

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME I

New York, Saturday, December 12, 1914

NUMBER 6

THE European war is offering to American diplomacy a rare opportunity of reaching a better understanding with South America. It has brought home to the South American countries the desirability of closer political and commercial relations with the United States. In the past they have accepted the protection which the Monroe Doctrine secured to them against the aggressive action of European Powers, but they have accepted it reluctantly and suspiciously. They were afraid that the Doctrine could be made the excuse by this country for a more insidious but not less dangerous attack upon their independence. They were Pan-Americans in a lukewarm way, from a sense of duty, but they traded chiefly with Europe, and their sympathies and human ties connected them with Europe rather than with this country. But now, as neutral and pacific powers, they are beginning to understand some of the advantages of cooperation with the leading neutral and the most essentially pacific power in the world. They are beginning to see that Pan-Americanism has immediate, substantial, and incontestable advantages. It remains for the State Department to make this new attitude on the part of Latin Americans the excuse for a larger measure of official Pan-American organization. There seems to be no good reason why Mr. Carnegie's Pan-American Building in Washington should not become a far more effective and realistic House of Peace than has been a certain Palace at the Hague.

PRESIDENT Wilson is running the grave risk of presenting to the Republicans the issue of national defense. His opposition to an investigation into the military preparedness of the country by a select Congressional committee can and will be interpreted as an attempt to suppress the facts. The interpretation may be unjust, but it is inevitable. The wise way to discipline such agitation as this in favor of an increased military preparation is to supply it with an abundance of light and air.

only furnish to the agitators additional means of agitation. Mr. Wilson will never have a better opportunity of testifying to the value of his well-known preference in favor of "pitiless publicity." If there is one matter about which the public opinion of a democracy is entitled to be fully informed, it is this matter of national defense. In the present instance the discouragement of a thorough investigation is the more unnecessary because a careful reading of Mr. Wilson's message proves that he himself is alive to the grave importance of the subject. He advocates a strong navy, and is ready to encourage increased military training. He does not suggest under existing conditions the smallest step in the direction of disarmament. The question at issue is not whether adequate measures of national defense should be adopted, but whether the existing provisions for national defense are adequate. Military and naval authorities have declared in official documents that they are not. Is not public opinion entitled to an investigation which will help the voters to make up their minds as to the truth of these assertions?

THE proposed alternative of an investigation by the existing military committees of Congress will not and should not satisfy the country. It would be equivalent to no investigation at all. In so far as there are deficiencies in the military establishment of the United States, these committees are responsible. Why invite a body of men to investigate their own presumptive misbehavior? Congressman Gardner's resolution is not itself satisfactory in this respect. A special committee would make a more thorough investigation than would the standing committees; but Congress as a whole is as much responsible as are its military organs for the possible failure to obtain in return for our heavy military expenditures adequate military protection. A committee of investigation should contain a certain proportion of independent experts, who would not be hampered by their own interests

the attempt to make merely a partisan issue out of our unpreparedness is sheer "bunk." The responsibility is not Republican or Democratic; it is Congressional. Congress has stubbornly refused on the score of economy to appropriate the money needed to equip an efficient army, or build and man an adequate navy, while at the same time it has spent many unnecessary millions for the maintenance of useless and even injurious army posts and navy yards. Its attitude towards this problem of military organization has been consistently reactionary. The recent improvements in the military system have not been imposed upon the army by Congress; they have been imposed upon Congress by expert military opinion. It is the General Staff rather than Congress which proposes to revise our obsolete military code, and to democratize the American army by keeping the soldiers a shorter time in the barracks. Thus an investigation into the military unpreparedness of the United States becomes at least in part an investigation into Congressional ineptitude and malversation, and such an inquiry should not be confided to an exclusively Congressional committee.

IN spite of the partisan bitterness which has already been imparted to the controversy over national defense, good citizens who are neither militarists or passivists should be able to agree upon a present and a future course of action. Such men and women will deprecate no less than President Wilson does a merely alarmist agitation, which seeks to change immediately and fundamentally the military policy of the United States. They will support him in any attempt to deal with the matter of national defense soberly and patiently, but they will wish his treatment to be candid and thorough as well as sober and patient. They will wish Congress during its present session properly to equip the existing army with sufficient reserves of ammunition. They will wish the navy to be fully manned and its former efficiency restored. They will wish the added cost to be paid out of some of the millions which are being spent on the army and the navy chiefly for political purposes. Finally they will require a certain reconsideration of the military organization and policy of the United States. This country has never really tackled the problem of creating a sufficient body of well trained soldiers, without involving enforced service or an increased professional standing army. That is the great problem of American military reorganization, and the one which needs to be most carefully studied. It should be made a matter of study in the near future and an authoritative report on the

European war will be over and Americans will be better able to judge whether the treaty of peace will make increasing preparations for war more necessary or less so.

