

to see some phase that needs correction. We know the horror of child labor, for example, though most of us do nothing about it. Sometimes a mere narrative of what conditions are arouses us. But on the whole we do not move unless we are prodded, and we need the gadfly every bit as much to-day as when Socrates recommended it.

Only those who have great power do not have to agitate. If the directors of the Steel Corporation wish to change conditions in their plants they will not have to hold mass meetings and march in parades. But a group without power, a disfranchised group, has to do more than convince itself that what it wants is wise. It has to convince others, and make those others take an interest in the plan. That is why suffragists have to talk on street corners, get their pictures into the papers, go on "hikes," interrupt public meetings, and dress up as Joan of Arc. The same is true of the industrially disfranchised. The railroad engineers can present their demands, sit down at a long table and argue their case through statisticians and lawyers. But the miners of Colorado or West Virginia or Calumet, the steel workers of Pittsburg, the spinners and weavers of Paterson, the textile workers of Lawrence and Lowell, are industrially disfranchised, and every time they wish to make some advance they have to start a little rebellion.

The answer to them is not to suppress the rebellion, to ask that they should make peace at any price. In industry, as among nations, there can be false, dishonorable, and disastrous peace. There can be the inhuman peace of an efficient despotism, but it will purchase a temporary comfort of mind at a cost which no people can pay and still call itself free. For to those who have not settled into a panicky fear, the quiet of those who submit is often far more ominous than the disturbance of those who rebel.

Contraband and Common Sense

IN his letter to Senator Stone, Secretary Bryan puts up an able defense of the behavior of this government towards the warring nations in Europe. He is able to show that all the official acts of the United States in reference to the belligerents are sanctioned by established international practice, and that if the government had behaved as certain of its critics have advised, it would have given just cause of offense either to the Allies or to Germany and Austria. The technical justification is complete. It is a pity that the anti-

to be done, the administration is to be congratulated on so unimpeachable a legal record and so candid and dignified a justification of its course.

The correct attitude of our government has not been fully appreciated in Europe. The European governments have not, to be sure, had any legal grounds for complaint, but European public opinion at the present time is none the less very much disgruntled with the behavior of this country. Americans should recognize the fact that so far from being popular in Europe, they are disliked in Germany and their motives are questioned in England. The Germans resent the sympathy which American public opinion has on the whole shown towards the Allies. They have resented it from the start, but in the beginning they suppressed their feelings because they hoped to persuade Americans of the righteousness of the German cause. They realize now that they have not succeeded and cannot do so; and Americans who have returned recently from Germany testify to the growth in that country of an angry anti-Americanism. Neither is the situation much better in England. Englishmen were deeply wounded by the American note in respect to contraband. They do not for the most part dispute the fact that the American government had good grounds for protest under the laws of nations, but they claim to be fighting the battle of all neutral and pacific powers, and they ask for a clearer appreciation in this country of the legitimacy as a belligerent measure of the English effort to deprive the enemy of war supplies.

In the case of Germany a certain amount of resentment towards this country is inevitable. The American business public does and will continue to sympathize and trade with the enemies of Germany. The supplies which the Allies can purchase in the United States may make the difference between ultimate defeat and ultimate victory. The Germans would be more than human not to resent such sympathy and assistance; and if at the present time they seem to be more than human in the exercise of military power, they are certainly very human indeed in the cultivation and in the expression of their feelings. This resentment cannot wholly be avoided, but it can at least be mitigated by a timely tribute of admiration for the extraordinary devotion of the German people to their national cause, and for the superb fight they are making against such enormous odds. It might also be mitigated by the assumption of a less self-righteous attitude on the part of American publicists, and a modification of their attempt to try Germany in the Supreme Court of civilization and find a verdict with damages against her. Such a verdict may have to be passed but what

try is less deep-rooted than that of Germany, but it is scarcely less difficult to avoid. A serious difference of interests exists between the United States and England. From the English standpoint, every cargo of goods allowed to enter Germany may mean a longer war and heavier expenditure of English blood and treasure. England cannot stop the entrance of contraband into Germany by land. If it is to be stopped at all it must be stopped at sea, where England is supreme; and it cannot be stopped at sea unless supervision is exercised over American exports to neutral states bordering on Germany or Austria. On the other hand, this country wants to trade as freely as possible, and protests against the extent to which wholly innocent commerce has been hampered by the English searches and seizures.

The chief difficulty of the present situation is that neither party has as yet admitted the true cause of the trouble. Neither party probably will do so. The issue now at stake is the right of neutral states not to suffer from the belligerent acts of others. Aside from the minor questions of delays and unnecessary severity in the methods of examination, Americans are really protesting, not against the embarrassment of our trade with neutrals, but against the prohibition of our trade with Germany. This is the crux of the matter. Such a difference of interest is incapable of legal solution. The law governing the whole matter is in an indeterminate and fluid condition, and its application depends upon facts which are difficult to discover and whose ascertainment cannot be submitted to an international tribunal. Such being the general condition, the continuation of good relations with England depends upon the avoidance of narrow insistence on legal rights, and upon the exhibition of mutual courtesy, consideration, fair-mindedness and common sense.

There is an old adage about the dwellers in glass houses. It may be invoked with excellent results in almost any international controversy. Before insisting too strenuously on our rights, or condemning too severely the British policy regarding contraband, it might be well to remember for a moment our own past record. What about Mexico, for example? British interests in Mexico, far greater in value than any American interest now prejudiced by this contraband policy, have been ruined because, in response to our urgent request, Great Britain granted us a free hand to deal with the situation across our southern frontier. The administration's attitude toward business in Mexico does not square well with its position on contraband. The avowed humanitarian purpose in Mexico and the assertion of the

disregard of the Hague Convention by Germany.

Americans would like to believe that as a nation their motives are pure and their ideals high. Even though our actions may sometimes belie such a claim, we expect to be judged with tolerance and consideration. Are we always equally ready to be charitable in our estimate of the action of others? We have now an opportunity to demonstrate that we are ready to grant a consideration that we ourselves invariably expect. If this be our spirit, the contraband dispute will be settled without further friction.

When the war is over we may meet the real question that has been raised by the present controversy—the right of neutrals not to suffer from the belligerent action of others. International law as at present written concerns itself primarily with what belligerents may do to neutrals, not with stipulations for the protection of neutrals which may under no circumstances be disregarded. In this we have acquiesced. We may have an opportunity when the war is over to remedy our past mistakes. The surest way to gain this end, however, is first to define, and then to be able and ready to defend our position. Until we are willing to accept the responsibilities of attempting to extend the rights of neutrals, we cannot expect to enjoy to the full the benefits that neutrality should confer. Neutrality at present is passive. To be effective it must be made positive. We have neglected in the case of Belgium our greatest opportunity to give it new life. Another chance may come later. In the meantime, let us abide by the golden rule, and treat contraband with common sense.

Autocracy in Business

DURING the hearings before the Industrial Commission in New York, several witnesses forced on public attention the problem of working out a "safe and sane" form of corporate organization. The idea is gaining ground that an unwieldy and irresponsible directorate has much to do with the errors and evils connected with the management of corporations. After having long advertised the organization of big business as a model of practical efficiency, business men are now coming to admit the existence of radical defects, and remedies are being proposed based, curiously enough, upon what may be called political quite as much as business considerations.

The existing method of organizing the direction of large business is properly described and condemned as a sham. It suffers from a discrepancy