

the immediate future, but for a year from now. She will not be starved in four months, or six, but there will be all the difference in the energy of the Allied warfare as a whole if English anxiety for the future can be mitigated. With the shipyards of the United States mobilizing for future contingencies, the Allies are at liberty to give their full minds to the tasks of the present. Let us not be deceived by German pretensions that England will be forced to her knees before the United States can bring her strength to bear. We have no time to waste, but we have no reason to go at the task in panic. If the Shipping Board's belief that by next autumn we can turn out 200,000 tons of ships a month is realized, the problem will have been solved. The arithmetic of the situation is simple. The U-boats have been sinking half a million tons a month. If England, the United States, and the other maritime nations can replace four-fifths the loss every month, the marginal loss will not be a fatal drain on a world reserve of about 30,000,000 tons.

Other elements than new construction enter into the problem. The utilization of harbor resources to the limit is one of these. It has been pointed out by an English authority that cargo ships spend half their time in loading and unloading. This writer raised the question whether, for the maintenance of England's food supply, an individual's labor could not be more profitably employed in scientifically regulated dock-work than in cultivating the soil, or even in building ships. This phase in turn relates itself to the full utilization of railway facilities. If ship embargoes have produced railway congestion, it is a question whether a wisely regulated railway traffic in turn might not expedite the work of the ports. The whole is a task which challenges American organizing skill, and it is a task that should be attacked at once.

Censorship and Suppression

AMERICANS who believe in fair play and free speech will read with profound regret the news that the London *Nation* has been excluded from the foreign mail. The reason for this we cannot divine. The *Nation* has scrupulously upheld the Government and the war. It is the foremost English radical weekly; its editor, H. W. Massingham, is excelled by no one in his patriotism, and nobody else prior to the war so loyally supported Lloyd George in his various reforms. That he has frequently criticised the Government is true, but what are Americans to think when they learn that Mr. Massingham can hereafter write for his English circulation alone, that he must not be read in the United States, and that this ruling was arbitrarily enforced without warning or consultation? It comes with particularly bad grace at the very moment that the United States is making the supreme sacrifice of war to uphold England.

Indeed, now that we are to be more or less formally allies of Great Britain, her attitude to us ought to be improved in various aspects. Her censors for some time past have been telling us what we ought and what we ought not to read. The *Cambridge Magazine*, the *Labour Leader*, and *Common-Sense* are some of the other publications we are not permitted to see. Similarly, London has ruled that we may not receive any German newspapers, and one protest after another by our State Department has been ignored by the British Foreign Office. Since, we repeat, we are

allies, this churlishness ought to stop. If the German press is available in London to English journalists, it ought to be available to American journalists in New York. Indeed, the value of the German papers to us in America has become greater than ever. The British authorities ought to signalize their pleasure at our entry into the war by withdrawing all restrictions upon our mail, notably upon the letters to neutral countries.

What astonishes us particularly about the barring of the *Nation* is the stupidity of it. What must be its effect upon Americans? In a cause righteously conducted it would seem as if any opinion proper for Englishmen to read might be read abroad. If there are warnings to be sounded at home, such as that of a correspondent in the *Nation*, who declared that the enormous and rather chaotic bureaucratic development going on was a greater menace to England than the Kaiser, what harm could there be in letting Americans know about it? If for military reasons that was an improper statement to appear in London, then it should have been and could have been censored. If it rightly passed the censor, why should it not have been permitted to cross the ocean? When the German newspapers were first withheld from us we made various protests to Englishmen of note, only to receive the semi-official reply that it was not proper for Americans to read the German lies lest their anti-British propaganda should succeed!

This whole matter of the censorship and of suppression has now passed for us out of the region of the academic into that of the practical. There are two menacing censorship bills pending in Congress, the passage of either one of which would be most deplorable. This is not because the American newspapers fail to realize the necessity of a censorship on naval and military news. Every reputable newspaper is ready and willing to censor itself. An enactment of some kind is, we presume, necessary in order to prevent infringements by the conscienceless or careless few. But that ought not to be made the excuse for giving undue powers to the President or to any representative of his; and the official bill now pending is so drawn that the power to "prohibit the publication of any or all information, facts, rumors, or speculations referring to the armed forces of the Government, materials, or implements of war, or the means and measures that may be contemplated for the defence of the country except when such publication should have been duly authorized," is distinctly conferred upon the President "whenever in his judgment the defence of the country or the preservation of the public peace requires such action."

To give the President such powers in peace times would be to bestow upon him authority not possessed, if we are correctly informed, by the rulers of England and Germany. It would have enabled him, had it been in existence and had he so wished, to suppress all information as to our pulling down of the Haitian Government. It would have enabled Mr. Roosevelt to suppress all news of the "taking" of Panama, and it opens the door wide to interference with public opinion. Fortunately, the press of the country is awake to the dangers of the proposed legislation and is bent upon obtaining a revision which, while patriotically safeguarding the country, will at the same time maintain that free press which is never more needed than in time of national crisis. Public opinion must not be hampered by lack of legitimate news and criticism, and no honest paper should be denied the mails. Otherwise there will

smoulder dangerous fires underneath. Much evil has occurred in Europe since August 1, 1914, because the censor-

ship has not been confined to military news, and has too often garbled the truth.

