

THE LIVING AGE

Founded by E. LITTELL in 1844

NO. 3961

JUNE 5, 1920

A WEEK OF THE WORLD

THE SAN REMO CONFERENCE

FRANCE now has two very able representatives defending her international political interests in the forum of world opinion. One of these is ex-President Poincaré now political editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, one of whose articles we have recently published. The second is André Tardieu, a leader of the radical democrats in the Chamber of Deputies, who has recently been almost a weekly contributor to *L'Illustration*, where he finds a wide hearing outside of France. His historical review of the divergence of opinion between France and Great Britain regarding the conditions of peace with Germany, which we print in this number, is the ablest presentation of France's case which has come to our attention. But it seems to us to overlook what is perhaps the most important reason for the difference in the popular attitude—sure eventually to be reflected in the political attitude—of these two countries toward Germany. Great Britain sees primarily the economic side of these problems. It takes a business man's view of the conditions necessary for Europe's recovery. With France, the question is regarded primarily under its political and military aspects. These diverging

tendencies are stronger than the personal influence of individual statesmen, or the policies of cabinets and political parties.

We rarely have occasion to quote American opinion *via* the European press, but the following introductory paragraphs from a prominent article in the *Manchester Guardian*, written by its New York correspondent, seem too pertinent to be passed over without notice.

San Remo illustrates well the extreme difficulty of American participation in European affairs. It was a meeting of chief executives who assumed the power, and no doubt had the power, to commit their representative nations to future action which might involve the use of armed forces.

There is no one in the American political system who can do that. The President tried to do it in Paris, and as a result aroused among all the other animosities a fierce constitutionalist hostility. No American official would have the authority to 'negotiate,' as that word was used at San Remo. No American official can enter into a series of bargains involving promises with the least assurance that these promises will be validated ultimately. In other words, there is really no Plenipotentiary in the American system, and San Remo seems to have been an affair of Plenipotentiaries.

The San Remo conference may mark a turning point in the post-

Copyright, 1920, by The Living Age Co.

treaty relations of the Entente with Germany. At least it has thrown the light of publicity upon those relations in a way that had not occurred before. The London *Daily Chronicle*, which is an ardent Lloyd George supporter, presents a British version of what was accomplished there as follows:

A great European danger was averted at San Remo. For months the danger had been brewing. France was being given over into the hands of her reactionaries — and, to-day more than ever, France is the land on which, for good or ill, the destinies of Europe must depend. Clemenceau, who, if he gave his colleagues of the great alliance, when they were drafting the treaty in Paris, many a difficult hour, knew perfectly well how to keep his own extremists in hand — Clemenceau, to whom we did not always do justice, was gone.

It was not the Socialists, but the hardened tax dodgers, the discredited but irrepressible Nationalists, the armchair adventurers, all the clans of reaction that had been suppressed for five years, who most rejoiced in his fall. Millerand, they were sure, would be more amenable.

They would give the Boche what for. They would see if their war profits were to be stolen simply because England, ever perfidious, had set the example of an iniquitous income tax. If the Boche would not pay, they would just march in and take this, that, and the other,

The bugles of revenge were heard again.

M. Poincaré, straight from the presidential palace, let himself go in the columns of one of the 'largest circulation' journals. M. André Tardieu, a young statesman who at one time seemed to have the heritage of French political liberalism within his grasp, countenanced the agitation.

The fact that the Entente with Great Britain, to say nothing of the United States, simply cannot live on lines of reaction and adventure must be understood by many leading politicians in Paris. But these men were, or were on the point of being, overwhelmed.

The march to Frankfort converted a domestic development into a challenge to the Alliance. Mr. Lloyd George immediately saw the menace and instantly grappled with it. If there is any Britisher whose love of France is beyond the possibility of doubt, it is he.

He knows that not alone the name, but the deepest facts, require that the Franco-British Entente shall be a democratic understanding, that whatever specific agreements be made from time to time, the fixed relationship must be one

of common character and common interest. The march to Frankfort was only a blunder; the next step along that road might be a crime.

M. Millerand is not a reactionary, or an adventurer, or a man liable for any reason to misunderstand the nature or belittle the importance of British friendship. But he took over from M. Clemenceau a terribly difficult task.

