

of other descents: "What is the chief contribution that the American of Italian extraction makes to our American democracy?" It is surprising to note that a majority of the replies in regard to gains emphasize political rather than economic opportunity. Summarizing the losses of the Italian of the second generation, Mr. Mariano says: "They are his good manners, family ties, and at the beginning a reverence for race and elders. The first two 'losses' are peculiar to the Italian home; the last is a condition that obtains among all first generations of Americans." The answers in regard to the Italian contribution to American life are suggestive:

Norman Hapgood writes: "Industry so far; inspiration, I hope, hereafter"; Professor Grandgent of Harvard sees a lesson to older Americans "to appreciate the pleasure that everyday life affords"; William Dean Howells puts it: "Eager and unflinching industry, and politeness until they, too, imagine that politeness is un-American"; John Collier says: "He contributes to our civilization and therefore to our democracy that Hellenic element which Matthew Arnold contrasts with the Hebraic element. Not merely beauty and idealism and a tendency toward encouraging fulness of life, but an intellectual realism whose activity is predicated on this aesthetic view of life."

Like many others, Mr. Mariano is obviously a little appalled as he surveys the second generation—as he realizes how many have seized only what is noisiest, most recent, and least noble in the life about them. But he is hopeful in the thought that what we have is "a type in transition," a phrase to which he repeatedly adverts. These youths do not represent the "ultimate American," nor are they Italians, "for they scorn and are scorned by the adult Italian."

Exuberantly and thoughtlessly we plunged into this great experiment in the synthetization of races, and now that the alloy is commencing to run from the melting-pot, we are a little surprised and alarmed. But it is both foolish and futile to be discouraged. We were too hasty when we expected a finished product in the second generation. We must await another—perhaps many another. Assuredly, the children of the "newer immigration" are not quite what we hoped for; but are the children of any of the rest of us?

ARTHUR WARNER

Shakespeare's Lost Years

Shakespeare's Lost Years in London, 1586-1592. By Arthur Acheson. Brentano's.

IT is now nearly twenty years since Mr. Acheson issued his program or manifesto in which he undertook to follow out and carry to the point of proof the "several plausible conjectures" regarding Shakespeare's personality and private life which had been evolved by the "text-critics" and which, if proved, "would materially assist in visualizing for us the actual man" and "would lend some form and semblance of his personality" to the bare biographical outline constructed by antiquarian research. The fruits of this undertaking have been the well-known volumes dealing respectively with the "Rival Poet" and with the "Dark Lady" of the Sonnets. In the Advertisement to the latter work Mr. Acheson presented briefly the main conclusions about the plays of the "sonnet period" which he had reached, promising in future volumes to submit the necessary proofs. The present work is an instalment of these proofs. Mr. Acheson is a most painstaking, suggestive, ingenious, and arduous critic. He spares himself no trouble in the amassing of what he considers evidence; and while his main conclusions must be pronounced most questionable hypotheses at best and at worst most far-fetched fancies, one gladly recognizes the value of some of the by-products of his researches. And it must be said further that even in his most feebly supported conjectures there is food for thought, stimulus to further investigation.

The basic flaw in his work is that he set about it not open-mindedly but with certain preconceived opinions, to support

which he welcomed anything that seemed to him in the nature of evidence. Just what evidence it does not seem to have occurred to him to inquire. Nor has he reasoned out the nature of coincidence. Since he is unfortified against these attacks, it is natural for him to accept as definite allusions to Shakespeare some chance word or phrase to which the author of it perhaps never dreamed that any such connotation could be affixed; Chapman speaks of "judgment's butcher" and Mr. Acheson's instant interpretation is that the epithet carries an allusion to "the supposed fact that Shakespeare's father was a butcher." Moreover, even when an hypothesis is advanced tentatively, within a few pages we may come upon it again to find it employed as the trustworthy and proved support for some further step in the critic's argument. Such processes of reasoning vitiate his authoritativeness as a critic. Mr. Acheson is unfair to himself.

