soprano to childish treble sound out to us from the page. In the larger aspects of composition the art of the book is equally genuine and sound. The narrative never jerks and jumps, as in the romances of Scott, passing now to one and now to the other chief character; it flows evenly on, the life of Heloise at Nantes, whither she retires to bear her child, being left out of the story, and the nine years' wanderings of Abelard while Heloise is at Argenteuil being told in retrospect after the lovers have met again. (A single unnecessary and rather irritating error must be noted. In the American edition there are inserted in volume two some eight pages of additions and corrections that were written too late to appear in their proper place in the text. A publisher's note gives an incorrect indication of where these pages belong. They should *not* be read "before the first paragraph, p. 19, vol. 2." They are an amplification of the paragraph beginning toward the bottom of page 22. Unless this is noted the course of the story will be seriously interrupted and confused.)

Their chronicler leaves his lovers as they are journeying toward the convent of the Paraclete where their final parting is to come. But as we close the book our thoughts turn to the old legend, to which Mr. Moore quite properly makes no allusion, that when the body of Abelard was lowered into the grave of Heloise the arms that had so often embraced him opened once more to receive her lover. When Englishmen next stand beside the traditional tomb in Père Lachaise it will not be necessary to think of Pope's elegantly transmogrified lovers. For Mr. Moore has made the theme his own.

SAMUEL C. CHEW

Current History

IF any one doubts that the verse of Heine

Deutschland hat ewigen Bestand,
Es ist ein kerngesundes Land,

is as true today as it was a hundred years ago, he would do well to examine the scientific, philosophical, and historical literature produced by Germany during and since the war. It is an astonishing proof of the intellectual vitality of that country. My friend, Professor Edwin Plimpton Adams, the distinguished physicist of Princeton University, who fought in the British army before America entered the war, tells me that he has spent most of his time since his discharge "catching up" with what the Germans have done in his specialty while he was fighting. So it is also in history. The present review is not intended to cover any but the last year or so, and only to mention a few of the most outstanding works even in that period.

The greatest popular sensation has been made by one of the least valuable of recent German books, Oswald Spengler's "Untergang des Abendlandes." That the first bulky volume of this work sold 30,000 copies within a few months was partly due to the appeal of the dramatic title to the mood of a tragic time. To the average European it may well seem that not only the Occident but the world is tottering to its fall; and yet so little was the German defeat in the author's mind when he wrote that his few allusions to the war expect a German victory, while the greater part of the work was composed before the conflict broke out. If he believes in the decay of Western civilization it is not because of any sudden catastrophe, however terrible, but for other reasons drawn from a peculiar philosophy of history which he prefers to call "a morphology of history." He has convinced himself that human culture as a whole consists of single organic forms of civilization, each one of which leads a life analogous to that of a plant or animal; in other words, it is born by a special act, grows, ripens, decays, and dies. Such expressions as "a young and vigorous civilization," "a decrepit and moribund people," are commonly used as more or less conscious metaphors; but Spengler believes that they correspond to actual facts in the nature of things.

This being established, the author surveys the past and arrives at the conclusion that, disregarding the abortive civilizations which have met an untimely death analogous to disease or accident to the individual, there have been up to the present eight fully developed "cultures." One of these, the Mayan or Central American, lies completely outside the influence of the others; two, the Hindu and Chinese, are but slightly affected by external influence; the other five, arising in or near Europe, have powerfully interacted and competed; they are the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Classic (Greek and Roman), the Arabian or Magic (beginning with our common era and including the Byzantine and Mohammedan and the early Christian), the Faustian or Modern European (beginning with Charlemagne and extending to our day), and the Russian, which is evidently thought of as yet in its early youth and as probably the heir-at-law of our intellectual life. How can one recognize each type of culture, which sometimes manifests itself in such different races as the Greek and Roman, or in so diverse creeds as the Christian and Mohammedan? Spengler's answer is, by the unity of style stamping all the products of its genius. We all have an idea of the "classic" derived from the Greco-Roman world; we all know the "magical" quality of the early Middle Ages. Our own time is "Faustian" in pressing toward the infinite; its characteristic science is the infinitesimal calculus, and its characteristic art contrapuntal music.

For many persons the chief interest in Spengler's work lies in his predictions of the future, which he accomplishes by a sort of extrapolation. By putting all the various civilizations in an historical framework in which the parallels are made to strike the eye, he claims that he has made history "Copernican" instead of "Ptolemaic" or self-centered, as his predecessors have done. Thus he is enabled to foretell what course our civilization will take by comparing it with the life-forms that have preceded it. His general conclusion is that socialism and imperialism will increase for the next two centuries, and be accompanied by upheavals of increasing violence which will bring the end soon after the year 2200.

There is only one little fault to find with Spengler's grandiose thesis: it is delusion from beginning to end. Examine his enormous tables of parallels and see how he has had to sweat to make them fit into his scheme; how often literary and art forms are assumed to have been present but not now extant; how often perfectly remote phenomena are treated as analogous. The scheme, impressive as it is and dressed with much wit and occasional acumen, is not founded on empirical history, but is—to use the old cliché—"evolved from his inner consciousness," and is plainly derived from a romantic and all-too-zealous poring over Schelling and Nietzsche. Even the oracular, portentously self-confident tone is the voice of Nietzsche.

At the very antipodes of "The Decline of the Occident" stands the "Geschichte der Päpste," by Ludwig Pastor, recently ennobled as Freiherr von Pastor. The seventh and eighth volumes, covering the reigns of Pius IV and Pius V (1560-72), have just appeared, like their predecessors dense with new knowledge, thorough, exhaustive, wide in grasp, and close and pleasant in presentation. From the touching introduction we learn the hopes of the good old scholar that such works as his, and such influences as that of religion, may prove internationally binding forces to heal the horrible wounds of bleeding Europe. To recapitulate the contents of these two volumes would be to summarize the history of Europe for twelve eventful years, both in politics and in art and music (for Pastor devotes some pages to Palestrina and his fellows). Let us hope that the great work may soon be completed and that the recent volumes may soon find, as the first five German volumes found, an English translator.

A worker in the same period as Pastor is Max Lenz, whose seventieth birthday Germany is now celebrating, and the second volume of whose "Kleine Historische Schriften" is recently out. Containing essays on various subjects ranging in chronology from Luther to Bismarck, it exhibits perfectly the thought of the historian who has been called the truest disciple of Ranke. Doubtless he is inferior to Ranke both in learning and in clarity of style. The writer of this article has often heard him lecture and was chiefly struck at the time by his habitual transition from one subject to another: "Und damit, meine Herren," with the "damit" accented heavily, as Mark Twain thought it should be, on the first syllable. But he has Ranke's old-fashioned-liberal point of view, a most amiable weakness in a Berlin professor. At the same time he is intensely patriotic, choosing the Reformation for his favorite topic, as being "the proper German thought" from which German philosophy, "the deepest of all centuries," and "the giant edifice of science" have both originated. Compared to that revolution, I once heard him say, looking dreamily out from the fine Hessian castle at Marburg, "all other revolutions were mere child's play."

As Treitschke now passes for one of the typical prophets of Russianism, the publication of his correspondence, of which the third volume, covering the period 1866-1896, has just appeared, will doubtless excite some interest. It shows his prejudices and his dogmatism even more plainly than his history. The following extract from a love-letter to his betrothed illustrates half painfully, half amusingly his peculiar type of mind: "Sempiero, the greatest hero of the Corsicans, killed his beloved wife because she, to save her children, had betrayed Corsica. This historical anecdote always had for me a demonic attraction, because I have had such feelings and impulses myself."

PRESERVED SMITH

Drama

America at Play

IN the city of New York we are proud of the progress of the American theater. We discuss the Theater Guild productions; we express subtle reflections on the third style of Robert Edmond Jones or the directing of Frank Reicher. We sit in solemn conclaves prophesying the growth of a great native drama. Weary of such superb occupations we stroll to Carnegie Hall and hear Mengelberg conduct Tchaikovsky's Fifth Symphony. Next year we shall hear the great Richard Strauss himself. We are not deeply stirred. These things are our portion. Meanwhile the city of Deadwood, S. D., advertises for "good-looking lady to handle snakes."[1]

It is then that we are shaken. This island of Manhattan and its brief midwinter reflections in Chicago and Boston—what have these things to do with America? Our country is a continent. There are ten thousand towns. Rome fades into insignificance. O excellent first-nighter at a new Arthur Hopkins production, do you know how your fellow-countrymen take their pleasures at Williamsport, O., Ft. Collins, Col., Brownstown, Ind., Mount Etna, Ia., Kaney, Kan., Falls City, Neb., Homer, La., Las Vegas, N. M., Fairmont, W. V., Troy, Ala., Bradford, N. H., Columbus, Ga.? You do not. You have a vague notion that there are picture shows everywhere. It is true. But man is not content with the flat shadows of the screen. He wants dimensions, thickness, human warmth. He wants voices and bodies. So the American of the species who is a thousand miles from Broadway organizes "Round Ups," "American Legion Roundups," "Moose Roundups," "Jubilees," "Homecomings," "Farm Bureau Celebrations," "Spring Rodeos," "Merchants' Carnivals," "Old Settlers' Picnics," "Cowboys' Reunions," "Boosters' Association Frolics," and "County Fairs." Thither, if his town is by a great river, he summons the show-boats "Superior" or "Columbus" or "The Princess." If he is inland he calls for drama or burlesque "under canvas," for, let us say, Ben Wilkes's Big Tent Show or Zarrow's English Daisies or Billy Ireland's Blackeyed Susans Company.

Around some such central attraction a pleasure park is laid out which is commonly "situated in center of city near Main Street." Then advertisements are sent out for the minor shows that are to cluster around the central one, for "anything nifty, classy, and attractive," in the pregnant words of the American Legion Post at Philippi, W. V., and also for concessionnaires to put up their numerous and gaudy booths.

What is it that the people desire to see? The traveling showmen know. They are astute purveyors with highly organized instincts and plans. Let us dwell on their advertised needs, on the things which they know will be considered "nifty, classy, and attractive." They want—no words will do but their original and authentic ones—mermaids, sea-serpents and devil fish, two-headed giant, devil child, Siamese twins, lady palmists not over 35 (must be neat), women for Eliza and Ophelia, lady for Topsy (note the eternity of "Uncle Tom's Cabin"), two monstrous porcupines, hand-raised coyotes, alligators, crocodiles, bucking horses, the "smallest midget horse in the world," monkeys (ring-tail and Rhesus), boa snakes, fat girls, young male lion ("pedestal broke"), black-faced comedians—especially for medicine shows—sea lions, clowns and wire-performers, "babies in bottle," hula-hula dancers, girls for posing, acrobats, mind readers, magicians, glass-blowers, tattoo artists, ventriloquists, fancy roller skaters, chorus girls, dancing girls, Russian dancers, and performers on the calliope. We omit the bands, jazz and otherwise, the harmless, necessary carousels and Ferris wheels.

One has no difficulty now in summoning up the vision of these parks. It is hard to tell the "townspeople" from the "peasantry" since "store-clothes" are universal. They watch strange animals from the ends of the earth and clowns and tumblers and fake monstrosities and laugh at the slap-stick antics of the black-faced comedians and wander—especially the young men and women—into the tawdry tents of the tellers of fortunes and casters of horoscopes. (The horoscopes come in printed form and regular assortments and are manufactured in New York.) The weary dancers are in frayed tights and the medicine men are hoarse. But the crowd refreshes itself at the "look-house" and the "juice-house" and listens dreamily in the intervals of more active amusements to the band which plays Some Little Bird, In Candy Land with You, Dance Me on Your Knee, or the Blooey Blues Fox Trot and Oh, Please, Mr. Bird Man, Won't You Take Me Up in the Air, a composition described variously as "a dandy for dancing" and a "sure winner."

There are not only things to see and admire but others which one can buy and take home. Dolls are a great article. But not dolls for children. Comic, impudent, faintly provocative little images are popular—"Kewpie style dolls," "Jazz Kids," "Toddles Dolls," the "Kimball Kids," and the "Shimmie Dolls." There are Indian blankets and Chinese baskets (all cheap imitations manufactured in the East and shipped by the gross), lamps and knives and whistles, artificial mice and glassware, Elk and Moose insignia. And who shall describe the varieties

[1] We here depend upon information taken from such organs as *The Billboard* and from conversation with experts intimately in contact with the more casual strata of entertainments and entertainers.

of "ball gum" and "peerless pop-corn," the "flashy" boxes of chocolates—"½ lb. candy. Looks like 1 lb."—and the ice cream sandwiches? Strange, pinchbeck gaieties and indulgences from which these childlike people lapse back into the prosaic hum of small towns and the silences of the farms.

Another vision arises from these dusty scenes. Think of the vagrant players and dancers and barkers and freaks, of their relations to each other and to the populace which they astonish and amuse. A showman advertises: "Can use 1 more real Act or Fat Girl. Must be fat." Who would not wish to be for an hour within the soul of the applicants considering the measure of their proud obesity? A West Virginia community issues the call: "Cabaret dancers, come on. We treat you right." How, one wonders, are the cabaret dancers treated as a rule? The tone used to these "artists" by their prospective employers is not gentle. The showmen seem to be a querulous and busy lot. "The war is over, so come back to earth!" one of them shouts to his future helots. "Tell it all in first letter!" is the concise warning of another. Their impatience occasionally reaches an extraordinary picturesqueness of speech. A showman who wants a boxer writes: "Yellow birds, save stamps." That is almost grandiose.

Within the big show organizations there is, of course, stir and pride and festiveness when business is good. Thus when the Ed. A. Evans Shows struck Lincoln, Ill., "the midway was packed each night and shows and concessions got their first big money of the season." A musical comedy organization joined the shows that week and of it the press representative writes: "They can well be proud of their good-looking girls and swell flash on the bally as well as the high-class performance inside." Other great things happened. "Jazzbo Jim, the Jazzbo Baby, late of the Jazzing Minstrels, joined with the minstrel show." Everybody was in good humor and birthdays were celebrated. "Ruby Doby had hers on April 22." The heart of Ruby was not entirely quiet. She asked the press representative to say that "she would like for somebody to notify Doc Hall." There is a hidden pathos here. Who would not wish to know the story of Ruby Doby and Doc Hall? Consider, too, that these were pleasant and prosperous days. We can imagine a rainy week with no takings. The midway is empty. The sodden tent-flaps drip. The managers are surly. Dancing girls, freaks, acrobats, singers, players, huddle under their canvas in their "flash" costumes. What stuff for fiction! What sturdy young novelist will travel from town to town with the show-people and report their cause? A great book, a very great book, is to be written here. We know the story of the fashionable fiddler, his years in Vienna, his struggles, his loves. But there is the unwritten epic—broad as the earth, vulgar as humanity, packed with the savor and color of American life—the epic that shall relate the adventures and amours of "Jazzbo Jim, the Jazzbo Baby," how he got his name, celebrated his triumphs, endured his decay.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

International Relations Section

Why France Demobilized the Class of 1919

THE following are extracts from the mobilization diary which *l'Humanité* has been publishing ever since the class of 1919 was called out in the middle of May. The demonstrations resulted in an official inquiry and the subsequent gradual demobilization of the entire class, but the affair has been ignored by the bourgeois press except for an occasional attack upon the Government for ordering the demobilization.

May 15: A detachment of the 13th C. O. A. left Epinal for the Ruhr Monday night singing vigorously the International and our other revolutionary hymns. On Monday afternoon the men of the 13th who remained protested energetically against the bad food and refused service in protest.

The men of the 153rd infantry, at Romorantin, walked through the town accompanied by under-officers, preceded by the red flag. As a disciplinary measure those recalled were sent to join the 113th at Alais.

The first detachment of the 135th infantry, at Angers, left singing the International.

May 16: The officers of the 2nd squadron at Nancy searched the cantonments under the pretext that "suspicious propaganda" had been carried on by some reservists. One of them was imprisoned. As a protest the men of squadron 57, at Essey-les-Nancy, paraded, singing the International and crying "Down with the army!"

In the 109th R. A. L., at Poitiers, as soon as the news of the first demonstrations was spread, a hundred reservists assembled at 9 p. m. one night last week in the court-yard and shouted for demobilization. Immediately all the windows were opened and a general clamor arose, with all the reservists shouting and whistling.

May 18: At Bar-le-Duc, on May 14, a regiment of class '19 set out for an unknown destination. From the barracks to the station the boys sang the International vigorously, and the regiment came very near the point of revolt. Cries of "Down with the war!" alternated with the revolutionary hymn all along the road. Seventy comrades refused to go. They were imprisoned today.

May 19: In the 161st R. I., of Melun, the reserves were kept in the barracks for five days with almost no food. They were then sent to join the 110th infantry at Dunkirk. They left with cries of "Long live the Soviets!" and "Down with the National Bloc!"

The first and fourth groups of the 34th aviation, of Bourget, marched to the Pantin station last Sunday morning singing the International.

May 20: The military authorities concentrated at Plombières several important detachments of the 30th light infantry battalion and of the 26th and 12th infantry regiment, on the occasion of the departure for the Ruhr. On Tuesday night the soldiers demonstrated their discontent by forming a column and singing the International. The light infantry gave the signal by hoisting the red flag, and soon after the streets of this city were filled with the cry of "Down with war!" The staff was at its wit's end. A light infantry lieutenant who attempted to restore order among the demonstrators was knocked about. Then detachments of the 26th dragoons, cavalry gendarmes, and a company of the 27th infantry regiment were sent from Dijon to restore order. An encounter took place between the soldiers and a patrol, to the great disadvantage of the latter. As night drew on the demonstration subsided; but on Wednesday morning they started in afresh, and when the alarm for departure sounded at 3 o'clock the officers were forced to leave the soldiers. Toward 10 o'clock auto-trucks took the soldiers to Dijon for embarkation. Violent protests were held on the platform where the train, composed of cattle cars, was awaiting them. General Arbanère sent troops. A company of the 27th infantry surveyed the embarkation with fixed bayonets. Cavalrymen were assembled in a corner of the station ready to intervene. At twenty minutes past three the train pulled out and all voices joined in the International.

At Camp Avours, commune of Champagne, in the Sarthe, on May 13, the men joined in singing the International before Captain Garmer. Those on leave sang the International at the Saint-Eloi-les-Mines station. At Montferrand our revolutionary hymn sounded through the streets. In the same town the third cavalry, the 13th artillery, and the 13th train set out on May 18 singing the International and crying "Down with war! Down with the army! Revolution!" Red flags were hoisted on the cars and the officers could not get them taken down. They floated in the wind through the whole journey. At Moulins detachments of the 92nd infantry and the 33rd and 36th artillery set out crying "Down with the army!" At Saint-Etienne the men of the 14th dragoons and the 16th R. I. got up and sang the International.

May 21: On May 18, at 11 p. m. at the Chateaux station, a detachment of 250 men belonging to the 9th section of hospital attendants marched from the barracks to the station shouting "Down with war!" and "Down with militarism!" and singing the International.

Two weeks ago 400 men belonging to the 90th R. I. demonstrated, and ignored their officers. The men of the 110th R. I. at Dunkirk demanded their liberation, ignored their officers, organized a parade in the court-yard, and refused service. The *Nord Maritime*, slandering the participants, confirms our information. General Lacanelle, by issuing heavy penalties, admits the truth of these statements.

May 22: On May 18, in the station at Vannes, a detachment of 600 men set out, belonging to the 35th artillery. The band played the Marseillaise. The poilus retorted by singing the International and shouting "Down with war!"

On May 14, at Oréteil, 400 men crossed the town at 7 a. m., singing the International and shouting "Let's eat! Let's eat!"

On May 16 a detachment of the 21st colonial left the fort of Bicêtre and marched down Tolbiac Street singing the International. When they returned the command of Lieutenant Lépine to punish the men was ignored. Two sergeants who would not reprimand the men were demoted.

At Saintes 1,500 poilus left for Trèves and arrived at the station singing the International. The cattle cars were decorated with red flags at Saint Mariner, and revolutionary songs were played.

May 23: Reprinted from the National Bloc paper, *Le Populaire de Nantes*, May 20: "*Regrettable incident:* On Wednesday evening a detachment of the class of '19 left Vannes by special train for Trèves. Just when the train was starting and the band was playing the Marseillaise, strains of the International arose from all parts of the train, together with cries of 'Down with war!' 'Long live the International!'"

May 24: Dispatch sent by the station master at Saint Mariens to the Bordeaux commander: "Warn commander at Bordeaux that soldiers belonging to the convoys transported by train 5082-5084 hoisted the red flag and sang the International."

May 26: Reserves now cantoned at Germersheim, after traveling four days and three nights in street cars, were threatened with horse-whips by their adjutants upon their arrival at Trèves. They lay down on the ground and refused to advance.

The men of the 22nd battalion of the 21st colonials traveled as far as Crefeld, Germany, hoisting the red flag on their cars and singing the International.

May 27: Men of the 34th R. I. C. traveled two days, packed like sardines, with 30-40 men in a compartment. Upon their arrival, they were piled into the barracks and for two days all they had was a little revolting soup without bread, and morning and evening exercises. They had to sleep on straw.

May 28: The 9th company of the 151st R. I. now quartered at Solingen, Germany, has started to revolt, and is being followed by others. They show this by singing the International. Efforts of the commander to restore order were ignored. The men refused to assemble for drill.

May 31: Twelve hundred poilus of the 14th equipment train left for Lyons hoisting the red flag on their cars, and singing the International in stations and crowded places.

The End of Free Trade in England

THE British Government's new Safeguarding of Industries Bill, printed below, is described as a measure "to impose duties of customs on certain goods with a view to the safeguarding of certain special industries and the safeguarding of employment in industries in the United Kingdom against the effects of the depreciation of foreign currencies, and the disposal of imported goods at prices below the cost of production, and for purposes connected therewith."

