

nothing to them and that they are in favor anyhow of allowing Prussia to survive, is as false as if you were to say that the United States were a small mountain republic in the Balkans. Both statements are utterly divorced from reality. And I think it is the duty of one who has some experience of what real opinion is upon this side in the present stage of the war, to emphasize the gulf that separates such statements from the truth.

Let me repeat that it is open to any neutral not only to doubt our moral right, but to doubt the possibility of our success. What would be fatal for the future understanding of Europe by instructed opinion in your country would be to doubt that we upon this side are occupied in a task not of mere wrestling, but of execution.

If the matter were not very urgent and very practical I would not occupy your space with this letter. But it is most urgent and most practical. It is urgent because at

any moment the breaking down of the enemy's far too widely extended front may bring American opinion rapidly face to face with the temper of the Allies as the only force they will have to reckon with in Europe. And it is practical because a misunderstanding on the part of educated opinion often runs through a whole nation. I should think it of little purpose to write such a letter as this to the press, that is read by millions, because that press publishes nothing but silly fairy tales about the war, or reproduces the opinion of men over here (professional politicians and others) whose ideas are ephemeral and carry no weight. But a misstatement of fact in an organ soberly read by the instructed few is a much more serious matter. It may go very deep indeed, and it is in order to correct such misstatements that I have written this letter.

H. BELLOC.

Shipley, Horsham, England.

CORRESPONDENCE

In Behalf of Albania

SIR: The plight of one race of innocent sufferers from the war has been almost overlooked—the brave Albanians. A few words ought to be said about them, because the fate of Albania will have a bearing on the future of Europe and on the question of future war or peace far out of proportion to the numbers of the Albanians.

Several months before her entrance into the war Italy seized the Albanian port of Valona; while at nominal peace with all the world Greece occupied the port of Kortsche, while Montenegro and Serbia made several raids into northern Albania which had no plea of military necessity. The soldiers of all these races seized provisions and so interfered with agriculture that people are starving. Unfortunately, although there are forty thousand Albanians in this country, they are widely scattered and have no means of attracting attention to their unhappy homeland. Consequently America has not been aware of the Albanian situation, and only one relief-ship, a sailing-vessel, has been sent there. For a long while this was held up on its errand of mercy at a most critical time, by the refusal of the Italian government to allow it a passport through the illegal blockade which it is maintaining on the ports of Albania.

Unless the American government induces the Italians to remove their illegal blockade, there does not seem any possibility of helping the Albanians while war is raging all around them.

Now, however, is the time for getting the story of the Albanians before the public, in order that when the new map of Europe is made, Albania will have justice. The Albanians are the oldest people of the Balkans, and have been in possession of their mountains from time immemorial. They claim descent from the ancient Pelasgians and their language gives a clue to the names of Homer's gods and heroes. No other races have any valid claim to the territory occupied by the Albanians, and if any other race should try to enter into possession of their ancestral soil, the Albanians in their almost impregnable mountains would wage a costly guerilla warfare which could only be ended by their extinction. Although this is a very small part of the human race, the civilized world ought not to allow it to perish, because civilization is already indebted to it, and will be again when the splendid powers of the Albanians are allowed development. Under Scanderbeg,

this warlike people saved Europe from the Turk, and it has produced King Pyrrhus of Epirus, Alexander the Great, Saint Jerome, Constantine, Pope Clement XI, and the Italian, Crispi.

Apart from the question of justice is that of political expediency. Albania is in such a strategic position that it is coveted by all the neighboring races, but since none have any valid claim, if it were given to any one country or divided in any possible way, the result would be another war in the Balkans which might again embroil all Europe.

For this reason the Friends of Albanian Independence has been formed, an organization which has two objects: to get as much publicity as possible for the cause of Albania, and to get as many people as possible to sign the pledge-cards as a token of interest and sympathy in the Albanian cause. The pledge-cards contain the following statement: "Current history shows that there can be no permanent peace in Europe until the Balkans are tranquil. A free and independent Albania is necessary as a buffer state between rival powers, if there is to be peace in the Balkans. Therefore, I believe that when the new map of Europe is made after the war, the London Conference of 1913 should be respected and the territory of Albania confided to its lawful owners who have possessed it from time immemorial; and I hereby enroll myself among the Friends of Albanian Independence."