ALTHOUGH the preliminary report of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations laid before Congress on Monday is described as "merely a record of progress" and not as a statement of conclusions, it is, after all, a record of a year's work. It should reveal the intellectual approach, and give to the public some sense of how the Commission is mastering the enormous wholesale inquiries it has made. Nine people have listened to facts for a year; they have taken them in patiently and sympathetically, and if they are human they must be suffering from a very considerable indigestion. We say this because the scope of the hearings has been so vast that unless the Commissioners have been organizing the material in their own minds, they cannot have dominated the rush of facts and impression. But this preliminary report shows no illuminating hypothesis, and no tentative generalization to trace some form in the maze. It reads depressingly like a college syllabus in which what employers say is balanced against what employees say. It is stale to us, it all seems to have been said so often before, and to have been said so much better. We should not carp at a restatement of the obvious if only the Commission gave an indication that it had some way of lighting up the obvious with new suggestion. The report does not seem to stimulate thought, to give to the public any of that vivid, direct impression which so many months of hearing must have given the Commissioners. This may be because it is a mosaic of little arguments, a formless and seemingly undirected array of obvious but unsuggestive items. It leaves us with the notion that the Commissioners wandered all over the country, and their minds wandered all over the subject.

WHAT the public expects from the Commission is not new facts, nor even concrete proposals. It expects effective generalization which will give some practical leverage on the mass of what is already known. Perhaps this is to expect too much. It would indeed require a very high order of scientific imagination to dominate effectively the overwhelming confusion of modern industry, to organize into useful knowledge a thousand half-reported clashing facts, to make the whole subject intellectually usable to men responsible for action. But this, we think, is what may be called the ideal, the thing which the Commission would

too difficult, the next best thing the Commission can do is an effective work of publicity. It can dramatize the industrial struggle, and make people feel about it. Such an agitation would have some value, even if it showed no immediate concrete result. But the Commission should not vacillate, as it seems to be doing now, between agitation and invention, between muckraking and scientific inquiry. Hesitation here will only kill both the agitation and the investigation. The Commission seems not yet to have decided whether its business is the formulation of new truths or the popularizing of old ones.

IT would be easy to smile at the announcement that the Rockefeller Foundation is to investigate the Colorado strike. Where Mr. Rockefeller was so magnificently sure of the righteousness of his own position, the Rockefeller Foundation is proposing to make an expert inquiry. Where a business man was dogmatic to the last ditch, the scientists he endows think they have something to learn. But all these interesting paradoxes ought not to obscure the fact that the Rockefeller Foundation has accepted a supreme test of its own integrity. It has chosen the most difficult course, one which will strain its courage and its candor to the uttermost. This investigation is certain to be watched with something like a merciless interest, not only by the people who know a great deal about Colorado, but by all those who are inclined to distrust the effect of subsidies on scientific work. The Foundation must realize this. As it starts on its search, therefore, it cannot fail to elicit the tribute which courage arouses, and to find that an unexpected friendliness pervades an unrelaxing criticism.

LOOK at any page of any modern book, particularly one that thinks it is serious, and you will get the impression that it has been peppered with commas. Where our fathers sprinkled sand to dry their clear sentences, we sprinkle commas to liquefy them, to qualify and contradict and parenthesize and equivocate. They are the visible pocks that signal the disease ravaging within, a very plague and epidemic of over-niceness in our thought, a niceness that can say nothing without side-stepping, and ends by saying nothing. Take away the comma, and the modern philosopher, the modernist story-teller, is lost. A Greek would say, "The moon is a goddess." A scholastic would say, "The moon is the lamp of God." A child does say "The moon is green cheese." To say any one of these would show a more useful and more intelligent habit of thinking than to say, as a modernist might

be apprehended, in spite of all our astronomers, including Percival Lowell, the ingenious, if, at times, rather fanciful champion of life on Mars, as a mystical phenomenon, which must be studied, not as a nature-myth, though that is fruitful, not, as the old theologians, in the dark days when faith was firm, would have us believe, as something God hung in the heavens for our light, but as a visible sign, whither sent we know not, why we cannot guess, of that relationship, too long unimagined but now for the first time beginning to be suspected, between the soul of man and that outer freedom which, though it be denied, we must strive for, work for, die for, in the knowledge that at the last, how long we do not know, our eyes shall see, with the gladness with which the poor soul, born blind, first sees the light, the true, however stupendous, meaning of what the careless child, too often, unhappily, under the tutelage of unwise parents, calls gladly but ignorantly, green cheese."

