

He settles down into some expert job, and the fighting impulse dies.

The hardest of all attitudes to achieve is a continuous desire expressing itself in varied forms. But that is just what the war on poverty requires. It requires people who can abandon a theory without losing their purpose, who are loyal to their end and opportunist about their means. The moment there is confusion between instruments and ends, between what you want to achieve and the way it is to be achieved, danger sets in. Stake passion on a creed, passion will die with the creed. The history of disillusionment is the history of those who identify the failure of an idea with the failure of a purpose. For if you sentimentalize a doctrine, you risk more upon it than it is worth; and the secret of abiding faith is a readiness to abandon its instruments.

There lies most of the difficulty between some radicals and others. Working on the same impulse but on different theories, they find themselves in irreconcilable opposition. Out of it arises that curse of reform, the creation of pig-headed sects, each bent on doing a thing in a particular way or not at all, each forgetting that the only element in all their doctrines which is not open to doubt and experiment is the passion which inspires them.

Here, too, lies the real difference between the liberal and the stand-patter, between those who care and seek to find a way, and those who don't care and object to any way. To the man who hesitates because he sees real difficulties in a plan, every one owes the most honest attention. There are difficulties, and it is stupid to shirk them. But the trouble is that so many intellectual scruples are really only the cloak of indifference or laziness or private interest. Many a man conceals his lack of good-will by the appearance of nice discrimination, and what looks like a thoughtful hesitation is really blunt obstruction. With him a conflict of will is inevitable, and no compromise is possible short of a spiritual conversion. He and you want different things, and though you two appear to argue about ideas, you are bound to beat against each other because your purposes are opposed.

But men and women who are agreed on the ends, who really desire to carry on a crusade against poverty, can afford to search for varying methods without fundamental clash. Which road they take, how fast they travel, are of infinitely less importance than that they should take some road. For if the desire is there, freshly renewed, it can afford to try theories and abandon them, to experiment and fail, and the loss will not be serious. A mind determined to find a way goes on inventing, the springs of its energy flow. But a mind which lacks the desire to find a way will invent nothing will only

## Peace and Publicity

SINCE the war began, a sharp difference of opinion has emerged in respect to the probable effects of "pitiless publicity" on peace. According to European pacifist democrats, full publicity in the conduct of foreign policy constitutes an indispensable obstacle to war. Yet many American pacifists, who also have been fastening the responsibility for Armageddon upon secret diplomacy, are now favoring the discouragement of publicity in the interest of peace. The publicity which they wish to discourage is only indirectly connected with diplomacy; but the principle is the same. They are just as much afraid as a foreign diplomat of a full and candid public ventilation of questions involving the momentous issues of peace and war.

While much difference of opinion has existed among doctrinaire pacifists about the causes of the war, they all united in denouncing secret diplomacy. They all agreed that the war was contrived as the result of diplomatic intrigue, and that its calamities could have been averted if only popular opinion had been fully informed as to the course and the exigency of the negotiations. How far such ventilation of questions of foreign policy was to be carried has not been definitely stated, but it must certainly require the publication of the reports of diplomatic agents and their full discussion in the legislative assembly and in the press.

Although the United States has never become as deeply involved in secret diplomacy as have the European nations, a similar practice has existed in this country. Our diplomatic agents are responsible immediately to the Secretary of State and ultimately to the President. The President is independent of Congress, and he has always insisted upon his right to withhold from Congress papers or information whose publication would, in his opinion, be prejudicial to the public interest. No President has availed himself more liberally of this right than has President Wilson. From the beginning of the Mexican difficulty the information on which the President has been acting has been kept as secret as it would have been in Germany or Russia. The files of the State Department must contain a large number of consular and other reports which, if published, would help public opinion to understand what the conditions in Mexico really are; but none of them has been allowed to see the light. At the same time, the President's friends have resented criticism of his Mexican policy as a kind of national disloyalty. They have tried to discourage the public discussion of the situation on the ground that it embarrassed him in dealing with its appalling difficulties.

