

# The New REPUBLIC

## *A Journal of Opinion*

VOLUME I

New York, Saturday, December 5, 1914

NUMBER 5

INDICATIONS are accumulating that the time of Congress may be occupied less with the appropriation bills and the remains of the legislative programme of the administration than with the problems of military reorganization and national defense. The Republicans will do their best to concentrate public interest on the military unpreparedness of the country. Lacking, as they are, in an available and promising domestic policy, they need an issue on which they can assume an aggressive national attitude, one that will distract popular attention from economic issues and problems. The issue of national defense is precisely what they need. It offers the opportunity which every party seeks of converting patriotic feeling into partisan capital, and rarely is such an excellent opportunity provided. The military unpreparedness of the United States is notorious. It can be proved out of official document. It is not even denied by those who favor its continuation. It was bad enough during the years of Republican rule, but attempts were being made to diminish it. It has become worse since the Democrats have come into power. The Republicans can fasten a certain amount of responsibility for existing conditions on their opponents—enough to furnish them with a partisan issue. All they need in order to convert the issue into a veritable sword of partisan warfare is a refusal by the Democrats in Congress to consider the question and provide a sufficient remedy.

THE Democrats should not allow the Republicans to appropriate the issue of national defense. They should not encourage an agitation in favor of a very much more expensive and burdensome military establishment by refusing to provide a remedy for the deficiencies of our existing military and naval organization and equipment. No doubt such an agitation is the inevitable result of the European war, but if it must come, the opponents of militarism should not allow their forces to be divided by any action or any failure to act which

United States is not prepared to defend itself against attack. Its military establishment is not only entirely insufficient to support the Monroe Doctrine, or to defend the Philippines, Panama and Hawaii, but it is inadequate to protect our sea coast from invasion. The country must adapt its military organization and equipment to its needs. In order that the army and navy may not be excessively burdensome, it may be necessary frankly to abandon certain responsibilities which the nation has assumed in South America and the Pacific; but even though responsibilities are diminished, the preparations remain flagrantly inadequate. The Democrats should recognize this fact, and should blunt the edge of the sword which the Republicans will try to sharpen for their undoing. They should see that the fleet is sufficiently manned, and that its fighting efficiency is fully restored. They should vote larger appropriations for the equipment of the army and for adequate reserves of ammunition, guns and other military supplies. Finally, they should accept Congressman Gardner's resolutions providing for a full investigation into the subject of national defense and military organization. If they fail to do as much as this, they will be inviting a popular agitation which will be dangerous to their success at the next election, equally dangerous to national security and peace, and fatally distracting to steady progress in the work of social improvement.

AN orgy of map-searching and map-changing has brought into prominence the free but not unlimited country of Moresnet. This sovereign state had its origin in a boundary dispute between Holland and Prussia. The Council of Vienna, not wishing to have another war while everybody was so tired, decided to neutralize the disputed territory under the joint control of Holland and Prussia, and when Belgium became independent from Holland she kept this half-interest in the 1,500-acre nation. For years Belgium and Germany ruled the country by a sort of alternating arrangement, but

what is virtually self-government. They have no standing army, and obviously they could have no other kind. Being only a mile wide and a mile and a half long, the state of Moresnet has no imperial ambitions such as might be the curse of a thirty-mile country like Luxemburg. It has no coinage, no king, and little crime. It contains a mountain and a zinc mine, and, unless the Germans stepped on it on the way from Aix-la-Chappelle to Liège, three thousand people.

**T**HERE is no use in making believe that talk about prosperity or the contemplation of little Mary Sunshine will supply an answer to the hideous suffering of the approaching winter. We are face to face with a state of affairs so bad that already an organized charity like the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor reports more people on its hands than at any time in the seventy-one years of its history. It had forty-five per cent more families to take care of this November than it had last. On the lower East Side so many families have been evicted that one of the Justices who is forced to sign the orders has revolted publicly at the task. From Chicago come little items like this: "One State Street store at ten o'clock had been visited by four hundred and fifty-six applicants for positions. Of that number the management selected three girls." These facts indicate an inordinate amount of misery made in the U.S.A. They call for quick, concerted and generous action, which we shall not get by covering up the facts for fear of hurting business, or by starting a hundred overlapping, badly informed and badly financed committees, or by looking only on what is called the bright side of things. Every city needs to do at once what the New York city administration has this week done—appoint a central commission to coordinate all the existing agencies, to dig out the facts, to estimate the extent of the problem, and to drive a realization of what it means into the heads and hearts of all of us. The well-to-do are going to have to give this winter, the taxpayer is going to have to stand for real expenditure. But the giving will be totally inadequate and the spending of what is given will be wasteful if the newspapers and public officials are silent about the needs, and voluble about the little committees and the haphazard efforts of our well-meaning but undirected good-will.