Part I: Safeguarding of Key Industries

Clause 1: Charge of Duties

(1) Subject to the provisions of this act there shall be charged, levied, and paid on the goods specified in the schedule to this act, on the importation thereof into the United Kingdom, duties of customs equal to one-third of the value of the goods.

(2) Where any other duties of customs, not being duties chargeable under Part II of this act, are chargeable in respect of any goods chargeable with duty under this section, duty under this section shall not be charged except in so far as the amount thereof exceeds the amount of those other duties.

(3) No duty shall be charged under this section on goods which are shown to the satisfaction of the commissioners to have been consigned from and grown, produced, or manufactured in the British Empire, and for the purposes of this subsection goods shall be deemed to have been manufactured in the British Empire which would be treated as having been so manufactured for the purposes of section eight of the Finance Act, 1919 (which relates to Imperial preference), and that section shall apply accordingly.

(4) Where an imported article is a compound article of which an article liable to duty under this section is an ingredient or forms part, no duty shall be charged under this section in respect of the compound article if the compound is of such a nature that the article liable to duty has lost its identity, and any dispute as to whether an article has lost its identity shall be determined in like manner as disputes as to whether goods are goods specified in the schedule to this act.

(5) For the purpose of preventing disputes arising as to whether any goods are or are not any goods chargeable with duty under this part of this act the Board [of Trade] may from time to time issue lists defining the articles which are to be taken as falling under any of the general descriptions set out in the said schedule, and where any list is so issued defining the articles which are to be taken as falling under any such general description, the said schedule shall have effect as if the articles comprised in the list were therein substituted for that general description.

Every list issued under this section shall be published forthwith in the London, Edinburgh, and Dublin gazettes, and in such other manner as the Board think proper.

If within three months after the publication of any such list any person appearing to the Board to be interested delivers to the Board a written notice complaining that any article has been improperly included in, or excluded from, the list, the Board shall refer the complaint to a referee to be appointed by the Treasury, and the decision of the referee shall be final and conclusive, and the list shall be amended so far as is necessary in order to give effect to the decision, without prejudice, however, to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.

Part II: Prevention of Dumping

Clause 2: Definition of Dumping

(1) If, on complaint being made to the Board to that effect, it appears to the Board that goods of any class or description (other than articles of food or drink) manufactured in a country outside the United Kingdom are being sold or offered for sale in the United Kingdom (a) at prices below the cost of production thereof as hereinafter defined, or (b) at prices which, by reason of depreciation in the value in relation to sterling of the currency of the country in which the goods are manufactured, are below the prices at which similar goods can be profitably manufactured in the United Kingdom; and that by reason thereof employment in any industry in the United Kingdom is being or is likely to be seriously affected, the Board may refer the matter for inquiry to a committee constituted for the purposes of this part of this act.

(2) If the committee report that as respects goods of any class or description manufactured in any country the conditions aforesaid are fulfilled the Board may by order apply this part of this act to goods of that class or description if manufactured in that country, provided that no such order shall be made which is at variance with any treaty, convention, or engagement with any foreign state in force for the time being.

(3) An order made under this section shall be laid before the Commons House of Parliament as soon as may be after it is made for a period of twenty-one days during which that House has sat, and if that House before the expiration of that period presents an address to his Majesty against the order his Majesty in Council may annul the order, and thereupon the order shall become void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.

Clause 3: Charge of Duties on Dumped Goods

(1) Subject to the provisions of this part of this act, there shall be charged, levied, and paid on goods of any class or description in respect of which an order has been made under this part of this act, if manufactured in any of the countries specified in the order, on the importation thereof into the United Kingdom, in addition to any other duties of customs chargeable thereon, duties of customs equal to one-third of the value of the goods.

(2) Where goods are manufactured partly in one country and partly in another, or undergo different processes in different countries, and any one or more of those countries are countries in relation to which an order applying to the goods in question has been made under this part of this act, the goods shall be liable to duty under this part of this act unless it is proved to the satisfaction of the commissioners that 50 per cent or more of the value of the goods at the time of export to the United Kingdom is attributable to processes of manufacture undergone since the goods last left any country in relation to which such an order has been made.

(3) An order under this part of this act may extend to goods brought back into the United Kingdom after having been exported therefrom for the purpose of undergoing any process out of the United Kingdom, and in such case the goods shall be deemed for the purposes of this part of this act to have been manufactured in the country in which they have undergone such process, but the importer shall, on proof to the satisfaction of the commissioners of the value of the goods free on board at the time of such exportation, and of the identity thereof, and that no drawback has been allowed thereon on the exportation thereof, be entitled to be repaid by the commissioners such proportion of the duty paid under this part of this act, on the goods so brought back after having undergone such process as aforesaid as represents the duty on the value of the goods before exportation.

Clause 4: Remission and Repayment

Where an order has been made under this part of this act applying this part of this act to goods of any class or description on the ground that goods of that class or description being sold or offered for sale in the United Kingdom at prices below the cost of production thereof, the following provisions shall have effect:

(1) If any person by whom any duty would be payable proves to the satisfaction of the commissioners that the goods in respect of which the duty is payable have already been sold in the United Kingdom at a price which was not less than the cost of production the payment of duty shall be remitted.

(2) If any person by whom any duty has been paid proves to the satisfaction of the commissioners that the goods were on the first sale thereof within the United Kingdom sold at a price which was not less than the cost of production of the goods, or where there has been a change in the market conditions of the country of manufacture, not less than the amount which would on the date of sale have been the cost of production in that country of similar goods he shall be entitled to repayment of the duty so paid.

(3) No such remission or repayment of duty shall be made, unless and until there is produced to the commissioners a declaration in the prescribed form made by the consignor of the goods stating the cost of production, at the date of the declaration, of the goods, and the country of manufacture of the goods certified by a British consular officer, or by some other person duly authorized by the Board to give certificates for the purposes of this part of this act, to be to the best of his knowledge and belief a true declaration.

For the purpose of any claim to remission or repayment of duty under this section, the declaration by the consignor, duly certified by a British consular officer or other person as aforesaid, shall be conclusive evidence of the amount of the cost of production of the goods to which the declaration relates.

A certificate under this section shall be in such form and be subject to such conditions as to period of validity and otherwise as the Board may direct.

(4) Where goods which have been charged with duty are, without being sold, used in the United Kingdom for any purpose, they shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed on being so used to have been sold, and in such a case the sale price shall for the purposes aforesaid be taken to be an amount representing the price at which the goods were actually purchased from the exporter, together with freight and insurance and the amount of any import duty, other than the duty under this part of this act, which may have been paid in respect of the goods.

Clause 5: Proof of Origin

It shall be lawful for the commissioners, in the case of any goods which if manufactured in a particular country would be liable to duty under this part of this act, to require the importer to furnish to the commissioners proof in the prescribed form with respect to the country of manufacture of the goods, and if such proof is not furnished to the satisfaction of the commissioners the goods shall be deemed to be goods manufactured in the first-mentioned country, provided the commissioners shall require such proof in the case only of goods consigned from such countries as the Board may direct.

Clause 6: Exceptions

Subject to such conditions as the commissioners may direct for securing that the provisions of this part of this act shall not be evaded, this part of this act shall not apply to any goods which had left the place from which they were consigned to the United Kingdom not later than seven days after the date of the order applying this part of this act to goods of the class or description in question.

Clause 7: Constitution of Committees

(1) A committee for the purpose of this part of this act shall consist of three persons selected by the president of the Board from a permanent panel of persons appointed by him who shall be mainly persons of commercial or industrial experience.

(2) Any person whose interests may be materially affected by any action which may be taken on the report of a committee shall not be eligible for selection as a member of the committee.

(3) A committee to whom any matter is referred under this part of this act shall forthwith inquire into the matter so referred and report thereon to the president of the Board.

Clause 8: Cost of Production

In this part of this act the expression "cost of production" in relation to goods of any class or description means the current sterling equivalent of (a) the whole price at the works charged for goods of the class or description for consumption in the country of manufacture, or (b) if no such goods are sold for consumption in that country, the price which, having regard to the prices charged for goods as near as may be similar when so sold or when sold for exportation to other countries, would be so charged if the goods were sold in that country; after deducting in either case any excise or other internal duty leviable in that country.

Clause 9: Duration of Orders

An order made under this part of this act shall, unless previously revoked by the Board, continue in force for three years or such less period as may be specified in the order; but any such order may, subject to the provisions of this part of this act, be renewed from time to time by an order made in like manner and subject to the like conditions as the original order:

Provided that the Board shall not have power to revoke any such order except after reference to and consideration of any report thereon by a committee constituted under this part of this act, and that an order made on the ground of depreciation of foreign currency shall not be made or continue in force after the expiration of three years from the passing of this act.

Part III: General Provisions

Clause 10: Value of Goods

(1) The value of any imported goods for the purpose of this act shall be taken to be the price which an importer would give for the goods if the goods were delivered to him freight and insurance paid, in bond at the port of importation, and duty shall be paid on that value as fixed by the commissioners.

(2) If in ascertaining the proper rate of duty chargeable on any goods under this act any dispute arises as to the value of the goods, that question shall be referred to a referee appointed by the Treasury, and the decision of the referee with respect to the matter in dispute shall be final and conclusive.

Sections thirty and thirty-one of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, shall, as respects any such dispute as to value, have effect as if an application for a reference to a referee under this provision were substituted for the action or suit mentioned in those sections.

Clause 11: Determination of Disputes

If any dispute arises as to whether any goods imported into the United Kingdom are goods specified in the schedule to this act or in any list made by the Board under part 1 of this act, or are goods to which an order made under part 2 of this act applies, the question shall be referred to a referee to be appointed by the Treasury, and the decision of the referee with respect to the matter in dispute shall be final and conclusive, and sections thirty and thirty-one of the Customs Consolida-

tion Act, 1876, shall apply as if the dispute were a dispute as to the proper rate of duty payable, with the substitution of an application for a reference to a referee under this section for the action or suit mentioned in those sections.

CLAUSE 12: SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS

(1) If it is proved to the satisfaction of the commissioners that a duty of customs has been duly paid in respect of any goods under this act, and the goods have not been used in the United Kingdom, a drawback equal to the amount of duty paid shall be allowed on those goods if exported as merchandise.

(2) Section six of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, shall not apply to goods liable to duties of customs under this act, and any such goods imported into the United Kingdom after exportation therefrom shall be exempt from duty, if it is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioners either that the goods had not been imported previously to exportation, or that no drawback of duty was allowed on exportation, or that any drawback so allowed has been repaid to the Exchequer, provided that goods which have been imported and exported by way of transit under bond shall not be deemed to have been imported or exported under this provision.

CLAUSE 13: EXCEPTIONS

Subject to compliance with such conditions as to security for the reexportation of the goods as the commissioners may impose, this act shall not apply to goods imported for exportation after transit through the United Kingdom or by way of transshipment.

CLAUSE 14: INTERPRETATION

1. In this act:

The expression "the Board" means the Board of Trade; and anything authorized under this act to be done by the Board may be done by the president, or a secretary or assistant secretary, of the Board, or by any person authorized in that behalf by the president of the Board. . . .

Part 1 of this act shall continue in force for a period of five years from the commencement thereof and no longer.

THE SCHEDULE: GOODS CHARGEABLE WITH DUTY

Optical glass and optical elements, whether finished or not, microscopes, field and opera glasses, theodolites, sextants, spectroscopes, and other optical instruments.

Beakers, fiasks, burettes, measuring cylinders, thermometers, tubing, and other scientific glassware and lamp-blown ware, evaporating dishes, crucibles, combustion boats, and other laboratory porcelain.

Galvanometers, pyrometers, electroscopes, barometers, analytical and other precision balances, and other scientific instruments, gauges, and measuring instruments of precision of the types used in engineering machine-shops and viewing-rooms, whether for use in such shops or rooms or not.

Wireless valves and similar rectifiers and vacuum tubes; ignition magnetos and permanent magnets; arc-lamp carbons; hosiery latch needles; metallic tungsten, ferro-tungsten, and manufactured products of metallic tungsten, and compounds (not including ores or minerals) of thorium, cerium, and the other rare earth metals.

All synthetic organic chemicals (other than synthetic organic dyestuffs, colors, and coloring matters imported for use as such, and organic intermediate products imported for their manufacture), analytical reagents, all other fine chemicals and chemicals manufactured by fermentation processes.

$3,000,000
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

10 to 27 Year 5¾% State Bonds

Exempt from Federal Income Tax, Including Surtax

(Also exempt from all taxes in North Dakota)

Interest Payable Semi-Annually in Gold, January 1 and July 1, each year, at New York, Chicago and Bismarck

Maturities: 1931, 1936, 1941, 1946, 1948
Denominations $100, $500, $1000

Full Credit Obligation of State — These bonds have back of them the entire resources of the State, amounting to $3,000,000,000, and constitute a full faith and credit obligation of 70,000 square miles of territory, 17,000,000 acres of which are under cultivation.

Special provisions have been written into the constitution safe-guarding the payment of both principal and interest, which cannot be changed or repealed until both have been paid.

Special Real Estate Series — In addition to placing behind the Bonds the credit of the entire State, its full taxing power and its total resources, first mortgages on improved North Dakota Farm lands have been filed with the State Treasurer as a direct security. They represent approximately 40% of the valuation of the land, and in no case can the valuation be more than 50%, which is the ratio by statute. These mortgages are on farms under cultivation and the interest is now being paid. As a consequence, an interest fund has already been created. The interest and amortization payments on the mortgages are sufficient to meet the interest payments on the Bonds and retire them at maturity. A further guarantee of the sinking fund is assured by direct tax on real estate and personal property.

Resources of North Dakota — Its population, according to last census, is 645,730. Approximately 30,000,000 acres are occupied by farmers and 17,000,000 acres are under cultivation.

The value of the cereal crop in 1920 was $192,248,000, and of its live stock and dairy products $56,000,000, a total of nearly a quarter of a billion.

Its bonded indebtedness including this issue is less than ½ of 1% of the State's assessed valuation.

The total Bond issues of North Dakota amount to but little more than 10 cents per acre. For each dollar there is property to the value of $500. The total indebtedness of the State after the present issues are sold will be about 1-40 of one year's production.

Purpose of Issue — The purpose of the issue is to stimulate agriculture by advancing to farmers additional capital secured by first mortgages on their improved farms. This plan of rural credits is followed in other States and is on lines similar to the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Legal Investment for Trust Funds — These Bonds offer a legal investment for trust funds and Savings Banks in New York and most other States.

Validity of Issue — The constitutionality and validity of the law authorizing the Bonds has been passed upon and approved by the District Court, by the Supreme Court of North Dakota, by the United States Federal District Court and by the Supreme Court of the United States in an unanimous decision. Copies of this decision will be furnished by the undersigned.

All legal matters in connection with these bonds will be subject to approval of our counsel, Messrs. Wood & Oakley, Chicago, Ill.

Price 100, to Yield 5¾%

All checks must be made payable to:—The Bank of North Dakota.

The right is reserved to reject any and all applications and to award a smaller amount than applied for.

Interim certificates bearing the same interest will be issued until the Bonds, dated July 1, 1921, are delivered.

We invite the closest investigation of this issue by the most conservative bond buyers.

Write or call for booklet, containing full description—or mail check, postal or express order for as many of the bonds as you may desire.

The State of North Dakota

Bond Sales Office
3061 Equitable Bldg., New York, N. Y.
Telephone Rector 4425

Fiscal Agent
The Bank of North Dakota
Bismarck, N. D.

Bond Sales Office
1059 Peoples Gas Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
Telephone Harrison 8639

TO OUR FRIENDS:

Summer now beckons you to the seashore or mountains and if you are not a subscriber you may have difficulty in obtaining

THE NATION

in some remote section which perhaps you intend visiting.

To avoid annoyance we suggest that you subscribe for a period of three or six months and let us mail a copy regularly to you each week while you are out of town.

3 months $1.25 ***6 months $2.50***

One year $5.00

SPECIAL OFFER

Upon receipt of $5.00 we will mail a copy of THE NATION for 52 weeks and in addition will send you free of charge a copy of Will Irwin's New Book, THE NEXT WAR.

USE THIS COUPON

The Nation,
20 Vesey Street, New York City.

Please send me THE NATION for 52 weeks and a copy of Will Irwin's New Book, THE NEXT WAR, for which I inclose $5.00.

Name .....Address .....

Foreign postage $1.00. Canadian postage .50.

7-20-21

The Nation

Vol. CXIII, No. 2926 FOUNDED 1865 Wednesday, August 3, 1921

The Great God Property

An Editorial

Dyeing for One's Country

by Arthur Warner

Taxation or Confiscation

More Light on Mexico

by E. J. Dillon

The Outcome in Upper Silesia

by W. E. Nash

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. CXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1921 No. 2926

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.

ALREADY we are told that we are quite too enthusiastic about the coming Disarmament Conference, that, since the same men, or type of men, who controlled at Versailles will dominate at Washington, it is idle to expect any relief for humanity. To this we reply that we have never been under any illusions as to the dangers confronting the meeting. We are quite aware of the Washington belief that the majority of his Cabinet opposes the President on disarmament; that both England and the United States are going on with their fleet construction as if nothing were coming out of the Conference; that these so-called statesmen are all puppets in the hands of the great financial interests. We are afraid, too, that the coupling to it of the parley on Pacific problems is more than likely to prove a real danger to the Disarmament Conference. But granting all this, we still give profound thanks for it. We would rather it should be held and fail than never be held at all. For the mere meeting of the delegates will focus the world's attention on the folly of armaments as never before. The questions relating to it will be discussed for months by every newspaper on earth; the publicity disarmament will get could not be purchased for a billion of dollars and, if it gives promise of achieving something, the Conference will force its opponents into the open. These are priceless things in themselves; and with every month that passes even the Lloyd Georges and the Briands will come to see more clearly that there is no choice save between disarmament and bankruptcy. We trust they will soon have additional reason to perceive that it is a choice between disarmament and revolution.

OF course, everything depends upon the way the Conference is handled. If President Harding's representatives play their cards badly; if the Root type of mind prevails; if we once more bow down to Great Britain, the disarmament mountain will but give birth to a mouse. Yet even mice have their uses as a certain lion once discovered and mice as object lessons are not without value. As matters stand, however, we have nearly all the cards in our hands and how many tricks we shall take will depend entirely upon our players. Senator Borah does well to point out that the American taxpayer is deeply involved in what happens abroad, because our waiving our interest on the Allied debts to us is making it possible for France to be today a far more thoroughly militarized nation than Germany ever was, even in 1914; that England can keep up her far-flung battle line of 350,000 red soldiers is largely due to our generosity. We have heard much these last two weeks as to the question of the Allied debts to us. We trust nothing has been done or promised, or will be, that will keep us from using those debts for the advancement of humanity. We should lose not one moment in saying to the Allies that our people decline longer to finance the armament madness of Europe which today is responsible for more than 3,000,000 of men withdrawn from gainful pursuits and idling in the calling of war. This is an intolerable state of affairs for a sane world.

SO the noble Senator Clayton R. Lusk, 100 per cent patriot, defender of the sacredness of the home, persecutor of "Reds," compiler of the great "Who's Who in Radicalism," and administerer of the oath of loyalty to all teachers of the Empire State, has been "caught with the goods on." That is, he is found to have accepted by some little oversight a $1,000 silver service from some police detectives, after the event, for his kindly aid in passing through the Legislature a bill which redounded to their financial profit. Well, we are not surprised. Patriotism is still the last refuge of the political scoundrel—not that we would apply so harsh a word to Senator Lusk. He is no scoundrel; he merely acted according to his lights, and what those are we are now able to judge a little more fully than before. We merely would indicate that a certain type of aggressive patriotism has always been a political refuge in this country, and, of course, it was no fault of Senator Lusk's that he was found out so unhappily. We trust that no teacher will be so rude as to ask Senator Lusk how his Senator's oath of office bears upon that silver service, or that any radical editor will be so unkind as to try to relate the silver to the question of what constitutes the true loyalty to his State of a 100 per cent patriot. And we confess that we cannot see why the Republicans are talking of deposing him as Senate leader. Did he not merely accept a token of gratitude? Does he not most admirably typify the point of view of 1921 of the Americans who, for our sins, chiefly dominate our social, industrial, and political life?

THE NATION rejoices over the action of Senator McCormick in introducing a resolution providing for a thorough and searching investigation of the unhappy state of affairs in Santo Domingo. It is reported that Senators McCormick, Johnson, and Pomerene will form a commission for this purpose to leave in ten days' time. This is the proper mode of procedure: no investigation by Marines of the behavior of Marines, wherein judge, jury, jailer, and prisoner are all members of the same family, but an impartial Congressional inquiry, an honest and fair attempt to clear the good name of the United States and to make restitution for past injuries to a small country which should have been protected instead of being pilloried. The Senatorial commission should be accompanied by a corps of unbiased reporters who will see that all its findings receive proper publicity; it should not only make its investigation with the greatest care but should be equally careful that its recommendations are carried out. Meanwhile, the Dominicans may take heart of grace. Perhaps the worst of their troubles are over.

JUST when the Danish Government has flatly refused to erect a tariff barrier against the flood of German manufactures expected there, on the ground that such a tariff would be of no benefit in the existing grave industrial crisis, and that it would offset efforts to decrease costs of production and lessen unemployment, our House of Representatives has to rush through the Fordney Tariff quite as if we were back in 1890 and the world had not stood on its head since. We venture to say that the bulk of the hide-bound Republican Representatives who voted on July 21 for this measure and carried it by 289 to 127 gave no real consideration to any of the economic reasons which made the Danish Premier, Neergard, flatly refuse to consider a tariff bill after a congress of Danish manufacturers and industrial associations had served notice on him that imports from Germany, England, and America would shortly ruin Denmark. We are sure the 289 heard only the swish of the party whip and the orders of the privileged manufacturers and crop growers who own the Republican Party and insist that the Government shall help them to increase and stabilize their profits. Now the Fordney Tariff is in the Senate. Long may it rest there. Indeed, if it were wise the Senate would cut off its head behind the ears, that is, vote to strike out all after the enacting clause. But there is one sporting side to the passage of a wicked bill like this; it gives rise to endless speculation and betting as to whether it will hoist the Republican Party just as high as did the Payne-Aldrich tariff and when.

