

CHINA BENEFITS BY THE TREATY

THE PUBLIC

A Journal of Democracy

July 26, 1919

The President and the Conference

Real Test of Lloyd George

Program of Business Co-operation

Published Weekly in New York, N. Y.
Ten Cents a Copy, Three Dollars a Year

International Co-operation Must Be a Growth, a Development

By JAMES H. TUFTS *

Professor of Philosophy in the University of Chicago

FEARS and hopes now urge it upon a reluctant, incredulous world. But the beginnings—scientific, legal, commercial, political—timid and imperfect though they be, like our own early confederation, will work to reshape those who take part. Mutual understanding will increase with common action. When men work consistently to create new resources instead of treating their world as a fixed system, when they see it as a fountain, not as a cistern, they will gradually gain a new spirit. The Great Community must create as well as prove the ethics of co-operation.

* Quoted from "The Ethics of Co-operation" (Houghton Mifflin Co. \$1.).

Subscribe for the Public, Circulate It

THE PUBLIC is the only liberal political New York weekly publication that is supporting Wilson and the League of Nations. You will help support the President and do us a favor if you will show this number (and others) to friends who are interested in the policies for which The Public stands.

An introductory subscription for eighteen weeks will be accepted at \$1.

Five of these subscriptions will entitle the sender to a full year's subscription (new or renewal) for only \$1 additional.

THE PUBLIC
122 E. 37th St., New York

Enter my subscription to The Public for an introductory eighteen weeks. \$1 is enclosed.

Name

Address

Let me congratulate you heartily on your unique attitude regarding the Peace Treaty and the part played in its establishment by President Wilson. Your combination of sanity and progressiveness is so exceptional that your position deserves praise and support of all liberals.—L. C. B., Baltimore.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

July 26, 1919

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Editorial Notes | 787 |
| New Zealand's Problem..... | 789 |
| Japan's Opportunity | 790 |
| Prophesying as to Russia..... | 790 |
| The World's Change of Mind..... | 791 |
| China Benefits by the Peace Treaty, Gilbert M. Hitchcock | 792 |
| The President at the Peace Conference, John F. Moors | 794 |
| A Practical Program of Business Co-operation, J. George Frederick..... | 797 |
| Real Test of Lloyd George Yet to Come, Robert S. Doubleday | 800 |
| Current Thought | 801 |
| Books | 802 |
| News | 803 |

*Founded and Edited, 1898-1913, by LOUIS F. POST and ALICE THACHER POST
EDITOR: STOUGHTON COOLEY
LITERARY AND NEWS EDITOR: S. C. EBY
PUBLISHER AND MANAGING EDITOR: STANLEY BOWMAR
Published Weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
122 East Thirty-seventh Street, New York City
Single Copy, Ten Cents Yearly Subscription, \$3.00
Canadian, \$3.50 Foreign, \$4.00
Entered as Second-Class Matter January 11, 1917, at the
Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879*

THE LATEST BOOKS
By THORSTEIN VEBLEN
THE VESTED INTERESTS AND THE STATE OF THE INDUSTRIAL ARTS
By FRANCIS NEILSON
THE OLD FREEDOM
Each \$1.00 net; postpaid \$1.10
PUBLISHED BY B. W. HUEBSCH, NEW YORK

THE PUBLIC

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXII

New York, N. Y., July 26, 1919

Number 1112

JAILS and prisons are among the worst possible places to keep human beings. It is the object of modern penology to confine the inmates only as long as is necessary to keep them from repeating the offense, and to set them at liberty as soon as they are harmless. During the war it was proper to confine enemy aliens. Most Americans thought it proper to confine any one who opposed the Government in prosecuting the war. But that idea was fully realized by shutting up such persons during the remainder of the war. Now the war is over. These persons cannot now repeat the offense. Why keep them in prison? They are a burden to the State to support; they are a loss to their families; and they serve as martyrs to those who might well have their thoughts upon higher things. Roger Baldwin, Eugene Debs, Mrs. O'Hare are among our most highly moral citizens. They had but one legal fault; and the occasion for that has been removed. Why keep them and many others like them in prison when they can do no harm if freed? A great task is before us. It is nothing less than rebuilding the world. We need the help of every man and woman. Nothing would more fittingly accord with the new spirit of the time than an immediate and general amnesty for all political prisoners.

NO more discerning observer has visited Europe since the Armistice than Ray Stannard Baker, who went over as a correspondent and later was made head of the Publicity Bureau of the United States Peace Delegation. Readers who have followed Mr. Baker's career

as a writer and who have come to love and admire the gentle philosophy of "Adventures in Contentment," under his pen name of David Grayson, will be impressed by his comment upon the treaty. "The conditions in Europe," he says, "are much worse than people in this country can comprehend. Chaos still threatens to increase hunger, disease, and destitution. The imperative demand is for peace. The peoples must quit fighting and go to work, but before industries can be resumed, credit, raw materials, food, tools, confidence, and commerce must be provided in large part by the United States. Although the treaty is not perfect, it is the best that can be made under the present conditions. Its speedy ratification is imperative. There will be ample opportunity in the future to add what is lacking and to eliminate whatever is contrary to the public policy and a hindrance to the general good."

WORD comes from Czechoslovakia that the work of putting into operation the land reform that passed the national assembly by a unanimous vote is proceeding satisfactorily. A plausible explanation of this may be found in the comment of a Czech writer in *New Europe*, who says: "It should be remembered that since the institution of the Czechoslovak Republic there was no question more urgent or more important in Czechoslovakia than the exploitation of the great land owners, who were of German origin, and who received their land from the Hapsburgs for services rendered to them during the Czech Revolution in 1620. In this year the victorious Ferdinand II., who de-

feated the Czechs at the battle of the White Mountain, hanged, imprisoned, or exiled a very large number of the Czech nobility, and confiscated all their fortunes and landed property. Two-thirds of all the land holdings and properties of 659 Czech nobles, as well as many towns, were confiscated and became the property of the Hapsburgs and their German officers and feudal servants.^v Had they been Czech or Slovak land owners, and particularly had they been kindly or had they fought with the people for the liberation of their country, it would not have been so easy to dispossess them. The smaller the land holdings the closer the relation between tenant and proprietor and the less friction between them, though the evil inseparably involved is as great in the one case as in the other. If one must be bestridden by an oppressor, pray that he be a foreigner.

GREAT BRITAIN has just found a fortune under her feet. Oil has been discovered in Derbyshire. The discoveries come in consequence of governmental anxiety as to the future oil supply and are the result of investigation and borings conducted wholly at public expense. From first to last the whole proceeding is by the public, and it would seem that the public title is a just one. If any private enterprise is to be rewarded in apportioning this good gift, it would seem that the first share should go to the scientists responsible for the enterprise from the beginning. Yet, strange as it may seem, under English law neither public nor private enterprise is to be rewarded, and the oil is the property of the owners of the earth's crust more than a half mile above the oil supply. This, like the question of compensation for coal deposits, does not raise the question of private enterprise at all. What is rewarded here is neither enterprise nor thrift, but somnolence. What a success Rip Van Winkle would have been in the peerage!

A CONGRESSMAN'S outlook upon life is generally reflected in the measures he introduces. The bane of any national body is the provincial mind, and we have the provincial mind raised to the highest point—or shall we say the lowest—in the present Congress. An examination of the bills introduced during the

first two weeks of Congress indicates, for instance, that Mr. Mondell of Wyoming introduced twenty-one bills. One of them was the usual bill for woman's suffrage, which every Congressman introduced for campaign purposes. Thirteen of them were for the erection of local buildings, donation of captured cannon, building of monuments, and so forth, in the home district. Eight were land grabs and two were for a reform of the postal system. Mr. Lodge gave to the world two bills of interest to the general public as against eight for captured cannon and seven for the pensioning or granting of relief to private individuals. Mr. Knox, who is an authority upon the League of Nations, labored and brought forth five captured cannon and one private pension bill—nothing of interest to the general public. Mr. Borah has fathered ten private pension bills, but the only thing of general interest is a bill to change the name of the Panama Canal. Contrast any of these with the record of Senator Owen, who probably has as many demands made upon him for the relief of individuals as any one. Yet he did not find it necessary to introduce a single bill of that nature. Of the twenty-one measures bearing his name, fourteen bear directly on problems affecting the entire public and seven are for the adjustment of the relations of Indians to the Federal Government. Yet on the whole we should say Mr. Owen makes less noise than any of the gentlemen mentioned.