COLONEL Roosevelt's criticism last Sunday of the President's Mexican policy was an example of the kind of fighting which has turned so many of his natural admirers into bitter enemies. The article gave the sense that the Colonel had gone out to "get" the President, to bury him utterly in a landslide of contempt, and that the means to be employed were any that happened to be at hand. Colonel Roosevelt is too sophisticated a man not to know that no one can draw the Catholic Church bodily into a political controversy without starting more than it is possible to finish. He should know that to put behind a criticism the dynamite of religious passion and the popular fury that is always aroused by tales of lust and cruelty is to create an atmosphere of unreason in which no decent discussion is possible. Where his profound knowledge of foreign affairs and his very realistic judgment might have made contribution to the Mexican puzzle, he has kicked up so much dust to gain a petty end that thousands of people who would like to learn from him will see nothing but a disagreeable row. We do not think that Colonel Roosevelt intended, as his enemies are saying, to align the Catholic Church against President Wilson. He was probably deeply horrified by the stories of atrocities, his sense of immediate fair play was aroused, and, somewhat driven by his prejudice against Mr. Wilson, he struck blindly and unfairly.

OUR national attitude towards agriculture is changing. We are to-day less inclined to boast of our bountiful harvests than to consider our crops in relation to the feeding of an ever-

harvested in 1914 than in any year in our history, the apple crop was greater than ever before, and there was an almost unexcelled production of cotton and of oats, barley, rye, potatoes, tobacco and hay. But in spite of the greater diversification of crops and of an increase both relative and absolute in the output of important products, our agriculture as a whole does not begin to keep pace with the growth in our numbers. In fifteen years there has been no considerable increase in our corn production, and in the same period, though our population has increased by over twenty millions, there has been a substantial decline in numbers of our cattle, sheep and hogs. The country would seem to be rapidly approaching the time when, unless something is done for agriculture, America will cease to be a food-exporting country.

THAT doughty prophet of law and order, *American Industries*, in announcing the "opening of the bomb-throwing season in New York," suggests its old and infallible remedy for all forms of unrest and social discontent. "Put an effective muzzle on the leaders" and social peace is automatically attained. It is very logical. Meet the illegal vocal literary violence of individuals with the legal armed physical violence of the State, and the "imbecile rank and file" will leave off being incited and rally to the standard of such champions of order and peace. Incidentally, will the American ever get over that incorrigible itching to stop the mouths of those who say things which are unpleasant for him to hear?

THE English Parliament after a session of only two weeks has adjourned, not to convene again until February second. Never before have such large crowds been present at its opening. It is generally admitted in London that the people were particularly eager to welcome some official public discussion of the problems confronting them. That discussion during the present session has been confined largely to the spy danger, recruiting in Ireland, censorship of the press, the management of recruiting stations and soldiers' pay. Not the least remarkable element in the situation has been the thoroughgoing cooperation on the part of the Opposition. In view of the strong censorship that exists over war news in England, and the perhaps growing restlessness over the Irish attitude, it seems to Americans unfortunate that Parliament could not have kept open for a longer period because of its psychological effect upon the people. Their desire for undiluted truth from the front and their feeling about England's unpreparedness for war

Pacifism vs. Passivism

HOW far the existing naval and military establishment of the United States is sufficiently equipped, manned and organized is a matter of fact which could have been settled by an exhaustive and impartial inquiry. It does not involve the fundamental problems of peace and war. But the fundamental problems of peace and war have been raised by the manner in which the proposed investigation is being discussed and by the reasons for which it is being opposed. The dogmatic pacifists will not have the question of the military preparedness of the United States even considered. They stigmatize any increased military and naval expenditure, no matter what its purpose and limits, as viciously militaristic. They are seeking to identify American pacifism with a policy which amounts practically to disarmament, even though the rest of the world goes armed to the teeth. So far as they succeed, they will be doing more than our militarists have ever done to prevent an effective ideal of peace from becoming a really leavening influence in American foreign policy.

The dogmatic pacifism of Bishop Greer and the *New York Evening Post* is derived from the doctrine of non-resistance. Bishop Greer frankly declares that the only way effectively to prevent or diminish war is never to fight. Peace and war are irreconcilably antagonistic terms. Sincere pacifists must consequently oppose war under all conditions and for any purpose; and they must stand like a rock against any preparation for war. If such an interpretation of pacifism is true, the friends of peace would have every reason to be profoundly discouraged. It would hand the world over to the militarists. It would establish militarism in the very constitution of society. The militarists, too, believe in an irreconcilable antagonism between peace and war, but they interpret the antagonism as an argument for war rather than for peace; and they are right. If the only sincere way of acting on behalf of a pacifist conviction is an uncompromising individual and national refusal to fight, then peace is an unattainable ideal. The people who were willing to fight in order to get what they wanted would continue to fight and would continue to get what they wanted. The people who were unwilling to fight in order to get what they wanted, even though they were in a numerical majority, would have to reconcile themselves to the great denial. At best they might be allowed to occupy a few isolated retreats in a jungle of warring powers. The beasts of prey would rule.

The moral values expressed by the words peace and war are not irreconcilably antagonistic. The