The prominent endorsers of the Friends of Albanian Independence include Miss Jane Addams, Prof. Emily G. Balch, Mr. George W. Coleman, Mr. Edward W. Deming, Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, Mr. Hamilton Holt, Mrs. Haviland Lund, of the Forward-to-the-Land League, Miss Mary White Ovington, Prof. Herschel Parker, Prof. Edward A. Steiner, Prof. Radislav A. Tsanoff, Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, Mr. George Fred Williams and Dr. Evangeline Young of the Boston School of Eugenics.

The pledge cards can be obtained from 97 Compton Street, Boston, Mass., the headquarters of the Vatra or Pan-Albanian League of America. If anyone desires to give financial assistance to this movement, contributions should be sent to any of the organizers, Father Fan Noli of 97 Compton Street, Boston, Mass.; Christo A. Dako of 18 North Street, Southbridge, Mass., or the undersigned at Elbowoods, North Dakota.

JOSEPH F. GOULD.

Elbowoods, North Dakota.

An Englishman on "Pro-Germanism"

SIR: Your own comment on Professor Perry's interesting criticism of *THE NEW REPUBLIC* seems so complete in its refutation of his case as hardly to require any additional annotation. But as an Englishman, at least as convinced as Professor Perry of the moral rightness of the Allied cause, perhaps my personal comment on his position may not be entirely beside the point.

It is surely clear that to believe in the rightness of a cause does not imply release from thought of the consequences to which a victory (or defeat) of that rightness may give rise. The whole point of *THE NEW REPUBLIC*'s attitude—at least so far as I have ventured to interpret it—is to urge that it is now futile to discuss the origins of the war. On that point the judge has summed up and the jury has delivered its verdict. The real issue is the sentence; and as the whole future of the world is bound up in that issue it is immensely important to get such intelligence as we have concentrated on achieving such a settlement as will not result in any of the combatants having that feeling of "balked disposition" of which Mr. Graham Wallas has emphasized the disastrous consequences. If to advocate this is to be pro-German one most sincerely hopes that Mr. Asquith is pro-German to the last degree.

Professor Perry writes in the conviction that it is necessary to hang any dog with a deservedly bad name. *THE NEW REPUBLIC* urges that measures should be taken to reform it, and has been very usefully suggesting ways and means. The latter method seems immensely less wasteful.

I do not know how far Professor Perry keeps in touch with English opinion, but I am certain that he will find in the *Nation* and the *Manchester Guardian*—by far the ablest representatives of what is best in English thought—an attitude essentially similar to that of *THE NEW REPUBLIC*. It surely is a little childish to be angry when it is possible to be constructive. Professor Perry, I take it, wants, with the rest of us, a definite peace and release from the care of *Weltpolitik*. But he will never assist in its obtainment so long as he does his thinking about its terms in an angry mood. That is not the way settlements have been made.

HAROLD J. LASKI.

McGill University, Montreal.

Casualties in the European War

SIR: Part of an article on this subject by Mr. Gerald Morgan which you published recently has been reproduced in the English press.

May I, as one who has given considerable attention to the question of the combatants' relative losses, suggest that Mr. Morgan is not quite correct in his statement that, proportionately, Russia and France are losing at much the same rate as Germany? When he says that Austria is doing so he is, if anything, under the mark, because a bigger percentage of the Austrian than of the German losses consist of prisoners who are—save for the exceedingly unlikely event of their being liberated by their own armies—permanent losses, as a good number of wounded are not.

In proportion to the relative size of the two armies, the French losses should be four-sevenths, say 57 per cent of the German losses. Now, I calculate the gross German losses for the first sixteen months of the war at 4,750,000 and the gross French losses at 2,000,000, or, say, 42 per cent of the German losses. Were one to take net losses, the comparison would be slightly more favorable still to the French, as the proportion of their wounded who make a

rapid recovery is a trifle higher than in the case of the Germans.

With regard to Russia, Mr. Morgan is perhaps right if he refers only to the armies that have been put into the field, but that is an altogether erroneous way of considering the question, because it overlooks the fact that Russia's reserves are several times larger than those of Germany. It may indeed be doubted whether the latter, including those who are barely physically fit, exceed one million, a number which will only last them five months. Unless some other reserves are called up before they are ready, it is questionable whether it is not a matter of weeks rather than months before the Germans will find a diminution in their numbers actually facing the foe.

