

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXII

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1920

NUMBER 279

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Week | 169 |
| Leading Editorials | |
| General Wood Goes to the Voters | 172 |
| Senator France | 173 |
| The A. F. of L. in Politics | 175 |
| Rent and Housing | 177 |
| General Articles: | |
| The President's Industrial Conference..... | |
| Felix Frankfurter | 179 |
| America in Passaic | 182 |
| William Hard | |
| The Diary of Mrs. Randall..... | 185 |
| Francis Hackett | |
| A Death (Verse)..... | 188 |
| Clara Shanafelt | |
| Correspondence | 188 |
| Reviews of Books: | |
| The Negro Speaks..... | 189 |
| F. H. | |
| Three Younger Poets..... | 190 |
| Padraic Colum | |
| The Dickens Circle | 191 |
| L. N. B. | |

The Week

THE Treaty of Versailles is a Christmas stocking with no bottom to it. Each time you think it's empty, someone who really knows the trick produces a new surprise. Take Article 429, for instance. André Tardieu, member of the French Commission at the Peace Conference, draws Article 429 from the darkness and illuminates it with a new light. It represents, he says, a small compromise on Mr. Wilson's part. While the Senate was debating the Treaty M. Tardieu did not explain the Article. But it is of more than passing importance. "Read the text," he says, "and understand it."

THIS is the way M. Tardieu himself understands it: If, after occupying the left bank of the Rhine for fifteen years, France has "no other guarantees of security," then "such occupation might be prolonged until other guarantees exist, whether they are obtained through the coming into force of the American, British and French compact or other equivalent guarantees." Will the general guarantees of a League of Nations be sufficient? The inference clearly is that they will not. M. Tardieu demands the special tri-party alliance or its "equivalent"—that special tri-party alliance which was described to us as a purely temporary device to fill the gap before the League got started. In any event M. Tardieu apparently thinks that France

herself is to be the judge as to whether existing guarantees are or are not sufficient. "In a word, no guaranteeing treaties, no evacuation in 1935." Is this indeed what Article 429 means? Americans ought to be certain, before they sign a contract with Europe. Article 429 looks very much like another piece of French realism painted with the red, white and blue of Mr. Wilson's American ideals.

AT last, says an Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw, "the long-planned Spring attack by the Russian Soviet armies apparently has been commenced." A Münster dispatch to the Courant (Rotterdam) asserts that the attackers plan to be "at the gates of Berlin by the beginning of July." Where are they now? Not on Polish soil, or on the Polish frontier, but deep in the territory of Russia itself—along a line of which certain points are actually two hundred miles from Polish territory. For more than a year the Polish statesmen have been crying wolf. They have not been satisfied with the generous boundaries drawn by the Peace Conference. They want the frontier of 1772, and they have sent their armies to get it. During the next few weeks we shall probably hear a great deal about Russian invasion and "Berlin by July." Perhaps the Soviet armies will make real progress. But they have a long way to go before they have cleared their own territory of an invader. Until Polish troops are back on Polish soil it is Poland and not Russia that plays the role of the aggressor.

NO party yet can boast of victory in the German revolution. The Communists still hold a number of important industrial centers. At the same time the class they boasted they had crushed still walks unmolested about Berlin. Von Jagow and General von Lüttwitz are now explaining their positions in the daily press. The majority papers have at least a paper victory. But they do not deceive themselves about the fact that the effective power is still in the hands of the labor unions who can call the general strike, and the workingmen who

can comply with it so far as they choose. If the militarists and the partisans of the old order are still on the scene they know that it is because they are tolerated, and not because they have any power to improve their lot.

WILL the people use the power they have won again, or will they let the country fall back into the hands of those who have run it on the rocks in the past? The answer to this question will be found in the developments of the next few weeks. The great mass of the people were outspoken in condemning the militarist crowd. But they seem about as reluctant to follow the extreme Communists in a fight for complete overthrow of the existing order. The promise of a larger representation for labor in the Cabinet and of general elections in the near future contents the greater part of the workers. They regard this as a less costly way to record their gains than in further bloodshed.

THE proletariat represented by the Independent Socialists, however, demands much more. It insists that two members of the cabinet known for connections with large interests go the way of Noske. In forcing the withdrawal of the Bauer cabinet they scored a substantial victory. They now insist that the Von Kapp militarists appear before a workingman's tribunal. But most significant of all is their demand that the regular army be dismissed and that the workingmen be armed in their places. If this demand were conceded they would add to their strike control the strength of the army. The bulk of the radicals, however, do not appear to be inclined to hold out on this point. They are confident enough of their gains to look forward without anxiety to the elections.

DESPITE the protest of many groups in England and America, both Mr. Lloyd George and M. Millerand insist that the Sultan is to keep his hold on Constantinople. Mr. Lloyd George gives some disingenuous reasons why. He does not admit the pressure of French banking interests, the mutual distrust of the Foreign Offices, or the fear of British imperialists that England's hold on India is too tenuous to risk giving the Mohammedans a grievance. Instead he says that the decision to leave the Turk in Europe was made because the Allies did not want the expense and responsibility of governing Constantinople. President Wilson, in his present note has protested against this decision. Will the Premiers reply (politely) that having taken no share in the drawing of the Treaty we can scarcely protest against its terms? In the event of such a reply Mr. Wilson, we hope, will

point out to the Premiers that failure on our part to help draw the Treaty is no reason why we should be expected to guarantee, by League or alliance, terms of which we entirely disapprove.

