

THE LIVING AGE

VOLUME 317—NUMBER 4121

JUNE 30, 1923

A WEEK OF THE WORLD

THE GROWTH OF IGNORANCE

PROFESSOR JOHN BURNETT, who delivered the Romanes Lecture at Oxford this year, took for his subject 'Ignorance.' He expressed the fear that the civilized world might be facing another Dark Age.

The only knowledge worth distributing is living, first-hand knowledge, and that, from the nature of the case, can only be realized in its fullness by the few. That is, however, the only reservoir from which the needs of the many can be supplied, and it is therefore supremely important to consider from time to time whether it is being maintained at the proper level. . . . The nineteenth century had a simple faith in the progress of knowledge and enlightenment, but we now know too much history to have any assured confidence in that. There have been Dark Ages before, and they have generally supervened on periods when knowledge of a sort has been more widely distributed than ever. So far as we can see, the decay has always set in at the top. It cannot be denied that there are warnings and portents at the present day such as have before now heralded an Age of Darkness.

The Professor believed the young men of the present are, on the whole, healthier in body and mind, and more intelligent, than those of his own generation. On the other hand, he was

certain that the young men of to-day are absolutely and relatively more ignorant than those of forty years ago, and, what was worse, that they have less curiosity and intellectual independence. Every university teacher in the country whose memory could carry him back a generation knew that the educational authorities had had to lower their standard of teaching and examination progressively for the last thirty years, in every department except the physical and natural sciences.

Those inclined to differ from the Professor's views will doubtless reflect that a growing knowledge of the physical and natural sciences is perhaps a sufficient compensation for the alleged decline in other branches of knowledge possessed by undergraduates.



JAPANESE STUDENT PACIFISTS

WHEN the Japanese Association for the Study of Military Science attempted to hold its inaugural session in the auditorium of Waseda University at Tokyo last May, pacifist students, who were in an overwhelming majority, disrupted the meeting. Before it opened they began their protests by shouting 'Bring your murderers on the platform,' and 'Down with the militarists!' Although the Dean and prom-

Copyright 1923, by the Living Age Co.

inent professors, the commanding General of the Tokyo Department, and the Vice-Minister of War were on the platform, heckling continued with increasing violence until the close of the meeting, after which the protesting students issued a call for a convention to agitate against the Association for the Study of Military Science.

General Shirakawa, the Vice-Minister of War, was greeted with the cry that blood was dripping from his decorations. The students sang 'Thousands die to raise one hero to fame.' The officers' speeches were drowned by the noise, and the meeting closed in the utmost confusion.

Osaka Mainichi speaks of the disturbance as 'unprecedented in Japanese educational circles,' and says the incident 'comes as a rude shock to the Japanese people.' However, this journal simultaneously denounces the Association for the Study of Military Science as an 'inappropriate and inopportune undertaking,' and adds that the students' protest is 'another conclusive evidence of the unpopularity of soldiers among the Japanese.' *Yomiuri* says: 'This trouble has revealed to the public mind the alarming changes that have come over the ideas of Japan's rising generation.' It considers both parties to blame. The Government's plan to detail military officers to schools to give military training is criticized as likely to undermine student-discipline. 'Antimilitarist ideas will be more rapidly fomented among Japanese students.'

*

CONFLICTING EVIDENCE

WE are accustomed to divergent versions of identical incidents in our own press; but a perusal of the press of other nations is required for a full appreciation of the contrasting and multicolored hues that tinge the specta-

cles of those who watch world affairs. Even in the same country, men of kindred temperament and training place the most diverse interpretations upon a similar situation. For instance, the London *Economist* summarizes Poincaré's review—in the Chamber—of the results of the Ruhr occupation so as to convey the impression that the cost of this measure is not excessive, in fact 'much less than has been feared,' that French furnaces are now receiving more coke from the Ruhr than they require, and that the prospect of a large supply of coal from that district is very rosy. Under the same date the London *Statist* asserts that Poincaré's report failed to mention heavy deficits—for instance, on the operation of the railways—that completely reverse the figures as to the cost of occupation; and that if it had recorded France's losses 'from depreciation in exchange, the huge bills paid for British coal and coke, and the injury done to the iron and steel trade with the number of furnaces in blast reduced by forty since the beginning of the year, the adverse balance would surely run into hundreds of millions.' The *Statist* denies the correctness of the figures as to coke and coal-deliveries, though it admits some improvement in the output of pig iron.