HENRY FORD may or may not be an "ignorant idealist," as the opposing lawyer in his libel suit got him to admit, but he has shown himself to be a very foolish man by placing himself in the hands of a quibbling attorney in order to punish the Chicago *Tribune* for calling him an anarchist. He should have known that to be called an anarchist by a newspaper—particularly by the *Tribune*—did not make him one. He should have known that the people of this country had long ago placed him beyond the reach of calumniators. His service during the war, his offer to do anything possible to aid the country, and his refusal to accept any profit for what he did, rendered him an objectionable person to all profiteers, and to one of their chief apologists, the *Tribune*. It looks bad for men who have made vast fortunes during the war

when all citizens were called upon to make sacrifices—and most of them did—to have a manufacturer furnish supplies without profit. Besides, it has been announced that Mr. Ford is about to raise wages in his factory from six dollars to seven dollars a day.

MR. LODGE prides himself upon his scholarship. Yet no man in the Senate appears to be so abysmally ignorant of history as this same Scholar in Politics. Upon more than one occasion in the last year less pedantic colleagues of the Massachusetts Senator have exposed his lack of information not only upon European but upon American history as well. Six months ago, when he was fulminating for the return to Italy of every sort of former Italian territory, Senator Lewis proved by a few adroit questions that Mr. Lodge was blissfully unaware that some of that territory is now part of France. The scholar ceased blushing about the time Congress adjourned. Last week he undertook to bait Mr. Hitchcock with reference to Shantung. He invited the Nebraska Senator to tell of the circumstances that surrounded the acquisition of the Peninsula by Germany and referred feelingly to the killing of missionaries by the German fleet under whose guns the treaty was extorted. But the silence was painful when Mr. Hitchcock pointed out that the embarrassing position of the United States had arisen largely because a former Republican administration had acknowledged and recognized this shameful German treaty. Not only that. Mr. Lodge's bosom friend, John Hay, had officially, as Secretary of State, complimented Germany for her liberality. It is not of record that Mr. Lodge spoke again that day, except to move adjournment. Scholarship, it would seem, should consist fully as much in knowing the elements of recent history as it does in literary subtleties.

New Zealand's Problem

THE Liberal press of New Zealand is not content with the present land tax in force in that Dominion. In Wellington the New Zealand *Times*, one of the most powerful dailies in the country, is urging a higher tax. It says the present rate is not high enough to retard speculation in land, nor to prevent the large

land owners from monopolizing the natural resources of the country.

During the war land values in New Zealand increased \$240,000,000. Fully half of this increased value, it is estimated, went to the large owners. While one hundred thousand of the young men out of a population of one million (equivalent to ten million from the United States) were fighting for their country, the land holdings of from 6,000 to 7,000 of the largest land owners, "who merely monopolized their country," increased in value by not less than \$120,000,000.

The *Times* contrasts this income with the income of those to whom war pensions were paid up to January 31st, and says that at five per cent. on their \$120,000,000 each of the large land owners received a pension that he did not earn of from three to four times the amount paid to the average war pensioner. "Clearly," the editorial continues, "the taxation of land values is one of the directions in which the national Government should seek to break away from the vicious circle of increased wages chasing higher prices, and increased prices following higher wages, to which, through recent legislation and by way of the Arbitration Court, the Dominion at present stands committed."

The New Zealand *Times* is not alone in calling attention to the land question. A few weeks after the war broke out, the then Minister of Finance, the Hon. Sir James Allen, quoted figures to show how the large holdings were constantly increasing in value not because of their own increased production, but because of the general growth of the country around them. In a recent budget speech the Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward, Minister of War, spoke of the same thing.

While under the graduated plan of land value taxation the large land owners in New Zealand do pay at a heavier rate on the unimproved value than small owners, it is not sufficient to shake them loose. The encouraging thing is that New Zealand is again discussing the subject of land value taxation, in which, twenty years ago, she led the way. Indications are that as soon as the Prohibition question, which is absorbing public interest, has been settled one way or another, the business men of the Dominion will take up the taxation problem and make a strong campaign for the further

relief of industry from oppressive taxes, and will advocate the use of the taxing power to open up the land for closer settlement and to stimulate production all round.

Japan's Opportunity

SELDOM has a nation had such an opportunity as Japan now has to win the good opinion of the world. When Japanese statesmen set out sixty-odd years ago to modernize their country they made a careful survey of the nations of the world, selected what was considered best in each, and began the work of emulation. They chose the British political system, but adopted the German military plan. They patterned their foreign policy after the accepted European teachings and practice, and they adopted the industrial and commercial systems of the western countries.

That they have had a marvelous degree of success in all their undertakings is now apparent. They instituted representative government and created an efficient military system. They have extended their spheres of influence in many directions, and they have developed industry to a remarkable degree. Japan vindicated her right to the rank of a first-class nation by the test of ages, the right of might.

But there was one test that she did not pass. She did not secure social equality, and this has been a sore disappointment. To be barred as a race and as individuals was something intolerable to a spirited people. So eager were they for this recognition that they were willing to pledge almost anything in exchange for it in the treaty; and the fact that they were refused makes the coveted privilege the more precious.

Unfortunately for the carefully laid plans of the Germans the world's sentiment has taken a sudden and radical shift. Militarism and the doctrine of might, as exemplified by German junkers, and which had a large field in Japan, has been discriminative. Democracy and not militarism has come to the fore. According to the new ethics it is not the nation of the greatest armament, but the nation of the greatest freedom and finest sense of justice, that is setting the standard. It is not the nation that can subdue other countries, but the nation that can protect weak nationalities, that is most commendable.

This is Japan's predicament in regard to China. She has secured the German rights in Shantung in keeping with the old system of internationalism; but public ethics has changed to such an extent that she is looked upon as a despoiler of a friendly neighbor. True, she has promised to do certain things that, if done, may establish substantial justice. But similar promises were made in regard to Korea, and recent performances have certainly been disappointing.

No matter how pure Japan's motives may be they are now under suspicion, and at a time when it furnishes excuses to the opponents of the treaty for opposing ratification. It is her duty, therefore, as a nation interested in establishing a better international order, to make immediate and specific declaration as to her position and intentions; and it is a rare opportunity for her to win the good will of the world by foregoing even a semblance of advantage over China or Korea.

Prophesying as to Russia

NEVER has there been such a field for prophecy as that offered by Russia. Germany, India, China, Japan, Korea, no land has had so many apologists, such ardent advocates, or such determined detractors; and yet it remains unknown and incomprehensible. In spite of all the interpretations, and notwithstanding the reports of volunteer investigators, the guessing as to actual conditions in that unhappy land appears to be as good now as at any time in the past.

In the beginning it was all so simple. An autocracy, a corrupt nobility, a great mass of stolid, ignorant peasantry, with a few wild dreamers trying to stir the mass to action. War brought the opportunity. The autocracy and nobility failed. The Government broke down; even the magic word patriotism could no longer rally the people.

Revolution followed. Autocracy and nobility were driven out. A hodgepodge democracy assumed the reins, but the more popular constituent assembly failed. Then followed impossible ministers, and more impossible ministers, men who were always promising but who were ever failing. Though the Government had assumed the form of a democracy it retained

the substance of a tyranny; and new prophecies came forth like lava from a burning mountain.

It soon became apparent that outside opinion had mistaken the revolution. The world was fighting its own battle. Though the friends of Russia wished the revolutionists all good fortune, they were striving to win their own war. That great mass of people, however, so long dumb and passive, but now roused to action, had dreamed too long of the revolution to permit themselves to be distracted by a world war.

After much vacillation, and many overturnings of ministries, the ultra-radicals swept it all aside and set up the rule of the common people without any regard to former privileged classes, and the hitherto almost bloodless revolution was turned into an orgy of economic and social experiments, to the delight of the proletariat and the despair of the bourgeois.

Then came the great eruption of prophecies: The Lenine Government would last but a few days; the people were against it; they would rise and drive the adventurer out of the country; they would set up a really free government. And day by day, week by week an endless succession of tales came to us; but still the Lenine Government persists, still the promised uprising tarries. It is now quite apparent that the prophets were not in tune with their subject. Some vital factor has always been omitted. Lenine may be all that his enemies have claimed, but in the eyes of the Russian people the others appear to have been worse. He may have set up his government on an impossible foundation; but if so he must have corrected his early mistakes, for it is not in the nature of error to persist in the face of truth.

What is the truth in regard to Russia? Can nobody speak with authority? The right settlement of the Russian problem is vital not alone to Russia, but to the world's peace. When at the beginning of the war the air was filled with stories of German atrocities in Belgium the tales were so incredible that many persons doubted, but when Lord Bryce issued his report doubts disappeared. Cannot Lord Bryce, or men of his standing, settle our doubts by a similar investigation? Meantime, until these doubts have been removed, can we not keep our hands off and restore trade between Russia and the outside world?

The World's Change of Mind

POLITICIANS of a certain type have been wont to except to this or that proposed advancement that it could not be accomplished until human nature changed. Congressional eloquence has poured itself out lavishly in recent months to prove that this is the insuperable obstacle to the workability of a League of Nations. This sort of reasoner goes on the theory that to state the argument is to have settled the point, as though human nature was unchangeable, was as fixed as the mountains or the law of gravitation.

