

THE LIVING AGE

VOL. 327 — OCTOBER 17, 1925 — NO. 4241



A WEEK OF THE WORLD

SAKLATVALA, M.P.

MR. SHAPURJI SAKLATVALA had acquired some prominence in Great Britain, aside from his obscure eminence as an Indian Member of Parliament, before he became a day's international character by virtue of the publicity given him by our State Department. The London *Morning Post* had already started a campaign against his inclusion in the Interparliamentary Union delegation to Washington; and twitted him with denying his Communist and revolutionary professions when he signed the declaration demanded by our immigration authorities for admission to this country.

Mr. Saklatvala is a Parsi of Bombay, about fifty years old, and a registered member of the British Communist Party. Like several other Asiatic or semi-Asiatic Radicals in Great Britain, he comes from the capitalist circles of his native land, and until the middle of last September was a departmental manager in the great Indian firm of Tata, Limited.

Although the British public doubtless would have preferred that Mr. Sha-

purji Saklatvala had never appeared as a member of the delegation in question, several English papers disapproved the action of our State Department. The Liberal *Westminster Gazette* said:—

It is impossible to think that the United States Government has acted wisely or with dignity in revoking the passport visé granted to Mr. Saklatvala. In doing so they have simply exaggerated the importance of one to whom very little attention has been paid until the question of this visit to America rose above the horizon to disturb the peace of a handful of Die-hards and to give an opportunity to two nations to make themselves ridiculous in the silly season. But America has also shown a strange discourtesy. The question of Mr. Saklatvala's visit has been discussed at such nauseating length that no one can imagine the United States has been taken unawares; and yet no action was taken until two days before he was about to leave. After all, Mr. Saklatvala is a member of the British Parliament, and surely it is an extreme and antiliberal step to treat him in this way. America has before this digested a good many incendiaries and made use of their cheap labor; and if some people have lost their heads about this boggy of Bolshevism, surely it is a little extraordinary that they should insist on an insurance at our expense. There is, more-

Copyright 1925, by the Living Age Co.

over, another point at issue. The gentlemen who are visiting America for the Inter-parliamentary Conference are not, of course, strictly a delegation. But Mr. Kellogg's action in picking and choosing whom he will have tends to make it one, and creates a very unhappy precedent for these meetings. No one in this country is very much concerned with Mr. Saklatvala, who, until the other day, appears to have reconciled his revolutionary principles with an important position in a firm which has no special liking for expensive labor, to say the least. But it is surely giving him a wholly gratuitous publicity to ban him, to quote Mr. Kellogg, like 'the humblest immigrant.' He has not been treated in that way, and he is not 'the humblest immigrant.' All that Mr. Kellogg has done is to add an unpleasant appendix to an extremely foolish comedy.

The *London Times*, in a more non-committal leader, thought it doubtful if Mr. Kellogg was well advised in drawing attention to Mr. Saklatvala's recent speeches, and characterized that gentleman as something of a parlor Bolshevik. Another point in Mr. Kellogg's defense of his action also deserves correction, in the opinion of this journal. 'He speaks of Mr. Saklatvala and the agitators of his type as supporters of anarchy'; but 'so far from being the champion of no rule at all, the Communist of to-day is the unabashed defender of that Eastern despotism of which the Statue of Liberty at the gates of the New World is an embodied defiance.' But if the *Times* has any misgivings as to America's ground for excluding the temperamental M.P. for North Battersea, it reconciles itself to the result with this reflection: 'Meanwhile he has had his advertisement. The scruples of the members of the British group who declined to visit the United States and Canada in his company need trouble them no more, and many of them will doubtless feel that the action of the State Department has probably saved

them from the duty of blushing and apologizing for his unrepresentative extravagances.'