THE majority report of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs which has been investigating certain war-time scandals among enlisted men at the Newport Training Station finds the Navy Department responsible for conduct of a particularly blameworthy sort. The men at that station were housed under conditions which made possible—and indeed extremely likely—the development of vicious practices. When such practices developed the authorities, very hard put to it in dealing with them, resorted to the device of an investigating squad the members of which are said to have had to participate in the vicious practices in order to get evidence sufficient to convict the ringleaders. In this the authorities went one step beyond the old scheme of setting a thief to catch a thief: they are reported to have set innocent youths to catch experienced offenders. Just where the blame is to be laid does not appear from the report of the subcommittee, which divides along party lines in accusing or exoneratir the former Secretary and the former Assistant Secretai of the Navy. The blame doubtless lies with stupid sr ordinates somewhere. This is the kind of thing which we ought to expect from the naval mind; just as the vicious practices were the natural result of herding masses of young men together under such unnatural conditions. In every army and every navy these immoralities take place.

THE Silesian situation grows worse rather than better, and by refusing Great Britain's appeal for a quick determination of boundary lines the French will have to bear the chief blame for what may come. The irregulars on both sides in Upper Silesia grow more restless as time passes and no decision is reached, and the dispatch of more French troops is likely only to have the effect of stirring up trouble. Three plans of settlement are suggested in Mr. Nash's able article on another page of this issue, and it is easy to determine which is the most fair and workable; the Allies have the plebiscite to go by and in addition volumes of facts on every aspect of the question. There is no excuse for delay; hence France's insistence on further investigations by "experts" cannot be honest in intent. A settlement is needed now, and every day's postponement makes the ultimate settlement harder.

WHEN he writes to so able and enlightened a newspaper as the Baltimore *Sun* Mr. Lamar, lately Solicitor to the Post Office Department, should realize tha he is no longer advising his former chief or his colleague and should stick to the facts. The *Sun* and its readers know the facts, and when Mr. Lamar lumps together the Milwaukee *Leader* and the New York *Call* and the *Liberator* under the head of "communist papers" he makes his readers smile, and the rest of his argument, good law though it may be, loses nine-tenths of its force. Also when Mr. Lamar assumes that an espousal of the principle of free speech is tantamount to an espousal of everything that may thereupon be said, he adopts a pitiable trick that no good lawyer should be guilty of. The Baltimore *Sun*, like some of the rest of us, knows that two of the papers in question are not communist at all but are rather bitterly set against the communist faction in the socialist movement in the United States; it knows that none of them is advocating bomb-throwing as the method of ushering in the cooperative commonwealth; it knows that the fight for free speech is every man's fight and that it has no more connection with revolution than it has with reaction. But Mr. Lamar will never pay attention to facts, for facts interfere with fulminations. Meanwhile we wish to support every effort of the Baltimore *Sun* to make it possible for the New York *Call* to carry its appeal to the Supreme Court. The *Call* is not only appealing for its own rights; it is appealing for justice and freedom from bureaucratic tyranny for every man and every publication in the United States.

THE conviction of Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Va zetti of murder in the first degree is, according to t intrepid Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee, only anoth milestone in the case and not the end. Despite the warning of Judge Thayer in the beginning of the trial that the prosecution could not introduce any evidence concerning the social or political beliefs of the defendants, Sacco was on

July 7 compelled to answer questions on his attitude toward government in general, on anarchy, deportation, America as a free country, and America as a place of educational opportunity. The fact that Sacco evaded the selective draft law was also brought into the testimony. The contention of the defense all through the trial has been that the case was a frame-up, an attempt to "get" Sacco and Vanzetti for their years of work for labor and for their radicalism. But the twelve good men and true who, after listening to Judge Thayer's fair and just charge to the jury, took five hours to reach a verdict, thought otherwise. The defense, hampered as it is by lack of funds, will nevertheless make a fight for a new trial. Why do not the Italians in this part of the country unite to help their countrymen in a case which bears many of the earmarks of the Mooney affair?

THE future prospects of the dirigible airship seem as difficult to measure as the chances for peace in Ireland, or the prospects of Greek success in the latest offensive. The British Admiralty has rejected it definitely for all time despite the valuable scouting service attributed to the Zeppelin which accompanied the German fleet in the battle of Jutland, and the British Air Ministry is getting rid of all of its remaining craft by turning them over to the Disposal Board in despair, for, despite the offer of the Air Ministry to give away these airships, plus their materials and hangars, for nothing, no private enterprise has asked for them to start an airship line. This is attributed to fear of accidents, the high cost of service, plus the question whether it can be made to pay, and to airplane competition. This news is puzzling because in Germany the Zeppelins have been doing well and because the American Consulate in London reports that a British company which intends operating a daily airplane service to Paris, Brussels, and Amsterdam is contemplating a bi-weekly airship service to the United States and Canada with a ship carrying fifty passengers and a crew of fifteen—and providing a bath with each cabin! For about $250 passengers are to have the pleasure of crossing in fifty hours. As to this, we shall see what we shall see, particularly when the great new dirigible we are building in England for war purposes crosses the Atlantic this fall. Meanwhile, the fact remains that Europe is far ahead of us in the use of airplanes for commercial purposes.

WARS may come and peace may go, but science keeps on—or ought to keep on—forever. Among the explorers and the archaeologists business is once more beginning to attain "normalcy." Donald MacMillan with six companions is off in the auxiliary schooner Bowdoin for Baffin Land, to explore a region still practically as little known as when William Baffin announced his discovery and put his name on the map over three hundred years ago. Flinders Petrie and his experts are unpacking and cataloguing the thousands of finds made in Egypt during the past two years by the British School of Archaeology, which has plundered a splendid cemetery and turned up a host of those little figures, carved from wood, in which the ancient Egyptians eft their most realistic record of daily life: "a miniature granary filled with busy servants; a kitchen where one cook turns a trussed goose on a spit, while another (his wig removed for coolness' sake) fans the fire; a sacrificial ceremony; the setting of a table; and high-prowed boats with sails of brown linen, manned by crews of black-haired sailors." Among these finds is the body of a girl who the experts say must have died 8,000 years ago. In weather as hot as this we have forgotten precisely how you can tell whether a person has been dead 8,000 years, but we feel disposed to guess that several politicians now making a great stir in the world have been dead nearly that long—if the public and they only knew it.

THIS has been climatically as exceptional a year in Switzerland as elsewhere. Not only has the drought profoundly affected the height of rivers and lakes, it has had a marked effect upon the glaciers as well. Never, in living memory, says the *Manchester Guardian*, were high rocks so bare of snow at the same date as they are now. It is an amazingly snowless summer, with the result that there is more climbing without guides than ever and one party has already paid for its daring by severe suffering and by frozen limbs. As for the glaciers, they have continued to spread out and progress despite the lack of snow and cold. The very absence of snow has made the crevasses widen and the "snouts" of the glaciers advance. This makes many observers question the truth of the assertion that all glaciers are steadily decreasing in size and will some day disappear, just as all the peaks are gradually wearing away and getting lower all the time—not so rapidly as to be noticeable to the naked eye, but quite obviously to the scientists. The hotel-keepers will, we trust, benefit by reports of the existing curious state of affairs, for the war has rendered most of them bankrupts or near bankrupt. We hope that many of the very great throng of American tourists going over this year will help out Switzerland, generous minister during the war to the wounded and suffering of both sides, just as we rejoice that the millions of dollars Americans are leaving in France this summer will help the finances of that country not inconsiderably.

WHEN the owl and the pussy cat went to sea in their beautiful pea-green boat we are sure that they got no more publicity from the local press than has been given to the adventurous Mr. John B. Kelly and his wife who, with two paid hands and a friend, have navigated the Atlantic ocean in 33 days in their 51-foot schooner yacht. Not that we begrudge them publicity; on the contrary this is one of the worth-while happenings that too often are overlooked. Anything which makes for the development of yachting along sound lines is well worth while. For years the America's cup races produced a type of freak yacht which was immediately imitated by small-boat sailors, with the result that our harbors were full of eccentric, spoon-bowed, fin-keeled craft that had to run for port whenever a sea kicked up. There is no reason why a 51-foot craft shouldn't cross the ocean fairly comfortably, provided it is built to go to sea and stick out a blow. That fine sailor, Thomas F. Day, and two others crossed in a 15-foot boat, the Sea Bird, a few years ago. Some of the fastest and most adventurous sailing ever done by Americans was with the Baltimore clippers in the first half of the last century on boats of a length of only 75 to 125 feet. They thought nothing of a trip to Africa and too often came back from there laden down with slaves. They kept the seas in all weather, and without the aid of the wireless and the auxiliary engine which Mr. Kelly had on board of his up-to-date little craft. At the same time we would not depreciate Mr. Kelly's achievement. He and his wife showed a fine, sporting spirit which will, we hope, find many imitators.

The Great God Property

MORE and more it becomes apparent that the single point at issue between us and Mexico is the sacred right of private property. Our Administration is insisting on behalf of our oil kings and land barons, as well as on behalf of the small American investors in Mexico, that their property in that country shall be safe from confiscation and perhaps, also, from severe taxation approaching confiscation. The Administration has made it perfectly clear in its attitude toward Russia that it will have nothing whatever to do with a government which does not respect and preserve private ownership of property. It plainly believes that the individual's right to property is the foundation stone of human society and of all government, and there is no need to question the sincerity with which Mr. Harding and Mr. Hughes feel that in their attitude toward General Obregon they are not merely standing upon sound legal and moral rights, but are breaking a lance on behalf of the very structure of our society. All Obregon need do to free himself from our pressure is to sign a treaty confirming what he has said in the New York *World* and elsewhere that Article 27 of the Constitution of 1917 shall not be construed retroactively, that Mexico will not recapture the property of American investors without adequate compensation and all will be well; he will be recognized by us and congratulated on the progress Mexico has made under his wise and able government.

Now, if one is prepared to admit that private property has rights beyond all else, rights superior to human rights, rights beyond the power of any government to contravene, then one must heartily applaud the stand the Harding Administration is taking. Unfortunately, if one is an American with some knowledge of the history of one's country, it is not quite easy to abase one's self absolutely before the altar of the Great God Property. For a large portion of the history of the United States has to do with the question whether human rights were or were not superior to property rights. When we abolished slavery we not only took the slaves that were the property of Americans away from their owners, thereby ruining many of them, but we actually did the same to the foreigners, British and others, who owned slave property on our soil. Nor did we offer or even give to those foreign owners one single dollar as compensation for the loss of their property. In brief, we did precisely the same thing which we are now warning General Obregon that Mexico must under no circumstances do to our nationals owning property there.

But if it be contended that this is not an analogous case, that one must not compare property in human beings with property in oil or grazing lands, we need only go back to 1919 for another example of the confiscation, or destruction, of the property of aliens in the United States. The prohibition amendment to the Constitution in 1919 destroyed the property of British and other foreigners who had invested heavily in American brewing and whiskey companies. There is no redress for them, and we should like to see what would happen to any foreign government which might have the effrontery to ask Uncle Sam to refund the losses he has inflicted on its citizens by the exercise of his police power in the interest of temperance. It is not, however, necessary to confine our investigation to the practices of the United States in this matter. If we go overseas we find that no one questions the right of the German Government to levy a capital tax upon the private property of individuals or companies whether they be aliens or alien-owned and so to confiscate a large slice of their property without redress.

Even more striking are two recently recorded decisions of the British Court of Appeals regarding the confiscation of British property by those arch-confiscators the Soviets. In the case of an English company which purchased lumber in Russia it decided that that company had no cause for redress because its property was confiscated by the Soviet Government without compensation and resold. The court asked itself whether the act of confiscation was "in its nature so immoral and so contrary to the principles of justice . . . that the courts . . . are not to pay any attention to it." The court decided that the Soviet Government was well within its rights. In delivering his judgment Justice Scrutton said that at present British citizens who might be contributing to the state one-half of their income in income tax and super tax, and would have to give a large proportion of their capital in death duties and had the fear of a capital levy hanging over their heads, could hardly consider that sovereign state immoral which considered that it was right for it to vest *all* individual property in the state. Subsequently this same British court held that the holders of Russian state bonds could not attach in England gold rubles taken from the reserves of the former Russian Government, although that gold reserv had under the old regime been mortgaged to the holder of Russian notes.

Now, we admit it is true that these cases were affected by the fact that the British Government had recognized the Soviet Government. We submit, however, that the principle is not affected by a mere question of recognition. If it is morally wrong for General Obregon or the Soviets to confiscate property when not recognized, it is, if anything, a more serious offense to confiscate it when the favor of recognition has been conferred. If the sacredness of private property is the foundation stone of all government and of our civilization we cannot see how this bolshevistic English court can escape the execration of mankind by skulking behind recognition, which is, after all, merely the exercise of judgment by an administrative official who may or may not be affected by political or commercial considerations. So if we soon go to war with Mexico it will be to prove for all time the sacredness of American-owned private property wherever it is. For that we have the ships, we have the men, we have the money, too. We trust that no one will complain if in the process of establishing the principle of the safety of exported capital abroad, the capital of each and every one of us at home is decreased or in part confiscated in the interest of the man who put his money beyond the border. Finally, let it be clearly understood that *The Nation* repeats, in the face of the Administration's prayerful consideration of th sacredness of American property abroad, its belief th Mexico has the right "to adopt a 'confiscatory policy' if sh chooses," provided she treats everybody alike; and that if she took every blessed oil well and every American-owned acre in Mexico it would still not call for the shedding of a single drop of American or Mexican blood.

Law-and-Order Anarchy

IN the State of Texas during June nine persons were kidnapped by bands of citizens and tarred and feathered. During the week of July 18-25 at least eight more, one of them a woman, were subjected to the same indignity. In Miami, Florida, a British subject, archdeacon of the Episcopal church, was similarly treated because he was said to have advocated social equality between Negroes and whites. The British Government has declined to take action in the matter. Cecil Harmsworth, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, is quoted as saying in the House of Commons: "I am confident the United States authorities will take such steps as may be necessary to see that justice is done without representations from His Majesty's Government." It is profoundly humiliating to be compelled to voice our conviction, based on similar occurrences in the past, that the United States authorities will do no such thing. The Ku Klux Klan, the 100-per-cent Americans, the American Legion all conduct their kidnapping or horsewhipping or tar-and-feathering parties with impunity. It has even been charged, notably by Judge Hamilton, of Texas, that the fault lies not with the law but in the laxity of the persons whose duty is to enforce it. Again and again, in lawless outbreaks of this sort, no persons have been arrested, although the victim was able to recognize his persecutors, and there is at least one case—that of a Texan who had been horsewhipped for alleged cruelty to his wife—in which no action was taken by the jury except to return three indictments against the victim. On one of the latest of these occasions, namely the tarring and feathering of two citizens of Deweyville, Texas, the "Beaumont local of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan" assumed responsibility for the affair in the newspapers.

Texas and Florida are, of course, not the only States in which lawlessness prevails. In Massachusetts, in Pennsylvania, in South Dakota, in California, to mention only a few, the same sort of thing goes on. Homes of foreigners are burned, Japanese are "deported," men are tarred and feathered. This is exclusive of actual lynchings, of which the Department of Records and Research of Tuskegee Institute reports 36 in the first six months of 1921, as against 12 during the corresponding period of 1920. The outstanding fact in almost every one of these cases is that nothing is ever done about it. The law continues to be defied and the vast majority of American citizens to ignore all such happenings. From time to time more or less feeble attempts are made to rectify matters by passing a law. Thus it is reported that the House Judiciary Committee "is considering" an anti-lynching law introduced by Representative Dyer, of Missouri—an excellent bill, by the way, which might do much to remedy the situation if it were passed. It is expected, however, that Southern members will filibuster against it if it ever reaches the House. Again a resolution requesting that a bill providing penalties for persons "disguising themselves and violating the laws of the State by inflicting punishment upon persons against whom no legal complaint had been filed" be submitted to the Texas Legislature, has been presented to Governor Neff. The bill is aimed at the Ku Klux Klan, but as yet no action has been taken on it.

This sort of thing has gone on in America for two hundred years. Of late it has become worse instead of better. And why not? After four years of war, of spread-head atrocities on behalf of civilization and democracy on the front page of every newspaper, what wonder that violence should become the order of the day? War is organized, legalized mob action; the present mob action is only the more dangerous because it is unorganized and illegal. And there is another phase to the situation which is even harder to combat: Mob action is immensely enjoyable for everyone taking part but the victim, who, after all, cannot expect much consideration. Schoolboys derive much sport from the more or less harmless torture of a comrade at a fraternity "initiation." There is no doubt that the same spirit actuates the staid business men who dress up in a sheet and, calling themselves Knights of the Invisible Empire, pour tar over the body of a member of the community they dislike and then rip open a feather pillow above the black, sticky, loathsome mess. It is, like the fraternity party, usually harmless. The victim does not die. Until a majority of the population can be made to see the enormity of mob action in a civilized state, no anti-Ku Klux Klan bills or anti-lynching bills will make any difference. No bills will even be passed. Ninety per cent of the people of the United States are law-abiding and utterly indifferent to the other 10 per cent who, while calling themselves 100 per cent Americans, are deriving amusement from not being law-abiding—by means of tar-and-featherings or by defying the prohibition amendment, perhaps. Until we remedy this major defect we must go on fearing, not the overthrow of the Government by the Reds, but its overthrow by the Red-White-and-Blues.

The Country Doctor Passes

SINCE the days when medicine emerged from priestcraft the country doctor has been mildly glamored with romance. His service and self-denial have won the natural gratitude of his neighbors; the isolation of his calling has averted professional criticism; his ambitionless mediocrity has insulated him from lay jealousy and hostility. Literature has been truthfully kind to him. Balzac and Sarah Orne Jewett each devoted a novel to the country doctor in settings familiar to them—provincial France, rural New England. Margaret Deland's "Dr. Lavender" is the prototype of the practitioner of fiction, kindly yet shrewd, physician and father confessor, a dependable recipient of his community's faith. Even in the unretouched photography of "Main Street" Dr. Will Kennicott emerges as the most decent character of them all. Good, plodding, unimaginative, he rises in action above the mild caricature of his novelistic environment. The midnight operation in the lonely farm house touches the novel's high point, both of idealism and realism.

Is the country doctor passing in America? Beyond question, yes. Modern invention has greatly diminished the rigors of his existence. A three-hour struggle through a night of blinding storm has become an easy thirty-minute ride in a closed automobile. The telephone saves him no end of useless calls. Yet the very beneficences which material civilization has carried into plain and hills have vicariously sown their seeds of discontent. In modifying the frontier civilization destroys it. The country doctor has always been a frontiersman. Lone, he battled the elemental perils, self-sufficing, adequate, *faute de mieux*, in his field

of individualistic human enterprise. Specialization and the revolutions in science bore to him the first suggestion of inadequacy. The city, equipped, can do things so much better. The X-Ray machine, the biochemical and bacteriological laboratory, the modern hospital—no longer always totally inaccessible—beckon with a frequently irresistible appeal. Stranded amid the rapids of progress the country doctor is resolving into his primitive components—leech, herb-doctor, bone-setter, midwife. For his lessened hardships he pays dearly in the fatal consciousness of diminished capability.

Throughout the land the country doctors' positions are becoming vacant. A small Massachusetts township—open country, widely separated farms, cross-roads with their huddled dwellings—is compelled to offer a $500 annuity to the physician in the hope of luring some one to settle there. A New York village advertises that the public health fees amount to $250 annually, that the "former doctor had a large and lucrative practice," and that "another village located three and a half miles to the south is also without a doctor." For the average rural community in the East this means a grave situation. But in the West it has been a chronic condition ever since the country was opened up, and one of the most moving and startling publications of the Children's Bureau paints a picture of the suffering and misery of the frontierswoman to make one hang one's head. The number of preventable deaths in childbirth is appalling, to say nothing of needlessly lost babies and of hideously unnecessary suffering. Montana, Arizona, New Mexico—these are three of the States that bear a most unenviable reputation, where doctors must go fifty and seventy-five miles across country after the call has come, without that nursing assistance deemed so vital in the East. In a single Montana county of 359 mothers who gave birth to children over a short period only 129 were attended by a physician. More than three-fourths had no prenatal care whatever. Fortunately, the passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill by the Senate on July 22, with the approval of the Presidential physician, Dr. Sawyer, means that at last the country is moving to remedy the evils of unattended maternity.

Bad as that situation is, that it is serious in the Empire State appears from the fact that in his annual message of January, 1920, Governor Alfred Smith, of New York, recommended the appointment of State physicians and nurses in rural communities now destitute of medical aid, the State to share the expense and to cooperate with the rural communities. But the legislature paid no attention to the Governor's appeal for this entering wedge in the socialization of the medical profession of America, just as nothing has come of the proposal much mooted in England during the war to do the same with the medical profession in that country. Plainly, the need is becoming so great here that the call for medical missionaries at home will soon compare in urgency with that for medical missionaries in the Near and Far East and India. Once State aid is accepted by the country doctor, will he have to sink his personality still further? Will he then take his place merely as a local and county authority, a health constable, a village veterinarian, *qui nihil humani alienum*, set apart from no human interest, or will he as a member of a great State profession be shifted every four years from city to country, from East to West, from North to South, like an army officer on his tours of duty or a Methodist clergyman?