But as matter of fact human nature does change. This is what alone gives their fascination to the drama and philosophy of history. It may be readily admitted with profound philosophers that human nature is *per se* totally undivine and as full of selfishness as an egg is full of meat,—that only an influence outside of itself—from heaven or elsewhere—can make it permanently lovable or even passably decent. It must be just as readily admitted with a wide range of historical students that the moral status of mankind remains the same from generation to generation and that all the differences between decades and centuries lie in the varied achievements of science and the application of scientific truth to the lives of men. Yet we still have abundant right to discount the human nature argument in behalf of man's remaining in the jungle of the wild beasts of historic diplomacy and militarism. We do not need to count on the inward and spiritual regeneration of the people as a precedent condition of peace on earth, or on the heredity of moral principles or inclinations as the ground of hope for good will among men.

Wise and forward looking men, in contending for the League of Nations, are not dreaming of celestial perfection on earth or an instinctive righteousness coming by birth without culture or care. They are not relying upon these kinds of change in human nature; but they are nevertheless counting on a real change. They demand and expect a change of mind on the part of peoples and their governments in respect of war and peace and national glory and international fraternization. Human nature has been changed countless times in multitudinous ways. To hang a man for stealing a sheep in New York

City, to justify a man for driving his wife home with a horsewhip in Boston, or to sanction a man's sale of his children into slavery in St. Louis lies outside of the wildest fancy in our decade; but it is not so very long since these acts were sanctioned by law. Many approved ancient customs would seem to us atrocious and inhuman crimes. It is not that men are born inherently better in these days, but society has changed its mind. The individual is born and reared in a different atmosphere, and his life is shaped according to more enlightened standards.

Precisely as the standards for personal behavior in communities have improved because men have changed their minds, so nations have steadily altered their attitudes toward one another because of the entrance of new conceptions of truth that have changed the mind of populations and governments. Now that the war is really ended one should be able to appraise at their proper value the real strides forward that had been taken up to the time the conflagration began. The story of these rapprochements through peace conventions, through commercial, postal, financial, scientific, educational, and other common, interlinking interests is absorbing, illuminating, and stimu-

lating. It was Germany's aloofness from certain of the Hague conventions and other modern principles of internationalism that worked the moral division that made war immediately inevitable. Wilhelm, Tirpitz, and Hindenburg stood for an unchanging mentality. Their dominating standard for war and peace as well as their ruling national love was the same as that of Friedrich and Bismarck and von Moltke. Germany was headed for catastrophe because she could not and would not change her mind sufficiently to place her in alignment with the transforming mentality of the advancing peoples of the world.

The League of Nations gathers up all our attainments in civilized internationalism and takes a tremendous step forward in the permanent organization of the peace of the world. If it requires a change in human nature, then let human nature be changed. It does not call for the slow processes of the inward conflict with spiritual enemies, or for the tedious or problematic changes of ethical heredity; but simply for the mental growth and readjustment that come from education and enlightenment, from humane and rational taking thought with the purpose that benign and clearly defined ends may be achieved.

China Benefits by the Peace Treaty

By Gilbert M. Hitchcock
United States Senator from Nebraska

THE latest attack upon the Peace Treaty takes the form of a tempest in a teapot over the so-called Shantung provisions. Shantung is one of the provinces of the Chinese Empire containing a population of about 36,000,000 people. When the great war broke out Germany was in possession of certain concessions, rights, and property in this peninsula. These included the possession of the town of Kiao-Chau, which Germany had protected with an elaborate system of fortifications. They also included railroads, mining properties, and great commercial privileges. All of these have now been ceded to Japan by Germany in the pending treaty of peace. Over the few articles of the treaty in which Germany transfers these rights and properties to Japan a great hullabaloo has now been raised. Enem-

mies of the treaty charge that the rest of the world is uniting to take away from China a province containing millions of her people and make a present of it to Japan. The American people are called upon to repudiate the treaty or at least to strike out this section, and thereby indefinitely delay the establishment of peace.

The facts of history are that Germany had a good title to such properties, concessions, and privileges as she held in the Shantung peninsula. She got them by treaty with China made in 1898, some twenty-one years ago. She held them without dispute and without question. Every nation in the world acknowledged her possession and acquiesced in her ownership. The United States did so under the administration of William McKinley, when John Hay was

Secretary of State. At that time Germany formally notified the United States that it had made the treaty with China and that the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States in that region would not be in any manner impaired. Thereupon John Hay, our Secretary of State, on September 6, 1899, addressed a communication to the German Government asking for the observance of the "open door" in the territory taken over by Germany. Von Bülow on behalf of the German Government responded on February 10, 1900, assuring our Government that there would be no departure from that policy in the territory under German control.

For a generation this condition continued with Germany in undisputed possession of the Shantung concessions. Then the great war broke out on the first of August, 1914, and Japan joined the Allied Governments against Germany and undertook the conquest of the fortified town of Kiao-Chau and other German possessions in the Shantung peninsula. In November of that year Japan won a complete victory over Germany and ever since that time has been in possession of the properties and concessions which Germany held. The United States did not enter the war until two and a half years after Japan had conquered these German possessions and made good her title to them by agreement with China, Great Britain, and France. All this time China was a country neutral in the war and so was the United States.

Then the United States came into the war against Germany, and China also dissolved her diplomatic relations with Germany and declared war against it. I have said that China agreed to the transfer by treaty of Germany's rights in the Shantung peninsula and the proof of this is found in the treaty of 1915 between China and Japan. In Article I. of that treaty the Chinese Government gives in advance its full assent to any agreement that Japan and Germany may make relating to the disposition of her rights, concessions, and interests in Shantung. That agreement between Germany and Japan is made in the very provisions of the treaty now being attacked. The first paragraph reads as follows:

Germany renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights, title, and privileges—particularly those concerning the

territory of Kiao-Chau, railways, mines, and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.

How ridiculous, therefore, is it to claim that the pending treaty takes away from China something that she deeded to Germany twenty-one years ago, which Japan won by conquest from Germany and which China by treaty confirmed to Japan four years ago.

I have treated this matter altogether upon the theory that Japan gets everything in China that Germany had, including certain rights of sovereignty that Germany exercised. As a matter of fact, however, this will be found not to be the case. In the pending treaty Germany renounces in favor of China many benefits, privileges, and concessions that she secured by special protocols and arrangements in 1901, 1902, and 1905, and Germany also transfers to China great quantities of property and surrenders to her many of the sovereign rights which she has been exercising in the past. These concessions were wrung from China after the Boxer uprisings and they are now transferred back to China instead of being turned over to Japan.

I have not dwelt on the fact that representatives of Japan have made repeated public promises that Japan intends to turn back to China even those concessions which she captured in the war and to which this treaty confirms her title. These promises have been made with sufficient publicity and emphasis to justify China in going before the League of Nations when it shall be organized to ask that this pledge be carried out.

I may say in conclusion that China is a tremendous beneficiary by the formation of the League of Nations. In the past the Chinese Empire has been the victim of spoliation and aggression by a number of nations. Hereafter China will be protected by the agreement contained in the League of Nations. Article X., particularly, so often attacked, is a bulwark of defense for China because it is a guarantee of the political independence and territorial integrity of every member of the League against outside aggressions. It will at least save China from future aggressions. In the past China has had no such protection. The treaty, therefore, instead of injuring China is a direct source of strength and protection in the future.

The President at the Peace Conference

By John F. Moors

Member of Boston Finance Commission and Member of Harvard Corporation

WHEN the President first went to the Peace Conference he was the commanding figure in the world. The autocracies of Central Europe lay at his feet. He had defined and ennobled the allied purposes in the war. He had lent the hard-pressed allies billions of needed money and had sent overseas millions of needed men. The menace of Germany was gone, sunk in what he truly called "black disaster."

Today Senator Hiram Johnson is going about the country and saying: "Italy despises us; France distrusts us; England uses us; and Japan bluffs us. Alas, how the mighty have fallen!"

The President might have retained the worldwide prestige which he enjoyed when the armistice was signed without lifting a finger. No American urged him to make his unprecedented journeys to Europe. On the contrary, he was bitterly assailed when announcement was made that he was going. He might have assumed that his job was done, not that it had only begun. But back in June, 1916, he had said: "Force will not accomplish anything that is permanent in the great struggle. The permanent things will be accomplished afterward when the opinion of mankind is brought to bear upon the issues." The more insuperable the obstacles to a wise settlement the greater the need for a leader of men, who knew the way and was trusted, to lift Europe from its ruin and to usher in a new world order. There is no evidence that, in deciding to go himself to the Peace Conference, Mr. Wilson weighed his reputation in the balance, even though the prospect of utter defeat must have been formidable.