**J**UST now it is not a question of a radical remedy for unemployment. What we have failed to plan in comparative prosperity we shall not be able to carry out spontaneously in a terrible emergency.

establish unemployment insurance, to take the "unemployable" out of the labor market, to regularize production. All these necessary steps may receive an impetus this winter when people have seen what it means to be unprepared for a crisis, and when they have been thoroughly frightened by the demonstrations of the unemployed. But this legislation will not immediately help the thousands of families who are already in want of beds and food and clothes. Their first need is self-respecting relief, given to them because they have to have it. At the present rate of giving they are not going to be relieved. We are informed by one competent observer that the charities at home are having their budgets cut something like fifty per cent because the more spectacular suffering of the Belgians has diverted much of the normal giving, and because there has been a good deal of "economy" among the rich which has left the American charities with smaller resources to meet a larger demand. It suggests how unseeing and how fickle is private philanthropy, for terrible as it is to starve in Belgium, it is no less terrible to starve in the United States.

**K**ILLED: 3631. This is the record of mines and quarries in the United States last year. It means a death rate of about three and a half per thousand. To complete the picture we learn that the injured are estimated at one hundred thousand. These figures are from the report of the Bureau of Mines, and are accompanied by a statement of the Director, Dr. Joseph H. Holmes, that, taking the hazards of the industry into consideration, the losses are excessive and unnecessary. We commend the miners to the consideration of those who fear that peace will destroy the courage of mankind.

**N**EWs dispatches this week suggest that the President is considering whether he should ask Congress to amend the Sherman Anti-trust Law so as to allow exporters to cooperate in foreign markets. This amendment might be accompanied by an inquiry of the new Trade Commission into the industrial combinations abroad with which American merchants compete. The suggestion, we believe, is a good one. It would be public recognition of the fact that artificially preserved competition is an anomaly when markets have widened to the world. It would be the abandonment of prejudice against size, and the beginning of an open avowal that the object of legislation about business is not to obstruct organization or to hinder cooperation. The people of the United States have no interest in unbending roles. Their interest as consumers, as

**A**DMIRAL Mahan will be missed not only by his friends but by everybody who likes controversy at its best. Dying at the age of seventy-four, after making his mark upon the thought of our time, he had probably done his work as a writer of books. But his admirable work as a newspaper controversialist was by no means over. Every now and then, though not nearly so often as he had something to say, he would send to one of the New York papers a letter upon some topic of immediate interest; perhaps a protest against unfair attacks upon Colonel Roosevelt's motives, perhaps a discussion of the ethical questions raised by Mr. Bruce Ismay's departure from the Titanic. No one else had quite such a happy hand in controversy. Nearly every one of his letters proved the possibility of using courtesy and fairness as highly destructive weapons.

**"U**NDER a Democratic President and Governor," says the *New York Evening Post*, "Kansas has produced a record wheat crop amounting to double her best preceding yield." But against this admittedly magnificent achievement there was the fire in Salem, Mass., the loss of the Davis tennis cup, civil war in Mexico, uncivil war in Europe, a dry September, and the hoof-and-mouth epidemic.

**I**T would have been slightly miraculous if the war had come to an end without protests against breaches of neutrality by Colombia and Ecuador. There will be more of these protests. Peru, in particular, is almost certain to be technically guilty of offenses against neutrality. From a point a little below the Gulf of Guayaquil southward for more than five hundred miles her coast is barren, with long unlighted and uninhabited tracts. Such a coast is an invitation to belligerents to slip in and establish a wireless station. In the heavy fogs which abound there it is easy for a belligerent vessel to come and go unobserved. Peru can do little but go through the motions of keeping this part of her coast patrolled. She must trust more to the difficulties of navigation than to her own vigilance.

**T**HE success of the Institute opened by Columbia University for the purpose of providing public lectures, concerts, etc., at small costs, suggests the question why university graduate courses of historical, literary and philosophical interest should not be made public on similar terms. If the public are intelligent enough to follow a single lecture where the professor concentrates into an

self? Why should a professor of distinction and of more than local reputation be listened to only by the dozen graduate students who happen to be "taking their degree" in his department? The wider audience should have a bracing effect upon the speaker. The idea that he is giving his substance not only to perfunctory or awe-impressed students would tend to increase his responsibility. There would, of course, be the usual objection on the ground of the sensationalism of the press. Professors giving public courses might find their ideas distorted and spread in scare-heads through the papers. They themselves might be discredited and ridiculed. The sensitive professorial soul without any great conviction of the value of his course usually has a horror of notoriety, and yet, on the other hand, there must be professors who want or would be willing to have exactly that.