Naturally the Labor press was indignant. The *London Daily Herald* characterized the incident as 'a fitting pendant to the Monkeyville trial,' while the *Morning Post* derived acidulous gratification from the following reflection: 'The American Secretary of State has in effect indicted this country, when he proclaims a man who has been admitted to our Parliament unfit for admission to the United States. We cannot resent such a rebuke; we should rather profit by it and take warning while there is yet time of a danger which grows by neglect.' The Conservative *Saturday Review* shared this opinion. It also declared 'the principle which guided Mr. Kellogg . . . perfectly sound. No lesser revolutionary agitator would be admitted; then why one who has the miraculous letters M.P. after his name? . . . We are glad that a grand chance for self-advertisement and misrepresentation of the Empire has been denied to Mr. Saklatvala.' The *New Statesman*, however, anticipated precisely the opposite effect from his exclusion: —

Communists in this country practically owe their existence to the uproar that is made about them in the anti-Bolshevist press. Small in numbers and poor in ideas, they can always count on appearing on several million breakfast-tables as an army corps of artful and desperate devils. They have just had another first-class advertisement in the hue and cry against Mr. Saklatvala. Mr. Saklatvala is a gentleman given to perverid oratory, which, if it does not always fill the House of Commons, frequently keeps it in session, we believe, in the small hours of the morning. But Mr. Saklatvala is also a member of the Interparliamentary Union, and wants to go with it to America. Certain Conservative M.P.'s thereupon refuse to accompany a man who has attacked the Empire and the Flag, and

the Rothermere press lashes the suburbs into a fury against the Reds. Finally the American Secretary of State crowns the hero and martyr by canceling his passport visé for the U. S. A. And so the Reds get another tonic and Mr. Saklatvala is incited to say still ruder things about Stars and Stripes as well as Union Jacks.

*

GENEVA AND SECURITY

LAST month's sessions of the League met in an atmosphere appropriately described by Premier Painlevé when he said in his opening address before the Assembly: 'The hours of enthusiasm are followed by less stirring but equally useful hours of adaptation and adjustment to reality.' *L'Europe Nouvelle* believed the Protocol the chief issue before the delegates. 'M. Painlevé pointed out that there are two ways of reviving it — by proceeding from the general to the particular, or, as the Anglo-Saxons prefer, from the particular to the general.' France and Great Britain, in other words, may apply the principles of the Protocol to a particular accord between themselves and Germany around which may cluster other pacts with other States, inspired by the same spirit and recognizing the same principles. This is the attitude of *Le Temps*, which, in discussing Mr. Chamberlain's advocacy of special pacts between nations under League supervision instead of a general Protocol, said: 'It is perhaps rash to affirm that this will be the best solution from a general point of view, but it is without doubt the best solution from a strictly English standpoint, since Great Britain is unwilling to undertake more than is necessary to safeguard her own interests, and since, believing herself safe behind her wall of water, she sees no immediate threat to her security,' but it insisted with Paul-Boncour, who delivered an eloquent address before the Assembly the following day, that 'the spirit that presided over the elab-

oration of the Protocol is still as much alive as ever, for the very principles upon which that document was established are being embodied in the regional pacts proposed, and are at the present the object of active negotiations. The Protocol, even if not ratified, even if abandoned, has marked a great moral step forward, for it has made actual the idea of organized peace.'

Finally, the London *Economist* concludes a summary of the movement toward international arbitration now making visible headway in all parts of the world with the same thought in a different form: —

The need for security is still acute. Individually, nations are seeking to protect themselves by direct agreements of different types. There are, as M. Painlevé pointed out, treaties like those on which the Little Entente is based, linking States which, as beneficiaries by the war, have common interests. There is the very different, and in some ways more hopeful, type projected between Britain, France, Germany, and other Powers for the security of States ranking among the vanquished as well as among the victors. Simultaneously, there are being negotiated numerous treaties of arbitration between States which apprehend no immediate danger but which desire to banish the prospect of war from their horizon. Here, again, there are two fairly definite classes of arbitration treaty, one of which, like the Geneva Protocol, purports to provide for the peaceful settlement of all disputes arising; the other, like the Covenant, leaving the door still half-open for war in non-legal cases. Some countries — Sweden, for example — have contracted treaties of both types. What that means is that there is going forward in Europe a process highly beneficial, with which the League can never lightly interfere, but from whose results, on the other hand, the League should not be divorced. The partial agreements are well enough as stepping-stones. They may be all that is possible at the present moment. But sooner or later they must be coördinated and universalized, and linked up permanently with Geneva.