

some extent, as the casualty lists show, he retaliated. Much of the fighting, most of it in fact, was occasioned by white hoodlums and was deprecated by sober citizens. Still, the Negro had an unsympathetic environment and an inequitable administration of the law and of the police to contend with. The measures he took for defense were not entirely unnecessary.

Although the fighting in Chicago was preceded by bombing of Negro residences, was occasioned by the unprovoked murder of a Negro boy by a white man at a bathing beach, and although white mobs burned Negro houses and brutally murdered unoffending Negroes, the Chicago Grand Jury found it necessary to protest against proceedings begun exclusively against Negroes. They found it necessary to call to the attention of officers of the law the fact that if Negroes alone were prosecuted and no white men, dangerous tension might be renewed between white and colored citizens.

The press, as always, recklessly prejudiced the public safety. When a disastrous fire burned eighty houses of Poles and Lithuanians near the stockyards, the Chicago Daily Journal and the Chicago Evening Post carried stories, news articles and headlines imputing the blaze to Negro incendiaries animated by race hatred. A white man was subsequently arrested charged with having set the fire. The immediate consequence of this newspaper outcry was a movement to deprive Negroes of their jobs at the stockyards. The packing houses actually had to postpone for three days reemploying their colored workmen. When the Negro stockyard employees did return to work, it was only under a heavy militia guard and white workers made

their objection to the guard a pretext for threatening a general strike against the employment of Negroes. Meanwhile a number of hotels and other places of employment announced they had replaced their Negro employees with white men.

Coincident with the economic retribution the race riots put upon the Negro came numerous suggestions that the North must adopt the southern policy of Jim-Crowism. Of Jim-Crowism in the North there seems to be slight danger. The Negro's struggle here will be in the field of industry. He will have the difficulty, so long as he remains unorganized, of any group of workers permanently distinguished by superficial characteristics from their fellows. The American Federation of Labor has begun to recognize the danger of this division and its possible uses against labor. It was this, probably, that motivated President Gompers at Atlantic City. Despite industrial troubles, the Negro will continue to come North as his manhood rebels against the position of inferiority in every sense which is forced upon him in the South.

The question, then, which the Negro has posed, arises from a caste civilization of the South, which, as soon as the war furnished occasion, extended its problems to the entire nation. That question is: What place is there in a democracy for permanently distinct racial groups who accept that democracy on its own terms? In the growth of his determination to die if necessary in this country in defense of democracy, the Negro has shown his readiness to maintain it. The problem becomes one of ways and means. It demands study and investigation rather than passion and obscurantism.

HERBERT J. SELIGMANN.

## A COMMUNICATION

### The New Anglo-Persian Treaty: An Asiatic View

THE imperialist never does anything except for the good of the people whom he brings under subjection. England rules Ireland for the good of the Irish, India for the good of the Indians, Egypt for the Egyptians, and now she is going to rule over Persia for the good of the Persians. The military and the public purse are the two outstanding emblems of sovereignty. War and peace both depend upon them. England is going to control both of these under the new treaty which she has made with Persia, for the benefit of the Persians. We are assured by the New York Times that the "entire press of England welcomes the treaty . . . as good for Persia and necessary for the safeguarding of India." A few liberal papers however are grumbling, as usual. The Daily News says that "the treaty, while guaranteeing Persia's independence does not leave her a free hand;" the Manchester Guardian remarks

that "if this had been done by another Power the arrangement would be regarded as a veiled protectorate;" the Liverpool Post observes that the "the secret way in which the matter has been gone about is certainly unpleasant." The French press is very uneasy and the Supreme Allied Council at Paris is somewhat disturbed.

This is another illustration of "open covenants, openly arrived at" and also of how the League of Nations is going to protect the small nations that have been invited to join it. The bargain is apparently to the mutual advantage of the parties. Persia gets the protection of Great Britain as Egypt did, the blessings of English rule as India and Ireland have, and England gets an additional vote in the League of Nations. The United States will, of course, bless the new arrangement as she has already done in the case of Egypt.

Yet there is another side of the picture. The Young Persians threaten revolt. One of them, writing to a friend, from France, over date July 19, 1919, says:

"Persia, poor Persia, is breathing the last moments of her existence. The English have put up a very reactionary cabinet which is seeking nobody's interest except their private pockets. They are controlling the election of the Parliament which is now going on, so as to secure a majority of old men, ignorant bribe takers, rascals. They (presumably the English) are taking all sorts of concessions for railroads, and mines. They are publicly demanding that Persia secure British advisers for their administration, in other words, they are playing the same game of eighty years ago in Egypt. They are strangling us and yet they call us independent. All the young and educated element is exiled and there are scores of them living in Paris and Switzerland. The Shah, that young rascal, has become a vassal of the English, fattening his pocket, and ignoring the everyday life of the people which passes before his eyes."