IN his note to the Premiers on the Turkish settlement Mr. Wilson again insists upon the establishment of an independent Armenian state. Mr. Lloyd George agrees in principle, but asserts: "Up to the present we have only received requests from America to protect Armenia, without any offer to assume responsibility." That is true. From the start the American Senate has shown itself hostile to the idea of a mandate for Armenia and to any method of practical assistance that might serve as the equivalent for a mandate. But Mr. George has little justification for throwing stones at American policy. While he has been "awaiting America's decision," the British Foreign Office and a British army have cut off Armenia's gates to the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, and reduced the country to a barren plateau surrounded by hostile Mussulmans. Mr. George laments our indifference. Indifference is the last charge that could be made against the men who are now directing British policy in Asia Minor.

AMERICANISM, we are discovering, is not only intensely patriotic. It can also be intensely practical. Take, for example, that 100 per cent organization: The New York League of Americanism. This institution has "a fund of between \$100,000 and \$200,000 for propaganda purposes." "The Americanism part of it is a joke." The real object of the League is "to kill off health insurance and other fool legislation."—This is some of the evidence introduced in a report made to Governor Smith by the New York State League of Women Voters through its executive council and chairman, Mrs. Frank A. Vanderlip. The members of the Women's League believe their evidence to be reliable. They have, in effect, challenged the State to an investigation. At the very start of their career as voting citizens they declare they have been startled by evidence of an attempt on the part of organized "vested interests" to influence legislation through "a regime of pseudo-patriotic propaganda."

IT is not surprising that the League of Women Voters found the anti-Bolshevist crusade and high-minded organizations like the National Civic Federation playing a part (along with "Americanism") in the blocking of the welfare bills at Albany. The Lusk Committee, says the League's report, has used Bolshevism to spread "insidious conceptions" about the welfare bills and their advocates;

the National Civic Federation has served as a speaking-tube for the gentle voices of manufacturers who think health insurance akin to revolution. When the Associated Manufacturers and Merchants "investigated" health insurance in England, "it was specifically stipulated by Babcock [the secretary] that the investigators should be 'in harmony with our views' Babcock's attempt to get an investigator, qualified and disinterested, to prostitute himself to report adversely on the health insurance experience in England, was a failure. It should be noted in passing that the same Frederick L. Hoffman of insurance connections, who assisted Babcock in California, later went to England and through the National Civic Federation and elsewhere is making adverse reports."

IT is patriots of the calibre of Mr. Lusk and Mr. Sweet who are responsible for the trial of the five Socialist Assemblymen at Albany ("the Americanism part of it is a joke"), and who now bring forward five bills designed to head off the drift of public opinion towards health insurance, eight-hour days, and other "fool legislation." One of these bills aims to take care of the revolutionary school-teacher who might agree with Thomas Jefferson about the folly of suppressing free speech. It provides that all teachers—those now teaching and those who may wish to, in future—must apply to the state authorities for a license. Such licenses will be granted only to a "person of good moral character" who will support "the institutions" of the state and nation. At any time, "for any act or utterance" showing that he is "not loyal" to these institutions, the license may be revoked and the teacher be deprived of the starvation wage which is now paid him.

A SECOND measure proposed by Senator Lusk goes a long way around the legislative bush to put the Rand School out of existence. It rules that without first procuring a license from the state, "no person, firm, corporation, association or society shall conduct, maintain or operate any school, institution, class or course of instruction in any subject whatever." Moreover, no license shall be granted "unless the regents of the university of the state are satisfied that the instruction proposed to be given will not be detrimental to public interests" [i. e., tending toward none of this "fool legislation"]. Licenses, of course, are to be subject to revocation after trial—that is always the Mikado's privilege. And for teaching without a license, sixty days in jail or a fine of one hundred dollars is provided. One wonders just how literally this measure is to be taken. Does it apply to a parent who

teaches his child to spell cat? A parent is clearly a "person," the spelling of cat is certainly a "course of instruction." Will the jails be filled to overflowing? Or does the law apply only to the spelling of cat socialistically?

THE three other bills introduced at Albany are a little less startling than those which deal with schools and teachers. They are drawn along more familiar lines, providing for further "Americanization" and for a sharper watch on the criminal anarchists and the seditionists. Introducing these five bills, the Lusk Committee says:

The laws already on our statute books, if properly enforced, are adequate to protect the institutions of this State and to preserve the constitutional rights of its citizens.

One wonders, in view of that declaration, why these five measures were ever introduced. And then one remembers the only really salient factor in the whole affair. The Lusk Committee has a face to save. It embarked upon a riot of unwarranted searches and seizures. It produced no Bolsheviks. It can, it now proposes to demonstrate, at least produce some legislation.