The chief "preconceived opinion" with which Mr. Acheson began his Shakespearean studies was that allusions to Shakespeare's private affairs and to the affairs of his friends and to various public events entered into the composition of all, or nearly all, the plays. As his argument has developed this hypothesis has branched out in various directions: to Mr. Acheson the Earl of Southampton is beyond question the patron of Shakespeare; Mistress Davenant is the link between the two and the key to the mystery of the Sonnets; Chapman, the "rival poet," and Matthew Roydon, the author of the much discussed and infinitely tiresome "Willobie his Avisa," and Chapman and Roydon are the center of a gross, bitter, libelous and long-drawn-out warfare waged against the gentle Shakespeare. The chief contention now advanced is that John Florio, who was tutor to Southampton, quarreled with Shakespeare and that the purpose of the latter in writing the first draft of "King Henry the Fourth, Part One" was to warn his patron that poor Florio was a very Falstaff, a "misleader of youth." In the course of this discussion other matters are touched upon: the early relationship of Shakespeare and Burbage; the notion that following the first meeting of Shakespeare and Southampton in August, 1591, Shakespeare began at once to use the events of Southampton's private life as material for all his plays; and the claim that "King John" was composed in 1591 to stir up sympathy for Sir John Perrott, who was imprisoned at the time.

It is in this chapter on Perrott that Mr. Acheson's illusive plausibility is most apparent. There are certainly singular resemblances between Perrott, the natural son of Henry the Eighth, and the bastard Falconbridge. Mr. Acheson has drawn up a series of detailed and almost convincing parallels. For the obvious objection that Falconbridge is a character in the old play of "The Troublesome Reign" Mr. Acheson is prepared by contending that the author of that play likewise intended that his audience should see resemblances between the bastard and Elizabeth's stormy, virile, and picturesque half-brother.

The book thus runs the gamut of ingenuity, from the well-nigh convincing, through the dangerously plausible, to the merely fantastic. It is a tangle of tenuous evidence and involved inference. It is impossible wholly to refute because we are here dealing not with a dishonest person who distorts evidence, but with a sincere, high-minded enthusiast who has the congenital habit of requiring of wisps of fact that they bear a burden of deduction too heavy for them to carry. Hence his work always commands respect. And hence his arguments seldom, if ever, carry conviction.

SAMUEL C. CHEW

The Press and Politics in Japan

The Press and Politics in Japan. By Kisauburo Kawabe. The Chicago University Press.

JAPAN was conquered by its own militarists a thousand years ago and is still terrorized by them. They have held unbroken power and have never changed their animus or purpose. Despite abundant phenomenal change in governmental routine, the people act in the main from habit and tradition and not from modern education. The history of politics, since 1868, has

meant simply the rise and alignment of new classes or groups. Political parties have as yet no relation to the people. Party government has no meaning apart from clan instincts or class interests. The men of the sword still rule. This is the real thesis which Dr. Kawabe's facts set forth, though he does not make this his open contention.

The hope of democracy in Japan lies in journalism, under which can best be massed and drilled the forces already latent or in development and looking to democratic ends. Yet until 1860 scarcely five Japanese in a million knew what a modern newspaper was. Only a few hundred persons were interested in the subject of government. The men in power treated those who held different political opinions as traitors and cut off their heads. This was the rule both inside the nigh three hundred clans and in the center at Yedo. It was the only and the approved way to secure unanimity of "public" opinion.

Dr. Kawabe, educated in America, has written a most welcome, illuminating, and informing book. Nevertheless, it is defective as regards the period before 1875. He does not mention the real father of journalism in Japan, Guido F. Verbeck, the accomplished American missionary. In 1859 Verbeck purposely chose Nagasaki as his field of labor, in the extreme southwest, whence nearly all of modern Japan's ablest men have come. Rich in European culture, able to use eight languages, with a unique opportunity, an unrelenting zeal, and a comprehensive foresight and versatility, he in one decade taught half the young men who made the Government of 1868. Then he became their first adviser in Tokio, head of their university, and planner of the national education system. He it was who proposed the great embassy round the world, in the personnel of which over one-half were Verbeck's pupils.

