

ign trade; according to the Commission's report, but, on the other hand, the competition for foreign trade may very well be much sharper. The present belligerent countries will be aided by national merchant marines, international banking facilities and a governmental policy which encourages combination. Small American exporters, bringing to export business the competition, the independence and "the play of individual forces," which is our "settled domestic policy," find themselves at a sharp disadvantage in their battle with the combined exporters of another land. What the Commission calls "equality of opportunity" at home becomes a serious handicap abroad. A bill which permitted exporters to cooperate for foreign trade, but safeguarded the interests of the domestic consumer "against any artificial stifling of domestic competition through combinations or unfair practices," was up at the last session of Congress. Surely there can be no objection to its passage now. Once again a chapter is added to that curious book which might well be called "Indirect and Bashful Attacks on the Anti-Trust Law."

**P**ICARESQUE beyond the invention of genius is the affidavit of Theodore H. Martin, "hustler," "jackroller" and repeater of Kansas City, Missouri. Mr. Martin's regular business is to wait for jovial drinkers, put chloral in their glasses, and then lead them into alleys and take their jewelry. His principal interest in politics is to defeat prohibition; on the side he gives good-natured aid to the great political parties. On November 7th Mr. Martin accepted \$5 to vote for Mr. Hughes, and then cast 37 ballots for Mr. Wilson. This crushing defeat for bribery was accomplished only by a considerable heroism. Mr. Martin memorized 37 names and addresses, in all cases except one connected the right name with the right address, and even confessed to the appellation of J. C. B. Ish. "Knowing the nature of the business which was required of us," writes Mr. Martin, "I had as a precautionary measure brought down and left near headquarters, in the alley, two suits of clothes besides the one I was wearing, but did not find it necessary to make even one change." There was a crowd of "barrel-house bums" also illegally voting, but the hustlers refused to associate with these low fellows and received their beer and whiskey in a different place. There were also a few "shovel stiffs"—field laborers—but their character was clearly unequal to their responsibilities and, writes Mr. Martin, "after being furnished a few drinks and receiving \$1 for their vote they became unreliable and could not be depended upon when questioned by Republican workers at the polls." Mr. Martin himself

was above accepting money for his votes. All he would take was a political promise—the protection of his legitimate business in a restricted territory. For the discovery of this aristocrat of entrepreneurs we are indebted to that excellent and most accurate of papers, the *Kansas City Star*.

## British-American Irritation

**I**N August, 1914, Britons and Americans were very close together. Newspapers and public speakers were denouncing Germany in the same phrases, and so far as outward expression went the English-speaking nations had become one spiritual community. But since 1914 the experience of the two peoples has diverged. Behind the phrases which inaugurated the war, behind the simple formulæ which were used to explain its origin, the British have placed their lives, their wealth, their pride. No wonder then that the slogans of the war are vivid to Britons as they no longer are to us. For if all that Americans wrote and said in the first months of the war was unimpeachable truth, our peace is indeed dishonorable, and we ought to be fighting alongside the Allies. But events soon showed that though many of us used much the same language as the Allies, the words had a totally different pragmatic value. Not only the election, but the campaign conducted by the Republicans, showed that the bulk of the American people, though they talked like a belligerent, never intended to be one.

The small minority here who desire American intervention, and the great mass of the British people who naturally desire it also, concluded that the stamina of America is decaying because it did not go to war when it talked like a nation at war. It was humiliating to look at the gap between American words and American deeds. Imperceptibly at first, but none the less surely the American people began to close up the gap, but they did it not by squaring their deeds with their words. They began to square their words with their deeds. Having fixed upon non-intervention as a policy, they began to analyze the old phrases, and for over a year we have been witnessing a growing tendency in America to take a less partisan view of the war.