In ten days M. Millerand and his most influential fellows, have been brought to accept Mr. Lloyd George's principle of reasonable and concerted action, an open disavowal of any policy of adventure.

MORE RUMORS FROM RUSSIA

YESTERDAY we were told that the recovery of Europe depended upon the political stability and economic revival of Germany; to-day we are told that Russia holds the key to the problem of world recovery. This is probably only another way of saying that no single nation holds the fate of the world in its lap. Economic health must be restored before we can have social and political health. Until Russia resumes the production of food and raw materials, some factories in Western Europe and Great Britain will be under-employed, and part of their population may remain undernourished. So long as those conditions prevail, social unrest and political disturbances will continue; and there will be a world shortage of primary materials which will retard, for instance, the restoration of prices to their normal level in our own country. Therefore, all the light which we can obtain upon Russian conditions is of direct practical importance for ourselves. Our interest in Russian social theories and their application may wane, and turn from apathy to aversion; but our concern in the material welfare of the Russian people, and for their efficiency as producers, will probably be kept alive by the practical exigencies of our daily life.

As many of our readers doubtless know, the London *Economist* seldom

speaks upon such an important subject as Russian economic conditions except on a basis of expert information. The article we reprint from its columns is a matter-of-fact résumé of our latest intelligence from that country. Our second article upon Russia was written by the Editor-in-Chief of the former *St. Petersburg Zeitung*, an opportunist German daily in the capital of the Tsars, which was one of the last bourgeois publications in that city to be extinguished by the Bolsheviks. Exiles from Russia, whether natives or foreigners long domiciled in that country, are apt to be inspired by their own hopes and interests to expect a speedy overthrow of Bolshevism. That prediction has been characteristic of exile literature ever since Lenin and Trotzky came into power. To this extent we may discount Kügelgen's political speculations. But his analysis of underlying conditions is probably exceptionally well informed.

Novaya Russkaya Zhizn, a Russian paper printed in Helsingfors, quotes extracts of a speech delivered by Rykov, Chairman of the Bolshevik Supreme Economic Council, at the Congress of Delegates of Economic Councils held at Moscow on January 25, from which we select the following:

We have but one special train a month to haul iron to Central Russia from the Urals. We need about ten thousand tons of cotton a month from Turkestan to keep the textile factories of the Moscow district employed. As matters stand we have only two trains a month from that region. . . . We suffer the same embarrassment regarding raw materials from nearer sources; for example, the flax crop in Russia used to approach three hundred and fifty thousand tons. It fell to seventy thousand tons in 1918 and has declined greatly since that year. This is explained by the fact that the peasants have taken to raising grain instead of flax, because they could not get food from other districts. . . . During the first half of 1919 about a million hides were delivered to our central offices. The number during the entire year of 1920 will not exceed six hundred and fifty thousand.

The speaker said that if the blockade was lifted and peace made with Soviet Russia the shortage of raw materials in that country would be more serious than ever, because the government would have to use these to exchange for manufactures. In addition to the other difficulties confronting industry, was a scarcity of labor. Some of the workers had joined the Red army, others had withdrawn to the villages. Trotzky said: 'Hunger, lack of houses, and cold are driving the working people away from the manufacturing centres into the country, and not only into the country, but into the ranks of the illicit traders.'

Apparently, however, peasant self-help is beginning to exert itself — in defiance of Bolshevik theories and decrees — to save the spark of economic life which still survives in Russia. A primitive, self-subsisting peasant democracy may at last evolve from the present chaos.

PROPAGANDA INCIDENTS

PESTER LLOYD, the Conservative organ of the German speaking residents of Budapest, in an article intended to emphasize the necessity for intelligent Hungarian propaganda abroad, supports its contentions by the following illustrations:

This is the more necessary because our hostile neighbors, and particularly the Roumanians, are conducting an unscrupulous propaganda against Hungary abroad. Let us illustrate this by one or two examples. Articles favorable to Hungary appeared in some prominent Paris newspapers. They attracted great attention because they were written by very prominent journalists. Immediately a counter-agitation started. The authors of these articles and the editors of the journals in which they appeared, received a flood of letters from Roumanians, Czechs, and Serbs residing in Paris, urging them not to advocate the Hungarian cause.