WE doubt whether there is much political value in the way General Wood's managers have answered the charges of the New York World. Mr. Norman J. Gould, Eastern Manager of the Wood Campaign, does "not care to affirm or deny" the World's list of millionaire contributors to the Wood fund. He does not deny that a vast sum has been expended. In fact, he asserts that he would like to have it vaster still: "We have not collected \$1,000,000 but would like to have that sum to spend befittingly in bringing General Wood before the American people." For General Wood, according to Mr. Gould, "is America's foremost citizen." "There is a demand for him throughout the United States." Why is it that the managers of America's foremost citizen, in demand throughout the country, would like to have a million dollars to bring him before the people?

SENATOR BORAH has pointed out the one way in which General Wood's managers can meet the serious charges that have been brought against him. That is by dealing candidly with the public. "What General Wood and his managers should do is to come out, not with the ordinary denial, but in a public statement giving the public the names of the subscribers to his campaign fund, the amount of their subscription, and the manner in which it is being used." So far, however, there has been no sign of such fair dealing. General Wood says he

has nothing to add to Mr. Procter's statement, and Mr. Procter is content with stating that "General Wood is the candidate of the people." . . . "You don't have to beg people for their brutal and shameless money," says the Wood manager in New Jersey. "They literally throw it at you."

LABOR is profiteering as unscrupulously as capital. That is the burden of many an editor's song. Would you call \$9.79 a week profiteering? That is the average sum earned in 1919 by 1587 women workers in the confectionery industry of New York State—as reward for an average working week of 43.6 hours. Or perhaps \$10.58 a week is profiteering? That is what 3,313 women in the cigar-making industry earned, as compensation for a week of 46.8 hours. These figures, and others as shameful, are based on a survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and are now published by the Consumers' League in a pamphlet called *Women's Wages Today*.

IN all, the wages and hours of 13,322 women workers in New York State are covered by the Bureau's survey. What do the figures show, in general? Forty-seven per cent of these workers, in nineteen different industries, earned *less than 30 cents an hour* during the period covered. "This means," says the Consumers' League, "that even if the women worked the full 54 hours allowed by law, almost half of them were earning less than \$16.20. As a matter of fact, the number earning below a living wage is greater than 47 per cent." Many of the women worked less than the legally permissible 54 hours.

General Wood Goes To The Voters

THE net result of the South Dakota primaries was to show that no one of the three Republican candidates, General Wood, Governor Lowden or Senator Johnson, is the decisive choice of the voters. The three men are closely bunched, and none of them has even half the votes in his favor. Wood had the organization and lots and lots of money; Lowden had an organization and money; Johnson had almost no organization and little money. He gained steadily on the other two men, and secured an amazing proportion of the votes. If he can show anything like the same proportionate strength at the convention in June, Hiram Johnson will be the arbiter of the result. Unless great things happen he cannot himself be the nominee this year, but he will, if he can hold

his present pace, decide what other men shall not be the nominees.

If South Dakota is representative of the western sentiment, the minority which supports General Wood is on the defensive. The bulk of the Johnson voters would prefer Lowden to Wood, and the bulk of the Lowden voters would prefer Johnson to Wood. The reason is that a majority of the voters in the western country are moving today in response to an increasingly powerful anti-militarist sentiment. The best proof of this is the character of the campaign waged by the backers of General Wood. Let anyone who doubts this examine the Wood newspaper advertising in South Dakota, or the literature of the Leonard Wood for President Committee.

Take as a sample the four page newspaper issued by that committee at Mitchell, South Dakota, on March 10th, 1920. Johnson is hardly mentioned. It appears from this document that the contest is between Leonard Wood and *Colonel* Lowden. The Governor of Illinois was a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Illinois National Guard in the Spanish-American War. But General Wood is just plain Leonard Wood. The editors of the newspaper are consistent in making this distinction, in itself a pretty plain confession of how the majority of voters in South Dakota feel about a military President.

But they proceed. Seven times in four pages they print the following squib:

HOW WOOD AND LOWDEN DIFFER.

Leonard Wood does NOT approve of universal compulsory military training. Colonel Frank O. Lowden in two Chicago speeches INDORSED universal compulsory military training in a "POSITIVE, DEFINITE AND ENTHUSIASTIC MANNER."

The ordinary reader would, we fancy, gather from this that it was a fine thing that Mr. Leonard Wood did not approve of universal compulsory military training, and that it was a damaging thing to Colonel Lowden that he had twice indorsed it. The newspaper goes on to *prove* that Colonel Lowden indorsed universal military training at a meeting in the Congress Hotel in Chicago. "Mr. Lowden may pretend that he has never been an advocate of universal military training, but the record is against him." Why, one may ask, should it be so desirable to prove in South Dakota that your opponent is for universal military training, unless it is likely to lose him votes.

But Mr. Wood does "NOT approve of universal compulsory military training" in South Dakota. What does he approve of? First let the General's leading supporter in the state, Governor Peter Norbeck, speak (March 5th):

If the government offered to send your boy to the State Agricultural College at Brookings, or to some