From Heat to Herrick

THIS blazing August on the heels of a pitiless July h no real terrors for the man or woman who know Herrick and can turn even from our most torrid cities to the meadows and brooks and hawthorn-guarded cottages of Herrick's dainty Devon. He rises forever with the dawn and summons his perennial Corinna, "sweet Slug-a-bed,"

> To come forth, like the Spring-time, fresh and greene;
> And sweet as Flora.

Love itself cannot inflame his morning worshipers: they walk through the early streets to the woods of May, courting one another exquisitely with all the forms of a ceremonial which Horace might have sung or Watteau painted. Here, in one bright season, are daffodils and violets, primroses and gilliflowers,

> Millions of Lillies mixt with Roses,

tulips, pansies, marigolds, daisies, the cherry and the oak, laurels and cypresses, grapes and strawberries, spring standing side by side with purple harvest and cozy winter. Here are all exquisite scents, new rain on turf and tree, the smoke of quaint poetical sacrifices;

> The smell of mornings milk, and cream;
> Butter of Cowslips mixt with them;
> Of rosted warden, or bak'd peare;

"the flowre of blooming Clove," "Essences of Jessimine," honey just brought in by bees, spiced wines, incomparable possets; the perfumes of youth and love and joy. Here, too, are delicate forms and precious colors, smooth narratives of a hundred rural customs chosen because they fit fine verses, and whimsical pious little odes and graces before meat and thanksgivings and creeds and prayers such as no other poet ever uttered. Where else has adoration better lent itself to union with politeness than in this counsel to children:

> Honour thy Parents; but good manners call
> Thee to adore thy God, the first of all.

Surely something ran in Herrick's veins which was calmer than the hot blood of his kind in general. He laughs at Julia, Sapho, Anthea, Electra, Myrha, Corinna, Perilla, and at himself for having had and lost them; he tricks out his raptures of devotion with the blithest figures of speech:

> Lord, I am like to Misletoe,
> Which has no root, and cannot grow,
> Or prosper, but by that same tree
> It clings about; so I by Thee;

he takes his ease in his country Zion as if it would last eternally and yet amuses himself with cheerful epitaphs for himself and with advice to his pretty mourners. He could be passionate enough about his calling; but he saw his world as images of marble, as pictures of gold set in silver, as charming ancient stories come to life again yet still with the dignity of remembered perfectness about them. It is a defense against August to remember the happy commentary upon Herrick which Dryden wrote when he imitated the lines to Perilla—

> Then shall my Ghost not walk about, but keep
> Still in the coole, and silent shades of sleep—

in that admirable invitation to another cool world:

> When, tired with following nature, you think fit
> To seek repose in the cool shades of wit.

Dyeing for One's Country

By ARTHUR WARNER

BIG Business may not have shown great alacrity to die for its country in time of war, but it is evening up by unbounded enthusiasm to dye for it now that we are at peace. The theory of protection for industry, as it has existed heretofore in America, has been to assist a domestic business to compete against a foreign one in our markets by placing a customs duty on imports of the outside product. Expensive as this may have been for the consumer, it has at any rate permitted him to have the foreign article if willing to pay the price, and has allowed the alien producer to compete if he could in spite of the handicap imposed. That was the old protection. In the Fordney tariff we were asked to advance to a super-protection demanding for one industry, at least, the total elimination of foreign competition. The new tariff measure provided for an embargo for three years upon all foreign dyes except where the Tariff Commission ruled that a desired sort was not obtainable here; and this clause, barely defeated by a vote of 209 to 193, is sure to be re-presented.

Behind this extraordinary demand is a chain of facts even more astonishing. The first link was the liquidation during war time of the German chemical interests in America by the Alien Property Custodian. This was accompanied by the seizure of their patents. Both actions were contrary to accepted international usage, which sanctions the temporary holding but not the destruction of the property rights of individuals in time of war. The next step was still more amazing. The bulk of these patents—some 4,500—were then transferred at private sale for a nominal $250,000 to the Chemical Foundation, a newly organized corporation surrounded with a halo of scientific and patriotic unselfishness but in fact owned by various commercial interests. The Chemical Foundation grants the right to use these patents by issuing non-exclusive licenses "to manufacturers *whose Americanism and competence are unquestioned.*" The italics are mine, but the words are from the prospectus of the Foundation and reveal potentialities for restriction and favoritism, even though they may not actually have been practiced. Finally, the Foundation awarded its presidency to Francis P. Garvan who, first as head of the Bureau of Investigation of the Alien Property Custodian and later as Alien Property Custodian himself, had pulled the strings for the Punch and Judy show throughout! Having thus obtained a potential monopoly in the United States, the Chemical Foundation now asks us gullible Americans to make its future as sure as death or taxes by granting an embargo against foreign competition. Not all the material for comic opera was known to Gilbert and Sullivan.

How is it possible, one asks, for such a sequence of events to take place virtually unnoticed and, until recently, unopposed? The answer is in one word: patriotism. The shareholders of the Chemical Foundation purpose to dye (at a handsome profit, of course, but keep that quiet) for their country. The material interests opposed to the scheme have mostly been tarred with German nationality or connections, while the public has been inflated with propaganda to the effect that the manufacture of dyes is a "key industry," essential to the training of a corps of skilled chemists and the development of a business that, in case of war, can immediately be turned into the making of explosives and man-killing gases. As a fact, there are dozens of industries more vital in either war or peace than that of aniline dyes. Dr. Charles L. Reese, chemical director of the Du Pont Company, in speaking before the Cotton Manufacturers' Association in 1918 (before the blessings of a monopoly by embargo had been thought of), said:

> There has also been much talk in the papers with regard to the wonderful advantage Germany had on account of her extensive dye industry, in that she could immediately turn all the great dye plants into munition factories. I do not consider that the presence of the factories themselves was a matter of very great importance to the Germans. . . .
>
> Now what were the conditions in this country? There was no dye industry of any great magnitude, but there was a well-organized explosive industry with a well-organized chemical organization. . . .
>
> The first effect of the Great War was to call upon this organization to meet problems which seemed to be almost as insolvable as those presented by the dye situation, since many of the raw materials necessary for the manufacture of munitions had been secured from Europe, just as the dyes had been. This organization, however, was able to meet the situation in such a short time that the want of these materials did not occasion a day's delay in the production of powder.

Thus it appears that even if this generation is to spend the rest of its days preparing to kill and to be killed in the "next war," there is no need to be especially tender toward the makers of aniline dyes.

Probably, if it hadn't been for Sir William Perkin, the issue would never have arisen. He picked the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge back in 1856 when, in trying to make quinine by oxidizing aniline, he produced a mauve solution, the first synthetic dye. The development that followed is one of the most fascinating stories in modern industrialism. Other colors were rapidly created by chemical means. The madder fields of France were plowed under and chemical dyes (made in Germany) were used even to redden the trousers of French soldiers. Royal purple, hitherto obtainable only in small drops from a shellfish in the eastern Mediterranean, became so cheap that cats as well as kings might wear it, while the indigo crop of India, which in 1897 was worth $20,000,000, had shrunk by 1914 to a value of $300,000.

Although the making of dyes from coal tar was discovered by an Englishman, development of the industry passed to Germany. By 1914 the Germans were manufacturing more than three-fourths of the world's consumption of coal-tar products and were providing the basic materials for most of the rest. They were supplying America with nine-tenths of its dyes, of which as many as 900 different kinds were imported in appreciable quantities.

The British control of the sea ended this situation when the European War began. Dyes mounted to fabulous prices in the United States. At that time there were only seven firms, employing 528 persons, engaged in dye making in this country. Patriotic devotion (as the manufacturers insist) or the stimulus of rich profits (as infidels hint) led to a speedy and enormous growth of the industry. By 1917 our exports of home-made dyes exceeded in value that of our imports before the war. In 1914 the American dye product

was valued at $2,500,000; in 1919 it was worth $67,000,000; in 1920 exports alone were rated at $25,000,000; in the first three months of the current year $40,000,000 in new capital was put into the field. The vice-president of the Du Pont Company has said that its profits were greater in 1918 than during thirty-two previous years combined; that after giving $2,000,000 to the Red Cross, and buying heavily of Liberty Bonds, the company still made $129,000,000 net.

This is the "infant industry" which, fondled first by the War Trade Board and then dandled by the "emergency tariff" act, now asks that the embargo against foreign competition become a settled policy. The dye makers say that the existing tariff of about 30 per cent is useless. If cut adrift with only that weak anchor, they declare fearfully that the great German cartel will not hesitate at huge losses in competing with the American industry, plant by plant or color by color, until it has wrecked the whole. This competition seems to have been developed lately in order to bolster up the present demand for an indefinite embargo. When A. Mitchell Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian, reported to Congress in regard to the Chemical Foundation and his sale to it of German patents, he said "the institution will be able to protect the American industry for a considerable period, and this should be all it needs. It appears to be the universal view of the more competent manufacturers in this country that, given five years of freedom from German competition, the American industry can hold its own."

[illegible]mer explains that the Chemical Foundation is not a profit-making enterprise (although its stock is held by companies that are decidedly that). According to early announcements the stock was to be held, as Mr. Palmer put it, by "practically every important American manufacturer." The Foundation is capitalized at $500,000, of which half has been set aside, according to Mr. Palmer, "to commence immediately and prosecute with the utmost vigor infringement proceedings whenever the first German attempt shall hereafter be made to import into this country." The other half, as stated earlier, was paid to the Government for the German patents. Of this curious sale Mr. Palmer says: "The price thus paid was necessarily determined somewhat arbitrarily"; and he adds airily, "the great majority of the patents were presumably valueless."

In a frank talk with me in which he furnished every detail asked for in regard to the stockholders and management of the Chemical Foundation, Mr. Garvan pointed out that the organization was not monopolistic because it did not issue exclusive licenses under any of its patents but granted their use for a small consideration to all applicants. The royalties asked were only 5 to 10 per cent of the selling price of the product, and the total royalties realized from domestic manufacturers by the Foundation during 1919, 1920, and the first three months of this year were only $73,789.16. Mr. Garvan said further that the importance of the German patents had been overestimated, since not more than 10 per cent of our dyes were manufactured under them. Of the 4,500 German patents held by the Foundation, the use of only 413 has so far been asked for.

The control of the Foundation rests entirely in the common stock, which represents $100,000 of the total capital of $500,000. No one interest can hold more than two $100 shares. Only 240 shares have actually been issued, to 165 holders. The administration of the patents is in the hands of a board of five trustees, self-continuing until the last patent expires, which will be in fourteen years.

Mr. Garvan's statements make it evident that the Foundation has not in fact abused its powers, but there seems to be fair ground for the assertion that it possesses a monopoly, since public property was granted to it, a private corporation, on terms which make abuse possible. Moreover, it is apparent that under an embargo the American dye industry would have a monopoly of the domestic field against international competition.

How does it happen that manufacturers requiring cheap and good dyes, particularly makers of textiles, have not protested against this attempt to establish a dye monopoly which will certainly increase their costs and probably foist upon them inferior materials? It is a case of "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." The same legislation that provides for an embargo on foreign dyes also contains tariff protection for textile makers. Nevertheless objections have been made. The great Amoskeag mills are in opposition to a dye monopoly, while Joseph S. Rambo, president of Rambo and Regar, has said:

> There are at least three [domestic] large manufacturers of direct black, which today brings from 80 cents to 90 cents a pound and is about half the strength of the concentrated pre-war product which sold at not more than 25 cents. Methyl violet, of which there are many manufactures, today is selling for about $1.75, and is approximately the same grade as pre-war goods at 32 cents. Acid black is today selling for $1 to $1.10, and is slightly better than half the strength of the concentrated pre-war imported product at 26 cents. Indigo, one of the most important colors, is today about 60 cents, against a pre-war net price of from 15 to 16 cents. When we consider that the domestic production of these colors in 1919, as given by the United States Tariff Commission, was: Methyl violet, 574,000 pounds; acid black, 1,800,000 pounds; direct black, 7,250,000 pounds, and indigo, 8,800,000 pounds, one can readily understand that the textile man's dyestuff costs have tremendously increased.
>
> Take a hosiery mill which dyes silk and cotton stockings. Before the war it used about six pounds of Zambesi Black B, at 30 cents, for dyeing 100 pounds of hosiery. Now, if it feels it can afford a black of the same character, it probably would use the domestic product at $2 per pound, which is about 20 per cent weaker. In other words, a pre-war cost for dyeing of $1.80 per hundred, as against a present cost of $15, or an advance of about $13 per hundred pounds. Now a mill dyeing a thousand pounds of hosiery per day is not at all exceptional, and its increased cost on this basis for dyestuffs alone would be $130 per day, $650 per week of only five days, or approximately $34,000 per year.

Opposition to a dye monopoly and the methods of the Chemical Foundation has also appeared in Congress. In a speech on May 9 Senator Moses (Republican) of New Hampshire charged that the youthful and anemic dye industry had spent $104,932 for "legislative expenditures" in 1920, maintaining "one of the most highly organized, best paid, and arrogant lobbies that the Capitol has ever seen." Some $50,000 went as fees, he said, half to Joseph H. Choate, Jr., general counsel of the Chemical Foundation, the rest to Judge J. Harry Covington who left the Federal bench to work for the dye interests; while by last accounts $21,000 was still owing to Mr. Choate. According to Senator Moses, Mr. Choate "has spent no inconsiderable part of his time roaming about the country addressing parlor meetings of ladies in advocacy of national defense to be obtained by giving his clients an absolute monopoly in the dyestuffs market of America." Senator Moses might have added that Mr. [illegible]'s pen has also been busy. In the *Nation's Business* for June, for instance, is an article by him entitled Key Industries at Any Cost!

Senator King (Republican) of Utah joined in the attack, asking for a special committee to investigate the activities of various lobbies in connection with Congressional legislation. The matter was referred to a sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, consisting of Senators Cummins, Sterling, and Walsh. In the House on July 5, Representative Frear (Republican) of Wisconsin condemned the dye embargo thus:

> During the war an American dye business of enormous proportions grew up over night like a mushroom, extracting unconscionable war profits from the American public. For six years it has enjoyed a complete embargo against all foreign dye competition. The American dye industry is now controlled by the Chemical Foundation that represents over a half billion dollars in assets. This trust now demands a continuation of the war embargo so that dye prices, still maintained at several times pre-war prices, may be continued indefinitely without danger of competition, while the ultimate consumer pays the bill.

That large sums have been spent to create aniline Americanism is admitted by Mr. Garvan, formerly Alien Property Custodian and now president of the Chemical Foundation. In an interview printed in the New York *World* he is quoted as saying that the Foundation had forwarded "many thousands of books and pamphlets dealing with chemistry to the leading colleges, public and private schools, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, civic organizations including women's clubs, financiers, and business men generally." That this propaganda interested (possibly beguiled) many persons is evident from Mr. Garvan's further remark that in response to this sowing of words the Foundation had received more than 10,000 letters.

To build up industry by tariffs, embargoes, and monopolies is admitted by all students to be economically unsound. That it may nevertheless be desirable from political or social considerations is arguable. But if on this score we were to subsidize an industry (which is what a protective policy comes to) the community ought first to control that industry, to the end that its money should go for its own purposes and not be diverted into the coffers of private business. By any other arrangement we would be buying a pig in a poke.

Taxation or Confiscation in Mexico

By E. J. DILLON

TWO interesting illustrations of Mexico's entanglements are worth recording. They show how defenseless she is before her great northern neighbor and how incumbent it is on this neighbor to use its strength sparingly and in accordance with the promptings of reason and humanity. Today General Obregon as President of the Republic has but one sheet anchor of salvation—the consciousness that his policy is based on justice and the hope that interest no less than principle may impel the present business-like Administration of the United States to give him the requisite time to unfold it.

Hampered by a heavy foreign debt for the settlement of which creditors and politicians are daily clamoring, the Obregon Cabinet is at its wit's end to find the wherewithal to pay the interest. And unless it can hit upon some happy device, the country will soon fall under an international financial as well as an American moral tutelage. Usually necessitous governments have the choice between taxation and a loan. But Mexico is an exception. Not yet recognized by the only country able to lend her money her rulers are obliged to obtain a contribution to the service of the foreign debt by taxing what will bear taxation. And that is oil. There is no other way. Accordingly General Obregon has recently increased the tax on oil produced in the country by an average, it is computed, of 25 per cent and decreed that the proceeds shall not be swept into the bottomless pit of wasteful expenditure, but shall be applied exclusively to making payments on the foreign debt. This measure is gall and wormwood to the companies which will have to pay the augmented impost. Their representatives in Washington are said to have immediately made preparations to call the attention of the State Department to the decree which they regard as "virtual confiscation," and therefore a crime in international law. It is even reported that its effect on Mexico's outlook in the negotiations now going forward between the two governments will be distinctly prejudicial.

President Obregon, with whom I exchanged views on the general as well as the concrete question, contemplates it from the same angle of vision as did Russia's eminent financier, the late Count Witte. His opinion may be summarized as follows. Taxation is an essentially democratic measure. It furthers the interest of labor which has a right to demand that as large a share as is safely possible of indispensable public expenditure shall be defrayed by taxes on capital. Today this is eminently true of the Mexican state which sorely needs money wherewith to heal the wounds inflicted by ten years of anarchy and to undertake reforms without which the state cannot long subsist. And at present money can be had only within the boundaries of the Republic. None of the ordinary devices are of avail. Economy presupposes a fairly well-filled exchequer—a boon which Mexico has not enjoyed since the days of Limantour. Moreover thrift, however stringently practiced, would contribute nothing toward the service of the foreign debt, seeing that the pinch of penury is felt in all departments. And at the moment when more money is required than ever before all hopes of a foreign loan are coincidently barred by what may be termed the triple alliance of American, British, and French bankers, which has imposed on Mexico a politico-financial boycott.

The only way to ease even partially a situation like this which is as painful as it is dangerous is taxation, and to this expedient every country in the world is having abundant recourse today. Indeed in some progressive states taxation has been raised to a level not far removed from confiscation. In others, as in Germany and Sweden, the governments have compelled the great industries to admit them as partners with a right to a share of the profits. Against these innovations private corporations and individuals have murmured but in no case have their respective governments ventured to protest on their behalf. For they are all in the same boat. Necessity knows no law but that of justice, and it is recognized as a principle that if all

the industries of a class are equally liable to a tax the demands of justice are satisfied. And if it be objected that in the case under consideration the industries in question are all owned by English-speaking foreigners who regard it as an unfriendly act, Mexicans would retort that the possession of one privilege does not entitle the holder to claim another. Natives and foreigners are alike subjected to the new tax.

There are however other ways of looking at the matter. Every country is entitled and every government morally obliged in the interests of its citizens to adopt protective measures in the form of export dues on those natural resources which once exhausted can never be replenished. And no foreign state, however painfully its nationals may be hit, can fairly oppose the levy of such a tribute. Unhappily for themselves many countries have failed to exercise that right and their respective governments have neglected to perform the corresponding duty, and the consequences which ensued are writ large today in the decay of industry and commerce, the plague of chronic unemployment, the unrest—in some lands the revolt—of labor, and general discontent. The twenty-eight millions of workers in England who today are dependent for their living on doles meted out by the state are currently supposed to be strike victims. But one would not be far wrong if one sought for the origin of their pauperism in the improvidence of their rulers who made no provision for the lean years which they ought to have known were coming.

Today statesmen vainly deplore the shortsightedness of their predecessors who allowed the most precious resources with which nature had endowed their country to be brought to market and disposed of, so to say, for a mess of pottage to the foreigner who built fleets, railways, and established lucrative industries with the proceeds of the transaction. If an importing country is earning, say, a 1,000 per cent profit on a product, is it meet that the country which owns it should be forced to do with 10 or 20 per cent? In favor of such a contention there is nothing to be urged.

Examples are many and instructive. For nearly half a century Great Britain squandered the coal on which her world status depended, selling it at absurdly low rates to foreign peoples who were thus enabled to establish new industries or to renovate old ones and to compete with her successfully in the markets of the world. From 238,000 tons sold out of the United Kingdom in the year 1816 the total exportation rose to 1,606,000 in the year 1840, to 15,495,000 in 1878, to 76,382,000 in 1906, and to 80,366,000 in the year 1914. If England had imposed an export duty of, say, $9 on that coal her miners would have had a decent living wage; so too would the sailors who manned the ships that carried it to Singapore, Piraeus, and other foreign ports; the mine-owners would have had larger profits and the country generally would have benefited. Instead of that the workers were during that long period ill paid, badly housed, and chronically embittered against the upper classes, while the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Russia, and other states were enabled to build merchant fleets and establish a flourishing carrying trade at the expense of England. Further, she picked the very best product of her coal measures for the home and foreign markets, leaving the inferior coal to be mined later at enormous cost. England likewise parted with her excellent iron ore for about two pounds sterling a ton, whereas now she is paying three pounds a ton for iron ore which she is compelled to import from Sweden. In the year 1819 the amount of iron ore sold and exported to foreign parts was but 73,000 tons. In the year 1853 the total had risen to 1,261,000 tons. In the year 1890 it amounted to 4,001,000 and in 1907 to 5,152,000. And it never occurred to any of the various governments which discharged the functions of the nation's trustees to levy an export tax on one of the nation's main assets. Today the iron ore has to be purchased from Scandinavia and one of England's chief resources is gone irretrievably.

The United States dealt and is still dealing in a like thriftless way with certain of her natural resources, such for instance as her forests. Estimates made by the American Paper and Pulp Association, which are admittedly somewhat crude, compute the forests still existing in the United States at between 500,000,000 and 550,000,000 acres. Originally, however, the country possessed a forest area of no less than from 850,000,000 to 900,000,000 acres. And at the present rate of consumption the stand of matured timber in the United States will be exhausted within fifty years! Only a drastic and speedy reafforestation policy can save the nation from this disastrous consummation.