Similar discrepancies appear in the German press accounts of the recent Communist troubles in the Ruhr. *Kölnische Zeitung* says: 'We are actually seeing to-day the strongest capitalistic and imperialist Power of Europe coquetting with Communism in the Ruhr for political ends. Communism is to prepare the way for France to accomplish her design, and when that is done, she will speedily crush those who have been her tools. France is trying to break our passive resistance in the Ruhr by playing Germans against Germans.' This journal

reports that the regular trade-unions are on their guard against this possibility, and are coöperating with employers to stifle the Communist agitation.

On the other hand, *Rote Fahne*, the Berlin organ of the Communists, attributes the strike and disorders entirely to two conditions, which it describes with much local detail: the rapid rise of prices accompanying the recent depreciation of the mark — which made a radical revision of wages necessary — and the employment of 'Fascisti bands' and 'mine Pinkertons,' by employers, to defeat all labor agitation. 'The workingmen answered this provocation by smashing the Fascisti bands, driving them out of the police headquarters (at Gelsenkirchen) and taking possession there.' In conclusion this journal asks: 'What was the object of this provocation by the capitalists? Nothing else than a bloody preparation by the German bourgeoisie for a capitulation to the French . . . in order that Stinnes, Loucheur, and de Wendel may reap a huge profit.'

Again, *L'Europe Nouvelle*, a Paris Liberal weekly, prints a letter from a young soldier in the Army of Occupation, describing the attitude of the Rhenish population toward the French: —

Germany is certainly a country of paradoxes. To convince yourself of this, you have only to look at the bus conductor clad like an officer of the Guards, or recall the Day of Mourning in the Rhine country. On the latter occasion the merchants shut their shops, for fear of being reported, but smoked and joked together behind their doors. Your Rhinelander is a good fellow. On the train he will read newspapers that denounce our soldiers as 'bloody barbarians,' but he will rise to help a poilu encumbered with his arms and haversack. The atrocities reported in the press do not stir his blood. He is more concerned over the price of margarine than over the in-

cidents in the Ruhr. . . . So they live from day to day, obeying the Prussians with resignation, but on a friendly footing with us, neither loving Berlin nor caring for a Rhine Republic.

About the same date an equally liberal and veracious German paper, *Berliner Tageblatt*, describes Treves, 'the oldest city on German soil,' as reduced to the semblance of 'a North African military camp' — thronged 'with gaunt, turbaned sons of the desert in red-and-white robes, and long files of brown and black negroid red-fezzed Algerians, Tunisians, and Senegalese, jabbering a dozen African dialects.'

The process by which the white population is being expelled to make place for colored troops is described as follows: 'At five o'clock in the morning a certain section of the city is completely surrounded by Spahis and other colored troops. All communication between it and the rest of the town is severed. Trucks fill the streets; and a spectacle follows that must remind these black men of incidents that happened a few years ago in their native African villages, when soldiers suddenly appeared at their doors of a morning and dragged their young men away from weeping and wailing parents to fight for the glory of France in a distant and unknown land. . . . For that is the way white Germans are now treated. Billeting officers knock at the doors of the houses, awakening the terrified dwellers from their sleep. An interval of from five to ten minutes is all that is allowed for them to vacate their homes. Cases have occurred where women working in the garden in the early morning have been forced to leave in army trucks without going back into the house to remove their aprons. Naturally, such things depend upon the character of the particular officers in charge. . . .

'It should not be forgotten that there

are honorable Frenchmen who deplore this. One of these, on seeing a railway employé, his wife, and nine children weeping on the street, with all their worldly possessions tied up in little bundles, said: "It is horrible. I would like to help you, but I cannot. I must obey orders." When German residents were ejected from their homes at Kurenz not long ago, several French railway employés watched the operation. The wife of one of the French workingmen burst into tears, and exclaimed: "If I had known of this, I should never have come. I am going away. I will never live in that house. God's curse would be upon me there."



QUEENSLAND ELECTIONS

QUEENSLAND Laborists have won an important victory in the May elections, retaining in power, with an increased majority, a second consecutive Labor Premier, against the predictions of those who hoped to see popular wrath visited upon a Government that had essayed expensive and unsuccessful adventures in many fields of state and industry. The expected reaction against radicalism has not set in.

The Conservative press in Great Britain consoles itself for this unexpected result with the conjecture that responsibility has a sobering influence upon Labor politicians. The present Premier has vigorously opposed those of his own party who are trying to abolish the arbitration court and substitute for it vague devices proposed by the All-Australian Trade-Union Congress for settling trade disputes.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Theodore, the Labor Prime Minister, who is regarded as the ablest Parliamentarian in the Queensland legislature, is a Rumanian by birth. According to a Melbourne correspondent of the London *Times*, 'his political astute-

ness allows him altogether to outwit the rather dull individualities opposed to him.'