"The situation in Persia has never been so gloomy as it is today. The only solution is revolution, by which the present traitors can be overthrown and punished. I am glad of one thing, and that is that this darkness will only bring about better days. The more the people suffer the more they will realize that they should wake up. Everybody has to keep his mouth shut when he goes there, but I have hopes. To tell you the truth, at present John Bull has not only India and Egypt but Persia and Turkey, Afghanistan and Turkestan, Caucasia and Armenia. All these countries are full of English troops. They are ruled directly or indirectly by the English. The darkness prevails, but hope and confidence will surely take us through the darkness and make us reach the light." The other young Persians are also raising a protest.

We have let the young Persian speak for himself, without even crossing his t's and dotting his i's, except that we have omitted three words in which he speaks of the young Shah in rather unparliamentary language. Those who have followed the domestic struggle in Persia which started in 1907, and has been going on since, in spite of temporary reverses due to intrigues of the Russian and British diplomacy, can appreciate the force of the young Persian's remarks.

As the Paris Temps points out, Persia has a constitution by which a treaty to be binding requires to be ratified by the Persian Majlis (Parliament) unless for the sake of expediency it is a secret treaty. Now England is not prepared to take any chances. Although the treaty is secret and does not require the ratification of the Persian parliament England is taking steps to secure a majority of her own liking in the Persian Majlis. The English may have that majority and the treaty may be ratified but to us it seems that England's imperialism in Moslem countries may very likely be the first effective step toward the disintegration of the British Empire.

In her anxiety to "safeguard" her empire in India, Great Britain is destroying the independence of the Moslem nations, one by one. It is mockery to say that Afghanistan and Persia are any more independent than Egypt. To them is going to be added Mesopotamia and the "independent" kingdom of Hedjaz. Moslem Turkestan must follow suit. The whole Moslem world will thus come under the sway of Great Britain; the latter will make railways, and set telegraphic and postal communications between these

countries and thus realize the dream of Cape Colony to Cairo and Cairo to Calcutta. This will give the last finishing touch to the edifice of the greatest empire that the world has ever known. Then will begin the decline. The Moslems can *never* be reconciled to the destruction of their political power. The passive "loyalty" of the Indian Moslems has so far been principally due to the lack of free intercourse with the Moslems of other countries and their belief that Great Britain was the best friend of Turkey. That belief has been destroyed and even if Great Britain manages to let the Sultan retain the nominal sovereignty of Constantinople, which is problematic, the Moslems will not accept that concession as a mark of England's friendship for the Mohammedans. The young Persian's remarks on the subject are very significant. The British protectorate over Persia, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, Turkestan, and Egypt means for the Mohammedans numerous opportunities of intercourse and thus what is a misfortune, now, will, in the course of time, turn to be a blessing in disguise. The Hindus of India have already adopted an attitude of friendliness towards the Moslems and they will not do anything which is likely to hamper the Mohammedans regaining their independence in purely Moslem countries. England is relying on her capacity to purchase the support of the princes and the chiefs by guaranteeing their power, privilege and purse against the democratic wave, but she is entirely mistaken in her estimate of Islam and her potentialities if she thinks that in all Moslem countries she will succeed so well as she has in India. She may for the time being crush the feeling of Moslem resentment in India; she may base her calculations on her ability to crush the Bolsheviki in Russia; having crushed Germany and Russia she may feel safe in her friendship of France and the United States, but time only will prove whether she has not involved herself in entanglements which may sooner or later be her undoing. Filled with their victory the English are riding on a new wave of imperialism which eventually may be the last.

LAJPAT RAI.

## Nations or Members of the League?

SIR: One obscure point weakens the force of Dr. Kallen's interesting argument in favor of Article X of the Covenant (New Republic, August 6th): Does Article X guarantee *nations*, or *members of the League*, against external aggression? If it guarantees *nations*, then it may, as Dr. Kallen argues, guarantee security of internal change; and Mexico and Soviet Russia, outside of the League, are as well protected against interference in their internal readjustments as are Haiti and San Domingo, within the League, against annexation. But the extract quoted by Dr. Kallen from Article X speaks only of a guarantee to *members of the League*. How does that protect a Mexico, "significantly" not invited to join the League of Nations? And if Article X does not protect nations who are not members and who can be barred from membership as long as their ideas of "self-government" do not suit the great Powers, why should Article X have the support of liberals?

DOROTHY BREWSTER.

New York City.

## Bankrupt?

*Saint's Progress*, by John Galsworthy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

SOMETHING has departed from Mr. Galsworthy. When he began to write he was said in some quarters to be a man of medium intelligence and of limited capacity for experience. Obviously he had his decorum and his extreme repression. But there was in him that exceptional sensitiveness to people which is the essence of poignant fiction, and with it went social irony and courage and a delicate yet powerful strain of idealism. It was perhaps a slim gift of divine energy, but it was divine and it was energy and it ennobled his earlier books and plays. And then something happened. The thin cuticle thickened. The curious power of insisting on spiritual realities stiffened into priggishness or wobbled into sentimentalism. What was like Turgeniev in him eventually vanished like the dew. There now remains a facile, graceful, rather nerveless and distinctly complacent magazine storyteller who has practically ceased to be an artist but who still presents an accomplished imitation of the real thing.

