

# The New REPUBLIC

## A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VII

New York, Saturday, July 1, 1916

Number 87

### Contents

Editorial Notes.....	207
Leading Editorials	
Annexation: A Suppressed Wish.....	210
Homeless Radicals.....	211
The Negro Migration.....	213
Educational Articles	
American Education and Culture.....	John Dewey 215
A Moral Equivalent for Universal Military Service.....	Randolph Bourne 217
The Teacher and the Gary Plan.....	Elsa Ueland 219
The Meaning of the Wirt Plan.....	Alice Barrows Fernandez 221
General Articles	
The Russian Offensive.....	Gerald Morgan 223
Leaders of the Irish Rebellion.....	James Stephens 225
The Voice of the Pullman.....	Alvin S. Johnson 226
Correspondence.....	228
Books and Things.....	P. L. 230
Reviews of Books	
The Hope of Democracy.....	W. L. 231
A Wrong Kind of Text-Book.....	H. J. L. 231
A Misadventure.....	Harold Stearns 232
Archaism.....	234

**E**XACTLY what we expect to accomplish in Mexico is in desperate need of authoritative definition. If our minds are set on intervention to restore order in Mexico, we know of a certainty that we must accept war. If we are still seeking merely the defense of our own border against banditry and can devise no better method than that of holding Mexican territory jointly with hostile Mexican forces, we shall have war whether we want it or not. And if we must have war, why all this feverish haste about it? This is not a case in which a quick blow is necessary before our antagonist can marshal his resources. Mexico is practically as well prepared for war as she will ever be; how inadequately we are prepared for war is made startlingly clear by Mr. Henry L. Stimson's letter of June 28th in the *New York Times*. When the National Guard regiments, now being rushed to the front, are recruited up to full strength, not more than thirty per cent of their personnel will have even the meagre training afforded by one year in the Guard. And that year represents just one twenty-fourth of the time given to intensive training by European

countries before a recruit is considered fitted for the front. Manifestly it is political, not military counsels that are pressing an invasion of Mexico with these ill-trained forces. Such show of force, even if it is little more than show, may conceivably make the Mexican government back down. But the temper of the Mexican government, it would seem, has been sufficiently tested, and we can not afford to play with life and death in further experimenting with it. What Mr. Stimson urges is that if the purposes of our Mexican policy, to be executed by military means, involve a state of war, let us recognize this state, and let our policy be guided by military canons, not political. Withdraw our forces, if need be, from Mexican soil and establish a line that our regular forces can hold against Mexican attack until we have had time for adequate preparation.

**F**OR many days before the Carrizal incident our government had full information of the Mexican military orders to repel any American advance not directed northward. Etiquette required that Carranza should give notice of such a purpose to Washington, not transmit it to Pershing through Trevino. Accordingly, under the laws of etiquette Washington knew nothing about the orders. But etiquette can be too scrupulously observed at a time of crisis like the present. What the case required was either a sharp note to Carranza demanding the countermanding of the offensive orders, or an order to Pershing to keep his men in camp while the matter was under discussion. Through the failure of our government to act upon either alternative, we are placed before the world in the ugly light of a nation that wants a fight, and has not the moral energy to proceed without manoeuvring for a technically just cause.

**M**EXICAN treachery is something we were all taught by our school histories to believe in. This may account for the readiness with which we accepted the first highly colored reports of the

Carrizal encounter. Captain Morey's account now makes it plain that the Mexican commander conducted himself much as any other competent military commander might have done. He was under orders to stop the advance of the American soldiers, and gave due warning of the fact. The American soldiers were under orders to proceed to their destination, and on the belief that the Mexican forces were not strong enough to hold their ground, formed for attack and advanced. Instead of running as they were expected to do the Mexicans opened fire. What evidence have we here of treachery? Such incidents will be inevitable so long as the two governments remain at a deadlock and permit the issue of orders by their respective commanders that are certain to lead to clashes of armed troops. Mexico and the United States are neither at peace nor at war, and for this confusion American and Mexican soldiers must pay with their blood, shed in vain.

**T**HE prevailing impatience over the failure of the National Guard to mobilize promptly and without friction is scarcely reasonable. All well informed people anticipated what has taken place. The state militia has been neither organized, equipped nor trained so as to make of them a dependable body of soldiers. They are being shipped off to the Mexican border rather faster than might have been expected. The real ground for criticism is not that they are being mobilized too slowly but that it is necessary to assign them to active service so quickly. They are not ready for the vicissitudes and dangers of a campaign. In the case of a war against a nation with a thoroughly equipped and trained army, it would be both culpable and disastrous to expose such a body of troops on or near the firing line, or to subject them to the rigors of active military service. They can doubtless give a sufficiently good account of themselves against the half-armed, ill officered and badly trained Mexican armies, but if they have to be dispatched in the near future into Mexico, they will suffer cruelly from lack of mere physical preparation. No wonder the militia is going to the border reluctantly and in many cases with bitterness in their hearts. They were never intended for police duty of this kind and they should never be called upon to perform it.