The reviewer, on arriving in Japan in 1870, when political outbreaks with their resultant crops of heads on poles and pillories were common, found Verbeck busy at an elaborate paper dealing with the freedom of the press, especially in relation to law and order. This, in due time, he submitted to the Government—the chief administrators holding sessions in the parlor of their American servant. It was hard for these men, who themselves had suffered or lost friends for their political opinions, to change, now that they were in power, from the eye-for-an-eye and the tooth-for-a-tooth policy. In fact, for years to come, and until 1879, a cabinet minister went out sword in hand in the good old style to cut off heads. In this way votes of censure were met. Finally, after the new despotism had been, as of old, sufficiently "tempered by assassination," Ito laid aside the sword and substituted incarceration for decapitation. He began imprisoning enemies for differences in political opinion. Then Ito went to Europe, to sit at the feet of Bismarck, ignoring the chance to study in England. Returning home, he drafted a constitution which fixes the real seat of authority not in throne or emperor but in the Upper House, the military class, an invincible bureaucracy with two irremovable members of the Cabinet—the ministers of war and navy, who are able at any time to wreck it—while only a fraction of the budget can be controlled by the Lower House. How the militarists have riveted chains upon a nation, dictated diplomacy, debauched religion, prostituted education, and made all human activities controllable by government serve their purpose belongs to another volume, which Dr. Kawabe may yet furnish.

The critical reader, who will not be misled by phrases, will value this work highly. It tells of mechanical and other difficulties surmounted and of national methods of transportation and education developed, without which successful journalism is impossible. The political awakening of the masses has been an amazing achievement, and it now remains to be seen whether the military and aristocracy can keep back the rising tide of democracy, especially as concerns labor. Japan has tried hard to isolate herself from the shock of interior change, without securing what can accurately be called a success. In the past she kept her isolation, through hermitage. Now a minority in-

trenched in privilege seek to build an iron-clad wall of exclusion on a foundation based on mythology and fairy tales with little or no vital relation to the soul of that world civilization which her own more enlightened people crave. Those who have seen the old Japan—as rich in horrors as in beauty—do not despair, and Dr. Kawabe's book helps them to hope. Iyeyasu said "The people are the foundation of the Empire," and the age of the sword is sure to give way to the age of discussion.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS

The Peace Conference

A History of the Peace Conference of Paris. Edited by H. W. V. Temperley. Vols. I-III. Oxford University Press.

THIS imposing work, two volumes of which have yet to appear, will probably long remain the most authoritative as well as the most elaborate record in English of the Peace Conference. The undertaking apparently owes its inception and its form largely to the late Professor George Louis Beer and Lord Eustace Percy, members respectively of the American and British delegations. The names of some sixteen American and English scholars are given as contributors to Volumes I and II, although their several shares, except that of Mr. A. G. Ogilvie of Manchester University, who is responsible for the sketch maps in all three volumes, are not indicated.

The plan of the work, which as a whole constitutes the first publication of the Institute of International Affairs, includes much more than a history of the Conference and a collection of its documents. As a preliminary to the account of the peace negotiations we have a survey of the immediate political background of the war, the whole course of military and naval operations, the political and economic effects of the war upon the countries involved in it, the events of the armistice period, and the war aims of the belligerents. These matters, which as a whole are extremely well handled and embody a good deal of frank criticism, fill the first half of Volume I. The account of the organization and work of the Conference and of the Supreme Economic Council, which together with a discussion of the pre-armistice agreement and the armistice convention with Germany occupies most of the second half of Volume II, is an authoritative and critical record for which every student will be grateful. The texts of all the armistice documents are given in an appendix.

Volume II is wholly devoted to an exhaustive analysis of the pre-armistice agreement and the treaty with Germany and of the principles which they were intended to embody. Nothing so thorough, so detailed, and so critical has thus far been published anywhere, although particular phases of the subject, especially the question of reparation and indemnity, have been more searchingly examined in special studies like that of Professor Keynes. To this is added an informing chapter on the history of Germany from the resignation of the Prince Max Government, in November, 1918, to January, 1920, including the formation of the new German Constitution. Volume III comprises the official English text of the Treaty of Versailles and the official index, together with English texts of the German Constitution and of the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, extracts from the speeches and messages of Mr. Lloyd George, President Wilson, and others, and a useful chronological summary of events from June, 1914, to August, 1920. The treaties with Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey are presumably to be dealt with in later volumes.

It is obvious that Professor Temperley and his associates have worked under some restrictions. They evidently have not felt themselves at liberty to discuss at any length the personal or political characteristics of the leaders who actually made the peace, and a number of important documents have apparently not been available. The most remarkable omission noted has to do with the question of Shantung, in regard to which the