It was those magnificent forests and the trades and industries to which they gave rise that enabled railways, steamships, and flourishing marts to be constructed. The city of Seattle, for instance, is an offshoot of the splendid forests which are fast vanishing and of the mines which are approaching the point of exhaustion, and when these will have ceased to repay the cost of exploitation and nothing remains but agricultural produce, the effects will be sinister, durable, and far-reaching. The timber sold to the foreigner did not fetch more than one-quarter of its intrinsic value, the remaining three-quarters going to enrich countries overseas.

Similar remarks are applicable to the low prices which ruled for oil, iron, and copper. Again the United States sold its crude oil for $1 a barrel, out of which the producer received from fifty to eighty cents. The average price for some forty years hardly exceeded $1 a barrel. Today it has risen to nearly $3. And according to the most competent geologists half of the oil in the United States is already exhausted. Germany bought large quantities of American oil and for some thirty years she imported from various countries perhaps fifty million barrels annually. Her industrial corporations refined it at large profits and manufactured various other articles out of the by-products. The average price was one dollar for a barrel and the Germans sold the gasoline, vaseline, saccharine, paraffin, perfumes, and about two hundred products in all at a price equal to $20 the barrel.

In a like thriftless but strictly constitutional way the United States parted with its copper at the rate of $200 a ton, Germany being a large buyer. She took over a hundred thousand tons of copper a year—before the war the average price between 1890 and 1911 being not more than ten cents a pound. During the war it rose to forty-two cents. In order to give to Germany that copper at ten cents a pound the railways had to carry it from Montana to the sea for $8 a ton. Today the freight is double that.

A cognate if less apt illustration is afforded by the trade in cotton. The United States, with a practical monopoly of cotton, disposed of the crops during long decades at the rate of from five to eight cents a pound, a price rendered possible only because of cheap labor in the South. This money did not allow the laborers a sufficient living wage,

the owners a fair return, nor the railway companies adequate pay for carrying it to market. What could and should have been done was to levy an export duty on the produce, raise the wages of the agricultural laborer, and oblige the foreigner to whom an exorbitant and unearned share of the value was accruing to contribute to the well-being of the country and the people who were creating it.

In this fatuous way the English-speaking races went on lavishing the natural resources of their countries on the foreigner and compelling or allowing their own people to dissipate its wealth to enrich strangers overseas. Today the best copper and silver mines of the United States and the best coal measures of England are well-nigh exhausted, the industries of the latter country are, to put it mildly, on the wane, and the labor situation generally is disorganized.

Now, is it unreasonable in itself or tantamount to an unfriendly act toward foreigners for the President of Mexico, who has the interests of his country at heart, to profit by the mistakes of the British and the Yankees? He does not think so, nor does he believe that the great English-speaking nations entertain any such opinion. Mexico's oil, mines, and forests constitute her greatest economic asset and also, unluckily, her heaviest political curse. And to allow these resources to be carried out of the country in the improvident way in which England and the United States permitted them to be exported would today be a crime and a disaster.

The sharp polemic now going on between the press of Mexico and that of the United States on this question of taxation is confused by the smuggling into it of political issues. The essence of the matter would seem to be whether or no the increased tax is confiscatory. If the reply is in the negative, there is no objection derived from international law which will hold against it. And that is the stand taken by the Mexican Government. Of course if it could be shown conclusively not merely that production will sensibly fall off in consequence, but that the oil industry as a whole will become unprofitable, there should and would be no hesitation on the part of the Mexican Administration to temper the wind to the shorn sheep. For no government, and least of all one that needs money as badly as does that of Mexico, would be fatuous enough to commit economic suicide by cutting off the main source of its existence. What confiscation would be to the foreign oil companies would spell bankruptcy and ruin to the Mexican state. Taxation to the point of confiscation carries its own remedy. In this case one has but to conjure up in one's mind's eye a picture of the oil companies abandoning work because it had been made unprofitable, and the obstinacy of the Mexican Government in maintaining it and dispensing with its principal source of revenue to realize how fantastic is the idea.

Mexicans urge that today oil is being extracted and exported at a rate calculated to alarm the nation's trustees. It is a repetition of what England did with her coal and iron ore and the United States with its timber. Immense fortunes have been and are being made and taken away by foreigners, few abiding traces of which are left in the land. So considerable are the quantities of Mexican oil at present imported into the United States that voices have been uplifted here calling for an import duty on it. Now why, it is asked, should a foreign government as well as foreign corporations draw enormous gains from a product which yields relatively inadequate profits to the country in which it is found? If it can bear an increase of taxation—and this is admitted by all—why should the government which contributes nothing to the exploitation be the beneficiary? Again, it cannot be asserted that there is any international law which forbids a government to regulate in the interests of the community the exploitation of natural produce or even manufactured commodities. Every state is at liberty to put in force such measures for the purpose as it deems called for. Examples of the exercise of this right during and since the war are numerous, and for the protection of a source of wealth which can never be replenished the right is unassailable.

From the fiscal point of view the arguments that favor the Mexican position are forcible. There is something peculiarly revolting in the contention that a nation should go to rack and ruin for lack of the funds requisite to carry on the government of the country when that country is teeming with wealth. And Mexico thinks she can discern a regrettable touch in the policy of a powerful neighbor which presses her to pay her debts, yet closes to her all avenues to credit throughout the globe and by way of crowning the work disputes her right to raise part of the money by taking her full share of the resources which she herself possesses at home. A more stringent boycott, a more deadly grip, they say, it would be difficult to imagine.

General Obregon's exposé of the motives for the increase of taxation is masterly and convincing. The tax, he argues, is not discriminating against the foreigner in favor of the native. The Constitution of Mexico, against which so much has been written, is the foreigners' best protection, for it forbids both exemption and discrimination. Mexico, he further argues, has been aptly termed the treasure house of the world. Incalculable wealth lies hidden in its mountains, plains, and valleys. Enormous fortunes have been made by foreigners in extracting part of that wealth. Yet 90 per cent of the native population is vegetating in poverty, squalor, disease, and ignorance because this stream of riches flows by without touching them. "Common humanity dictated a change and it is this change that Mexico has made. We stand today on the principle that the natural resources of a nation belong to the nation."

Those are the words of a man whose love of justice is a passion and for whom the service of humanity is a cult. I traveled through most states of the Republic with him and I can bear out what he advances respecting the piteous condition of the nation whose mineral wealth is fabulous. That condition is a blot on humanity. It is intolerable, and no man capable of enduring it, whether on principle or expediency, deserves to stand at the head of the ill-starred Mexican people.

Contributors to This Issue

E. J. DILLON, who contributed the striking article on Alvaro Obregon and His Policy for *The Nation* of July 20 and who writes again on Mexican affairs in this issue, is one of the most distinguished of European journalists.

W. E. NASH has been the correspondent for the Chicago *Daily News* in Europe for the past two years.

RICHARD ROBERTS is pastor of the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, and a distinguished writer upon public affairs.

AMY LOWELL, the best-known poet of the Imagist school, is also one of the leading American critics of poetry.

The Outcome in Upper Silesia

By W. E. NASH

FIVE-CORNERED wars are rare in history, yet a conflict of that kind really seems to have taken place in Upper Silesia this summer. No belligerent party quite agreed with any other and each desired a different solution. Were it not for the general exhaustion of Europe a new world war might easily have resulted, in which the *entente cordiale* between Great Britain and France would have been split open beyond repair. This catastrophe was nearer than most people realized; indeed, all danger is not yet past, for Poland and Germany are still glowering at each other across the frontier and are backed in their plots by the rival policies of France and England. Moreover Austria, Hungary, and the Balkans are vitally interested in the Silesian question because a large part of their coal supply comes from that territory. Without exaggeration it can be said that this is the most important region in Central Europe. A heavy responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the Prime Ministers of England, France, and Italy when they meet to decide its ultimate fate.

On May 3, 1921, miners and peasants of Polish descent, clad in tattered working clothes and led by one of their own countrymen, Adalbert Korfanty, flared up in rebellion at the rumor that Upper Silesia was to be given to Germany. Whatever may be said about the justice of their cause or about the advisability of allowing a minority to dictate to a majority, there can be little doubt that these simple Polish workers were animated by a real hatred of the Prussian, generated by decades of past mistreatment. Their plans succeeded with startling rapidity. Mines, pitheads, factories, and villages, which stud the flat, thickly inhabited countryside of the industrial area, fell into their hands without a fight. Moreover, in the rolling agricultural districts further to the westward they were met not by Allied troops, who had sworn a solemn oath to maintain order in Upper Silesia, but by improvised German bands as heterogeneous as themselves. Neither side was well armed; neither had heavy cannon, poison gases, or airplanes. No systematic trench lines were dug, as during the Great War. Nevertheless, a sanguinary little struggle of skirmish parties, fitful in the daytime but desperate at night, did result and did cause many casualties. A front line tended to stabilize itself along the river Oder. The roads both great and small were commanded by earthworks and machine-guns. No one was allowed to pass without special military permission. So matters stood about May 21.

Meantime the attitude of the Allies had been developing in a significant manner. Ten thousand French troops adopted a benevolent or passive behavior toward the Poles, giving them free rein wherever possible, and retiring from all garrison posts save the large cities of Kattowitz, Beuthen, Tarnowitz, Gleiwitz, and Hindenburg. In the last-named city they allowed the insurgents to commit revolting outrages on defenseless German refugees, while in the other cities they maintained only a very poor show of protecting German lives and German property. Poles were allowed to arm themselves for battle, but it meant death or imprisonment for a German to be caught defending his home with weapons in his hand. Only when German defense bands began to form along the banks of the Oder did the French wake up to the seriousness of the situation and, forgetting entirely which side had begun the rebellion, see fit to fill the world with cries of a new German military menace.

Three thousand Italians, on the other hand, who had come to Upper Silesia to assist in police work, did their duty nobly. They resisted insurgent aggression and did not hesitate to fire on disturbers of the peace. Over twenty-five Italian soldiers were killed in conflicts with the Poles in the districts of Pless and Rybnik. The other Allied nation represented in Upper Silesia, namely Great Britain, had no troops in the country when the trouble began save a dozen or two officers engaged in administration work. These latter soon found themselves in a position of great humiliation. When they attempted to act impartially and protect Germans from violence, as all Allies had sworn to do, their orders were ignored by French troops. They were treated as a negligible quantity by the Poles. One officer, a certain Major Creacy, was backed up against a wall and threatened with death; another, Major Powel, was arrested for traveling without a Polish pass; while Majors Crichton and Bond were several times threatened with violence.

These and other incidents caused a feeling of intense bitterness between British and Italians on one side and French on the other. The English accused the French of double dealing and bad faith, the French the British of pro-Germanism. The colonel second in command of the British contingent told the writer that if he had had his way he would have broken openly with the French. Other British officers sent such vehement reports to London that Lloyd George was induced to make a startling Silesian speech in the House of Commons on May 13, wherein he issued sundry veiled warnings to France and open ones to Poland and the Polish insurgents. Italian and British officers almost ceased to associate with Frenchmen in the tortuous streets of Oppeln, the animated little country town that serves as the capital of Upper Silesia.

Meantime public opinion in Poland and Germany became more and more excited. Every sort of equipment was sent from Warsaw to Korfanty's soldiers, while volunteers from Bavaria, the Austrian Tyrol, and German Bohemia flocked to the *Selbstschutz* ranks. The Poles concentrated in the north, captured the town of Rosenberg, and pressed on through the woods toward Kreuzburg. The Germans appointed Von Hoefer, a famous general of the old regime, as their commander. On May 25 about 2,000 Bavarians burst loose from the small bridgehead of Gogolin on the left bank of the Oder, overcame Polish resistance in some near-by lime kilns, and advanced about fifteen miles inland. Their impetus was so great that a small party of sixty men, armed with hand-grenades and knives, captured the stronghold of the Annaberg, which if well defended should have been able to hold out against an army. Much booty fell into German hands there. On June 3 Von Hoefer again pressed forward and captured the important strategic points of Kandrzin and Slawentzitz. If not restrained by an Allied ultimatum, there is reason to believe that he could have advanced as far as the industrial area, for all that stood in his way was a French garrison in Gleiwitz.

From May 28 to June 3 British troops under a "hustler" named General Henniker had been arriving in Upper Silesia. It was soon seen that in theoretical cooperation with the French they were to be used to clear a neutral zone between the belligerent parties. One British sergeant was killed by the Poles; three Frenchmen were wounded by the Germans. Every time a French contingent went near the German lines it had to be accompanied by a British officer, and the inverse relation held good for British troops and French officers in the Polish lines. How the Allies ever made progress under such conditions remains a mystery, yet it is a fact that little by little they did succeed in pushing back both Poles and Germans. The hard-pressed cities in the industrial area, which though garrisoned by French troops had undergone all the rigors of a merciless siege, were restored to communication with the outside world. Transportation was reopened, the coal trade revived, and a semblance of order restored, though as far as can be ascertained the insurgents were not deprived of their arms.

In the plebiscite which took place on March 20, 1921, the German inhabitants polled approximately 60 per cent of the total number of votes cast, thus gaining a plausible claim to the province as a whole. Their claim was disputed by the French and the Poles, who asserted that the Versailles peace treaty contained provisions for a partition of the territory. In two counties, those of Pless and Rybnik, the Poles gained a large majority. In the territory west and north of the Oder the Germans won "hands down." In the industrial area the result was very close. The easiest solution, therefore, would seem to be to give away the undisputed counties where the vote was decisive and to keep the central area under international control, a plan favored by moderate men of all factions. This would simplify the problem of maintaining order and would guarantee a fair division of the coal output. Unfortunately, however, it meets with unbending hostility on the part of the French leaders. They want to give all the land up to the river Oder, the city of Oppeln, and the county of Kreuzburg to the Poles, on the basis of the following theory: Every commune (township) must be considered as a separate entity. Not the number of individual votes but the number of collective township votes shall determine the victory. Thus if Poland gained sixty townships in the county of Beuthen, totaling 48,000 votes, and Germany six large cities, totaling 50,000 votes, Poland would win, or at least would be entitled to keep all rural communities which declared for her. The other Allies objected to this plan which would make the map of Upper Silesia look like a crazy quilt.

The Supreme Council of Allied Premiers intends to meet during the summer to decide the fate of Upper Silesia. Three solutions lie open to it: (1) The whole country to Germany; (2) Pless and Rybnik to Poland. West bank of the Oder and county of Kreuzburg to Germany. Central, industrial district to remain under Allied control; (3) so-called Korfanty line, giving all the valuable part of the country to Poland.

The first plan is championed by the British, the second by the Italians, and the third by the French, all three, probably, from selfish motives. It is rumored that the British have invested considerable sums of money in German Silesian factories. It is known that Italian bankers have thrown millions of lire into the Polish textile industry. It is suspected that in a treaty recently concluded between France and Poland the French pledged themselves to deliver Upper Silesia into the hands of the Poles in return for valuable concessions in the Galician oil fields. Most students of the situation to whom the writer has talked agree that the second plan stands the best chances of adoption, because it is a compromise between French and British wishes, which both can accept without forfeiting pride or prestige.

Taste and the Man

By LUDWIG LEWISOHN

"IF, then," the professor said, stroking his beard unquietly, "if, then, you allow no standards or certain tests by which the worth of a piece of literature can be established, how are we either to learn or to teach? What are we to study and what are we to transmit as of assured fruitfulness and value?"

"You are, if I may say so," the critic answered thoughtfully, "too proud and too humble at once. You are too proud because you are afraid to spend your time on anything except the perfect and the permanent; you are too humble because you will not let yourself realize that by the exercise of the thought and sensibilities of just such men as you the perfect and permanent is established, is, I had almost said, created."

The professor shook his head. "You go fast. Take up your two points separately. Life is short and feverish. It is not pride that forbids us spending our time on anything but the best."

"The best," the critic repeated slowly. "You work with such hard concepts. There are, I think, several kinds of best. There is, of the one kind, the Pharmaceutria of Vergil. The hexameters are beautiful and liquid beyond description. But as you hear their music you are also a little flattered and sustained in your favorite moods by knowing that it has sounded across so many centuries. You recall, too, that Macaulay thought a certain passage in the poem the loveliest and most moving in Latin poetry. And it is, indeed, charming in itself. But some of its charm is also in the very antiquity of that little lad who sighed for his sweetheart in the orchard. And is not mere antiquity in itself, quite like novelty in itself, an adventitious source of interest though, I should grant you at once, by far the nobler?

The professor smiled. "Your psychology is sound even if it is a little like prying. But I am curious to hear about your other kind of best."

"Let us suppose," the critic said, "that a novel appears with a style and form of but mediocre quality and also, so far as we can see, with little chance of being remembered for many years to come. But let us suppose, further—for it happens every year—that this novel renders and thus clarifies some vital and widespread experience of the men and women who live today so accurately and so closely that life itself is a little changed and its difficulty a little mitigated—would you not recognize there, too, a value of the best kind?"

"But, what has it to do with art?" the professor asked.

"Nothing, if you limit art to a few simple gestures permanently molded. But the majority of men are not connoisseurs of such beauty. Life is, as you said, short and feverish. They do not want to die before they have learned to live."

"Are the classics barren in that respect?"

"No, but insufficient. 'Non omnia possumus omnes.' How true but how cold and general. Also, it is didactic—a maxim pronounced from without. We need experience more than maxims."

The professor shook his head. "It seems to me that we began by talking about one thing and are now talking about

another. I am acquainted with the modern doctrine of art as expression. I understand it though it means little to me. On the basis of it I am not unwilling to grant you an excellence in literature made up of such elements as you have described. I still desire to know how, without norms or standards, we are to recognize among the works of this or any age those that will be permanent because their beauty will be, like the beauty of the Pharmaceutria, permanently persuasive to the souls of men."

"You want," the critic said, choosing his words carefully, "a recognition before the fact which cannot come because it is not born until after the fact. The friends of Vergil by believing in the permanence of his poem began to create it. Their equals in sensitiveness and insight approved that judgment in generation after generation. Separately these judgments were subjective and independent of external norms in every instance. Collectively, however, the agreement of so many identical subjective reactions over so long a period of time came to constitute the only kind of objectivity we know at all. I said you were too humble and I meant that you will not take toward some contemporary work the attitude that Vergil's friends took and so begin the creation of that permanence in beauty which you crave."

"But suppose I have not their good fortune and my subjective decision is reversed?"

The critic smiled. "The extremes of humility and pride are one," he said. "You are too humble to judge because you are too proud to take the chance of having judged wrongly. You want the safeguard of standards in order to avoid the risks of human fate."

"I do not admit your picture of human fate," the professor cried, "as excluding the recognizably transcendent and eternal! Where are we to rest in this mad flux?"

"We are in it," the critic said sadly. "No shore is visible. I refuse to suppose a shore because I am weary at moments. Life and art create their values from within. Here or nowhere is eternity."

The professor arose. "I refuse to live in such a world!"

The critic smiled again. "That is an old and frequent cry. Your classics have not taught you their great lesson of resignation. But that cry grants my case. I, at least, have a chance of being more useful than you who ask for a moon you do not even see."

"It is better to ask for a moon that does not exist than to consent to a moonless world."

"Ah, you idealists," the critic said, "you offer a fine and heroic spectacle for us in our leisure hours. But we who are meek do the work that needs to be done upon the earth and perhaps we shall, as it was foretold of us, inherit it after all."

In the Driftway

WEEK-ENDS in the country, the Drifter had about decided, were no better than week-ends in the city. It was hot, it was dusty, innumerable small, black flies buzzed in front of his nose, poison ivy lurked he knew not where, but probably just where he was walking. He sulkily refused to remark the much advertised display of nature on every side and instead kept his eyes doggedly fixed on the brown caked dirt at his feet. Thus it was that the end of the road took him unawares and with a gasp he drew back from plunging over the brink of what lay before him. Rushing, swirling, foaming and breaking over rocks and roots, an intrepid mountain stream beckoned to him. Almost before he thought about it he was in it; the water was cold! There was at least one pool deep enough to swim in, and swim the Drifter did, pushing the smooth, yielding water away from him, drawing himself slowly and lazily through the magic coolness. A large frog on a green stone regarded him calmly. The trailing branches on either side of the stream drew wet but not disapproving fingers across him as he passed under them. He was swept over slippery, moss-covered pebbles by miniature rapids and halted on the other side by an inconsiderable whirlpool. Who, he reflected, would not live forever in the country if he could! No dust, no heat, no mosquitoes—without a single stab of conscience he named over as assets the things he had been condemning but a few moments before. And, though he does not wish this to be used as an argument by the Prohibition forces, it was water that made all the difference. Nor does he wish this story to come to the ears of the Blue Laws advocates, for all this happened on a Sunday, and though it is certainly less sinful (and infinitely more desirable) than reading the Sunday newspapers, its very pleasurableness might serve to put it on the Indigo Index Expurgatorius.

* * * * *

THE Drifter cannot refrain from the pleasure of giving to *The Nation's* readers this amusing characterization of the unbeloved British Winston Churchill by "Lucio" in the *Manchester Guardian,* entitled Mr. Churchill's Palm Tree, a suggested inscription for the palm tree recently planted by Mr. Churchill in Jerusalem in the presence of 5,000 Zionists:

Stranger, I am no common tree,
For Winston Churchill planted me;
Churchill, the burden of whose song
Was "All in turn and nothing long";
Who sought at first the warrior's crown
And helped to do the Mahdi down;
Who fought at Spion Kop's retreat
(And later on at Sidney Street);
Who changed his party like his hat,
And office oftener than that;
Who, wearied of the Board of Trade,
Home Secretary was promptly made,
Next, turned the navy's new physician
And launched the Antwerp Expedition,
Then fell from grace, but rose again
To guide the army and its men,
To rule o'er Whitehall's little Prussia
And cost us God knows what in Russia,
To see red uniforms restored
And give the R. A. F. a sword.
Such was the Man that planted me,
Churchill, the chosen of Dundee,
Who ruled the air, the land, the sea;
And, not content, now plays the lion
Before the assembled hosts of Zion,
Thus "featured" (for a time at least)
As Emperor of the Middle East.