On January 22, 1917, while we were still at peace but were within a few weeks of entering the war, he addressed the Senate and showed how even then he was looking forward to the problems of the peace table and even then was taking the Senate into his confidence. "I have sought this opportunity to address you," said Mr. "because I thought I owed it to you, as the

council associated with me in the final determination of our international obligations, to disclose to you without reserve the thought and purpose that have taken form in my mind with regard to the duty of our Government in the days to come, when it will be necessary to lay afresh and upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations." How many Americans have, through ignorance, failed to note how early he thus was in making his plans, how prompt and courteous he was in laying these plans before the Senate, how unlike have been the facts and the well-distributed tradition that he has given the Senate just cause for indignation through ignoring it, and how even at that early date he foresaw just such a conference as has been held.

Many ardent American radicals have, however, now joined hands with partisan and reactionary Senators and with those Americans like Senator Johnson who maintain that America should sacrifice nothing at this time. These radicals conceive that in signing the Peace Treaty the President has compromised his principles. Let us examine his program of two and one-half years ago, as expounded to the Senate, to determine whether or not his old friends can now justly call him a "lost leader."

In the address to the Senate of January 22, 1917, he specifically said of the questions which must come before the Peace Conference: "Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candor and decided in a spirit of real accommodation, if peace is to come with healing in its wings and come to stay. Peace cannot be had without concession and sacrifice." His new critics have jumped to the conclusion that he has stultified himself by adhering to this spirit of accommodation and, if need be, concession.

If we compare his program with his achievement we find that in his address of January 22, 1917, he said: "In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted

that peace must be followed by a definite concert of powers which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm us again. Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man, must take that for granted." Behold now the covenant of the League of Nations has duly emerged from the Peace Conference! On January 22, 1917, he spoke of laying "afresh upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations" and said: "It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise. To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their Government ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty." Here we see the contrast between the "America" for which the President has consistently spoken and the "Americanism" for which Senator Johnson is now speaking. Mr. Wilson always conceives of America as the servant of mankind, the great nation of manifest and proved idealism, the land of free men with hands of friendship held out to all other men. Mr. Johnson's Americanism is fundamentally selfish and suspicious, with "Safety First" its motto. Mr. Johnson would have America make no sacrifice. Mr. Wilson has secured for America the moral leadership of the world through sacrifice and through the trustworthiness which must accompany unselfishness.

Turning again to the address of January 22, 1917, we find that the President said: "Mere terms of peace between the belligerents will not satisfy even the belligerents themselves. If the peace is to endure, it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind. There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace." On July 10, 1919, he told the Senate that these objects had been accomplished in so far as it was possible for the Peace Conference to accomplish them. On January 22, 1917, he further said: "The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded must be an equality of rights; the guarantees exchanged must neither recognize nor imply a difference between big nations and small; between those that are powerful and those

that are weak." On July 10, 1919, he said: "The atmosphere in which the conference worked seemed created, not by the ambitions of strong Governments, but by the hopes and aspirations of small nations." On January 22, 1917, he said: "So far as practicable every great people now struggling toward a full development of its resources should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the seas. Where this cannot be done by the cession of territory, it no doubt can be done by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself." Now from the conference has come the internationalization of Danzig, not for the benefit of the chief belligerents but in behalf of stricken Poland. "With a right comity of arrangement," said he January 22, 1917, "no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce." Yet it is because the conference has done this very thing for Poland that many former friends of the President have become his bitter critics. On January 22, 1917, he said: "The question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programs of military preparation." On July 10, 1919, he told the Senate: "War had lain at the heart of every arrangement of the Europe that had preceded the war. Restive peoples had been told that fleets and armies, which they toiled to sustain, meant peace; and they now know that they had been lied to; that fleets and armies had been maintained to promote national ambitions and meant war. They know that no old policy meant anything else but force, force—always force." Throughout the recorded purpose and the recorded achievement run along parallel lines, except that a deeper note is struck after the long agony than before it.

Here is a sentence from the address of January 22, 1917, which has peculiar interest now: "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world." Yet the Republicans in the Senate have contended month after month that the Monroe Doctrine was to be undone by him. Conversely, from this whole address with its prophetic grasp of deep principles now becoming facts, the ignorant critics of the President selected three

words, "Peace without victory," reiterated them over and over with contempt, misinterpreting them, and without knowledge of the address as a whole.

No Republican Senator has said publicly that his views are tainted by dislike of the President or a desire to impair the President's prestige. But after hearing the President's account of his stewardship July 10th Senator Brandegee could see in the address of that date only "soap bubbles of oratory and souffle of phrases"; Senator Moses said that the President's address was an "appropriate description of the League of Nations as an international come-on game"; Senator Smoot called it "another Wilsonian essay, but not quite up to the standard"; Senator Poindexter found the address "disappointing"; and Senator Harding described it as "the appeal of the internationalist and utterly lacking in ringing Americanism." Is it possible that any Americans, whether Senators or not, can honestly be as stupid as this? Of all the Republican Senators quoted only one, Senator McCumber from far-off North Dakota, had the wits plus the magnanimity to call the address "very impressive." The others clearly want the Democratic Party beaten next year. Are they not doing their utmost to elect it?

To many Americans it may have seemed easy to conceive so excellent a program as that of the President's before we entered the war, to carry on our part of the war so efficiently, and now at the peace table to make achievement fairly comparable with program. If, however, we take for pace-maker the Republican leader in the Senate, Mr. Lodge, we may get a measure of the President's true greatness. Senator Lodge did not seem interested in the President's pre-war program; all that he and his friends urged was the need of military and naval "preparedness." He interjected himself recklessly into the President's peace negotiations; insisted that we must fight all the way to Berlin before we could make a just and lasting peace; had no conception of the moral strength of America as the disinterested nation asking nothing for itself, for he said December 21, 1918: "In those indemnities (to be paid by Germany) the United States must have its proper and proportional share"; was the principal sponsor for "the leak" of the Peace Treaty, from which nothing

came except confirmation of the Senator's spite; and busied himself with Senator Knox in a blind effort to separate the covenant of the League of Nations from the Peace Treaty itself, having either not grasped the fact that they were parts of a common whole or having willfully determined to destroy this common whole.

The President could not in six months transform human nature throughout the world. Only the ages can do that, and until human nature changes the task which he set himself will not be fully accomplished. But he has taken the lead in transforming the old diplomatic standards of the world. It was he and not Clemenceau or Lloyd George who stood alone against what seemed to him unjust Italian ambitions and appealed to the world over the heads of the Italian Peace Delegation. Neither Clemenceau nor Lloyd George faced the world even in company with him against Italy, yet he did not lose their good will and coöperation. And the Italian Delegation after a proud departure and magnificent acclaim at home came meekly back to him at Paris. It was clearly he who took the lead in denying to France her cherished protection in the Rhine frontier. Somehow England was denied the German Colonies in Africa, mandataries being substituted. He insisted successfully that every salient fact about the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations should be published promptly.

Some of his critics see cause for ridicule and stern censure in the severity of the terms to Germany, contrasting them with his exhortation that we should be as just to those to whom we do not wish to be just as to those to whom we do wish to be just. Alas, the terms had to be severe, unless the stupendous damage done by the Germans should all be borne by their victims in the war. Germany could be spared only if France and Belgium should be forced to bear the burden. In particular, France was entitled to reparation for her destroyed coal and iron mines and such reparation is made possible by the device of placing the Saar basin under the League of Nations. France is not to get this basin unless fifteen years hence the inhabitants vote to join her. Here again we see clearly a restraining hand. Alsace-Lorraine, which Germany held by conquest, is, as in the program, to be restored; but equally the northern part of Schleswig-Holstein may, after a plebiscite, be re-

stored to Denmark, the logic being the same for one of the chief belligerents and for one of the smallest neutrals; there is to be the desired plebiscite in Silesia; Danzig is to be internationalized, but only that one of the principles of the President may not be violated. If Germany loses substantially by these changes, how little do the suffering allies gain! Though Germany cried aloud that she would not sign such a treaty, she did sign it. In both this case and the temporary secession of the Italian Peace Delegates from the conference, the steadiness of the President and his associates has been one of the many instances of reserve strength that should not be overlooked.

In his second inaugural, March 4, 1917, President Wilson said: "The thing I shall count upon and the thing without which neither counsel nor action can avail is the unity of America—an America united in feeling, in purpose, in its vision of duty and its opportunity of service." When over a year and a half later, just before the election in the fall of 1918, he asked that this unity of purpose be granted him, the American people seemed not to understand; the elections went against him; the Republicans insisted that he was a discredited man; his

enemies followed him to Europe with stories that he did not truly represent America. His position must thus have been made immeasurably more difficult at Paris.