With regard to British losses and resources, it should be borne in mind that the figure of 500,000 for the former includes casualties to the Indian and Colonial troops, while the figure given by Mr. Walter Long, a member of the Cabinet, of 3,000,000, as the total of the British army, does not include Indian and Colonial troops. One should add at least 750,000 to it for men from parts of the Empire outside the United Kingdom.

Mr. Morgan need not trouble himself about what British troops will do in 1917. A study of the German and Austrian casualty lists shows, after the necessary emendation has been made, that by Christmas, 1916, the German and Austrian armies, as such, will have ceased to exist.

FREDERICK G. JACKSON.

Leeds, England.

Favors Negro Segregation

SIR: I have read the views of the late Booker T. Washington on "Segregation Laws," published in a recent issue of *THE NEW REPUBLIC*, with a great deal of interest. It is a subject which should be discussed freely, because the negro race has certainly made great strides within the last decade, and their progress has now assumed such proportions that there must be some kind of an intelligent understanding of the negro and his needs by white people to prevent prejudices and barriers arising which will militate against the negro's realizing his higher hopes.

I must take exception, though, to some of the views as set forth by the late Mr. Washington. He says: "Personally I have little faith in the doctrine that it is necessary to segregate the whites from the blacks to prevent race mixture." Let any fair-minded citizen take a trip to the sections of New York inhabited by negroes, and after making a close study of the question, he will soon be convinced that segregation is by long odds the proper thing. Negroes who have the welfare and the progress of their race at heart know that their people wish to be left alone to work out their future growth in their own way. They do not wish to have white people intrude upon them any more than the whites wish to have the negroes invade their places.

The intelligent negro knows now that he and his race have a future, and if he is true to himself and his people he will resent any outside interference.

In the eyes of God all men are equal, but students of sociology know that there is a barrier which must forever exist between the whites and blacks, and which no time can remove. Certain laws in nature are as immutable as the seeds of time, and they cannot be changed. Silver is not gold, and while both metals can be made into beautiful creations, they must forever remain dissimilar. So is it with the white and the black races. Both have their shining

lights, their great and their good men. Both have their yearning hopes, their dreams for higher and better things; but they are different, and if the future generations of both races are to be preserved to move along to their higher development there must not be any race mixture. Segregation is to my mind the best way to preserve the environments of both races. And I do not infer by this that the negro is to be made to live in dirty or unwholesome surroundings, but I do mean that he should inhabit certain sections of the cities where he can be given free scope. This can be done without enacting laws making it compulsory.

In the upper section of this city there is a colony of colored people which has grown within the past twelve years from 100 inhabitants to nearly 100,000. The negroes there are left pretty much to themselves, and it is amazing the progress they have made. They have their own enterprises in business, and they are only concerned with their own affairs. As long as the white people do not annoy them there is peace and harmony. Their one wish is to be left alone. When the negroes began settling there in that section of the city, the white residents resented it, and tried to stop the influx, but greedy property-owners kept on selling leases and property to the negroes, so that now it is purely a negro colony, and one of the largest in any of the northern cities. How much better it is that they should be there in the one locality than scattered all over the city.

JOHN JAY LINDLEY.

New York City.

What the Investor May Do

SIR: Is not the answer to Nicotinus, whose letter appeared in your issue of December 11th under the heading "A Stockholder's Dilemma," that he ought not to be a stockholder? There are any number of other investments in which a man may put his surplus capital besides becoming one of the owners of a business being conducted by a corporation. Individual responsibility for wrongs and injustices can only be carried to a certain point. Beyond that it becomes sentimentalism. A super-conscientious individual might refuse to take out life insurance because some of his premiums might be used to purchase the securities of corporations in the business of which one branch might be conducted in such a manner as to work injustice to employees. It would seem to me that this is carrying individual responsibility to an absurd length.

Why should it not be possible for the conscientious Nicotinus to accept the facts as they are and to make his investments accordingly? When he buys stock of a corporation, whether it is on the advice of his trusted bankers or on the strength of his own judgment of values, he is in fact becoming a partner in the business of that corporation. The voice which he can have in the management of the corporation's business depends in part on the size of his investment as compared with the amount of stock outstanding, and in part upon his willingness to put himself to trouble.