**T**HOSE officers and soldiers in the National Guard who are leaving their ordinary occupations reluctantly, and with a sense of grievance against the government, should however bear in mind one extenuating circumstance. Last winter when this problem of increasing the army was under discussion, the War Department proposed a plan for

a Continental army whose object was in part to relieve the state militia of responsibility for active service except in time of great emergency. That plan was defeated at least in part because the state militia as a body objected to being superseded as the second line of the national military organization. The National Guard insisted on being "federalized," and if it is to be "federalized" it must be willing to accept as part of its regular job full liability for any kind of service required by the policy of the national government. Because they insisted on being "federalized" its members certainly blunted the edge of any personal grievance against the administration for calling them out; but it does not justify the administration in not having fought harder for a properly trained national army. Although the President knew what was needed and how ill prepared, morally as well as physically, the state militia must be for national police duty, he weakly consented to the exigency of Congress and the National Guard. The utter lack of enthusiasm of the militia for their present service constitutes a sufficient justification for reversing the prevailing policy of converting local territorial troops into a national army. If the President is obliged to ask for volunteers, the new recruits should not be incorporated in existing units of the state militia. They should be organized into an independent body of national troops, which after this Mexican business is over, could be perpetuated as the core of a Continental army.

**O**NE of the few important constructive proposals to be found in either platform is the one embodied in the following passage from that of the Republican party:

Transportation.—Interstate and intrastate transportation have become so interwoven that the attempt to apply two and often several sets of laws to its regulation has produced conflicts of authority, embarrassment in operation, and inconvenience and expense to the public. The entire transportation system of the country has become essentially national. We therefore favor such action by legislation—or, if necessary, through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—as will result in placing it under exclusive federal control.

The Republican platform was adopted June 9th. In accepting his party's nomination the day following, Mr. Hughes touched upon the transportation question in the following words:

We must take up the serious problems of transportation, of interstate and foreign commerce, in a sensible and candid manner, and provide an enduring basis for prosperity by the intelligent use of the constitutional power of Congress, so as adequately to protect the public on the one hand, and on the other to conserve the essential instrumentalities of progress.

**N**OTWITHSTANDING Mr. Hughes's more general language on the railroad situation, probably the essential divergence between his views and those of his party on this important matter is to be found in the faintly expressed doubt of the latter whether the national government would, without a constitutional amendment, have the power to carry out the proposed reform. But that phase of the question would seem to have been disposed of by the Supreme Court's decisions in the Minnesota Rate case (230 U. S.) and the Shreveport case (234 U. S.) which quite clearly lay down the principle that the national government may regulate the intrastate rates of interstate carriers with a view to establishing one harmonious system of rates for such carriers, that is to say, for practically all the railway lines of the country. It is interesting to note, moreover, that in both these litigations Mr. Hughes spoke for the Court. What will the zealous guardians of the purity of the judicial ermine have to say on that point?

**T**HE Progressive National Committee added little to its own glory, or for that matter to Mr. Hughes's strength, by the "endorsement." In private talk and even in public interviews these gentlemen announce the undoubted truth that the Progressive party is dead. Since the party is dead what business have thirty odd politicians to pretend that a "party" has "endorsed" a candidate? The party is dead, so dead that progressive voters are foot-loose, and no one is entitled to speak for them. They are independent voters in this campaign, and no one should deceive himself into the belief that a discredited majority of National Committeemen can deliver the voters who are Progressives. So far as actual result goes, nothing has been changed by the action of the National Committee. A majority of the voters would have gone to Hughes anyway, leaving a strong minority for Wilson. The "coterie" has merely added another unrepresentative and foolish move to the series which began with the January statement, progressed through the callous cruelty of the convention and culminates now in this graceless attempt to go back comfortably into the Republican organization.

**H**ARDER to understand is the feeling of those sincere Progressives who are surprised and disappointed that Mr. Roosevelt should support Mr. Hughes. There never should have been any doubt about it. For more than a year Mr. Roosevelt has made anti-Wilsonism the supreme article of his political creed, and on that issue no third party was conceivable. The real Progressives have followed, followed, followed Mr. Roosevelt so blindly that they did not see where his leadership

led. They too proclaimed anti-Wilsonism the supreme issue. If they meant what they have said, they have no complaint now. Mr. Hughes is a sincere and able exponent of the Roosevelt doctrine as preached this last year. The fact of the situation is that the Progressives have only just realized the logic of Mr. Roosevelt's propaganda. Faced with the result they are suddenly aware that they do not regard anti-Wilsonism as a supreme issue. They care for something greater than that. Since they feel that way they should never have allowed the issue to be drawn as Mr. Roosevelt has drawn it. They should not have written the platform they wrote at Chicago. They should have kept a Progressive creed alive, and fought for it. That alone would have prevented the stultification which is theirs. The real Progressives abandoned their faith for hero-worship and desire for immediate success. The penalty they are paying is the inevitable result.