Nevertheless, how serene he was when he returned, how courteous again to the Senate, how impersonal! One might almost imagine that he had not heard of the many attacks on him or the many devices to thwart his purposes among his enemies in that body. With all promptitude he laid his handiwork before the Senate and put himself at the service of the Senate, that it might be supplied with all needed information. He seemed to think that the Senators would now be glad to *begin* their deliberations. He showed us our birthright in the vision which he saw of the future. "It was of this," said he, "that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead, and nowhere else." It is he who has given America the moral leadership of the world, the greatest of the blessings that have emerged from the agony of the war. He has laid at our feet a priceless opportunity. Shall we pass it by and prefer the mess of pottage that the Senate has been holding before us while he has been gone?

A Practical Program of Business Co-operation

By J. George Frederick

President of the Business Bourse International; Author of "Sales Management" and "Breezy"

WHILE the radicals rave, while the anarchists bomb, and while the unpractical theorize in this active period of reconstruction, is it not an important thing for men of training in affairs to organize a plan of business co-operation that will make the fullest use of the lessons gained from the war, and aim to take a vigorous hold upon the opportunities and responsibilities created by the new situation?

The American miracles of war effort were principally due to American business brains, and the principal tool of these American brains was business co-operation. Not only is the continuation of such business co-operation a highly practical matter, but it is also a highly patriotic one, for the reason that this country is not the only one which mastered some of the

secrets of business co-operation. American business as a whole will have to face the organized, coördinated effort of other nations in the future.

Leaving the international aspect of the matter for some more mellowed time, the matter of national business co-operation provides superabundant opportunity. The very first thing to do is to save some of the benefits of co-operation that were developed in war time. Chief of these is the unification of industries. Under the stimulation of the United States Chamber of Commerce, over a hundred industries coördinated themselves, appointed central committees that were authorized to speak for the industry at large, and thus provided these hundred industries for the first time in business history with

a composite voice, which brought order out of chaos in dealing with the great business network of the country.

But this centralized voice of industry received a benefit through its ostensibly patriotic service which is susceptible of great development. In the first place it shattered to bits the ancient business notion of rivalry, jealousy, and distrust. It developed a new principle, which is now termed by many "competitive co-operation." It brought to the fore a new principle in business; the principle that it is possible not only to compete but to coöperate at the same time. It marked off the logical sphere wherein competition must necessarily reign; but it preserved a very interesting sphere where it was profitable for all concerned to coöperate. When unrestrained competition reigns without the saving grace of coöperation the industry suffers, and of course so does the public.

Competitive coöperation, then, is the first practical principle to apply in a business program for the future. Let business houses compete with each other in the fullest possible sense on quality and service, and price also when it is a true measure of quality and service; but let them also coöperate to perform the necessary function of educating the public; of studying the mutual problems of cost, management, materials, administration problems, labor problems, standards (both in the article and in the methods of doing business), and finally, but far from least, coöperation in the acquiring of basic, vital information which will eliminate waste, make the goal more sure and definite, and even assist the smaller concerns through the availability of important information usually possessed only by the highly successful.

The Webb law permitting combination for export is one of the most prominent of the definite steps in this new direction, because the need for it in export was so exceedingly great. Davids can slay Goliaths once in a while, but it is no sound commercial principle to send out Davids to fight Goliaths. Yet this is what has happened heretofore in the matter of exports. But just because it has been so extremely obvious in the export branch of business is no reason why other branches of business have not had similarly obvious need of such coöperation. The business of agriculture is one of the finest examples of coöperation in existence. No matter

how small may be the farmer in what remote part of the United States, no matter what insect or blight may fall upon his plan, there are experiment stations, grange societies, farm bureaus, and agricultural departments, both State and national, which will supply scientific details and oft-times scientific men and advisers. In fact, out in California farmers of certain types can wire to the State authorities and have shipments of special pest-eating and pest-destroying insects shipped to them which will eradicate their pests.

The Agricultural Department and experts are in a splendid coöperative league with the farmers everywhere to develop the fruits of nature; and the results are that the American farmers have more than doubled their output within recent years, have added many billions of new wealth.

The business man has nothing comparable to such service at his command. Although he pays no less and usually considerably more taxes than the farmer who gets such splendid service, and although he usually employs more men than the farmer, he finds a Government which is indifferent if not actually hostile to his problems. Instead of setting up expert assistance it sets up obstacles to him. This period of lack of coöperation seems now happily to be at an end, and a new period of Government coöperation developing. The Department of Commerce, even though neglected by Congress out of general spite toward business, has made headway and will no doubt make considerably more headway in the future. A Department of Commerce that would serve the business man as the Department of Agriculture serves the farmer would be a very wonderful institution. There would be leaflets on as many of the details of business management operation as there are detailed reports and booklets on thousands of insects and special subjects in the Department of Agriculture.

A practical plan of business coöperation, therefore, must very necessarily include a much larger appropriation for the Department of Commerce, a much more varied and active and immediately practical scope of operation for it, together with a plan and a campaign to make such information effective and to put it to use. It is one of the most astounding facts in America that this country, although conceded

all over the world to be the most progressive business country in the world, has virtually no trade statistics at its service. The census is in the main compiled from a sociological slant, and for most business purposes is useless. Private firms maintain at huge expense research and information departments of their own, which develop information, placing them at a tremendous advantage over the smaller business man who cannot afford to get the basic information which his Government should give him without cost.

The next broad item in the development of business coöperation is that of standardization. Under the leadership of the Bureau of Commercial Economics some quite marvelous results were obtained during war time. The number of paint colors were reduced from 100 to about 24 with general beneficial results all around, and little or no hardship to any one. The automobile business has pulled itself up to enormous height to third place in American industry in almost miraculous speed, mainly by means of the ladder of standardization. Long ago that industry utilized the marvels of co-operation—it standardized screws, steels, sizes, parts, etc., in a manner which alone saved the industry from a riot of exasperating, expensive, and suicidal differentiations. The automobile industry was built up to a large degree on the principle of competitive coöperation, and remains to this day a monument to this principle as well as to the principle of standardization. Similar standardizations, not only in minor matters but also in larger matters, are possible in almost every other industry, as the war amply showed.

But there is a larger view still of standardization in which all business can share. Business in the past has suffered exceedingly from a general lack of standardization. Business standards, both ethically and technically, have received rude jars and shake-ups and must now again be put together into a code of standards to which the business game may subscribe and thereby save temper and money and Government prosecution. Already many splendid beginnings have been made, notably in the advertising business, where conditions have become notorious enough to demand immediate action. The trade commission has already set up a certain tentative set of standards which are in

process of fermentation and discussion. The practical program of business coöperation for the future must necessarily include a clear marking out of business standards, first in the matter of ethics and in general business courtesy and practice, squaring in all particulars with enlightened social points of view. It will then be quite as definitely unpractical and in bad form for a man to violate such principles as to violate the standard rules of the game of tennis.

Finally, but far from least in the program of practical business coöperation, there is the placing of a share of the responsibility of management upon labor. I put this matter, often called the "democratization of industry," the other way around, for the sole reason that I believe this side should be emphasized. To bring labor upon the Board of Directors and in management counsel is a highly practical thing if only viewed from one point of view alone. The excesses, balkings, and wrongmindedness of labor have in my opinion been due to nothing so much as disconnection from the disciplining effect of responsibility, and a sharing in the delight and stimulation of seeing and understanding the whole operation and of achieving the goal at large of business. When this sharing of management with labor is squared up to sound economics by also sharing the risk the practical program will be complete. There is nothing revolutionary in this idea, and all the hocus-pocus of the worker owning his industry, or its tools, is merely words in contrast to the thing in flesh and blood when a body of workers is given a share in the risk and profits of an enterprise, which is all any one has who owns parts (shares) of an enterprise. There are several practical ways of accomplishing this, and it is no part of this article to enter into the technique of the method. Efficiency engineers who understand management haven't the slightest bit of fear regarding this principle of labor sharing management, which in some quarters among capitalists has been an anarchistic bugaboo.

Business coöperation on a practical program comprising only the few items enumerated above can double productivity in a very short period. The time is here for a consolidation of the war's gains industrially and a drive ahead into new gains.

Real Test of Lloyd George Yet to Come.

By Robert S. Doubleday

Editor of the Peekskill Daily News

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE, England's premier, comes out of the great war a bigger man, as the world measures men, than he was when he went into it. He is a more powerful politician, in the somewhat better sense, a more distinguished and successful statesman.

A truly big figure nationally before the war, Lloyd George emerges from the most trying and testing of experiences a still greater factor internationally.

He has been plotted against in his own land with all the cunning and determination that his political opponents could conjure up, but, in the midst of his great labors and responsibilities during the prosecution of the war and, since its termination, at Versailles, he has found it possible to confound his political enemies and put them to rout.