Distorted reports, innuendoes, and lies were widely circulated for the purpose of converting any nascent sympathy for Hungary into hatred.

When these measures proved ineffective articles began to appear in rival newspapers attacking public men and authors who showed us the slightest favor and charging that they were bribed. . . . When the Roumanians were in Budapest they took several Bolshevik leaders into their service, including one of the best known of the Communist commissioners. These men accompanied the Roumanians when they retired from Hungary. Fifteen of these former Hungarian Bolsheviks now have their headquarters in Transylvania where they are in charge of newspapers in the Hungarian language, which are propagating Communist principles and Bolshevik doctrines, as we know to our misfortune, with great success. There is a possibility that the Roumanian authorities will themselves be the worst sufferers from this strategy; for this Bolshevik propaganda may not stop with Hungarian industrial workers, but spread to their Roumanian peasant neighbors. For the time being, the Roumanian authorities are willing to take any risk in order to substitute Bolshevism for Hungarian patriotism in the hearts of our fellow nationals in the annexed territories.

A FRENCH LABOR PARADISE

L'ACTION FRANCAISE quotes a letter written by a member of Parliament from L'Oise, condemning the shameful extravagance and waste in the regions under reconstruction. A machinist astounded by the amount he received came to the deputy in question with his pay envelope. In addition to 625 francs regular wages monthly, he was allowed for eight months of service 5391 francs in special bonuses. The deputy found many instances on the payroll where men were paid from 6000 to 9000 francs. The heavy pumps at Faverolles have been set up and taken down eighteen times on account of the blunders of the engineers in charge. The expense of these unnecessary operations was between 140,000 and 150,000 francs. One company operating in the same district purchased 20 electric units. In order to give employment to its machinists, it had these units assembled and set up twice. Six laborers, receiving 20 francs a day, were ordered to clean the parts.

When they had finished and asked what they should do next, they were told to 'go over them again.' These incidents are causing bitter complaint among the farmers, who cannot compete with the reconstruction contractors in wages. It is a common saying among French laborers: 'Why, here you have to work. I can get more pay doing nothing in the reconstruction area.' Autos and gasoline are wasted prodigally. A truck will be sent to a distant town to get a case of pears. One six-ton truck was sent from Hargicourt to Montdidier to take over a lock. The deputy himself has seen heavy beams, 21 to 24 feet long, urgently needed for reconstruction work, cut up to be used for private fuel by an official. He noticed six Dickinson cisterns worth 30,000 francs abandoned and rotting by the wayside. The superintendent in charge knew nothing of their existence.

AMERICAN MONEY FOR GERMANY

LE TEMPS devotes a leader to the financial aid which Germany is receiving from the United States. Besides describing the alleged plan for operating the North German Lloyd and Hamburg-American Lines under a coöperative agreement with American capital, this paper says:

It was recently reported that the city of Darmstadt had floated a small loan of 10,000,000 marks exclusively in the American market. The city of Coblenz anticipated its Southern neighbor by selling part of a loan in America a year ago; but this operation was *sub rosa*. That city proposes to ask American subscriptions officially this year for a larger sum, rumored to be 50,000,000 marks.

German manufacturers are devising various schemes to obtain credit for raw materials purchased in America. An experiment is about to be made on a small scale. Several spinners and weavers in Silesia have contracted with a group of American capitalists for cotton on credit. The American suppliers will have a lien upon the cloth made from this cotton. . . . It is

known that five large Chicago packers supplied Germany on credit last year with considerable quantities of meat and lard. The German Government paid for these provisions with short term mark notes. The receivers of these notes would have suffered considerable loss if American exchange had continued to decline. But the recent recovery in the mark has led to a renewal and extension of these credits.