TOREO REDIVIVO

DESPITE the humanitarian campaign against bullfighting in Spain, and the growing interest in other sports, the *corrida* seems to have as strong a hold as ever upon popular affection in that country. In fact, it shows indications of extending to Spain's neighbors. For the third time in the history of Rome, a bullfight has been held in that city. The first was in the year that America was discovered, 1492, when the Spanish Ambassador gave a festival to celebrate the capture of Granada from the Moors. The second, in 1500, was held at the gates of the Vatican, in front of St. Peter's, before the present magnificent Piazza was built. Now the Fascisti, perhaps balking at bringing back gladiators, have approved the establishment of what seems likely to be a permanent bull-ring in that city. Three corridas have recently been held, and the first torero to kill a bull was presented with an artistic cigarette-case in the name of Signor Mussolini. Naturally, there has been some protest. The eminent Italian journalist, Maffio Maffi, of the *Tribuna*, under the heading of *Pollice Verso*, wrote as follows:—

Our opinion is that Rome did not in the least feel the necessity for these taurine saturnalia of exotic importation. Rome, celebrated a few mornings ago as the world's ancient mistress of the highest civilization; Rome, exalted as the perennial lighthouse of spirituality in the intellectual baseness and confusion of the modern world, might have also allowed herself the luxury of refusing the right of citizenship—even if only provisional—to a bull-ring.

A contributor to *Heraldo de Madrid* ascribes the continued popularity of

the sport in Spain to his countrymen's national psychology: —

The psychology of the spectator at a bullfight is peculiar, just as a bullfight is peculiar. Buying a ticket to the ring is like buying a lottery ticket. You buy a chance of seeing something, but no certainty. . . . The best toreros and the best-bred bulls may prove a disappointment; on the other hand, a most unpromising programme may prove intensely exciting. It is this uncertainty that appeals to the spectator. In general, a bullfight is a dull spectacle. What keeps the spectators in their seats is the hope of something exceptional. This is where a bullfight differs from a theatrical entertainment. Any intelligent spectator can leave a dull play after the first act, sure that he is losing nothing. But at a bullfight you are never certain what may happen until the last bull has been dragged from the ring.



SOCIALISTS IN HAMBURG

WHEN International Socialist leaders of Europe tried to rally their disorganized and scattered forces after the war, their own disagreements prevented their assembling under a single banner. Indeed, they have not done so even to-day. The Conservatives formed a new International at Geneva; the Trade Unions organized for common effort with headquarters at Amsterdam. A more radical group of non-Communist Socialists formed an international at Vienna; and the Third — or Bolshevik — International was founded at Moscow. Now all these organizations, with the exception of the Third International, have compromised their differences and fused into a single organization at Hamburg. This unites, for the first time since the war, all the Socialists opposed to Bolshevism.

It is yet too early to estimate the importance of the new organization, which must be proved by its deeds. In aim and purpose it does not differ

conspicuously from the International that existed before the war; but its power and influence have been enhanced by the overthrow of the great reactionary monarchies, and the elevation of many Socialist leaders to responsible Government posts in all parts of Europe. Among the resolutions adopted by the Congress was one declaring that the imperialism of the ruling capitalist classes was driving humanity into new wars, which could only end in the extinction of civilization, and asserting that the Reparations problem could only be solved by a complete and sincere agreement between Germany and her creditors, without methods of force or occupation of territory. The capitalist class in Germany was held responsible for the failure of that country to meet its just obligations arising out of the war. Germany's liabilities should be fixed at what would be the present value of the property her armies have destroyed.



POINCARÉ AND THE SENATE

POINCARÉ'S rebuff by the French Senate in the matter of the Communist trial is variously interpreted by the foreign press. Poincaré's own organs denounce the Senate's refusal to try the Communist deputies for alleged unpatriotic agitation in the Ruhr. To quote *Figaro*, it is a conspicuous example 'of the vacillating stupidity and cowardice of politicians en masse, even when they are individually estimable and sensible.' *Le Matin* thinks the Senate's action calls for a revision of the organic law: 'the abdication of the High Court makes an amendment of the Constitution imperative.'

But the outside world mainly wishes to know if the Senate's action indicates that Poincaré's hold upon the Government is weakening. So far as foreign policy is concerned, press opinion

seems to be unanimous that such is not the case. The French people are behind their Premier in his Ruhr policy. However, many thus support a man whose personality is hateful to them, in order to maintain the prestige of their country. They will not relinquish the policy of pressure upon Germany, but they would much rather exercise this pressure through a different agent. Furthermore, the Senate, which faces a new election in January, is decidedly more 'Radical' — using the term in its technical, political sense — than the Chamber of Deputies. It would for several reasons prefer to have the January Senatorial elections and the spring elections for the Chamber held under a different Premier.