If Nicotinus desires to lend his money, not to take a share in the responsibilities and profits of ownership, he can buy bonds, real estate, mortgages and the like which his bankers will recommend to him. A bondholder of a corporation as an individual is simply in the position of a creditor. If the corporation to which he has lent money is notoriously unfair to labor, he can sell his bonds and make some other investment, just as a conscientious believer in total abstinence might refuse to lend money to a distilleries company; but surely the creditor's personal responsibility extends only to the obvious.

I have recently heard it argued that since all of the

capital which goes into a railroad property becomes fixed capital without the possibility of change in use, it might be sounder to recognize this fact by raising all this capital through the issue of bonds. This seems to me an entirely fallacious argument, but the investor who makes no distinction between railroad bonds and railroad stock in fact permits the working out of just such an arrangement.

THE NEW REPUBLIC—if I have succeeded in correctly interpreting its broad and many-sided viewpoint—believes in a development of society which will place on the individual more and more responsibility to the community. Under this theory the citizen who neglected to exercise his right to vote would be failing to do his duty as a member of the community. Is not this equally true of the man who voluntarily becomes a partner in a corporation business and then refuses to accept the responsibilities which a right to a voice in the management of the corporation gives to him?

W. E. HOOPER.

New York City.

For Undefined Preparedness

SIR: While it is to be hoped that the people of this country will come speedily to pay more attention to questions of foreign policy than they have in the past, it seems to me that you over-rate the necessity and the practicability of their "defining" our foreign policy as a step in passing upon the question of preparedness. One element of our foreign policy, and that the essential one for this question, may be taken as determined already: the undesirability of a foreign invasion. All that the "preparedness" movement signifies is, that the present war has awakened us to certain perils of our situation of which we had previously been careless or forgetful. Now, however, that we are awake to them, we mean so far as possible to insure ourselves against them.

Indeed, it seems to me that it is the exact obverse of your position which is the true one. For until we are reasonably assured against the horrors of foreign invasion, we are not in a position of moral freedom from which to define our foreign policy. Till then we shall not be free agents, any more than China is.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

Princeton, N. J.

"Open Letter" an Appeal to Sentimentality?

SIR: The contribution of Mr. John Lincoln in your issue of December 11th is an extremely interesting study. It is well to remind the public that the most acute sufferers from social maladjustment are not always the very poor. There are doubtless a vast number of individuals with fine sensibilities and intellectual equipments above the average who are deprived of gratifications, sometimes of necessities, to which a normal human being may honestly lay claim. To perceive clearly the materials out of which a lasting happiness may be built and to find them forever outside one's grasp is like death by slow torture. In such straits one must hew his way through the forest of pious myths and hampering conventions that hems him in on every side. For this reason I am sorry that Mr. Lincoln, presenting his altogether just grievance, has sought to appeal to a sentimental though obviously social morality—a morality which is at the same time a most effective weapon and the cleverest of disguises for those who desire the perpetuation of present economic arrangements.

DONALD LEIDIGH.

Columbus, O.

After the Play

I

IT is possible to imagine a play in which each of the characters spoke the author's mind, a play by Bernard Shaw, for example, where the dramatis personae—Bluntschli, Valentine, Julius Caesar, Andrew Undershaft, John Tanner, and so on—said nothing Shaw did not agree with.

Actually Shaw never gives us a play of this kind. He gives us instead plays in which some of the characters speak for his point of view and others against it. As a contest between points of view, as a criticism of that part of life which is a point of view, the result is often immensely stimulating. As a representation of life it is rather like what a portrait gallery would be if every sitter were painted so that you could tell which side he took in the main controversy of his epoch.

In January, 1882, a few weeks after the publication of "Ghosts," Ibsen wrote a letter—I quote the translation made by John Nilsen Laurvik and Mary Morison—about its adverse critics: "They endeavor to make me responsible for the opinions which certain of the personages of my drama express. And yet there is not in the whole book a single opinion, a single utterance, which can be laid to the account of the author. I took great care to avoid this. The method, the technique of the construction in itself entirely precludes the author's appearing in the speeches. My intention was to produce the impression in the mind of the reader that he was witnessing something real. Now, nothing would more effectually prevent such an impression than the insertion of the author's private opinions in the dialogue. Do they imagine at home that I have not enough of the dramatic instinct to be aware of this?"