. . . . . .

Here, in the shade that he designed
Rest, traveler, and compose thy mind—
By Allah (who knows all things hid),
'Tis more than Winston ever did!

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The American Legion

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a volunteer in the recent holocaust and an individual demanding freedom and personal liberty even in time of peace I wish to express my appreciation of Mr. Warner's articles on The American Legion. He is to be admired for his courage and commended for his temperateness.

We as individuals demand the liberty and freedom we fought for as a nation. The oligarchy of an organization or of a clique within an organization must not be tolerated. The prostitution of an organization formed ostensibly for the perpetuation of decent social intercourse is a disgrace to every honest veteran.

Is the American Legion unmindful of the earnest, even frantic, desires for eternal peace of the maimed victims of the war, or does it wish to perpetuate the hatred and the misery? Is its spirit militaristic or peaceful?

Mountain Lake Park, Md., July 7. H. B. LANDA.

British C. O. and Quaker Exemptions

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As I know how difficult it was to find out the exact condition of exemption for C. O.'s during the war on your side the Atlantic, I can understand the difficulty of being absolutely accurate regarding the British exemptions. Apropos, therefore, your reference in the article on the Society of Friends in your issue of June 15, may I point out that no exemption was given to Quakers as such, as is there suggested. Unofficial "official" offers of a special tribunal for Quakers were made, but were refused. All C. O.'s therefore were able to apply for exemption on a common basis of "conscientious objection" on moral or religious grounds alone. In practice, of course, the question was almost invariably directly asked as to whether the applicant was a Quaker, and if he were he was practically sure of exemption from combatant service. Neither Quaker nor non-Quaker C. O.'s however (with about two score exceptions) received the absolute exemption possible under the act, but a dead letter in practice.

Might I take the opportunity of informing your readers that a full history of the C. O. movement written by Principal J. W. Graham of Dalton Hall, Manchester, will be ready in the autumn. In this volume he will bring a good many facts to light which will make startling reading.

London, England, June 6 HUBERT W. PEET

The Tariff Bill: A Correction

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have seen a copy of *The Nation* which indicates to me that while your journal, I assume, wants to be fair it has utterly misstated the situation with reference to the pending tariff bill. The minority report of the Committee on Ways and Means simply outdid itself in vituperation but was lamentably short in facts and arguments. You follow it when you say in your editorial that the hearings of the committee were in secret. They were not. They were open to everybody and attended by large audiences. The Republican majority of the committee met by itself to frame the bill, just as the Democratic majority did when the Underwood bill was framed, the Wilson bill, and all other tariff bills were framed by a majority of the committee. The proceedings of the committee were given out much more freely than ever before, for the papers every day carried a summary of the rates adopted and even just how each member of the committee voted.

The principal complaint against the Payne bill was based on Schedule K, the wool schedule. This has been entirely rewritten on an altogether different basis, lowering the duties to the consumer of cloth from those levied in the Payne bill.

W. R. GREEN
Congressman from Iowa and Member of the Committee on Ways and Means

Washington, D. C., July 18

The Imprisoned I. W. W. at Leavenworth

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I call your attention, as well as that of your readers, to the cases of the I. W. W. prisoners at present doing time at Leavenworth? There are about one hundred and twenty of these men, all told. They are serving sentences varying from five to twenty years. I happen to be one of those serving a twenty-year sentence, so I can speak from first-hand knowledge.

We were arrested in 1917 under three indictments, known respectively as the Chicago, Sacramento, and Wichita indictments, charging us with conspiracy to hamper and obstruct the United States Government in the conduct of the war. After being held from one to two years under unspeakable conditions which caused the death of some, and others to go insane, in the county jails of Chicago, Sacramento, Wichita and other towns in Kansas, we were "tried," convicted, and given sentences varying from one to twenty years. Fifteen received twenty-year sentences and the majority of the remainder are now serving ten-year sentences.

Not one of us was proven guilty of any crime. We were convicted under the stress of war-time hysteria and public prejudice. Our real offense was that we all were, or had been, more or less active members of the I. W. W. We held, and still hold, certain opinions regarding the present system of society which are unfavorable to the ruling class and at variance with those held by the great majority of the people. Whether these opinions are right or wrong cuts no figure as far as the principle involved in these cases is concerned. If men can be imprisoned for their opinions then the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution no longer exist in the United States; free press and free speech are only empty phrases used to deceive the unthinking. If we are forced to serve out these sentences then no one is safe. Anyone holding opinions which the American plutocracy consider dangerous to their privileges can be thrown behind prison bars and forced to spend many years in a felon's cell. Our imprisonment not only means loss of liberty and all that makes life worth living to us. It is also a direct attack on the liberties of one hundred and ten million people. If the American people stand for these high-handed and savage judicial acts, unparalleled in any modern civilized country, it means that they have abandoned all claims to the rights and liberties for which our forefathers shed their blood. The lives of one hundred and twenty men are of little consequence. If forced to serve out our sentences we can do so, and I for one would rather stay in jail with a clear conscience than bow the knee to privilege on the outside. The real tragedy lies in the moral breakdown of a great people.

The only power that can free us is aroused public opinion. These cases must be investigated and the facts given wide publicity, and such a strong protest made to the officials at Washington that they may see their way clear to take action leading to the early release of all political prisoners in the State and Federal prisons of the United States. A small group of liberals and radicals are doing all in their power to bring about general amnesty for all political prisoners. Needless to say we thoroughly appreciate their efforts on our behalf. I ask you to add your voice to theirs, to the end that justice may be done and the voice of freedom, in unmistakable tones, may once more ring through the land.

Leavenworth, Kansas, July 13 JAMES ROWAN

To Carl Sandburg

By AMY LOWELL

I think I am cousin-german to Endymion,
Certainly I have loved the moon a long time.

I have seen her, a faint conceit of silver,
Shooting little silver arrows into a marsh pool at twilight.
I have seen her, high, round, majestic,
Making herself a jewel of fire out of a sea bay.
I have seen the morning moon, grievously battered,
Limping down a colored sky.
Tonight I saw an evening moon
Dodging between tree-branches
Through a singing silence of crickets,
And a man was singing songs to a black-backed guitar.

Today I saw a country I knew well but had never seen.
A country where corn runs a mile or more to a tree-line,
A country where a river, brown as bronze, streaked green with the flowing heads of water-plants,
Slips between a field of apples and a field of wheat.
A country where the eye seeks a long way
And comes back on the curve of a round sky,
Satisfied with greens and blues, tired with the stretch and exhilarated by it.

The moon stops a moment in a hole between leaves
And tells me a new story,
A story of a man who lives in a house with a pear-tree before the door,
A story of little green pears changing and ripening,
Of long catalpa pods turning yellow through September days.
There is a woman in the house, and children,
And, out beyond, the corn-fields are sleeping and the trees are whispering to the fireflies.
So I have seen the man's country, and heard his songs before there are words to them.
And the moon said to me: "This now I give you," and went on, stepping through the leaves.
And the man went on singing, picking out his accompaniment softly on the black-backed guitar.

Books

Architects of a New World

Problems of a New World. By J. A. Hobson. The Macmillan Company.
The Salvaging of Civilization. By H. G. Wells. The Macmillan Company.
The New Society. By Walter Rathenau. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

WE always know what to expect from a new book from Mr. Hobson—clear, straightforward thinking, precise statement, quiet, unpretentious rationality, and a steady march to a conclusion. One sometimes wonders whether he does not overdo his self-restraint; for while he is always persuasive, he is rarely compelling. The preceptor is never lost in the prophet; he always leaves us instructed, but seldom inspired. Often he brings us to a point when a hot hammer stroke would finish the argument for good and all; but he pulls himself up and begins a new chapter. And this is the more unfortunate because his perception of the nature and range of the values upon which human salvation depends is essentially of the prophetic kind. Argument for argument, materialism may make as good a show as idealism; and in the end we are compelled to an act of faith. We will to believe—either way; and Mr. Hobson has elected for a spiritual view of the ends of life. This view he expounds with infinite patience and unfailing clarity; but it never blazes up into a flame that sets others afire. He has all the equipment of the prophet except a sort of holy inflammability.

"Problems of a New World" has all the characteristic Hobson notes; but it leaves us with the same old sense of an unspoken clinching word. Mr. Hobson analyzes with his customary insight the psychology of pre-war Europe, and of the civilian mind in war time; he exposes with a pitiless realism the pathos of popular war idealism and its exploitation by politicians; he discusses the signs and prospects of industrial revolution; and finally he explores the conditions under which a new kind of world may be fashioned. One is aware of a certain lack of coherency between the main sections of the book; and there is a proportionately greater attention paid to the old world and its failings than we should expect in a book bearing this particular title. But taken as a whole, it is a massive statement of the psychological and spiritual background of the rebuilding task before us. The last chapter is—frankly—disappointing. It is hardly more than a catalogue of problems which serve to show the size of the job; and we have a right to something more than this from Mr. Hobson. But perhaps this chapter is only the foreshadowing of another book. At least, let us hope so; for Mr. Hobson can write nothing which is not welcome.

Two points seem to emerge as the essential message of the book. The first is an appeal that we turn from the stupid faith in force which the war has so tragically reinforced to reason "as the preserver of social sanity and the vindicator of the deeper and enduring purposes of mankind"; and the second—in the concluding words of the book—"The crucial test for all post-war reconstruction is the plain economic question: 'Does it increase productivity, thus liberating the worker from the burden of industrialism and enabling him to become a parent, an artist, a scholar, and a human being?'"

To pass from Mr. Hobson to Mr. Wells is to come into a much easier kind of world. Mr. Wells is too facile and voluble to be a reassuring guide. He is always brilliant; and in whatever he writes the going is good for the reader. Yet at the end of it one is conscious of innumerable notes of interrogation. Mr. Hobson reflects close patient thinking; Mr. Wells suggests sparkling improvisation. "The Salvaging of Civilization" seems to have come off the point of his pen as water comes out of a faucet; it gives no such impression of sweat and travail as does Mr. Hobson's book. Yet the book is very well worth reading. Apparently it consists of lectures intended for delivery in this country; and the lecture form has been retained. The first part deals with Mr. Wells's favorite project of a world state, for which he argues ably if not convincingly. The argument rests upon the present shrinkage of the world, which has become too small to tolerate those archaic and divisive groupings which men call nations. A league of nations, especially the existing League, is a preposterous sham, its very title perpetuating that principle of separatism which it is desired to overcome. But surely Mr. Wells himself introduces a needless obstacle to his splendid conception of human unity by describing it as a state; for the state has historically proved to be much more divisive than nationality; and it has always tended to a centralization of authority that soon or late invites disruption. What Mr. Wells has in mind is more like a world society welded together on the basis of a community of ideas and having some kind of clearing house for its public business. From this, he goes on to a very interesting discussion of a new Bible which shall be the repository of the common ideas by which the world is to be united; and he concludes with an analysis of the sort of education that will make for the world society.

The real defect of the book would appear to be its content externality. After all, it is an easy task for a lithe inventive mind to describe a world state, a world Bible, and a world education, and it is, let it be admitted, useful to have Mr. Wells and others do this kind of thing for us. It helps to habituate our minds to the terms in which we shall have to think if the world is to be saved. But coming to Mr. Wells after a reading of Mr. Hobson, it is difficult to resist the feeling that Mr. Wells can plan and scheme for the world's future so lightly and fascinatingly only because at bottom he does not know human nature; or at least because he does not pay much attention to it. This may seem a gross heresy in the eyes of those to whom Wells is "the law and the prophets"; but it remains a pretty problem how Mr. Wells is going to make the now numerous population of his novels live together in his world state.

Dr. Rathenau's position as Minister of Reconstruction in Germany gives his writings an unusual interest and a very large importance. But the writings should be read, as they deserve to be read, for their own sake. He is a man of broad vision and shrewd, penetrating insight; and he has always the courage of his conclusions. We have in him the unusual combination of great practical capacity and a fine idealistic temper. In "The New Society" he addresses himself chiefly to German conditions; and after all that we have heard in recent years of German materialism, it is piquant to have this successful industrial magnate insisting that the peculiar genius of Germany is in the field of intellectual and spiritual leadership. He insists that she was perverting her soul when she set out on her adventure in Realpolitik, and that her failure and her present distress are the just "recompense of reward" of her self-prostitution to the ignoble ends of imperialism. The most useful and stimulating note of the book is the frank throwing overboard of the current political and economic orthodoxies—both conservative and radical. Dr. Rathenau does not suffer doctrinaires or their doctrines gladly; like a compatriot in another sphere, he insists upon the "relativity" of political and economic theory; and he is very hard indeed upon the preachers of Utopias, especially upon those who compress their gospel into an easy formula. The special message of "The New Society" is the idea of "the Interchange of Labor." "By the principle of Interchange of Labor it is required that every employee engaged in mechanical work can claim to do a portion of his day's work in intellectual employment; and that every brain-worker shall be obliged to devote a portion of his day to physical labor." This is plain common sense of course; but the difficulties of working the idea out are obviously enormous. Dr. Rathenau does not, however, shirk from the endeavor to show how the principle may be put in practice; and it is perhaps in this that he makes his most fruitful contribution to current social thinking. For it is not likely that we shall ever attain a condition in which every man shall have, as George Meredith put it, "a full man's share in what is going on in life," until we have organized social life on the basis of "one man, two jobs."

RICHARD ROBERTS.

The Parasite's Tragedy

Alice Adams. By Booth Tarkington. Doubleday, Page and Company.

A SOMEWHAT somber critic, writing in these columns, recently censured Mr. Tarkington for the trivial conclusions with which he has been accustomed to end his novels, rounding them out on a note of glibness which mutilates the narrative and maddens the judicious. Almost as if to discredit his critic's censure, the novelist who committed such artistic mayhem upon Bibbs Sheridan in "The Turmoil" and upon the heir of all the Ambersons in the saga of that Midland family, has now in the career of Alice Adams kept his conscience honest to the last and has produced a masterpiece in comparison with which even his most serious earlier novels seem experiments in the art of fiction.

Looked at from a point of detachment which takes one a little outside the assumptions upon which the chronicle is based, Alice is not strictly a tragic figure. That passion of hers which circumstances thwart is no more, to put it coldly, than her ambition to dispose of her manifest charms to some dominant male who in exchange will establish her—of course lawfully—upon the substantial ground of privilege. Desire, in any of the deeper senses, she does not show any signs of feeling; what she loves in Arthur Russell is but incidentally himself and actually his assured position and his assured prosperity. So considered, her desperate machinations to enchant and hold him have a comic aspect; one touch more of exaggeration and she would pass over to join those sorry ladies of the world of farce who take a larger hand in wooing than human customs happen to approve. But Mr. Tarkington does not give that one touch more of exaggeration. The prudential motives of the mating instinct, he knows, are not to be esteemed too lightly. If Alice had captured Russell, to be sure she would not have been a very profound wife and mother; she would have been a parasite, however competent and charming, as long as her husband and his money lasted—and she would have taken remarkably good care to see that both lasted a long while. Yet for all that, her instinct to win a husband is an instinct as powerful as any she has and is all she has been taught by her society to have. In Mr. Tarkington's sympathetic handling she becomes important; her struggle, almost single-handed, without the aid of guardian dowager or beguiling dot, seems increasingly pathetic as the narrative advances; and her eventual failure, though signalized merely by her determination to make her own living instead of letting some husband do it for her, carries with it a sharp sense of tragedy.

Quite possibly Mr. Tarkington has never gone behind the bourgeois assumptions which his story takes for granted. Well, he has not needed to. Theodore Dreiser would have gone behind them and might have been lost; Edith Wharton might have gone behind them and would have been cruel. Mr. Tarkington sticks to familiar territory and writes with the confident touch of a man who is not confused by speculation. His style has never been more swift, more easy, more flexible, more accurate in its conformity to the vernacular. He attempts no detours and permits himself no superfluities. His piece is ready for the stage almost as it stands, if any producer has the morals to use it without some new, impertinent conclusion. It is packed with piercing observation. Alice's father with his poor head addled by the conflict in it between a feudal loyalty to his employer and a paternal loyalty to his pretty daughter; Alice's mother, with her ineffectual snobbery and her dumb longing to see Alice a success; Alice's brother, that ineffable young bounder who aspires to sink in the world as eagerly as Alice to rise: they have been cut out of real material with a keen tool. It would be hard to excel the dexterity with which Mr. Tarkington records the mean shifts of the Adams family to keep up appearances; yet he has excelled it in the dexterity with which he records the pathetic devices of Alice to hold her own in a circle which knows that she is slipping out of it and which does not care. The manners of the young have always seemed amusing to Mr. Tarkington; he has kept on watching them and laughing at them as his principal material; now he adds to his old tricks of comic truthfulness a considerate perception of the pathos of youth.

Next to the honesty of his conclusion, this mingling of comedy and pathos is what does most to give his latest book its superior quality. In the face of her losing fight, Alice is incomparably game. It strengthens the pathos of her story that the comedy holds out so well; it enlarges the comedy that the pathos is so essential to the action. Even the most comic things have their tears.

CARL VAN DOREN.

A Handbook That Helps

Modern Social Movements. By Savel Zimand. H. W. Wilson Company.

IF there is one fault which more than any other pervades American discussion, it is lack of precise knowledge of the facts upon which opinion must be based. This is true, not only of popular discussion of the newspaper-editorial type which so often makes inflated self-importance and prejudice do duty for information and judgment, but also of much of the opinion expressed by persons who are reputed to have received an education in the essentials and methods of scholarship. The excuse for this careless habit is that while opinions on many subjects seem to be necessary in a closely articulated "great society," the mass of information which one has to acquire in order to know one's way about any department of knowledge is so enormous that none but the specialist can hope to encompass it.

To meet such needs many handbooks have been written, but the really good handbook is rare. Either it is too superficial or else too comprehensive; either it reflects a personal bias or else it offers no perspective whatever. Particularly is this true in the case of controversial subjects such as Mr. Zimand has covered in this small volume. All the greater is our debt to him, therefore, for having produced a handbook which ought to serve as a model, about those modern social movements concerning which an inexcusable ignorance is sadly prevalent.

Trade Unionism, the Cooperative Movement, experiments in Industrial Democracy, the Single Tax, Socialism, Guild Socialism, Syndicalism, Bolshevism, and Anarchism are the subjects. The author's own comments on them are both enlightened and objective; they state clearly the essential facts, but cover in each case not more than a few pages. These summaries will serve the purpose of those who wish to know accurately the basic principles, but have only a few moments in which to acquire them. If every writer of popular articles or editorials on these matters would pause just long enough to consult this book before attacking his typewriter, the level of understanding would be raised immeasurably in a short time. After each summary follows an admirable bibliography, containing references to books, periodicals, pamphlets, and documents, inclusive enough to cover the important sources, but not so exhaustive as to be confusing. Descriptive sentences furnish a guide to the more significant works. These bibliographies will serve the student who wishes detailed information. Adequate scholarship is here made easily available to all.

GEORGE SOULE

The Dadaistic Dante

The Cryptography of Dante. By Walter Arensberg. Alfred A. Knopf.

DOUBTLESS it is possible to formulate coherent principles for a psychoanalytical interpretation of literature. The question that Mr. Arensberg really raises in this volume is whether it is possible to formulate a Dadaistic method of historical criticism. Even if we grant, with the followers of Fraser, that sex-symbolism plays an important part in primitive folklore, and with the psychoanalysts, that it plays an important and hitherto unsuspected part in the dream life of today, it is still a heavy tax on good-will to be asked to pass from these premises to the theory that the sex-symbolism of the savage was a commonplace motive of cultivated Ducento poetry, or that the writers of Dante's time anticipated in a precise and conscious manner the discoveries of Freud and the mannerisms of the present Montmartre school. Mr. Arensberg is an ultra-modernist in art, and consequently also in criticism. He sees everything through symbols. So he reads Dante as he would read Picabia; and the "Comedy" turns out, in his hands, a maze of points and oblongs, of convexes and concaves—symbolical all, to be sure—like a new Nude Descending the Stairs.

The question I have never seen clearly answered is where in all this so-called "new art" and "new criticism" blague comes to an end and seriousness begins; for the Dadaists and their predecessors are never so funny as when they seem most in earnest, while their humor has always a tinge of grimness and truculence. It may be in point to remark that the "symbolic" analogies stressed and strained in Mr. Arensberg's "Cryptography of Dante" are, when they are most convincing, traditional motives of Italian burlesque, schoolboy obscenities as it were, thrown in the face of professorial pedantry. And as humor of that kind they do very well. But here Mr. Arensberg seems to take them seriously, integrates them in a theory of folk-lore, not to say a philosophy of life. Is this not all a kind of super-blague—with the design to "string" the traditional Dantists a little, skilfully, perhaps symbolically, concealed?

This effort to prove Dante a Dadaist (the term Mama-ist would be more exact; for I am sure the psychoanalysts will all rejoice that the "mother-complex" has at last been held responsible for a masterpiece of literature) is one of the curiosities of Dante erudition, like the efforts that have been made to prove Dante a Jew, and a Mason. Its method, for that matter, is one of the most respectable: Dante has recently been proclaimed a Fascista by a politician in good standing; and I have heard a college president prove that Christ was a Bull Moose. Mr. Arensberg, however, shows restraint in one respect. It would have been trying indeed had he, as a convinced Baconian in Shakespeare matters, let loose his cryptography to prove that the "Comedy" was the work of Roger Bacon!