Lloyd George lacks, perhaps, that eminent degree of amiable fortitude that has ever characterized Balfour, and that is a quality which always in the end counts for most in the efforts for the attainment of good, providing of course it starts with a right purpose and is therefore well directed. Jesus the Christ was of course the greatest exponent and exemplar of tolerant, patient, and amiable leadership of thought, though he, possessing perfect knowledge, spoke with authority, and could and did on rare occasions cut short to the very root of things in a manner that clove clean through and lacked nothing in the way of incisive and demolishing rebuke. His leadership and guidance did not bear great, immediate results. For the most part the world scorned him, but it did so because he was wholly right and the world was largely wrong. By the inscrutable wisdom of his choice of method, however, he did what he could not otherwise have done.

Since his time great men, striving for ideals and the betterment of the world or claiming to do so, have effected some degree of compromise between tolerant patience and intolerant, bigoted impatience, according to their understand-

ing and their environment and the contemporaneous conditions. They have adopted, or at any rate manifested, various and sometimes varying shades of tolerance or intolerance, patience or impatience, humility or militancy, in their efforts for good as they saw it.

David Lloyd George, militant and even scathing at times, has for the most part maintained a marvelous poise, an apparently patient resolution that must have its incentive in a very great and positive purpose of good service, or a purpose which could not withstand close scrutiny at all. His career has thus far been so distinguished for a tendency toward general progressiveness and world betterment that he is entitled to the full benefit of the favorable estimate in any uncertainty. That there are doubts as to his purposes that he must overcome, however, there can be no question.

Prior to the war Lloyd George had seemingly set out upon the road of economic truth, social freedom, and world improvement. That he had even then disappointed some of his most ardent and hopeful, and incidentally most radical, friends is known, but apology for this was based upon political exigencies said to exist which it was claimed precluded his going as far as he was thought to be earnestly desirous of going. In any event his political power was not then what it is today. It may in all truth be said for him that he could not have done then what he can do now. Opposing powers and influences that would be ineffective against him now could have stopped him then. Lloyd George, like any other leader, must have public sentiment with him or he is powerless. Today his influence in England is almost immeasurable, and though he is by no means without opposition he has the confidence and support of his countrymen to a remarkable degree and with dominant force. Potentially, he is the maker of any new English laws and regulations, the father of any reforms, to be adopted in the near future in England. He need resort to no influences of impulse, no

dramatic situations, no doubtful acerbations, or political maneuvers to do what he desires or to secure what he really wishes. Merely a man, and in the common concept therefore having his limitations, he nevertheless can do more for social progress, more for the people of his country than any man has had the privilege heretofore of doing.

Lloyd George's great abilities are undoubted. He has rendered his country and the world very great service, in consideration of which his name will go down to posterity. Yet the real test of Lloyd George is to come. He can now do many of those things that it was at one time claimed he desired to do but could not. Notably, he can set in irresistible motion the machinery for ridding England of its greatest incubus, titled and untitled landlordism. Will he do it?

CURRENT THOUGHT

Song of Separation

"Song of Separation" by Chaplin, a member of the prison body, is inspired by an instinct stronger than the love of life, vivified and made vibrant by the most terrible tragedy that can befall a man within the walls. The author dipped his pen into his own life blood. He makes vocal the most sacred secrets of the human heart. He gives artistic expression to that tender sympathy of the human soul that makes "the whole world kin." Think of separation from "mother and boy" for twenty years!

TWO that I love must live alone,
 Fur away.
All in the world I can call my own,
 Only they.
Mother and boy in the rocking-chair,
Thinking of one who cannot be there,
Breathing a hope that is half a prayer;
 Night and day, night and day.

Here in my cell I must sit alone,
 Clothed in gray.
Bars of iron and walls of stone
 Bid me stay.
What of the world with its pomp and show?
Baubles of nothing! This I know:
Deep in my heart I miss them so
 Night and day, night and day.
—Leavenworth New Era.

The Influence of Fine Women

AT A GLIMPSE of the future comes to us when one has the privilege, as I had, of being with people like Miss Addams, Miss Wald, and Miss Balch. They are irresistible in the long sweep of time. And how wonderful to think of the coming influence of great women like them, whose vision must surely carry all women to higher levels, and ever inspire men to better standards.—*From a Paris letter by J. Henry Scattergood, in Friends' Intelligencer.*

Lloyd George on the League

WITHOUT disarmament, the League's convention, like the other convention, will be blown away by the first gust of war. Let us earnestly try the League. Had it been in existence in 1914 it would have been difficult for Germany and Austria to make war, and if they had America would have been in the first day instead of two years after.—*From a speech in the House of Commons.*

The Railroads

ATTACH little weight to the distrust of "socialistic" experiments. "Socialistic" is a catchword loosely used as a means of discredit in default of argument or thought. It has long been recognized that transportation by rail is a public business which the Government might properly carry on, and it is no more "socialistic" to do so than to provide and care for schools, highways, water supply, postal facilities, irrigation, fire protection, and any number of other activities now publicly administered. The question is one of practical expediency rather than of political theory.—*Joseph B. Eastman, Interstate Commerce Commission.*

An Entente of the Plain People

THIS I said in France, in the spring of 1914: "What we ask of Germany is that its Government should be an expression of the thoughts and feelings of the German people. An entente cordiale between the British and German aristocracy is easy; between British and German militarists is also easy; for both groups in both countries are to a large degree parasitic on the people. We want an entente between the body of peace-loving, intelligent, and honorable folks of both these countries. There can be no entente between the British democrats and the Chauvinists of any country, not even of their own."—*David Starr Jordan.*

Bertrand Russell on a League of Nations

IF the peace of the world is ever to become secure, I believe there will have to be, along with other changes, a development of the idea which inspires the project of a League of Nations. When a great war has just ended men's moods are amenable to the rational grounds in favor of peace, and it is possible to inaugurate schemes designed to make wars less frequent. But the League of Nations will be by no means sufficient if it is not accompanied or quickly followed by other reforms. It is clear that such reforms, if they are to be effective, must be international; the world must move as a whole in these matters, if it is to move at all. One of the most obvious necessities, if peace is to be secure, is a measure of disarmament.—*Proposed Roads to Freedom.*

BOOKS

The Farmer and the Future

The Food Crisis and Americanism. By William Stull. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1919.

M R. STULL was born on a farm and worked for his father until he was twenty-one years old. He then studied four years at an agricultural college specializing in agricultural chemistry, when on account of ill health he went into the farm mortgage business. He became associated with large institutions, and for nearly ten years had control or management of from 100,000 to 150,000 acres of farm lands scattered through four of the best agricultural States in the Middle West.

In the first part of his book he has a good deal to say, and he says it well, concerning the value of practical and humane education, one that would combine the culture of the head with the culture of the hand, and that would result particularly in the development of character. We agree with all he says, and would go a great deal farther, in emphasizing the importance and the privilege of physical labor in the life of every man and every woman of whatsoever class and distinction. The fallacy in the popular mind in regard to manual work is profound, and needs to be corrected by a recollection of the place work took in the development of the character of the most worthy kind of American citizenship in our best decades.

Granted the value of physical work, Mr. Stull draws a sharp distinction between the organized labor of the towns and the unorganized labor of the farms. His interest lies wholly with the labor on the farm, possibly because his farm mortgages have their seat in the country rather than in the town. He is even inclined to attribute greed, viciousness, and revolutionary lawlessness to the working classes of the industrial order. We think here he is inaccurate and inadequate in his treatment. His experience with the town laborer being evidently very limited, his estimate of industrial matters leaves out of the reckoning numerous factors in which town conditions differ from those of the country.

But of the needs of the farmer he has adequate knowledge, and discusses the difficulties, the injustices, and the problems of our rural citizens with great intelligence. His book was written before the war was ended and at a time when it seemed to the most sanguine that it might continue for months or years. His view is very markedly shaped and colored by the burden then laid on the farmer of feeding the nation and the Allies; but most of his arguments and conclusions apply as urgently and correctly to peace time as to war time. He does not criticise Mr. Hoover or his administration of food supplies, but he has no rhetoric to suffice for his condemnation of the packers and

other profiteers who scandalously piled up millions of loot, artificially raising prices to the consumers but leaving the farmers without just profits and in conditions where their handicaps were intolerable. He insists that there should be competent control of middlemen of all classes, and incidentally shows how our false notions of the meanness of physical work are responsible for the fact that a very large percentage of our population is engaged in intermediary occupations in tasks that could be accomplished by an exceedingly small percentage of the total population.

The burdens of the farmer are increased by lack of help because of this false ideal and because the boys leave the farm for the higher wages of the town. Thus the farmer has to put up with the most incompetent kind of help, and even that very hard to obtain.