There was plenty of material at hand: the old anti-British tradition implanted in every school-boy's memory, the blunders at Gallipoli and elsewhere, the Japanese alliance, the indefinite extension of British sea-power, the Irish episode, and a good deal of discourtesy in the British press. More and more Americans began to say that though Germany was the immediate instigator of the war, though the violation of Belgium was the greatest

crime since the destruction of Poland, yet the origins of this world-wide conflict were deeper than German militarism, and that the guilt must be distributed, however unevenly. Now it would be a mistake to suppose that America became more neutral because it had weighed the evidence. The truth is that America secured the evidence when it had determined to be neutral.

More and more the war has ceased to look like a clean-cut fight between right and wrong, between democracy and absolutism, between public faith and international lawlessness. Italy, Rumania, Russia with their aggressive programs confuse the situation too much, and the lack of any definition of the Allied objective has filled a growing mass of Americans with the sense that the remedy for this horror is not to be had by a "knockout," but is to be sought in radical reorganization. These obscure and half-formulated reactions have found their expression in the idea of a League to Enforce Peace, an idea which is much closer to effective American opinion to-day than any proposal for downright intervention or an out-and-out alliance with the British Empire. It is a true, though no doubt a pale and unappreciated crystallization, and perhaps even a compensation for the diminishing partisanship of America.

This spiritual change has reverberated in Canada and Great Britain. That America should talk big and not act was bad enough, but that America should soften its tone was worse. If you ask an Englishman to-day what it is that we have done to irritate him so, he will insist that he does not quarrel with us for staying out of the war, he will confess that our neutrality has been ultra-benevolent to the Allies, and sharply discriminating against Germany. Then he will point sadly or angrily to things which have been said, things which are unsympathetic to the reasons which are put out as explaining the Allied cause. He will complain about the alteration in the American temper toward the war. His irritation piques us, of course, and the result is a discouraging cleft in the feeling of the English-speaking peoples.

It is curious and significant that no such division has appeared between France and America. No doubt many Frenchmen are annoyed at us, and feel many contemptuous things. But they have been too discreet to let us hear them, and what is more, they do not talk English. For our part the feeling toward France has reached a pitch of almost ecstatic admiration. It is due to facts that are obvious enough, to the intrinsic loveliness of the French people, to their heroism and clarity and their steadfastness. But these qualities will not in themselves explain the spiritual differences in American feeling for France and Britain. The

mere fact that a nation has great qualities will unfortunately not always produce an international friendship, and the situation in America is such that we tend to an unlimited idealization of France and a hyper-criticism of Great Britain.

The real explanation surely lies deeper than the spiritual quality of the two peoples. It lies in those portentous historic forces which determine feelings and ideas. Americans have been able to love France as they do, to see the best in France, because the relationship of the two nations is fundamentally disinterested. But the attitude of Britons and Americans is determined in the last analysis by a dim sense that each means to the other so much of good and evil. Our destinies cross. We are inextricably entangled one with another, we know and the British know that the most terrible consequences are involved in our relationship. The feeling for France is the free friendship men give to those whom they meet only in their leisure. With the British we have to-day the discordant intimacy of business partners and family ties. We know that we cannot live apart, we have not yet learned to live together. We are close up to each other, bound in a common destiny, painfully aware of each other's faults, and a little shrill about announcing them.

The task of sanity is to recognize this and hold it in the front of all discussion. So involved are British-American relations that it is impossible to maintain them as they are. We must go forward to alliance or to enmity. Now and in the years immediately ahead this fearful decision will be made, and on it, more than on any other decision will depend the happiness of the western world. We are living out now the process of that decision, and all the existing irritation is a symptom of it. To find the bases of understanding is the supreme British-American task. We turn for help to the two peoples who will find their security in such understanding, the two peoples most able to mediate, the people of Canada and the people of France.

## Woman Suffragists and Party Politics

**I**N a recent issue of THE NEW REPUBLIC statements were made about the relation between Federal amendments and party politics, which to a number of correspondents seemed inconsistent. In one paragraph the National Woman's Suffrage Association was advised to revise its traditional policy of scrupulous non-partisanship. In another, amendments to the federal constitution were described as an indigestible diet for party politics. That an apparent discrepancy exists between the