A POLITICAL BALANCE SHEET

VORWÄRTS speaking officially for the Social-Democratic party thus summarizes the programme and accomplishments of the present government in a campaign appeal to German voters prior to the forthcoming parliamentary election:

i. Accomplished

1. Germany no longer a Monarchy but a Republic.
2. No more class privileges in voting but universal equal suffrage for both sexes.
3. The Referendum.
4. National unity strengthened by the centralization of the railways, the postal service, and other instrumentalities of communication in the hands of the central government.
5. Increased powers for wage earners and salaried employees to regulate their own conditions of employment through the Shop Council Law.
6. The right to employment and the right of the involuntarily unemployed to be supported.
7. Provision for socialization in the Constitution, permitting industries ready for this reform to be taken over by the national government, or by a state or municipal government.
8. An eight-hour day and Sunday rest enacted into law. The right to organize provided for in the Constitution. Abolition of special laws governing rural labor.
9. A heavy levy upon capital and upon unearned incomes.

ii. Proposed

1. Strengthening the Constitution of the Republic and defending it against assault.

2. Creation of a loyal Republican civil service and army.

3. Revision of the Treaty of Versailles through a prudent foreign policy.

4. Transfer of all appropriate industries to the government.

5. Systematic and efficient regulation of production and exchange by public agencies, chosen on a democratic basis, with Socialism as an end.

6. Increasing agricultural production by farm colonies; increasing manufactures and exports in order to procure provisions from abroad. Energetic suppression of illicit trading.

7. Adjustment of wages, salaries, and pensions to the higher cost of living. Adequate provision for war invalids and dependent survivors of fallen soldiers.

8. General protection for the economically weaker classes; resolute opposition to economic anarchy and exploitation.

THE DANISH ELECTIONS

As a result of the parliamentary election held in Denmark on April 26, the Liberals and Socialists appear to have gained the largest number of seats. Two Conservative organizations also increased their representation. The Radicals, who were more closely allied to the Socialists than the Liberals, lost heavily. The elections have resulted in a check to the Social-Democrats, although they hold four more seats than in the previous Parliament, because of the heavy losses experienced by their Radical allies. It is predicted that the new ministry will have unstable support, because the increased Socialist delegation still forms, with the decreased Radical delegation, a majority of the chamber.

FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN

BY ANDRÉ TARDIEU

BONAR LAW's speech of April 12, and that of M. Millerand the following day, record the restoration of harmony between France and Great Britain. Everyone will rejoice at this result. But in order that similar unhappy incidents may not repeat themselves, it is desirable to understand exactly the causes of the present one.

During this brief crisis the people of France were in complete agreement with their government. The position taken by Mr. Lloyd George on April 8 surprised and irritated us, because that position was neither just nor clear-sighted. From the first, the people of France were confident that the incident would pass without unpleasant consequences, because an agreement between France and Great Britain is as indispensable for our neighbors as for ourselves. We were equally convinced from the very first, however, that so far as Germany was concerned, if the evil were not irreparable it was at least serious. We have proof of that now in the recent speech of the German Chancellor.

This misfortune hung over us all last year, throughout the Peace Conference. Thanks to his unceasing vigilance and unequalled moral authority, M. Clemenceau succeeded in warding it off. Three months after he left office, three months after the treaty went into effect, the rupture occurred. It was the first victory Germany had won since defeating General Gough in Picardy, and since the *Chemin de Dames*.

In order to understand what occurred, we must recall first of all that ever since the armistice the question of the left bank of the Rhine has been a source of misunderstanding and friction between France and Great Britain. It takes three years of history to explain our recent week of estrangement.

From the beginning the British Cabinet failed to understand France's policy upon the Rhine. What France regarded as a necessary guaranty for the execution of the treaty and for its own security, Mr. Lloyd George and his colleagues — possessed by the memory of Napoleon and misled by the intemperate language of part of our press — distrusted as a danger for the peace of Europe. As far back as 1917, Mr. Balfour, in two public addresses, vigorously denounced the plan for an autonomous government on the Rhine, which had been suggested the previous January by Mr. Briand in a confidential letter to Paul Cambon, and which was later vigorously advocated by M. Clemenceau at the Peace Conference. From January, 1919, the British Government displayed equal energy, though always in a most amicable manner, in its categorical refusal to endorse the French occupation of the Rhine frontiers.

After five weeks of debate, France obtained on the 22d of the following April, in addition to the two treaties which the Allies offered it on March 14 in place of an occupation, their consent for the latter, not only by the