

port and the territory it serves. For all non-German goods would have to be carried by German ships and pay such freights as German nationalistic policy might dictate. Thus the port and its territory would become, in effect, a German colonial market, closed to the world.

The game is one at which more nations than one can play. Let Germany try to engross the shipping of a port, and she will find her industrial and commercial rivals taking steps to thwart her. And if this is not worth while, the other nations can engross the shipping of other ports. Whether the final result proved favorable to Germany or not would then come to depend upon the development of land transportation lines feeding the several ports. The war of competing ocean carriers would thus entail a war of railway construction and railway rates. In consequence the financial systems of the rival nations would become involved. With the export industries, the ocean carriers, and the banks of the several powers carrying on an economic warfare on neutral soil, what would be the chance of a lasting peace?

Ocean transportation is essentially an international interest. Nationalistic strivings can only work mischief in this field. Any country ought to be permitted to build as many ships as it may care to build, subsidizing them as heavily as it can afford, if it chooses. But the operation of such ships ought to be subject to international rules, requiring that the service be placed without discrimination at the command of trade, of whatever national origin. The American line ought to be required to carry German or British or French goods from New York to Valparaiso at the same rates as it carries American goods. If Germany opens a line to Valparaiso, she ought to be required to carry French and British and Scandinavian goods at the same rates as German.

With ocean transportation governed by international rules precluding discrimination, there would be no danger that any nation would reduce neutral territory to the status of a closed colonial market. There would be no reason why one nation should strive to balance its neighbors' merchant marines, ship for ship, as there must be if merchant marines are to remain instruments of nationalistic aggression. If Norway and Japan, owing to lack of natural resources upon which to employ their population, find it desirable to contribute to the world's shipping far beyond the ratio of their trade and population, this would be the concern of those nations alone. Norway's merchant fleet now serves as an international common carrier, and does any nation in the world regard the growth of that fleet as a menace? Japan might become the common carrier of the Pacific, maintaining hundreds of

thousands of her people by this employment and advancing the interest of the whole world, if she would govern her shipping enterprises according to the principles of internationalism.

The merchant shipping on the seas is now internationally controlled, as a measure of military necessity. The Allied nations have in a sense pooled their shipping. Each recognizes that it would be shameful to confine the use of its ships to purely selfish, nationalistic ends. And neutral shipping has been brought under the sway of internationalism through control by the Allies of bunker coal and through export embargoes. Is it too much to hope that the internationalism of war will give way, not to a nationalistic anarchy, but to an internationalism of peace? England, America and Japan hold the strategic points in the field of ocean shipping. Without their coöperation and good will, no other nation can hope to carry on an ocean trade extending over the world. These three nations, especially with the support of France and Italy, can practically impose their will upon the seas, if it is their will to impose rules fair to all the nations and conducing to the world's peace.

Future Limitations of Conscription

THE precise nature of the suggestions put forward by Cardinal Gasparri concerning the abolition of conscription as a part of the general approach to disarmament is not very clear. And even in the event of disarmament coming within the scope of practical politics at the settlement, it is unlikely that universal military service for European nations would be the first form of armament marked down for abolition. But there is one form of conscription of which the Allies might well demand the abolition, on the general ground that it is particularly evil in itself, that its abolition would tend to reverse one of the great political motives which go to promote war, and would facilitate certain concessions in Allied policy that might not be possible otherwise.

This form of conscription is the drafting of subject peoples, not enjoying self-government, and forming part, often against their will, of the state for which they are compelled to go to war.

The motive which pushes states like Germany and Austria to the retention of conquered territory is in large part the desire to add to their potential military force. The population of an annexed province can, even against its will, be somehow licked into shape as cannon fodder. And so it is retained even at the cost of risks and political inconveniences which but for the temptation of in-

creased power might cause it to be surrendered. Conversely, settlements which would perhaps be made most easily along the lines of loose confederation are resisted by rival groups in the interest of the balance of power—on the ground that such federated provinces might be brought within the scope of a hostile military system.

But certain limitations of the right of conscription would render possible some provision against that contingency. For instance, were the Allies to exact that any future plan of Home Rule for the various nationalities of the Austrian Empire should include the exemption from conscription of Tchecho-Slovak, Serbian, Rumanian, Croatian and Polish provinces, Federalism, from the point of view of the populations themselves and the outside world, would, to put it at its lowest, be more acceptable than it could possibly be otherwise. As to enforcement, such a stipulation would of course have the support of the populations concerned, and if it could be maintained for a decade in a country of universal suffrage the political importance—from the electoral point of view—of the exempted populations would help them to perpetuate their privilege.

The reciprocal undertaking on the part of the Allies has in large part been fulfilled by anticipation. England has already exempted Ireland from the operation of her conscription acts. British policy in this matter suggests certain analogies with the Austrian problem.

Britain would resist the demand for complete Irish independence, but is ready to concede an autonomy which includes the right of the Irish to decide for themselves whether they shall fight in Britain's wars. Britain has not attempted conscription in India and would without doubt be glad to extend the same exemption permanently to equatorial Africa. Indeed it is well known that certain of the more far-sighted statesmen of the South African Union are very anxious to secure an agreement to withhold European military training from the native populations of Africa, an anxiety natural enough on the part of white men living in vast spaces where they are outnumbered by black races in the proportion of from five to one to ten thousand to one! And such a proviso would meet certain German anxieties.