This suppression of information and this dis-

been prompted by an anxious desire to avoid war with Mexico. The President has failed to take the public into his confidence because the revelation of what occurred and was still occurring might arouse hostility to Mexico and help the advocates of intervention to force his hand, as President McKinley's hand was forced in the spring of 1898. In this as in other cases, responsible public officials who have to deal with the issues of peace and war almost always behave as if peace depended upon secrecy, and as if the one sure way to provoke war is to alarm and inflame public opinion by a full disclosure of the facts.

Ever since the agitation over American military unpreparedness began, many American pacifists have displayed for similar reasons a similar dislike of "pitiless publicity." They opposed a thorough investigation of the weakness of our present military establishment because they dreaded the possible effect on public opinion of a translation of the facts into newspaper headlines. They denounced the agitation of this dangerous subject, particularly at the present time, as unnecessary and unpatriotic. They declared in substance that the best way to get rid of the baleful agitation was to safeguard its provocation. Back of their attitude was a profound suspicion of American public opinion and of its liability to hysterical eruptions. If publicity endangered peace, they were for peace rather than publicity.

In truth neither publicity nor secrecy offers any guarantee of peace. A responsible executive is sometimes obliged to refuse information to the public because he realizes both that the facts may be perverted or misinterpreted, and that their publication may start an unmanageable wave of popular fear or anger. If the dispatches contained in the first part of the French Yellow Book had been published in 1913, when they were written, would they not have tended to precipitate rather than to postpone war? Yet those dispatches depicted truthfully the dangerous state of mind which was gathering in Germany; and the French nation was exceptionally well served by diplomatic agents who saw the truth so clearly and reported it so dispassionately. As long as nations are potential enemies and cherish aggressive designs against one another, peace will depend sometimes upon disclosing facts and sometimes on suppressing them. Calculated indiscretion has always been one of the devices of secret diplomacy, and the power to decide whether discretion or indiscretion is the better part of policy must always be left to a few trusted executive officials.

Nevertheless in a democracy the presumption is always against the man or the system which seeks to attain a public good by the road of secrecy. Publicity is not the indispensable element of peace.

essential leaven of a democratic nation. In any democracy there will always be agencies of publicity, such as the Hearst newspapers in this country, which will seek systematically to use sensational and damaging facts as a means of public intoxication, and the best way of providing against this poisoning of the wells of public opinion is a serious question which has never been sufficiently considered. Yet of one truth there can be no doubt. Useful immediate results, such as the preservation of peace, may sometimes be attained by the suppression of facts and the prevention of public agitation, but a democratic society in which such a suppression is frequently or persistently necessary is an inferior or a deteriorating democracy. A democracy must in the long run take the risk of publishing all the dangerous and disagreeable facts and agitating all the doubtful questions. It may make more mistakes as the result of "pitiless publicity," but the great object of such a society should not be the impossible one of avoiding mistakes. Its great object should be that of learning as much as possible from both its successes and failures, and in the absence of thorough publicity its experience can never obtain this desirable and essential educational value.

## Crime and Punishment

**A**MONG all the novels about murder the most salient is probably Dostoevsky's "Crime and Punishment." In that great novel, written by a man who had endured prison life and who knew at close range the criminal and the insane, the punishment of the murderer is his murder. In the end Raskolnikoff invites justice himself and seeks peace in expiating his crime, but the reader feels, and is intended to feel, that the worst penalty of his heartless act is his own piercing realization of it. For him the wages of sin is something worse than death.

A generation or two ago the stern voice of the Old Testament was often heard in English fiction, but of recent years nothing has been more frequent than the accent of commiseration and pity. Men of action like Rudyard Kipling keep up the tradition of the Day of Judgment, the march of inexorable law, but much more characteristic is the note of John Galsworthy in plays like "Justice" and "Strife." In all of Mr. Galsworthy's work, indeed, there is almost a monotonous recurrence of the contrast between the definite masterful, disciplinarian type of the older generation and the agnostic, reflective, indulgent type of the new. The humanitarian tendency or bias comes out in everything that Mr. Galsworthy has to say about the ruling