**T**HE horrors of the present war are intensified by the psychological reverberations which it sends through every part of the civilized world. In spite of the widespread character of the Napoleonic operations, the world could know very little of what was going on. Owing to the slowness of communication and the paucity of newspapers, what little there was known was limited to a very narrow range of readers. And the later continental wars were so localized as to interest a relatively small number of peoples or classes. But in the case of the present conflict there can be scarcely a person in the civilized world who does not feel an almost personal interest in the issues. That millions of men of all nations are being put at once in possession of these details of slaughter and ruin and turn of battle, with all the ensuing emotions, is a moving thought. And we are far more sensitive than the world was in its rawer days. Never could it have felt as we feel the recoiling horror of the thing, nor were there so many ideals and hopes of civilization and peace to be shattered into bits as ours have been. If the Peace Movement and the Socialist Movement did not prevent war, they at least taught huge masses of men to loath it. Thus we are doubly ravaged. The injury to good-will and idealism in the different nations will not be the least of the war.

**A** RECENT High School bulletin from the West advises its students, "Talk over your work at home. Tell about the interesting things in history, in English or in science, or your hard problems in mathematics. That will help you master your work." In other words, master your school work at home by methods which, owing to the



ONE'S credulity is stretched by reading in Petrograd dispatches that the German Crown Prince has been defeated on both the left and the right wing of the Eastern army on the same day, and that he is retreating simultaneously in two opposite directions. One need not be a rabid anti-royalist to feel that the Heir Apparent is hardly agile enough to accomplish this feat. One may also have doubts that General von Mackensen, a man of commoner clay, was crushed just south of the Vistula, also near Wielun, eighty miles distant. Granted Germany's superb system of military roads and railways, it yet seems that she would be compelled to divide her catastrophes more equally among her generals. The tradition about the Crown Prince originated while he was being defeated on the Western field. In the early days of the war it was no uncommon day's work for His Highness to be cut off, surrounded and annihilated on the center, on the left, in Alsace, and in odds and ends of Belgium and environs. Without disrespect it must be said that the enemy has not learned to recognize the Kaiser's eldest son except from a front view. Whenever they see anyone running, they say, "There goes the Crown Prince."

SIR Oliver Lodge has been conversing with friends physically dead as he might "converse with any one" at the meeting in London of the Society for Psychical Research. Some of the proofs of this statement "are being published." Let us assume that they have been published, and that in a single instance they do prove "the survival of bodily death." Let us minimize the importance of what they prove by granting that the solitary survivor's mind appears to have been impaired. Let us grant also that proof of survival is not proof of immortality, and that a second and absolute death may occur at any moment. Seen against a Christian background of faith in the immortality of everybody's soul, the thing proved does not look very large. Even so, would not this proof of the existence, perhaps for only a few years, of one life after death matter as much to mankind as proof of anything that has ever been proved?

MANY people protest that the United States had no obligations under the Hague Conventions, pointing out that these were "simply and solely" a gentleman's agreement among the nations; that "no penalties were fixed for backsliders, and no machinery for devising penalties was created." The point is only too well taken. It is a sad fact which everyone knows that the Hague Conventions rest on no force, and that at the first test they vanished

opportunity. We had the chance to put behind the Hague Conventions the force of neutral opinion. A world statesman would have seen—it was pointed out to the President at the end of July—that never was there a better chance to make a world's judgment articulate than when the Belgian crime was about to be committed. A warning in the last days of peace that the United States would not ignore the violation of the Hague Conventions would have injected into European diplomacy the dramatic fact that the law of the world was not an empty phrase. The steadying effect of that in those dizzy days is, of course, impossible to calculate now. It would at least have shown that there is such a thing as moral judgment among nations, that wrongs face the disinterested criticism of mankind, that somebody whose life is not at stake cares about the decency of the world. It would have suggested that at the next crisis a league of neutrals must be prepared to act, and so there would have been laid an historic precedent from which to build a world organization. Had we acted on Belgium, it would not have been so simple for Japan as the ally of England to violate China a few weeks later. Yet when we might have done the great service, we did nothing. We just comforted our souls by shrieking for peace.

CHICAGO'S Morals Commission was created on Tuesday night. The first news item about it which reaches us is a statement of Prof. Charles R. Henderson that the protection of the children of unmarried mothers is to be taken up immediately. It is a most moral beginning, and if the Commission goes on to protect the mothers, and from that to protecting women of the streets from blackmail and extortion, from horrid slums, low wages, no wages, educated ignorance and social superstition, it will indeed be a moral Commission.