For some years past a school of French military writers have made much of the potentialities of what they have called the "force noire" of France. The military power of France was to be strengthened by the training to arms of the uncounted millions of black Africa. Natives into whose country the white man had penetrated quite frankly as a master and ruler, because they were not yet capable of self-government, were to be

conscripted—compelled, that is—to fight in the distant and unknown countries of their masters, to fight against one great section of the white race. It is not be wondered at that the South African Union looked with a certain uneasiness upon such schemes. Its ghastly possibilities are too obvious to make comment necessary. An English labor organization recently put the case in these terms: "If the arming of the black millions of Africa for the purpose of fighting the white man's quarrels is permitted, a new danger, as well as a new horror, will be added to civilization. If a people is not fit to share the privileges of the Empire in the shape of self-government it should not be asked to share its burdens by fighting its wars. Forced fighting, like forced labor, is, in such case, whatever it may be elsewhere, undisguised slavery."

And could Europe look with equanimity upon the adoption of the proposal so often made during this war that the British empire should in future "develop the military potentialities of India," i. e., arm Asiatic populations running into three to four hundred millions just now coming into consciousness of a common nationalism? One thinks of certain possibilities in the development of China and its relation to Japan, and of both to an Asiatic body so vast as India having learned military cohesion under European tutelage.

We have here then pretty clearly indicated a certain limitation of conscription which the Allies will in any case in practice have to impose upon themselves. They have in consequence every reason for attempting to secure the application of the same general principle to the case of their enemies. It is by no means a forlorn hope, and even its partial application all around might aid in the solution of several of the thorny problems which will shortly confront us.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL

FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN JOHNSON

GEORGE SOULE—Assistant Editor
CHARLES MERZ, Washington Representative

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE: REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

Mexico Progresses

BY formal acknowledgment of his election as President of Mexico, the United States has now definitely accepted Mr. Carranza as the legal as well as the actual head of the Mexican government. The revolution is therefore officially concluded, and Mexico is welcomed back into the circle of governed nations.

And now that Mexico is back there is less disposition to find fault with her prolonged subversion of law and order to the business of internal warfare. Revolutions are better understood by America than before Russia started out to establish a democracy. Americans, even those despoiled of property in Mexico, are now inclined to ignore the past and to look forward to a reconstructed Mexico which will permit their gradual recoupment of losses. In the meantime, obstacles to industrial and commercial activity are lessening, though substantial ones remain.

The present crux of the Mexican problem is financial. The country cannot survive without an effective, aggressive government, and the government cannot survive without funds. Only a convincing demonstration by the government of its security and permanence will invite confidence enough to warrant effort for substantial financing.

The government is therefore just now going through the period of demonstration. It is living on its current revenues and on incidental internal loans in small amounts that are variously obtained. But in the meantime a deficit is piling up. Revenues are considerably greater than before the revolution, but so are expenditures. The principal expenditure is for the army establishment, totaling more than all other outlays combined. The army is partly needed to maintain internal order, and the rest must be kept on government pay until its officers and soldiers can be absorbed back into industrial or other civic activity.

Industrial activity, moreover, is the only certain remedy for banditry and constitutes, therefore, the immediate, urgent need of Mexico. Happily, business is resuming. Mine and oil properties are not left idle where it is possible physically or financially to operate them, though many mines are still idle whose operation would be of immeasurable advantage to the country. The present state of Mexico is a state of transition with a growing brightening in the prospect of a successful outcome.

Meanwhile, Mr. Carranza has organized a government and has taken firm hold on the administration of public business. He is a man of pre-eminent patience and perseverance, and in consequence of

these traits finds himself today greatly more secure and nearer to his goal than he has ever been since first he set out to overthrow the usurper Huerta.

The shibboleth of the Carranzista revolt was "The Constitution and Reform." To restore constitutional government was the war cry of the campaign against Huerta. To achieve reforms was the promise of ultimate benefit which Carranza held out to his followers. The constitutional government has been established under a new constitution. The reforms are in process of accomplishment, in so far as the immediate business of keeping the government in operation permits attention to them. The constitution itself radically altered the status of business and labor and made fundamental changes in religious and educational policy. The status of employed labor is greatly improved wherever there is the power to enforce constitutional and legal provisions respecting hours of work, compensation for injury, child labor and even participation in profits. Education is now a public instead of a church responsibility, and schools are in increasing operation.

Six years ago, discovering itself stagnant and starving in the midst of the glitter and prosperity of the Diaz régime, Mexico came to the conclusion that its problems were fundamentally economic. Years of proclaimed political liberty had not meant freedom. The Mexican revolution has accordingly been prompted by economic motives first announced by Madero, but subsequently sustained by the Carranza party of the Constitution and Reform. The program of the revolution finally expressed itself in the new constitution adopted last winter and sums up as follows: The economic development of the country has been almost exclusively in the hands of foreigners. Accordingly, foreigners are to be brought under the immediate control of Mexican laws and removed from localities where they might furnish excuse for foreign intervention, namely, the border and the immediate sea coast. Large mining holdings are to be restricted to imperative needs for actual development by a progressive tax on mine claims. Large landed estates are to be discouraged by prohibiting corporate ownership of landed properties and by a program of large estate subdivision through the exercise of the powers of eminent domain.

Most important is the attempt to divert the greatest of all recently discovered bodies of Mexican natural wealth into channels assuring the nation of participation in the profits of oil production by other means than taxes. Oil deposits are declared