Our author shows how the farmer has been at the mercy of the railroads. High rates were charged for transportation where there was no competition, and water transportation of great value to the farmer was destroyed by the railroads' charging a very low rate on lines parallel to the river. This was the general condition even to the very hour the Government took over the railroads.

He has considerable criticism of the Department of Agriculture, as lacking in perception of the farmers' real needs and as furnishing too rosy information concerning the outlook of farm conditions, even aiding and abetting land booms that worked disastrously to the farmers by whetting the appetite for land speculation, as failing to understand the need of renewal of the soil, as neglecting to teach the farmer the value of the material that he destroys by burning instead of plowing under and thus creating humus, and above all as failing to impress Congress and others responsible in the trying needs of farming communities.

Mr. Stull has given us a suggestive and instructive book, and while he is pessimistic as regards present conditions we think that his work should be to a considerable extent stimulating and inspiring to those interested in finding a remedy. The farmers themselves should rise up and organize, and make themselves heard in Congress and out of it for the reparation of their injuries. Not by reducing the wages of labor in the towns, but by justly increasing the wages of the people in the country will the labor problem solve itself in rural districts. All artificial hinderances, however, must be removed. The packers and the other profiteers should not be allowed in peace time to continue their stealings. All modes of transportation should be brought into an entire subserviency to the needs of the producer and the consumer. Elevators and banks should be regulated with the advice and in the interest of the farming community for which they are created, and all questions of importance to agriculture should be discussed with scientific and impartial intelligence, wholly apart from the demands of special interest or partisan politics.

The Monroe Doctrine

Gli Stati Uniti alla difesa dell' Europa. By Vico Mantegazza. Milan, Italy: Fratelli Treves. 1919.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL VICO MANTEGAZZA, of the Italian Army, is not entirely unknown in these United States. He visited our country some ten years ago and immediately wrote a book in which he recorded the impressions of his visit. In it he displayed his usual ability as a writer—Mantegazza has at least ten volumes to his credit—and his capacity as an observer of peoples.

As its title implies, Mantegazza's book deals with the participation of the United States in the World's War, and a good deal of it is devoted to an explanation of why our country was so late in joining the Allies. He reviews at length the tremendous obstacles President Wilson had to surmount before he was able to pen his message declaring war on Germany, which message, Mantegazza asserts, will pass into history as "a marvelous document of probity, sincerity, and faith."

The main obstacle, according to Mantegazza, was the Monroe Doctrine, which has caused such pathetic anxiety to Lodge, Root, *et al.* Mantegazza examines the famous doctrine coolly and critically. "The Monroe Doctrine," he says, "had its *raison d'être*, considered as a dogma of American policy, when the great republic was, so to speak, in a stage of formation, isolated from other parts of the world, and self-sufficing as to its needs. Washington had to a certain extent enunciated the doctrine in his Farewell Address, and Jefferson later on adopted Washington's advice as an American policy. Afterward Monroe gave forth his famous doctrine."

How has the policy embodied in the doctrine fared since the days of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe?

The first part of it, the *nemo me impune laccedit*, as applied to the American Continent, has been upheld to a certain extent only. We all know that Mexico was full of French soldiers not so very long ago, and that Spain bombarded Valparaiso and Callao to her heart's content. It is true that no European nation has acquired any territory in our Continent since the days of Monroe; but is this due to the doctrine or is it due to the jealousies of the European powers who could not agree among themselves for the plundering of our Continent? For it is hard to believe that even the most exalted jingo could imagine that the United States could withstand, single-handed, a combination of European powers. The Turks, without any Monroe Doctrine, were able to hold Palestine and Armenia, even though they were committing untold atrocities in those countries, yet all the European powers coveted them and would undoubtedly have taken possession of them had they been able to agree among themselves.

The second part of the Monroe Doctrine has been disregarded time and again by politicians of all shades, whose sleep was not in the least disturbed by Monroe's ghost. The Spanish-American War, the annexation of the Philippines, the intervention in China were, each and all, contraventions of the Monroe Doctrine.

The fact is, he contends, that the Monroe Doctrine, as understood almost one hundred years ago, is an utter impossibility in our present day. We are no longer isolated, we are no longer living in a world of our own, we live in the world and have for a long time interfered in its affairs, with glory to ourselves and benefit to most if not all of the countries concerned.

We did go into the World War for the sake of democracy, and until democracy reigns supreme in the world our job will be but half done, which is worse than not having started it at all!

MARIANO JOAQUIN LORENTE.

NEWS

Public Order

—Regulations issued by the Bureau of Internal Revenue offers religious organizations opportunity to obtain wine for sacramental purposes.

—So that he might carry on his fight in behalf of a change in the trials and convictions of enlisted men, Lieut. Col. Samuel T. Ansell sent in his resignation as a United States Army officer, which was accepted.

—The leaders of the recent general strike in Winnipeg have been bailed out of Stony Mountain prison and are awaiting trial charged with seditious activity by the Dominion government.

—A great gathering of Prohibitionists from all parts of the United States is expected in Chicago, September 1 and 2, for the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Prohibition Party, which was organized at a meeting in Farwell Hall, Chicago, September 1 and 2, 1869.

—For the first time in the history of the State of Alabama convictions were recently obtained and pleas of guilty were entered in a lynching case in which a white man, Frank Foukal, was the victim of a mob, who shot him to death in a cell where he was confined on a charge of murder.

—One of the first reforms undertaken by the Soviet Government of Hungary was a simplification of the marriage law, especially the sections dealing with divorces. The new law provides that, if both parties to the marriage contract are agreed on a separation, the court grants a divorce without argument.

—Hereafter all death sentences imposed by army courts-martial must be submitted to the President, regardless of the nature of the offense or where committed. General March, Chief of Staff,

has directed that the commanding generals of each department refrain from further exercise of the power to order the execution of a death sentence or dismissal conferred upon department commanders by the forty-eighth article of war, and that all commanders cause any record of trial involving execution to be transmitted to the President.

—Professor William P. Montague of Columbia University made a constructive suggestion in his lecture on "Philosophy of Radicalism" on the 20th at the Church of the Ascension, New York City. He reviewed briefly the tenets of the Socialist Party and the Syndicalist movement and expressed the opinion that the latter was the most serious of the labor problems. He finally declared that the crying need was an absolutely free press, conducted by a body of public-spirited men, or better still, he said, by the Government, wherein criticisms emanating from the most conservative to the most extreme radical group upon the vital problems of the day should be impartially assembled and given to the public for final judgment.

—Supplementing its articles of last October, which showed that the New York Telephone Company collected from its subscribers in New York City during the three years prior to Government operation more than \$14,000,000 in excess of the 8 per cent. profit agreed upon by the Public Service Commission, the New York *World* has presented further figures revealing what experts have referred to as the "recent profiteering" of the company. The company's sworn reports for 1918, which furnish the most up-to-date figures to which the public has access, show that the earnings for that year were nearly \$3,700,000 more than the Public Service Commission stated the company should collect from its subscribers in New York City.

Education

—Porto Rico is threatened with a strike of 2,500 school teachers unless the Legislature makes provision for an increase in teachers' salaries. The teachers are expected to refuse to sign contracts for the next school year at the present scale.

—The recent raise in teachers' salaries will cost California about \$4,250,000 a year, and will average, taking the State as a whole, about \$250 a teacher. The increase in teachers' pay was brought about by organized effort directed by the California Teachers' Association. This organization has a membership of 11,000.

—The American Federation of Teachers, drawing its strength principally from Illinois, Indiana, New York, and Washington, held recently its third national convention. It went on record in favor of one thousand dollars' minimum salary for school teachers throughout the country and in opposition to the exploitation of children in industry, agreeing to work for the establishment of adequate child labor laws.

—Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell has been appointed principal of the old college of St. Stephen's at Annandale-on-Hudson, New York, which was founded in 1868. At this college, it is claimed, there is a determined resistance to the tendency to luxury in college life that has made young aristocrats out of so many of our best young fellows. At St. Stephen's Dr. Bell aims to add to the conception of a liberal education of the old sort the necessity of studying social science fearlessly.

Suffrage

—A group of women in New York have started a monthly magazine called *Judy*. In the foreword they state that the publication "will be pro-woman without being anti-man; she will try to be experimental and entertaining without being silly, vigorous without being denied the use of the mails."

—A minimum wage of \$16.50 per week for women employed in all mercantile establishments in the District of Columbia has been agreed upon by twelve conferees representing the 7,000 women so employed, the 700 or more merchants of Washington, and the general public, who were called together by the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia to consider the wage conditions in this industry.

Cost of Living

—Automobiles which have been without tires for weeks in Hungary, according to reports from Budapest, have been equipped with new tires said to have been obtained by smuggling two carloads of French and Italian make into the country. The tires were sold for \$250 each.