MRS. Charles A. Beard complains that American history writers, notably Woodrow Wilson, do not make any mention of the achievements of women. Mrs. Beard thinks it is time that a history was written which treated women less anonymously; she is tired of having the sex referred to as "among those present" or "other persons" or "and their families." One might think from this criticism that Mr. Wilson referred to Pocahontas as "a so-called Indian princess" and to Barbara Frietchie as "a certain elderly party." But this would be an error, as these ladies are not mentioned at all. An examination of the index of the five-volume "History of the American People" shows distinct reference by name to Anne Hutchin-

## Property Rights in Colorado

**I**N appointing mediators for future disputes in the Colorado coal mines the President has acted wisely, and he has done equally well in issuing his statement of Sunday deploring the intolerant attitude of the coal companies. If, however, as is feared in some quarters, this action is merely a prelude to a withdrawal of the troops from Colorado, it will mean that the President, after a brave show of good intentions, has capitulated in advance of the battle. His protest, if it be followed by the removal of the troops, will be no more effective than was the whispered protest of Luxemburg to invading Germany. A gentle Mediterranean wind will as soon sweep Gibraltar from its base as such a mildly exerted moral influence sway the clear-thinking gentlemen of the coal companies.

These gentlemen know what they want and how to get what they want, and while they have a Sunday morning respect for the President's office, they have shown that they care no more during business hours for the actual President of the United States and all the politicians and agitators and pastors and social reformers in the country than they care for the gentle-faced Socialists who denounce them at street corners. The great coal operators can talk movingly concerning liberty and the right of humble American workmen to labor under any and all conditions, but what they really want is absolute and unquestioned dominion, a dominion extending over private action and private thought, and untempered by trade unions or other cooperative action of work-people. "You may be sure of this," said President John C. Osgood of the Victor-American Fuel Company, "when this strike is over we shall try a damn sight harder to keep the organizers out of our camps than we ever have before."

It was a social war that brought the troops to Colorado, and it is impossible, in considering the horrors and catastrophes of that social war, to absolve the mine owners from responsibility. It is true that the situation was not an easy one, for the strikers, evicted from the camps, were desperate and armed. But it was the mine owners who, even before the outbreak of the strike, repelled all advances and rejected all compromises. It was they who set aside the laws of the State, and contemptuously refused to meet the representatives of their employees during those early days when the strike might have been averted. Nor can they avoid the charge of a negligence which has led to killing. When their agents broke the stocks of their rifles over the heads of defenseless prisoners and later killed those prisoners, the mine owners who ultimately paid these agents were innocent and ignorant, as they

harassed and embittered men who needed no provocation. But when the companies gathered together professional fighters and their paid employees clothed in State uniform, they did not carefully assure themselves that all these fellows in whose hands guns were placed were graduates in good standing of approved Sunday schools. The result was brutality on both sides. If the mine guards and militia intentionally or unintentionally killed wives and children of strikers, the strikers themselves were not innocent of horrible atrocities. It was a conflict out of which no one came with credit, least of all the great leaders responsible for the conduct of the industry, for they were in position, had they wished, to learn the character of the men they armed.

In a larger sense, however, the responsibility is not personal. The more we study this struggle, the more clearly we see that we are dealing not so much with human perversity and cruelty as with an anomalous situation, based upon our antiquated conceptions of private property, and due in final instance to our very own conservatism. The situation resulting in all this bloodshed is one in which a man's employer owns not only the place in which he works but also the store at which he must buy, the house in which he must dwell, the streets upon which he must walk and the roads leading to and from this privately owned city. The workman is surrounded by private property rights, and all these rights inhere in his employer. The laborer's rights are extraordinarily attenuated. He can be expelled from the town with or without reason, for the town is private property. Without the company's permission no friend can come to him from the outside, for the town, privately owned, is usually situated in a cañon with a single road leading to it, and on that road stands the camp marshal, an employee of the company, with the power to make arrests and keep out unwelcome people. In one camp the State Superintendent of Public Education, on a tour of inspection, was stopped by a camp marshal and threatened with a revolver. Other State officials have been denied admittance to these privately owned towns. The right to eject is as absolute as the right to refuse admittance. If workmen gather for any purpose which the company dislikes or merely suspects, the guilty men can be sent "down the cañon." The camp marshal is under no obligation in exiling men to invent ingenious excuses. He merely says "Get out," and the man goes. The whole life of the worker is one continued trespass upon private property.

Under such conditions, what do the laws of the State avail, or, for that matter, the laws and Constitution of the United States? Is it a wonder that the laws of Colorado, guaranteeing the rights of