The Intellectual Mobilization of France

YESTERDAY afternoon, while a belated and unwelcome snowstorm was filling the streets of Paris with mud and slush, impeding traffic by omnibus and tramway, and administering a chill reminder that the coal supply is still straitened, there was enacted at the Sorbonne a scene which, so far as I have observed, has had no parallel in this or any other country since the war began. In the great amphitheatre, crowded to overflowing and with hundreds turned away, the National Federation formed to combat the enemy propaganda in France assembled, in an imposing demonstration, representatives of scores of affiliated organizations, to make, as it were, their common profession of faith in the nation's cause, and to pledge their support until the war should end in victory.

It was a moving spectacle. The President of the Republic, the Premier, the members of the Ministry, the President of the Senate, and the diplomatic corps honored the occasion with their presence. The orator of the day was Paul Deschanel, President of the Chamber of Deputies. A declaration of the terms of peace which must be insisted upon was read by Prof. Ernest Lavisse, eminent historian and member of the Academy. Then, one by one, the spokesmen of the great societies which form the Federation stepped forward and read their several statements. Monsignor Baudrillart, rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris and one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of France, spoke for the Catholic Committee of Foreign Propaganda; and to the declaration were appended the names of the Cardinal Archbishops of Rheims and Paris, of nine bishops, and of a long list of other noted clergy and laymen. The declaration of the Protestant Committee was read by André Weiss, of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences; that of the Jews by Professor Lévy, of the Collège de France; that of the Mohammedans by M. Doutté; that of the League of Instruction by A. Dessoye, formerly Minister of Public Instruction; that of the League for the Defence of the Rights of Man by Ferdinand Buisson; that of the League of Patriots by Maurice Barrès, of the Academy. Mme. Jules Siegfried, president of the National Council of Women, spoke for the women of France; the President of the Municipal Council of Paris, for the Council; Louis Barthou, for the fathers and mothers whose sons had died for their country; and Henri-Robert for the liberal professions. The Federation of Industrial, Commercial, and Agricultural Associations was represented by David Mennet, president of the Paris Chamber of Commerce; while Léopold Mabillean, director of the Musée Social, spoke for a group of social undertakings and workers. When all had finished, M. Viviani, late Premier and now Minister of Justice, summed up the spirit of the declarations which had been made, and accepted and endorsed them in the name of the Government.

Yet what was done with imposing dignity at the Sorbonne was only an illustration, on a grand scale, of what may be seen going on every day in the systematic education of public opinion. However prone to enthusiasm the French temperament may be, there is surprisingly little attempt in

France to arouse or cater to the volatile spirit which expresses itself in cheers and songs and parades, and the nourishing of which is often thought indispensable in a democracy. The great organized appeal, rather, is to the intelligence, the knowledge, the serious reflection of the community. Nothing could have been more characteristic of France than that such diverse groups—to quote M. Deschanel, "Protestants, Israelites, Mohammedans, and free-thinkers; members of the learned professions and of the press; farmers, manufacturers, merchants; societies for popular education, for moral education, and for health; social leagues and feminist leagues; societies for military preparation, for gymnastics, and for sport; maritime leagues, munition workers, and mayors of great cities"—uniting to voice their faith in a common cause, should hold their meeting within the walls of a great institution of learning; that the orator of the day should be a public official who is also a leading man of letters; and that the formal declaration of principles should have been framed and read by a professor of history.

It is instructive to note some of the many ways in which the intellect of France is being brought to bear upon the problems of national defence and national success. The Paris daily papers, for example, contain numerous editorials or signed articles—not "letters to the editor," as in the United States—by members of the French Academy, or by men of high standing as scholars, authors, or publicists. M. Gabriel Hanotaux, for example, writes for the *Figaro*, and M. Aulard, the historian, for *L'Information*. M. Maurice Barrès contributes to the *Echo* a long series of articles on religion and the war. M. Josef Reinach, one of the most influential political personages in France, has long done yeoman service in the daily press. It is not alone the fact that the French newspaper "leader" or "body article" has something of the literary quality which every French writer seems infallibly to acquire, that is significant. It is rather the fact that many of the best minds of France, recognized authorities in their several fields, deem it worth while to write for the newspapers, and that the public welcomes what they write.

The monthly and semi-monthly reviews are an even more interesting study. It is no small task to get out, twice a month, such solid publications as the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and the *Revue de Paris*. The former is edited by René Doumic, of the Academy; the latter by Professor Lavisse and Marcel Prévost, both also Academicians. All three are busy men in other than editorial fields and authors of extensive lists of important books. I have been turning the pages of these and other reviews for the period of the war and noting the hundreds of articles, by well-known writers, in which the events and problems of the war are systematically discussed. The widely circulated *Revue Hebdomadaire* publishes in full, among other things, the important lectures on war topics given every week under the auspices of the Société des Conférences. Equally significant, as a social phenomenon, is the fact that the support of the reviews comes almost exclusively from the reading public and not from advertisements. It is with the reviews as it