—The Department of Labor announces the following increases in prices of commodities since 1918: food, 107 per cent; clothing, 115 per cent; fuel, 79 per cent; metal products, 58 per cent; lumber and building materials, 61 per cent; farm products, 138 per cent; house furnishing goods, 131 per cent; the average for all commodities, 108 per cent.

—A remarkable variation is shown in the prices per bushel guaranteed by the various governments to producers of wheat for the years 1918 and 1919. They vary from Australia at \$1.14 to Italy at \$4.83. Striking contrasts are frequently shown between neighboring countries. Great Britain, for instance, has established \$2.28 and France \$8.94. Spain and Morocco are \$1.58 and \$8.96, respectively.

—In an effort to reduce the number of higher-wage strikes the municipal council of Paris, France, is considering the establishment of a department that will purchase the necessities of life in large lots and distribute them at cost to the hundred or more municipal grocery and meat markets now owned and operated by the city government.

—Investigation of the cost of living by a special committee of six representatives appointed by

Speaker Gillett has been proposed in a resolution introduced by Representative Johnson, Democrat, of Mississippi. The committee would be required to recommend to Congress "the proper course to pursue in order that the high cost of food may be reduced and those who are guilty of profiteering may be punished."

Public Ownership

—The Republic of Czecho-Slovakia will own and operate its own telephone system. It proposes to remodel, enlarge, and reequip the present service. For the purpose of study a commission will shortly be sent to the United States.

—By the provisions of a bill recently introduced into the State Senate of Pennsylvania, the State Highway Commissioner will be permitted to purchase land containing materials for use in the construction and maintenance of State highways.

Labor

—The total membership of British trade unions is now about 5,500,000, of whom approximately 800,000 are women.

—The clause of the Alien Bill restricting the amount of alien labor to be employed by any person, company, or firm in the country to ten per cent. of the working staff was rejected by the Committee of the Whole in the House of Commons.

—A survey made by the New York *World* through its correspondents in all sections of the country indicates that, in spite of the number of industrial conflicts which are taking place in the United States, there is no indication that at the present time industrial unrest is any more acute than it has been since 1914.

—An attempt is being made to organize architects and civil, mechanical, and electrical engineers. The Union of Technical Men in New York (with headquarters in the World Building) has over 800 members and there are organizations in Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, and Bridgeport.

—The novel spectacle of union leaders directing the breaking of a walkout by non-union strikers was presented to New York recently when 180 stokers, oilers, and water tenders of municipal ferry boats temporarily called off a strike that for three hours had caused 5,000 home-going Staten Islanders to stand in the rain awaiting transportation.

—The Right Rev. Charles David Williams, Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, who has been preaching a series of sermons at Grace Church in New York, recently made an appeal to the members of the Episcopal Church to further the democratization of industry, which, he said, was "coming as sure as tomorrow." He expressed the belief that in such a treatment of labor lay the greatest hopes for the future of the United States.

—The American Federation of Labor's national committee for organizing iron and steel workers has ordered the taking of a strike vote of 150,000 organized employes of the United States Steel Corporation and other iron and steel allied industries throughout the country. Taking of the vote will start at once and be completed in thirty days. In addition to the organized workers, an effort will be made to get the votes of unorganized workers, according to the committee. The strike vote will be taken by the twenty-four established international unions constituting the national committee. The right of collective bargaining is the chief demand of the union, said an announcement by the committee, which issued a list containing thirteen other demands, including establishment of the eight-hour day, increases in wages sufficient to guarantee American standards of living, and abolition of company unions.

—The North Dakota State Federation of Labor convention has voted to join hands on the political field with the North Dakota farmers. The resolution includes the right to organize, eight-hour day, minimum wage, equal rights of men and women, democratization of education by free text books and better methods of administration, State insurance for all workers, payment of war debts by heavy taxation, especially on incomes and inheritances, public ownership of all public utilities, reaffirmation of the right of free speech and free assemblage, labor representation in government and labor representation in international conferences.

Color Line

—John R. Shillady, of New York, Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has issued a statement charging that crimes charged to Negroes were frequently committed by white men who had blacked their faces.

—Although many wartime offices, created under the pressing need of war conditions, have been abandoned, that of Director of Negro Economics is to be continued, was the assurance given Director George E. Haynes, in a letter written by Secretary of Labor Wilson.

—Formation of a circuit of theatres for Negroes is announced by Lester A. Walton, managing editor of the New York *Age*, who will be general manager. The promoters will aim to provide more agreeable conditions for theatregoers of their race and to open opportunities for the Negro performer and playwright.

—In Washington, D. C., police reserves were called out on the 20th in the very heart of the city to quell soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians who made attacks on Negroes in retaliation for alleged attacks on white women in that city during the past month. The military was called out and practical martial law prevailed.

—The Rev. John Henry Simons, of St. Thomas's Church, Chicago, has recently compiled a survey of the colored people of five fairly distinct settlements containing the majority of Chicago's colored people. He says Chicago is fortunate in its large number of capable colored men and women interested in the community and in politics. In 1916 more than five hundred men and women were engaged as physicians, dentists, lawyers, clergymen, nurses, school teachers, and in similar professions. These, with the large number of women who have leisure time, have formed the backbone of men's and women's organizations. There are more than sixty women's clubs, many musical and literary societies, and organizations of endless variety.

Transportation

—The pre-war rate of 12 cents a pound on parcel post packages to Germany has been re-established by the Post Office Department. The limit of weight on such packages is eleven pounds.

—Public Service Commissioner Lewis Nixon in New York City, to the extent of his power, has abolished the free transfer privilege on the surface lines in Manhattan and Brooklyn. With two orders, one affecting the New York Railways Company and the other the B. R. T. system, he eliminated 1,077 free transfer points, and a change of cars at these points after August 1 will cost the riding public two cents each. The Commissioner's action ends a fight that was begun over two years ago by President Shonts of the New York Railways.

Reconstruction

—The Government of South Australia has undertaken housing for returned soldiers on a large scale and is paying particular attention to the building of small bungalow cottages for them.

—The Free Trade League of New York City has been incorporated to promote the policy of free trade among nations as an essential factor in securing and maintaining the peace of the world.

—A reclamation scheme has been determined upon by the British Board of Agriculture to reclaim lands now under water. The immediate enterprise covers 12,000 acres, but it is expected that ultimately a sufficiently large area may be redeemed to form a new English county.

—The American and French Governments have at last come to an agreement as to the price to be paid by France for the American military stores, buildings, railroads, and material. The price is still secret, but it is higher than the \$800,000,000 offered by France which the United States rejected.

—A large staff of experts is pushing work on Germany's preliminary plans for the restoration of devastated Northern France and Belgium.

These plans will be submitted to the Allies. At the same time the work of organization is being pushed, so that if the Allies accept Germany's tentative proposals, wholly or in part, the restoration of the devastated districts can be begun immediately.

Foreign

—Joaquin Sanchez Toca, confidential adviser to King Alfonso, will head the new Spanish Ministry which is to succeed the Cabinet of Antonio Maura, which resigned.

—Prince Louis Philippe, Duke of Bourbon-Orleans and pretender to the throne of France, has written to his supporters to "maintain their sacred union" in the work of reconstruction and to oppose any attempt at revolution.

—American capitalists have procured concessions in Russia from the Soviet Government, according to a Swedish newspaper which quotes the official organ *Sebernaya Kommuna*, in Petrograd. The concessions comprise the establishment and operation of approximately 2,000 miles of railroad and 22,000,000 acres of forest and land. The concessions include all mineral rights, and the right to establish steamship lines and to exploit water power. They are granted to Russian and Swedish agents. The latter are stated to be backed by American capital.

THE SCHOOL THAT STUDIES LIFE

The Training School for Community Workers
Reorganized on the Cooperative Plan

JOHN COLLIER, Director
In an eight months' course the School prepares students to meet the demands for trained workers in Communities, Industrial Welfare Organizations, Public Schools, Churches and Colleges. Also offers short courses for trained workers already in the field and for volunteers.

Address for full information
MISS A. A. FREEMAN, Room 1001, 70 Fifth Ave.,
New York City

St. Stephen's College

A Christian College, conducted for Christian men of all communions, by the Episcopal Church, furnishing undergraduate training of the highest scholarship, in an atmosphere of simple living and campus democracy.

Specializing in old-fashioned classical education and in those social sciences having to do with human relationships.

Terms: \$450 a year for tuition, modern quarters and good simple food. The low cost is due to simplicity of life and endowment.

Endorsed by the Commissioner of Education, State of New York.

There are a few vacancies for next year.

Address, at once,

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL, President

POST OFFICE, Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.

STATION, Barrytown on the N. Y. Central R. R.