**I**T is impossible to find a valid excuse for the action of the El Paso authorities in expelling Dr. David Starr Jordan, member of the unofficial mediation committee of the American Union Against Militarism. It is not yet treason to argue for mediation and peace, however obnoxious those ideas may be to the El Paso officials in their private capacity. The pretext under which the mayor and chief of police offered their advice to Dr. Jordan to depart, was that a demonstration was likely to be organized against him. But El Paso has no irresponsible lower class population, such as would make a "demonstration" formidable in Mexico City. The American population of El Paso is almost all of the respectable middle class, and could certainly be held in check by police organization that is powerful enough to ensure safety to the Americans of El Paso against a more numerous population of restless and hostile Mexicans. The expulsion of Dr. Jordan was simply a flagrant example of the intolerance that makes it questionable whether we yet have a call to impose order and civilization upon other peoples.

**D**DOUBLE taxation is a sufficiently serious evil when it arises out of competing local jurisdictions. It is intolerable when it arises out of conflicting international practice, as in the case of income taxation by both the country of origin of income and by the country in which the income is received. Under a recent ruling of our own authorities, income destined for foreign holders of our securities is taxable at its source. The same income is taxable to its recipients by countries levying income tax, such as Great Britain and Germany. This is a condition that interferes with the free flow

of capital over national lines and should be remedied. There has been much talk of late, here and in England, of the desirability of a change in our policy, to exempt income received by aliens residing abroad. A more appropriate remedy would be a change in the British law, and in the laws of all other income-taxing countries, exempting from tax incomes originating beyond the national domains. The United States, which protects the properties of William Waldorf Astor and permits them to yield income, has better grounds for taxing the income than England, within whose borders it is spent.

## Annexation: A Suppressed Wish

**M**EXICO and the world have been assured, in the most authentic terms to which we as a nation can give expression, that the United States will never again seek to extend its territory through conquest. Most of us private citizens have repeated this resolution to ourselves and have found that its sense fitted with our ideals. And in review of our past career as a nation, aggression upon Spain, aggression upon Mexico, aggression often threatened upon Canada, we bow our heads meekly and confess the evil of our ways. Just so the unjust rich man fattening upon the yield of his manifold estates bows his head and confesses, "I have been a miserable sinner, O, Lord; I have robbed the widow and disinherited the orphan; I have waxed great out of the unrequited toil of my brothers." But does he offer restitution? Not he. On his heart are engraved the words, "Somehow good." He manages his estates better than the widow and orphan would have done, and his toiling brothers have escaped the pitfalls of idleness. Do we offer to Mexico restitution of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California and the other territories we wrested from her in what we acknowledge was an unjust war? No indeed. Our thriving, smiling Southwest was divinely ordained for something better than to nourish *Hidalgos* and *peons*, Latin lawyers and *mestizo* revolutionists. We are not abjuring aggression for the past. Such aggression brought mainly good in its train. We are abjuring aggression for the future.

It is time to search our souls to discover whether there is not lurking in them a suppressed wish for aggrandizement, a wish that may become quite other than suppressed if we become maddened with blood. It is the fashion to treat Mr. Hearst as the solitary exemplar of atavistic land greed. With what sincerity? Question the average non-official individual; in many cases, still a minority, you will find him admitting that it will be dreadfully hard to

get out of Mexico once we intervene, yet is he insistent upon intervention. He would not dismember Mexico, yet he would hold the northern states until the rest quiet down—something he would admit, if pressed, may never happen. One finds many grounds for inference that disbelief in the ability of Mexico ever to maintain order within her borders is gaining adherents. A large proportion of our population believe that, morality apart, it would somehow be advantageous to the United States to extend its boundaries southward, and men who believe this might readily be converted, in shoals, to the view that it is our duty to end Mexican anarchy through annexation. They are not yet converted, to be sure. But let us think ourselves into the situation that will follow the first campaign of a war against Mexico.

Draw a line from Tampico to Mazatlan on the west coast, and you have cut Mexico in two—or rather better. In the vast territory north of this line live, at most, four million people. It is territory as nearly empty as California and Texas were before their annexation to the United States. Most of it is desert, or thin cattle range, but it contains the oil, the silver and gold and copper, the coal, an important fraction of the timber upon which American adventurers are casting their hungriest glances. Banditry may flourish in this territory, but organized Mexican armies are provisioned and munitioned from the south with difficulty, and it may be assumed that the first campaign will expel them. Beyond the line lies the densely peopled territory, and the country of hot, fever-infested forest and jungle. We may pursue the Mexican armies into this territory, or we may wait for advances of peace. We shall wait a long time, while behind our lines surveys are making of the immense resources that must lie fallow under such rule as Mexico has been giving of late. Let us bear in mind the fact that in popular political philosophy, the sole valid title of a nation to natural riches is the title of use. Here, we shall become aware, are riches untold lying unused. What shall we do about them?

In view of such considerations, it is not surprising that Mexican patriots tremble for the integrity of their state as our soldiers assemble on the border. They do not know how we shall feel about restoring states we have conquered after we have lost thousands of men in battle, after we have been poisoned with rage over the unnameable cruelties that the uncontrolled Mexican soldiers will inevitably practise upon such of our soldiers as fall into their hands alive. Nor do we know how we shall feel, then. And if we are to keep control of our acts in spite of any change of heart, we ought to lose no time in defining our objective, in fixing limitations upon what we may exact.