While Poincaré advocates a 'strong' foreign policy, he does not stand at the extreme Right. The ultra-Nationalists, manoeuvred by the astute Léon Daudet, and by Poincaré's opponent and rival, André Tardieu, would venture much further than the Premier in disregarding public sentiment in England and elsewhere, and 'going it alone' in foreign affairs.

In refusing to try the Communist deputies, the Senate was influenced to some extent by a feeling that such a trial would give altogether too much prominence to a group of obscure Labor politicians. A non-Bolshevist Russian paper, published in Berlin, believes that Poincaré has sacrificed prestige by his gesture of resigning, because 'in Paris the most dangerous thing a man can do is to make a mountain out of a molehill.'



CONSERVATISM IN CHINA

RODNEY GILBERT, whose informing articles upon China we have often

quoted in the *Living Age*, reports in the *North China Herald*, after a recent journey through the central provinces of that country, that a great wave of conservatism is sweeping through them.

Get together a group of scholars, soldiers, and officials, and talk of 'democracy's' blessings, and they acquiesce more or less politely; but say boldly that the Republic is a failure and the imperial system the only safeguard of peace and order, and you will be greeted with vociferous applause.

Simultaneously, however, the *Herald* publishes another opinion, from an equally authoritative source, to the effect that monarchy is discredited. The science of Chinese statecraft has always been to let the country govern itself. Apparently a democratic government will do this better than a monarchy.

A hopeful aspect of the situation is that, despite the present demoralization, the public demands a higher type of government than heretofore. With better education, newspapers, and swifter communications, the people are growing impatient of conditions that they would formerly have tolerated without protest. The public is also beginning to feel that if peace is to be won it must be fought for and not negotiated. The still unsettled struggle for supremacy between General Wu Pei-fu and Chang Tso-lin may culminate in a military campaign this present summer, staged on a larger scale than any of recent years.

Meanwhile, the Peking Government seems to be going from bad to worse. It is so hard-pressed for funds that it recently hit upon the device of printing five million dollars' worth of revenue stamps and pawning them for a fraction of their value, to raise ready money.

‘THE THREE-MILE LIMIT’

BY A LEGAL CORRESPONDENT

[Great Britain's controversy with Russia, as to jurisdiction over the waters of the Murman Coast, and her protest against the enforcement of the Volstead Act in American waters, lend timely interest to this discussion, by an eminent jurist, of the technical points at issue.]

From the *Morning Post*, May 21-22

(LONDON TORY DAILY)

THE ‘three-mile limit’; the ‘Territorial Waters.’ Periodically these terms, and the meaning of them, come up for public discussion, and as often there is displayed by those who discuss them a very grievous ignorance, not of their meaning only, but of the consequences resulting from their legitimate use. The misconception of their meaning may be thus expressed: the two expressions are synonymous, and the territorial waters extend universally to three miles from the shore; in other words, three miles is the universally accepted limit of the extension of territorial jurisdiction seaward.

Public attention was first specially directed to the question of the three-mile limit in 1876, when Ferdinand Keyn, a German subject and master of the German steamer *Franconia*, then being within three miles of the English coast, by negligent navigation ran down the British steamer *Strathclyde*, as the result of which one of the passengers was drowned. Keyn was tried, found guilty of manslaughter, and sentenced to two years’ imprisonment; but the legal question was heard before the Court of Crown Cases Reserved. The six judges were equally divided, and the case was argued a second time before fourteen judges, of whom, one having died, six held that the jurisdiction of the English courts was properly exercised because the offense was

committed within the three-mile limit; but seven held that the conviction was wrong because no such limit or jurisdiction existed; among them the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Alexander Cockburn, who delivered the most learned and probably the lengthiest of his many learned and lengthy judgments.

The decision in the *Franconia* case formed the basis of Sir Charles Russell’s great argument in the Bering Sea Arbitration in 1896, in which the question of jurisdiction on the high sea was directly in issue, for the United States claimed property in the fur-seals during their wanderings in the deep waters of the Pacific Ocean after leaving the breeding-grounds on the Pribilof Islands, and consequent jurisdiction to protect that property against foreign sealers on the high sea. While the British argument was being prepared I drew Sir Charles’s attention to Cockburn’s judgment. I had been in court and had retained a vivid recollection of the great Judge’s demeanor during its delivery—the consciousness that it was destined to be epoch-making, the pride that his indefatigable research had enabled him at last to fathom a question which the great jurists of the past had only fumbled over. Cockburn had published his judgment in pamphlet form, and I gave my copy to Sir Charles Russell. He was deeply impressed by its profound