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

Books in Brief

"A COMMENTARY upon Browning's The Ring and the Book" (Oxford) by A. K. Cook, a magnificent exegesis of a magnificent poem, should belong to every student of Browning if not to every student of poetry. It would be difficult to ask oneself a question about a line, an allusion, a place, a character, or a source which Mr. Cook has not taken exquisite pains to answer. His material, exclusive of prefaces and appendices, is arranged in twelve parts, corresponding to the twelve books of the poem, and consists both of detailed annotations and of general criticism. Mr. Cook is so saturated with Browning and the Old Yellow Book that he can well be forgiven the blindness which he repeatedly betrays in his general criticism to the one defect of "The Ring and the Book"—its over-particularization. Experts will always, apparently, be citing obscure sources which their poets have transformed, but the public, rightly indifferent to obscure sources, will always be complaining if the transformation is not complete; and Browning, of course, in spite of Mr. Cook, is often incomplete beyond either excuse or annotation.

"THE MYSTIC WARRIOR" (Knopf) is the autobiography in free verse of James Oppenheim, who believes he has achieved a new kind of objectivity through the process of psychoanalysis and a new kind of vividness through the dissolving-picture technique of the movies. The truth is that he is subjective and vague, sentimental and vain, self-pitying and self-pious to an all but incredible extent. Necessarily he talks about himself, and necessarily he describes a struggle he has had—the struggle to be free of profession and family for the sake of art. That might be a noble theme, and profoundly representative, but in Mr. Oppenheim's hands it is about as significant as the stickiest pages of an adolescent diary better burned. "I was always the artist to my finger-tips," he confides, at first only a "sober little fellow," a "dreamy little singer and artist," but eventually "inspired." "Fearful, timorous, bossy, over-masculine, shy girlish James" becomes a poet and threatens to "grow as old as Prospero." "The new psychology"

may or may not produce richer autobiographies than this at times excruciatingly tame and flat one; when it does produce better we shall recognize it by a native intensity and a bright importance, not by a banner of fabricated atavisms complexes flourished in our faces.

IN the two volumes of "Collected Poems" (Holt) by Walter De La Mare and in "Poems New and Old" (Harcourt, Brace) by John Freeman is represented the best work to date of two English poets who have become known to American readers chiefly through "Georgian Poetry," but whom it is almost inevitable to call Georgian on any account. Both are good poets; neither is great. Mr. De La Mare is easy and fine, writes charmingly for children, and haunts a certain shadow world with all the grace of one who belongs there; yet his pages are seldom distinguished by absolutely surprising lines. Always poetical, he is never unique. Mr. Freeman pursues an impressive and very independent path of reverie through Nature and the past of his own mind. Honesty, to which he is willing at any time to sacrifice pleasantness and strength, is his virtue; thinness, which not always can be called insignificance, is his defect.

FOR certain purposes—honesty, passion, elegance—Imagist poets make the very best translators. Richard Aldington has never done better work than now appears under the title "Medallions in Clay" (Knopf), a reprint, with additions, of four numbers contributed by him to the admirable Poets' Translation Series of the Egoist Press in London. The limpid and rich if decadent stream which the Greek Anthology pours perpetually into modern European poetry has seldom found such beautiful voice.

Music

Fifteen Minutes with Richard Strauss

SO much has been written about Richard Strauss, both as composer and man, that criticism for the time being seems exhausted, and there seems nothing left to be said by anyone but Strauss himself. For this reason, when I arrived in Vienna and learned that he was not inaccessible, I sent him a copy of *The Nation* and a little note requesting an interview for that paper. To my delight I immediately received an appointment at the State (formerly the Royal) Opera House, where Strauss is now director and conductor. At first I thought I had been so favored because of the copy of *The Nation,* which happened to contain, among other things, Ludwig Lewisohn's article on modern German poetry. But I was soon to be mystified. For when, at the appointed hour, I was ushered into the director's room, where I was unsmilingly greeted by the director, and just as unsmilingly presented to his wife, he began by saying: "I will not give an interview."

"Very well," I responded, "won't you please tell me something about your new work?"

"Certainly," quickly spoke up his wife, in English, who probably understood the Straussian harmonies even better, and who was, besides, amiably taking pity on my limited German vocabulary. "It is a light, three-act opera in small form for small orchestra, like the Mozart."

"But serious," joined in the composer.

"And who has written the text?" I asked, addressing him.

"I have."

"And the title?"

"Intermezzo," was the still briefer reply.

"He is working on the scoring now," further enlightened Frau Strauss, "but it will not be finished for a year. Perhaps we shall come to America next winter for the Metropolitan," she added, suddenly changing the subject to what was probably paramount at the time in the minds of both.

"I don't know," growled Strauss, sulkily. "They won't pay me enough."

"We would have to live in New York, and it is very expensive there," softly explained his wife.

"Yes," I said, "but," turning to the composer, "you would have a very good opportunity, as we have had no really great successor to Toscanini."

"You have Bodanzky, and he is very good—for America," he replied insolently. "America," he added, "has no understanding of Europe."

"Perhaps," I replied with some asperity, my own Strausian temper beginning to rise, "Europe has no understanding of America."

"Salzburg," he continued gloomily, ignoring my remark, "needs a Festspielhaus; but that would cost a million dollars. America ought to give it."

For a moment I was too astonished to speak. Only a short time before, on my way to the opera house, I had passed a man who had fainted from hunger in front of one of those cruelly glittering shops that line the Kärntnerstrasse, and the mute sympathy and white, bloodless faces of the gravely staring crowd were still haunting me. It seemed to me that Austria had more immediate needs for our millions than festival houses. So at last I said, slowly and curiously: "If you will tell me just why America should give Salzburg a million dollars for a Festspielhaus, I will write it."

"Because," he answered roughly, "America has no culture. Culture will always come from Europe."

"But," I protested, "it has been many years since you have been in America. You will find a great change, especially in the musical world."

"That may be," he admitted grudgingly, "but America needs Europe. Europe does not need America—only her dollars."

"I like America," tactfully interposed Frau Strauss. "I once gave between thirty and forty concerts there. I would like my husband to be at the Metropolitan for a winter."

"No," said her husband, "I will not go through what Mahler and Mottl had to endure."

"There is no reason why you would have to," I said dryly.

"Perhaps we will stay there three or four months," she persisted.

"No," he repeated angrily, "only one month. I will not give a year of my life to America."

"But there is no money here in Vienna," pleaded his wife.

"One needs no money here in Vienna," he replied sternly, and turning to me, indicated that the interview was over.

In writing to the composer I had said that anything he would have to say would be as much appreciated by my readers as by myself. I hope I did not exaggerate. Personally, however, being an American, I am still wondering which we in America need the more—such a luxury as Richard Strauss, or that inner grace, our self-respect.

HENRIETTA STRAUS

International Relations Section

American Labor and the International

IN answer to the objections cited in a letter from the American Federation of Labor to the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam, Secretary Oudegeest made the following explanation and statement of principles which the *American Federationist* for July reprints under the caption A Letter of Misstatement, Effrontery, and Domination.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS
Headquarters: Amsterdam—61 Vondelstraat, Holland
Amsterdam, April 12, 1921

To the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS:

We have great pleasure in acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 1st March, because we have written you over fifty times previously and with certain very rare exceptions have been unable to obtain any sort of answer. We are therefore all the more pleased that you have at length taken the initiative to open relations with us.

You will readily appreciate that this gratifies us beyond measure because our attempts to remain in regular touch with you, whereby certain misunderstandings could have been avoided, have been frustrated by the apparent impossibility of getting a reply when we approached you for cooperation and advice. As regards your letter itself we will answer this in the same order as you have written us.

You state that the American Federation of Labor finds it impossible to continue affiliation with the International Federation of Trade Unions because:

First, that the new constitution completely abrogated the principle of complete autonomy for each national trade union federation.

Second, that through the issuance of appeals and proclamations the executive body of the International Federation had committed the Federation to a revolutionary principle.

Third, that a system of dues had been adopted which would place upon the American Federation of Labor a heavy and unbearable expense.

We regret to say that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has evidently been incompletely or wrongly informed. If your executive has been accurately informed then it disavows the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress of 1919, for this delegation voted for the clause in article 3 of our constitution reading as follows:

"The International Federation shall consist of the national and general trade union centers of those countries which are organized on a definite trade union basis, the autonomy of the trade union movement of each country being guaranteed."

This delegation also voted for a system of dues which is now referred to by your executive as unbearable. The members of the delegation—namely, Messrs. Samuel Gompers, D. J. Tobin, and John J. Hynes—will recall that the dues were proposed by the British trade union representative, Mr. Stuart Bunning.

It is therefore absolutely untrue that national autonomy is completely abrogated. The system of dues and the remaining articles of the constitution were adopted in collaboration with your own representatives at the congress held in July, 1919, at Amsterdam.

It is absolutely untrue that an application for a readjustment of dues met with no favorable response from the executive body of our International. At a joint meeting with your executive held on the 4th November, 1919, at Washington, Mr. Gompers endeavored to secure a reduction of dues because the American Federation of Labor had not the necessary finances at its disposal to pay the relatively low rate of £1 sterling per 1,000 members per annum. The writer thereupon intimated that our executive body had not the right to introduce modifications in this rule because the constitution and the rate of contribution payable had been adopted at a congress. This matter was further deliberated at a meeting of our full executive body held on the 8th April, 1920. This body decided that the whole matter of dues should be brought before the next ordinary congress. This congress according to the constitution should be held in the latter part of 1921. Your organization was notified of this decision by letter dated the 22d April, 1920.

We who are advocates of a real and pure democracy neither wish or are able to practice a dictatorship, and consider it essential that modifications of the constitution should be made by our congress. We believe that you, who claim to be democrats, will justify our conception and will admit that we are right. . . .

In your second objection you convey to us that our executive body by means of appeals and proclamations has committed the Trade Union International to revolutionary principles. You state that our policy is completely at variance with the policy of the American organizations.

You refer incidentally to "revolutionary action" with the "socialization of industry as its objective," owing to which we quote your letter "there can be no compromise between the two points of view" (i. e., between your organization and ours).

This revolutionary viewpoint is further inferred from our appeal, issued on the 8th September, 1919, in which we appealed to the national trade union centers to take action against the transport of munitions and if possible against the manufacture of munitions for the prevention of all warfare (and not as stated by you in favor of Soviet Russia).

We regret that apparently you have only read two sentences from this appeal. If you could not see your way to indorse the appeal which was issued against war, we must assume that you have considerably less objection against the provocation and outbreak of a new world war than ourselves, and that as a matter of fact there is an abysmal and incompatible difference between your mental attitude and that of the workers of Europe. In Europe this appeal has been favorably received not only by the workers but also by important groups of the bourgeoisie.

You do not mean to say that the annihilation of human life, which generally speaking means the doom of millions of workers and the annihilation of millions of wealth producers meets with your approbation?

We take the point of view that any war, no matter whether it is commenced by autocratic or democratic governments, must be opposed and prevented by the working-class; more especially after the misery caused by the World War, which we have witnessed in Europe and you have partly witnessed in America. In our manifesto we have not written anything else than that stated in the preceding lines.

You refer further to our manifesto "Down with Reaction," "Up with Socialization" and quote the passage in which we urge the workers to fight against reaction and for the socialization of the means of production.

Permit us to observe that you have apparently read this manifesto as cursorily and imperfectly as all our other published documents. On account of this you made the American workers believe that the manifesto stated "Up with Socialism." Any worker with a strictly limited education could easily explain to you that "socialism" is not exactly the same as "socialization."

As regards the manifesto itself we must candidly confess that we fail to understand how it is possible for you, as democrats, to set yourselves in opposition to the struggle against reaction. At the same time we regret that you disavow your President, Mr. Samuel Gompers, before the eyes of the whole world, for is not Mr. Samuel Gompers the Honorary President of the Plumb Plan League? ("To secure public ownership and democracy in the operation of the railways of the United States"). This Plumb Plan League has precisely the same object as far as railways are concerned as that known to us in Europe as "socialization." Is, therefore, your President, Mr. Samuel Gompers, who signed the protest to us in your name, in agreement with his own executive or not? Or, otherwise, why should it be permissible to "socialize" the railways of America and not of Europe? . . .

Furthermore it is absolutely untrue that our executive body called upon the workers to give effect to this "revolutionary policy" by proclaiming a general strike on the 1st May, 1920. We think it necessary to inform you that for the past thirty years May Day has been regarded as a labor festival on the continent of Europe when the workers obtain a day's holiday either with or without the consent of their employers; and when in all towns and villages throughout the continent of Europe meetings and open-air demonstrations are held for the advocacy of labor's demands.

This custom is evidently unknown to you in America. Taking into consideration this custom of thirty years' standing we asked the labor organizations in 1920 to devote May Day to demonstrations in favor of those demands contained in our manifesto. As already confirmed, it is absolutely untrue to say that we asked the organizations to proclaim a general strike.

It is also absolutely untrue that our former president, Mr. W. A. Appleton, who has signed all our manifestos, resigned the presidency on the same grounds as held by the American Federation of Labor in its refusal to affiliate with us.

It appears that the information you receive is not always quite correct. Mr. William A. Appleton did not resign the presidency of his own free will. At the British Trade Union Congress (which is affiliated to our Federation) held in September, 1920, where your Federation was represented by Mrs. Sara A. Conboy and Brother T. Healey, it was a subject of general protest that Mr. W. A. Appleton had been appointed president of our International in view of the fact—as one of the delegates observed—that no self-respecting English worker would sit with him at the same table on account of his undemocratic and reactionary conceptions. You may verify this easily by reference to the report of the Portsmouth Congress although I do not doubt that both your delegates to that congress could inform you on this point. In consequence of this decision of the congress at Portsmouth it was impossible for Mr. Appleton to preside at our congress held subsequently at London because he knew that in that event the Parliamentary Committee would have set themselves against the presidency in public.

Mr. Appleton then chose the wisest course by handing in his resignation as president of our International in view of the opposition in his own country. Your President, Mr. Gompers, will clearly remember that Mr. Appleton was the nominee of the American and English delegates, no influence whatsoever being exercised by the other delegates in respect of his nomination. The resignation of Mr. Appleton therefore is entirely beyond the judgment of our executive body; his retirement was not because we were too revolutionary, but was due to the fact that as a labor leader he did not enjoy the confidence of the eight million workers affiliated with the Trade Union Congress.

This statement in your letter is, therefore, like the preceding ones, absolutely untrue.

You have further referred to your non-participation at our London Congress in November, 1920, and to the "ridiculous and flamboyant proclamations calling virtually for the overthrow of the democratic governments of the world, the United States included."

We are not sufficiently informed on the customs prevalent in America to judge what is regarded there as ridiculous and flamboyant. This, indeed, does not interest us very much. If America has other than European customs and a method of expression other than that followed by the population of Europe this may explain matters. Apart from these differences we presume that good faith, honesty, and square dealing are also valued in America. These attributes necessitate the production of proofs when an accusation is made. It will be difficult for you to adduce any proof whatsoever for the allegations made by you.

It is therefore absolutely untrue that in any one of our proclamations we have referred to or aimed at the overthrow of democratic governments. By this of course we do not mean to say that we are in agreement with the deeds of these governments.

If the American Federation of Labor expresses itself openly against revolutionary principles, that is their affair. Such pronouncement must be respected by the International Federation of Trade Unions because our constitution guarantees the autonomy of every country.

On the other hand, the American Federation of Labor must respect those principles which have found indorsement in other countries.

For our part we have done nothing more, as already indicated, than to carry out in all good faith the decisions of the Amsterdam Congress of 1919, and to comply with the constitution which was adopted there with the vote of the American delegation included.

In this connection we wish to state that the attitude of your President, Mr. Samuel Gompers, after our congress at Amsterdam is not very clear to us. At that congress "revolutionary" decisions were arrived at, including one in favor of an inquiry into the possibility of the socialization of the means of production. Your President raised objections to this motion. (We do not know whether he had then already accepted the honorary presidency of the Plumb Plan League.) He, however, accepted the articles of our constitution. At the conclusion of the congress he rose especially to make a declaration to the effect that he was not fully in agreement with all the resolutions adopted (no doubt there were other delegates who were in the same position) but nevertheless he wanted particularly to state that the American trade union movement would do all that was possible to assist this new International and would cooperate with the toilers of Europe for the improvement of the conditions under which these toilers had to live.

We regret to state that Mr. Gompers had not kept the promise contained in this declaration, whether due to forgetfulness on his part or to the attitude forced upon him by a vote of your Federation. We believe the latter because we are not for a moment inclined to believe that Mr. Gompers would deliberately break his word.

In coming to the close of your letter we must state that we are extremely glad to learn that your Federation desires to become affiliated with our International. The condition upon which you make your affiliation depend, namely, the autonomy and independence of the American Federation of Labor is covered by article 3 of our constitution which is still in force and is upheld by us.

We thoroughly understand that you seriously object to affiliate with a movement which "undertakes the destruction of the American labor movement or the overthrow of the democratic government of the Republic of the United States."

On the other hand you will realize that such an insinuation is so ludicrous and that the alleged intention is so far from our thoughts as to be beneath our dignity to waste words on the matter.

We are anxious for the American Federation of Labor to affiliate with our International. This was stated clearly enough at our London Congress. The affiliation of the American Federation of Labor is not a matter of indifference to us. If you have grievances supported on real grounds, which you are able to formulate without false representation of accomplished facts or without attempts at insinuation, we shall be very happy to go into such matters with you.

At the same time our executive body has been instructed by the congress to uphold the constitution. If you desire a modification of the constitution (either with regard to dues or to autonomy), you should not approach our executive body, but should submit proposals in a regular manner to the next ordi-

nary congress, which according to the constitution will be held this year (probably in November).

We desire that whatever interpretations are placed on what we write or on our actions shall be left for the account of those who give expression to such interpretations; but we demand from our coworkers that they shall be convinced of good faith on our side; and of our desire to promote the interests of organized workers within the scope of our constitution and as far as this lies within our power.

We presume that fundamentally you are in accord with us, and hope to receive a speedy intimation from you that you are prepared to negotiate with us with regard to our tactics.

Furthermore that on reaffiliation with our International you will submit your proposals for the amendment of the constitution to our next congress.

On behalf of the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions, J. OUDEGEEST, *Secretary*

Mr. Gompers Retorts

ON behalf of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Samuel Gompers sent the following reply to the secretary of the International Federation.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
Albany Hotel, Denver, Colorado, June 9, 1921

MR. J. OUDEGEEST, Secretary
International Federation of Trade Unions
61 Vondelstraat, Amsterdam, Holland

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER:

Your letter of April 12, addressed to the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, was received in due time and was considered by us, and we must confess that we were both surprised and shocked that a letter of the character you have written should be addressed to any bona-fide organization of wage-earners.

In the opening paragraph of your letter you speak of having written President Gompers over fifty times and that with certain very rare exceptions you have been unable to obtain any sort of answer. You must bear in mind that the functions and duties of the president of the American Federation of Labor are not confined to the affairs of the International Federation of Trade Unions; that his duties are manifold and exacting; that in spite of these facts, we find that your communications have been answered by him in all essential respects. The records of the American Federation of Labor substantiate this statement. In addition a number of letters were addressed to the President of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

In commenting upon our first objection to the continued affiliation of the American Federation of Labor with the International Federation of Trade Unions relating to the abrogation of the principle of complete autonomy for each international trade union center, you express the point of view that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has "evidently been incompletely or wrongly informed," or that we as the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor disavow the action and attitude of the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress of 1919.

Permit us to inform you that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has been and is completely and correctly informed both as to the constitution and what has transpired since its adoption. Neither has the Executive Council disavowed the action of the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress of 1919. While the constitution itself provides for the autonomy of the national trade union movement of each country being guaranteed, as a matter of fact it has been the actions of the congress, of the bureau, of the management committee, of the conference, and of the executives of the International Federation of Trade Unions that have altered the entire situation in that these bodies have completely disregarded constitutional provisions guaranteeing the autonomy of affiliated trade union centers. The dangers which the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress pointed out at that time have come to pass. In substantiation of that we submit the following:

Section 1 of Article 1 of the constitution of the International Federation of Trade Unions under the caption "Name" provides that the "national centers of the trade unions of the various countries shall combine in an international federation of trade unions, *the autonomy of the trade union movements of each country being guaranteed.*"

In the paragraph entitled "Objects of the Federation," in sections 1-5, both inclusive, the objects of the Federation are defined in general terms.

First of all the question arises, who shall have the power and authority to interpret and to apply specifically the objects intended by the general terms used in the above paragraphs?

The last paragraph in the article entitled "The Conference—Its Duties," provides the following:

"The Congress alone shall have authority to decide all questions of principle or tactics of a trade union nature apart from exceptional cases."

In agreeing to the constitution the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress of 1919 insisted that the congress, and the congress alone, had the authority of determining specifically what particular acts, principles, or tactics would come under the objects of the Federation.

The articles defining the duties of the bureau and of the management committee limit their functions entirely to the carrying out of the instructions given to them by the Congress itself, and to the rendering of such assistance to any affiliated national trade union center as is directly requested and which does not involve any of the other national trade union centers.

Nowhere in the constitution are the executives, the bureau, the management committee, or the conference clothed with authority to determine principles or tactics, or to originate a declaration of a general nature, or to attempt in any way to define the objects of the Federation. Despite all of these provisions to safeguard the autonomy of the national trade union movement of each country, these constitutional guaranties have been totally ignored or violated.

You will recall that at the congress held in Amsterdam, 1919, the following action was adopted:

"With this aim in view the Congress instructs the bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions to collect all documents and to keep this collection up to date which will give full information as to the results obtained by the socialization of the means of production of any branch of industry in the countries where such experiment has been made and to then communicate the results obtained to the national centers affiliated."