Mr. Galsworthy knows his "upper middle class" England. He commands its idiom almost too easily and he is familiar with its habit of mind. He is touched with a poetic appreciation of nature and the natural beauty of trees and flowers, and the world is not so much with him that he cannot imagine and suggest the aura that so often escapes the realist. It is on the basis of these aptitudes and facilities that he produces *Saint's Progress*. But where before he would have approached his English group with a fastidious truthfulness he is now content to fabricate as he sees fit. His elderly clergyman, too intent on his ideals to be a humanistic parent, becomes a Saint drearily sentimentalized. The saint's daughter Noel, ("Nollie" for short), is a transgressor against convention to the extent of having an illegitimate child during war-time; but while exhibiting her as deeply in love with her soldier and his legal wife except for the father's opposition and the boy's sudden departure for France, Mr. Galsworthy also exhibits her as a guilty creature to whom he is sweetly indulgent. The man who eventually rescues her from her guiltiness is an almost laughably correct version of the strong, silent Englishman. The pathos of the happy ending is in itself not important, but combined with the polite death-bed scene at which the old clergyman officiates in the hospital in Egypt, it marks a deterioration in Mr. Galsworthy not to be disguised.

But in addition to the conventionalizing of these contemporary portraits in line with herd expectations, there is an actual vulgarity of attitude which is not uninteresting. "They had found their enchanted spot, and they moved no further, but sat with their arms round each other, while the happy Being of the wood watched. A marvelous speeder-up of Love is War. What might have taken six months, was thus accomplished in three weeks." If it is all right to "make Culture hum," it is all right to speed-up Love. But then why not say, "The armistice threw sand in Love's gear-box," or "At this point their Love took a tragic slump." Mr. Galsworthy is no longer meticulous, however. He gives us such platitudes as these: "Certainly Edward Pierson shrank from the rough touches of a Knock-about philosophy. After all, it was but natural that he should." And of the strong, silent man: "English to the backbone, he could not divest himself of a sense of guilt." Substitute for English the word Ruthenian or

Czecho-Slovak, and the silliness of the phrase is apparent. It is only one of dozens of banal phrases that refer to religion, patriotism, motherhood, love. On these topics, Mr. Galsworthy is now as almost as profound an authority as Mrs. Humphry Ward.

The vulgarity is most significant, of course, in regard to the war-baby. Mr. Galsworthy shows representatively enough how the herd operates in good religious circles. There is the shower of anonymous letters, the hounding of the Saint, the transmission of smug reproof from those in authority. Little boys call "bastard" after members of the family, and everywhere men and women punish Noel for being irregular. But where Mr. Galsworthy's tired middle-aged conception is different from his earlier conceptions is in the estimate he puts on Noel's own relation to herself. It seems to him quite right that Noel should be regarded as having lost something of her chastity. "I want music and dancing and light," she cries, and the Belgian takes her to a cabaret and orders her *crème de menthe*. This is the emphasis that Mr. Galsworthy always gives to Noel. She had an illegitimate child, therefore she begs her brother-in-law to "loose the goat." But in the end, naturally, the goat is tied up and Noel marries the man who is English to his backbone.

Even the elderly clergyman Mr. Galsworthy sees as he ought to see him, sitting by a Victorian death-bed scene. "In faith I have lived, in faith I will die." So he says, and shifts once more away from Pragmatism and, as Mr. Galsworthy puns, prig-matism. Mr. Galsworthy believes he has portrayed a pathetic outworn figure. The truth is, he has stuffed a traditional clerical shirt. F. H.

## The Progress of English Social History

*Education and Social Movements*, by A. E. Dobbs. New York: Longmans Green & Co.

THE reconstruction of English social history goes on apace; and it has now reached a point where a general survey of progress has become possible. In a sense, the revival of interest in the inarticulate masses is perhaps due more to J. R. Green than any other single historian. He at least it was who cared more for Shakespeare than for Agincourt, and realised that Wesley was not less significant in the life of the people than Chatham. Since his time much special work of superlative quality has been done. In his life of Francis Place Mr. Graham Wallas recovered a unique figure for English history; and it is hardly too much to say that his book has set the perspective of all later writing upon the period. Mr. and Mrs. Hammond have written books upon the laborer of the Industrial Revolution which are works of imaginative historical genius. The writings of Mr. and Mrs. Webb on local government owe more to their massive exhaustiveness than to subtleness of insight; but they mark an epoch in English scholarship. M. Halévy's volumes on the early utilitarians are a model combination of exact scholarship and brilliant interpretation.

Mr. Dobbs's book is not perhaps in the front rank of this arresting tradition; but it is with the best of such work that its kinship lies. What it lacks is sharpness of conception and finish of detail. It reads as though Mr. Dobbs had been so mastered by his material as to lack that art of omission which, as Stevenson says, enables the historian to make an Iliad out of a daily newspaper. There does not, as a consequence, emerge from his narrative so definite a portrait of the time as his reader will find in Mr. Wallas's book or