Since we all know that no writer is a good judge of anything he has just written, we needn't be surprised at Ibsen's exaggeration. But although many of Mrs. Alving's opinions are Ibsen's private opinions, it is true that we do not feel this identity while reading or seeing the play, and also true that the whole play has a meaning which none of the characters ever puts into words.

What Ibsen mistook for a description of the method he followed in "Ghosts" is an exact description of Hauptmann's method in "The Weavers." There is not in the play "a single opinion, a single utterance, which can be laid to the account of the author." And much more than this is true. "The Weavers" is not a play of opinions. It is a play of misery and pity. Although Hauptmann represents the pity which some of his weavers feel for themselves his pity for them is immeasurably larger and deeper.

II

It is hard to tell which one admires more in "The Weavers," the greatness of Hauptmann as an artist or his greatness of soul.

We know that he listened when a boy to stories of his grandfather's life as weaver in Silesia. This much we learn from the dedication of the play to his father, who told him these stories. Of course we can never know how the creative imagination worked in secret and partly in unconsciousness upon these old stories, until the result was a play which gives us pictures of brutality and grimness without becoming itself either brutal or grim, in which pity is something stronger than wistfulness without becoming either indignation or despair, in which the pity is all the greater because the beauty is so great. In no play has the creative artist so hidden the moments at which he made his decisions. In no play has he looked at man with more pitying eyes.

III

How unreasonable they were seventy years ago, these Silesian weavers, of whom Gerhart Hauptmann's grandfather was one! They know that the sentence passed upon them the moment they were born, as upon every son of Adam, was of death, yet they ask for just bread enough to keep them out of death's inevitable hands for a few years yet, or failing that for a few days. Cannot they remember that if they die now they will be dead for ever, and their long days of labor running into nights of labor will be over, and no employer will grow rich any more because they weave and starve? No, they cannot remember. They do not know. To them there is one thing more bitter than the starvation that does not quite kill—the starvation that kills. All the worst-paid work of the world in all ages, in Silesia seventy years ago, and here and to-day, has been made possible by just this preference for merely keeping alive!

"In starved sieged cities, in the uttermost doomed ruin of old Jerusalem fallen under the wrath of God, it was prophesied and said, 'The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children.' The stern Hebrew imagination could conceive no blacker gulf of wretchedness; that was the ultimatum of degraded god-punished man." So, in "Past and Present," wrote Carlyle, who wrote also: "Yes, in the Ugolino Hunger-tower stern things happen; best loved little Gaddo fallen dead on his Father's knees."

The degradation and wretchedness of the Silesian weavers stops just short of this ultimate Ugolino-horror. Not very far short. Although protests are cried here and there by one man or one woman against the shape which injustice has taken for the moment, life has always been too near starvation for united protest. But there comes a change. Starvation may draw so near that even the nearly starved will revolt. The arrival of one man more, who has left their world and returned to it with a torch, adds the missing something, and the fire starts, the rising of the weavers is on. In no other play in the world do particular miseries grow with a growth so like nature's into a common blind will. We see before our eyes that strangely moving likeness between the force of a crowd and force in inanimate nature.

IV

In the making of this lifelike and unliteral play two wishes were fulfilled: the wish to make us feel what Hauptmann felt when he listened to his father's stories, and the wish to do this without letting the first wish seem anywhere to dictate. "The Weavers" is so profoundly and imaginatively composed that the only principle of arrangement one can divine in it is the author's will to deepen our feeling act by act. Whether he has his will, at any particular performance, depends largely upon the stage director's management of crowds. At the Garden Theatre this crowd management is competent without being at all wonderful. The acting is competent without being wonderful, except in Mr. Reicher's own case.

Suppose you were looking at a figure picture, by a sound uninspired painter, and suddenly found one single figure an unmistakable Rembrandt. How would you feel? Much as I felt while watching Mr. Reicher. Such acting is not ability or knowledge or a capacity for taking infinite pains. It is genius. What imagination in the way he follows the crowd off the stage at the end of the third act. If Mr. Reicher had played the part of Hilse, the submissive Christian weaver, Hilse would have taken our imaginations captive and falsified all the values of the play. That is why Mr. Reicher gave himself a less important part.

Q. K.