You will note that this action of the congress limited the work of the bureau to the making of an investigation of questions of socialization and to reporting its findings to the executives of each of the affiliated national trade union centers. These were specific instructions given to this bureau. The bureau undertook to express definite conclusions and to speak on behalf of the federation, going so far as to set up for the federation a definite though uninstructed policy, against which the American and British delegations protested. You will no doubt remember that the American delegation to the Amsterdam Congress argued and protested against the adoption of a resolution which declared that when a resolution is adopted by the Congress by a majority vote it would be binding upon all national trade union centers. The protest was founded upon the constitutional guaranty of autonomy of the national trade union centers as provided in the constitution, and the delegations from Great Britain and the United States voted in opposition and protest and maintained that their autonomous rights should not and must not be invaded.

In the proclamation sent out from the headquarters of the

International Federation of Trade Unions in Amsterdam the workers of all countries are officially urged to "manifest their [illegible] in this way and vigorously start the movement for the [illegible]lization under the guidance of their unions. . . ."

The proclamation also contains the following language:

"To all laborers in the world, there is one aim on which they *must* focus all their efforts and which should enlist them against the reaction. This aim, this common field of action, is the socialization of the means of production."

By this action the bureau has not only usurped the functions of making declarations without the unanimous approval of the congress and in violation of specific instructions limiting its authority, but it also undertook to give enforcement to those declarations as is evidenced in the following cablegram:

"Amsterdam, Holland, April 18, 1920

"Afel, Washington.

"Decided committee meeting great demonstrations on the first of May for socialization means of production and ratification conventions Washington conference. OUDEGEEST"

It is evident from the foregoing that while the autonomy of each trade union center is guaranteed by section 1 of the first article of the constitution of the International Federation of Trade Unions, these guaranties have been utterly and flagrantly violated and disregarded and in practical effect this section has been completely abrogated.

Then again under date of March 31 and April 1, 1921, there was a meeting of the international conference held under the auspices of the International Federation of Trade Unions at which there was adopted a resolution, approved by the bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions at its meeting held on the 14th of March, 1921. The declaration was made that it is a mistaken policy for governments to attempt a solution of the problems of reparation by exclusively financial measures. The meeting undertook to express a program on this subject and called upon the labor movements in all countries concerned to institute a campaign to *force* their governments to accept the solution proposed by the united international working classes.

In the article in the constitution of the International Federation of Trade Unions, entitled "The Conference," there is no power vested in such a conference to decide questions of principles or tactics of a trade union nature apart from "exceptional cases." We presume that the conference constituted itself the deciding body as to whether the above was an exceptional case which might warrant the conference in disregarding the autonomy right to each national trade union center. It is and was the understanding of the American delegation in attendance at the Amsterdam Congress of 1919 that the conference would have no authority to determine such questions but that this authority was vested solely in the Congress. If the autonomy of the national trade union movement of each country means anything at all, it certainly cannot mean that any other body but the Congress itself can decide such questions. It is our viewpoint that the conference not only exceeded its authority in acting upon this subject, but that it further violated the autonomy guaranties in attempting to give enforcement to the declaration of the conference of March 31 and April 1 by the adoption of the following resolution:

"With the object of carrying out the decisions contained in the resolutions adopted, the conference instructs the national trade union centers concerned to send regularly to the secretariat of the International Federation of Trade Unions monthly reports on what has been done by the labor movement to enforce the decisions and on what has been done by the governments concerned."

Pray, from whence comes authority to you to instruct?

By what right are "instructions" issued by the bureau, the management committee, or the conference?

Is the bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions to follow the procedure of the soviets by dictating and compelling men and national movements to do things upon order?

Was it not the intent that the International Federation of Trade Unions should be a voluntary organization, built upon the concept that for one to enforce his will upon another is tyranny?

Since when has autonomy come to mean compulsion?

The American labor movement is a voluntary organization depending upon the cooperation, the good-will, the intelligence and understanding of its members, and not upon the domination of one part by another.

The resolution of which you speak "instructs" the national centers to advise the bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions of what has been done to "enforce" the decision of the conference in relation to international affairs. What is the meaning of this order to "enforce" the decision against the governments? Is it not a command to revolution?

Notwithstanding the insinuations contained in your letter, it must be emphasized that the position taken by the officers of the American Federation of Labor, by the conventions of the American Federation of Labor, and by the American delegates to the international congress at Amsterdam has throughout been consistent and in harmony with the long established policies of the American Federation of Labor both regarding its domestic policies and its international policies. The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor reporting to the 1920 convention at Montreal said:

"You will observe in the report of our delegates to the Amsterdam congress that in addition to the question of per capita tax attention is called to the character of some of the resolutions and policies adopted, the trend of which is toward a theory which the American labor movement has persistently declined to accept."

In the letter under date of March 5, 1921, conveying to you the position of the Executive Council in relation to affiliation, there is the following:

"The executive officers of the International Federation of Trade Unions have committed the federation to a revolutionary policy which the American Federation of Labor in the interest of the toiling masses can not sanction but which on the contrary it is bound by every law of sanity and reason to oppose."

In your letter you endeavor to interpret the action of the Montreal convention upon the railroad situation as being in accord with the principles enunciated in the proclamation above quoted. Of course, we dissent from this viewpoint that you have expressed. We see no analogy between the two declarations whatever. That, however, is beside the question.

You make much of the statement that President Gompers was honorary chairman of the Plumb Plan League. The chief point of interest in that statement is that Mr. Gompers was on his way to Europe when the Plumb Plan League was formed and had no part whatever in its creation or maintenance. While his name was published as honorary chairman, to have interfered with that action at that time would have been extremely harmful to the railroad organizations in the crisis with which they were confronted regarding railroad legislation.

When the American delegates to the Amsterdam congress approved the constitution, it was with the distinct understanding that the executive officers, the conference, the bureau or the management committee, or any of them combined could not take any action conflicting with the constitutional guarantee of national trade union center autonomy unless it had the unanimous approval and support of all the affiliated national trade union centers. In the issuance of the proclamation to which we have referred, a new and foreign interpretation was given to the constitution, and the autonomy rights of affiliated national trade union centers were wholly disregarded. The only possible provision of the constitution upon which the bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions might base its action is that part under the caption of "The Conference, Its Convention," wherein it provides that "all propositions shall, as far as these rules do not provide otherwise, be decided by a simple majority." Again there arises the question as to which proposals require unanimous consent of all affiliated

national trade union centers and which may be decided by a majority vote. The only provision in the constitution bearing on this subject is that which guarantees the autonomy of the national trade union movement of each country. Under the indefinite arrangement set up by you, it is possible for the executives, the bureau, the management committee, and even the conference itself to disregard the autonomy of the national trade union movements of each country. The failure to define clearly those questions which may be determined by a majority vote and those which can only be determined by a unanimous vote, is a fundamental weakness of the entire arrangement of the International Federation of Trade Unions, and the officers of the International Federation of Trade Unions as well as the conference have not hesitated to use this weakness in disregarding the autonomous rights of the American Federation of Labor. . . . It is this action on the part of the officers of the bureau, the management committee, and the conference which has compelled the American Federation of Labor to decline affiliation with the International Federation of Trade Unions, at least until the autonomous guaranties have been fully safeguarded.

In substantiation of our objection quoted secondly in your letter "that through the issuance of appeals and proclamations the executive body of the International Federation had committed the federation to a revolutionary principle," it must be said that your letter constitutes a misrepresentation of the whole contention made by the American Federation of Labor and does so in a manner that is particularly objectionable inasmuch as it charges bad faith on our part. In your most recent letter you call attention to our quotations from the various proclamations dealing with socialization, the general strike, and the refusal to manufacture munitions of war, and you intimate that these appeals have been read carelessly or only in part and that a false understanding of their contents has been conveyed to the membership of the American Federation of Labor.

On the contrary, the character of the proclamations issued from the headquarters in Amsterdam was so amazing that each of them has been read not only once but many times in an effort to discover whether the apparent meaning was in reality the intended meaning. There has been no confusion whatever of the terms "socialization and socialism." . . .

Your attempt to appease the American workers by seeking to disguise socialization as mere government ownership would be amusing in any other connection, but surely you do not hope to deceive any thoughtful persons in such a transparent manner.

In the matter of opposition to war, your effort to misrepresent the position of the American Federation of Labor is equally unfair and unworthy. "You do not mean to say that the annihilation of human life . . . meets with your approbation?" is the way your contemptible inquiry is stated. The American Federation of Labor, since its formation in 1881, has never failed to set its face against war, but, on the contrary, at every opportunity (and where no opportunity existed it has created the opportunity), it has declared emphatically against international war and for universal disarmament by agreement. It was the American Federation of Labor through its president that wrote and cabled most urgent appeals to the late Carl Legien, the president of the general commission of trade unions of Germany, to make every effort to prevent the United States being forced into the European war.

The manner, the method, and the time of your proclamation could have had no other purpose than to assist the autocratic, tyrannical usurpers in Russia in their plan to undermine and destroy the democracies of the world and to make these democracies helpless against soviet propaganda with its military aggression and compulsory labor. You demanded that the workers of all countries refuse to manufacture and transport munitions of war.

You made that demand at a time when it could have been of service only to autocratic Powers and when it would have been, had it been acted upon, of disastrous consequences to democratic governments in the world.

The workers of the United States decline to obey proclamations of that character and particularly so when they hav had no voice in determining the issue.

We are not unaware of the continental European custom of observing May first as a holiday of the workers, but, surely, you do not expect that we will be convinced that your appeal in 1920 was not for a general strike on May 1, not only for the workers of Europe but also of the United States, particularly in view of the fact that in certain European countries it was sought to follow your command literally, with serious, injurious results long since known to all. Neither can there be any question of your intent in your proclamation of September 8, 1919, in which you urge the workers to "prepare, if necessary, for mass action by means of a general strike."

Your position is clear, even if your defense of it is not, and your position is such that the American Federation of Labor cannot lend its support and affiliation to the International Federation of Trade Unions while that position remains the official and recognized policy of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

Regarding the third objection, relating to the system of dues, there can be little added to what has already been conveyed to you on this subject other than that it is the further viewpoint of the American Federation of Labor that it should not be required to contribute to a fund that is being used to promote objects which are foreign to the true mission of the International Federation of Trade Unions and purposes which are not only clearly outside of its scope and unauthorized by unanimous consent of all affiliated national trade union centers, but which are repugnant to the American labor movement.

If complete autonomy means anything it certainly cannot mean that we should contribute to promote declarations anc actions which we cannot support or advocate.

We are further prompted to inform you that it was the clear and unmistakable understanding of all in attendance at the Amsterdam conference that the American delegates in attendance had no authority other than to report the actions of the Amsterdam meeting to the American Federation of Labor and that the American Federation of Labor could only become a party to the International Federation of Trade Unions by action of its convention. Every utterance made, every action taken, and every attitude expressed by the American delegation to the Amsterdam Congress was with this understanding clearly in mind.

It is, therefore, difficult to understand the great stress and constant repetition that are made in your letter to a possible repudiation and disavowal of the representations and actions of the American delegates for, as a matter of fact, they were indorsed by unanimous vote of the convention of the A. F. of L. . . .

To say, as you have said, that this body, itself composed of fully 570 delegates, representing 4,500,000 workers, does not understand and is ignorant and superficial, is to utter that which no visitor to an American Federation of Labor convention would approve by silence, much less express, and is to place upon yourself the responsibility for being misinformed and furthermore for expressing your misinformation in a most puerile and churlish manner.

Your intended affront, your charge of inability to comprehend and understand, is thus, as you will see, a charge against the Executive Council, the whole membership of our Federation, and against the 570 delegates who compose its conventions. We are certain that they will feel a resentment as keen as that felt by us as the Executive Council. . . .

We cannot accept your presumption at your own valuation. We must respectfully decline to accept your declarations and proclamations as truly expressive of the sentiments of the whole trade union movement of Europe. We have faith in the good sense and understanding of the labor movements

with whom we proudly stood side by side in the great war for democracy and human freedom, and we are hopeful that the me is not far distant when the trade union movements of the nations of the world may cooperate on a basis of com- good-will, understanding, and constructive effort.

n so far as our affiliation with the International Federation of Trade Unions at the present time is concerned, we must repeat the former declarations made in our communications to you, emphasize them, if possible, and await the hour in which it may be possible to fulfil our hopes of a united movement on a basis that accords with the philosophy of democracy, with autonomy for all, freedom for all, and a common goal of a better time for all the toilers and all the peoples.

So far as your letter reflects upon the character and the work of Mr. W. A. Appleton, the first President of the International Federation of Trade Unions and who resigned from that position, we may be permitted to say that after the many years of service which Mr. Appleton has rendered to the cause of labor and international good-will and solidarity we would prefer to hold our judgment in abeyance until he has been heard rather than to take your aspersions upon him as one hundred per cent true. The attitude which you have assumed in your correspondence with the American Federation of Labor, the unwarranted and untruthful charges and insinuations which you have made against our men and our movement, justify this position we have taken in regard to Mr. Appleton.

We have been under the impression that the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions was required to communicate with the officers of the national trade union centers, and if necessary, the latter to communicate to the trade unions affiliated to them; but, evidently in the hope that you could undermine the American Federation of Labor you s nt a copy of your letter to each of the international trade nions of America. . . .

SAMUEL GOMPERS, *President*

Statement from the Mexican Financial Office

Report Made by Eng. Joaquin Santaella, Chief of the Mines and Oil Department of the Secretary of Finances of Mexico

In order to clearly demonstrate, once for all, that the Oil Companies actually operating in Mexican fields, are entirely wrong when they consider as confiscatory the taxes that the Mexican Government has assigned to the production and exportation of oil, and with that pretext making their actual campaign, which possibly might end in an international conflict, it is necessary to analyze the cost of production and transportation of oil. Before doing so, I will copy what has been said about this cost by authorized oilmen, as Mr. Harry J. Smith, Secretary of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association and by Mr. W. R. Gray of the Oilmen Associations of Kansas and Oklahoma.

Mr. Harry J. Smith, in his report to the Association, stated that: "Mexico produced over 163,000,000 barrels of oil during the year of 1920, out of only from 184 to 200 wells, making an average production of 2,400 barrels per day for each well. (Geologist Arnold's report considered this average at 2,600 barrels.) The American wells only produce less than 5,000 barrels per day. Considering that the medium cost of a well is $60,000, we find that the 200 producing wells of Mexico, costing $12,000,000, produced . . .163,000,000 barrels in one year at a cost of $0.073 per barrel. In the United States with a medium production of 5,000 barrels per day for each well, 89,000 wells should be required to produce same amount of 163,000,000 barrels, and figuring the cost of drilling at $20,000 for each well, an investment of $1,780,000,000 would be necessary, and $10.92 would be the cost of each barrel."

Mr. W. H. Gray, representing the Oilmen Associations of Kansas and Oklahoma, asked the American Congress for an import tax on crude oil coming from Mexico, and stated as evidence that the cost of production in Mexico amounted to $0.10 per barrel. From all above stated, it can be deduced that the highest cost price of production has been considered at $0.10 a barrel; but the Oil Associations in the United States are figuring the total production of oil in Mexico, for all wells in general, when the truth is that the 41 producing wells in the fields of Zacamixtle, Amatlan, Los Naranjos, etc., have a medium daily production of 10,000 barrels and the 127 producing wells in the fields of Panuco 1.500 barrels per day. In the United States it is generally believed that the medium daily production of the wells in Mexico is of 2,400 or 2,600 as Geologist Arnold stated, for each well, and that is surely an error, because they do not know that oilmen in Mexico do not operate except those wells of big production, without paying any attention to wells producing less than 1,000 barrels per day, while in the United States this kind of well would be greatly appreciated as the production of their wells is of no more than 5,000 barrels per day.

Estimate of Cost of Production of the Mexican Wells

Total cost of drilling one well in the zone of Amatlan and Zacamixtle	Mex. Pesos		200,000
Interest on Mex. Pesos 200,000 at 6 per cent. ann.	"	"	12,000
Exhaustion figured at 50 per cent. per ann	"	"	100,000
Management	"	"	10,000
Work and Sundries	"	"	5,000
Total for one year	Mex. Pesos		127,000
corresponding to a daily expense of	"	"	349

As the real production in the wells of this zone is of 10,000 barrels per day the cost per barrel will be $0.035. The cost of drilling a well in the zone of Panuco is figured at no more than $60,000, Mex. Cy.

Cost of Exploitation in One Year

Interest at 6 per cent	Mex. Cy.		$3,600
Exhaustion 50 per cent	"	"	30,000
Management	"	"	10,000
Work and Sundries	"	"	5,000
	Mex. Cy.		$48,600

The medium daily production in the Northern District, including Panuca, Topila, Ebano, etc., is of 1,500 barrels, which gives a cost of $0.09 Mex. Cy. per barrel.

Cost of Transportation. (62 miles)

An oil pipe line of 62 miles long and 10 inches diameter, like the one constructed by the Mexican Gulf Oil Co., from Panuco to Palo Blanco, cost as reported by said company $5,000,000 Mex. Cy., and has a capacity of 30,000 barrels per day. Accepting this cost amount as real—no matter that it is exaggerated—because the price for an oil pipe line as the one referred to in the United States is only of $2,000,000, the cost for running said pipe line would be:

Interest 6 per cent	Mex. Cy.		$300,000
Depreciation 20 per cent	"	"	1,000,000
Management	"	"	30,000
Taking care of Pumps and Pipe lines	"	"	35,000
Repairs	"	"	12,000
Fuel 15,000 barrels at 0.05 Mex. Cy.	"	"	750
Total cost of exploitation	Mex. Cy.		$1,377,750

or $3,755, Mex. Cy., a day, more or less.

Calculating the unloading volume of said pipe line at 1,250 barrels per hour, we would obtain an amount of 30,000 barrels a day or 9,000,000 barrels per year of 300 days, with a cost of $1,377,750 Mex. Cy., that is $0.15 per barrel, which will be the standard price for net figures. The authorized tariff is of $0.02 for each ton-kilometer, in the connections for pipe lines.

The cost of transportation of each barrel from Panuco to Tampico through a 50 kilometer pipe line will be of $0.08 Mex. Cy., and the transportation of one barrel of light oil from Tuxpam and Puerto Lobos by a 40 kilometer pipe line will be of $0.06 Mex. Cy., more or less. The shipping freight tariff from Mexican to American ports, from Oil and Gas Journal, April 29th, and the "Shipping," June 10th, are:

From Tampico, Tuxpam, or Puerto Lobos to New York	$0.40 per barrel
From Tampico, Tuxpam, or Puerto Lobos to Galveston	0.22½ " "
From Tampico, Tuxpam or Puerto Lobos to New Orleans	0.30 " "

Duties per Barrel. (Crude of Tuxpam.)

Considering that the medium density of crude oil from Tuxpam is of 0.925 when exported the corresponding duties are:

Revenue Stamps	Pesos	0.312
Export Duties	"	0.397
Infalsificable. (Old bank notes)	"	0.031
Total	Pesos	0.741

Oil from the North district has a medium density of 0.98 and pays the following duties:

Revenue Stamps	Pesos	0.179
Export duties	"	0.246
Infalsificable (Old bank notes)	"	0.018
Total	Pesos	0.443

Revenue Stamps are paid as per circular letter No. 96, (May-June) but for this month (July) probably the amount to be paid is less.

Quotation in Texas.

The Oil, Paint and Drug Reporter published the 27th, June last, gives the following quotations for Mexican oils, per barrel:

Heavy crude oil from Tampico	$0.80—Ps. 1.60
Light crude oil from Tuxpam	$1.50—Ps. 3.00

Above quotations do not include duties as in that time these were paid by buyer, therefore, the real price was:

Heavy crude oil from Panuco	$0.90—Ps. 1.80
Light crude oil from Tuxpam	$1.67—Ps. 3.34

Above quotations continued during the first week of July past, as reported by the Financial Agency at New York. Probably they are improved now; improvement being due to the restriction that the Standard Oil and her allies ordered in the exploitation of oil. We must not fear the competition of American oil because the quotation at the well published by the newspapers increases very much with transportation charges, making prices higher. The minimum cost price being $1.75 their real prices are higher, as otherwise they would stop working, since nobody likes to work for nothing.

Actual Business.

Crude Oil from Panuco.

Cost of Production per barrel	Mex. Cy.		$0.09
Transportation to Tampico	"	"	0.08
Transportation to Galveston	"	"	0.45
Total duties	"	"	0.44
Total cost price in Galveston	Mex. Cy.		$1.06 per barrel
Price of barrel	"	"	1.80
Net profit, per barrel	Mex. Cy.		$0.74

Crude Oil from Tuxpam.

Cost of Production per barrel	Mex. Cy.		$0.04
Transportation to Puerto Lobos	"	"	0.06
Transportation to Galveston	"	"	0.45
Total duties	"	"	0.74
Total cost price in Galveston	Mex. Cy.		$1.29
Price per barrel	"	"	3.34
Net profit, per barrel	Mex. Cy.		$2.05
			$1.025

Any Company having enough wells, a pipe line and oil tankers, is able to export 20,000 barrels per day or 600,000 barrels per month, obtaining the following benefits:

With crude oil from Panuco	Mex. Cy.		$ 444,000
With crude oil from Tuxpam	"	"	1,230,000

From the Book "Fragment of a Life"
By A. ZIMMERMAN

God loves all all the lonesome
Those that are with sad and sick souls;
With longings hidden in their hearts
For far, far worlds and unreached goals.
God's with those that in silence cry
And only cry when all alone
For the dreams holy unattained
And for the days dear that are gone.
God loves the lonesome that cry
As an oak dying, lonely, quiet,
Because long hours he, himself
Cries in the darkness of the night.
God loves to be with all that cry
When all alone, of their sad fate.
O, he, himself, of worlds fair dreamt
Long ages that he could not create.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.