

using our old clothes; we couldn't; we have to keep them ourselves—has managed to keep the children clothed, is able to keep them, in some manner, upon the streets and fit for school. These are some of the conditions, and I am not facing those conditions on a salary of \$1,500, because I am able to make nearly half that much on the outside. I make nearly \$2,200 a year altogether, and yet these are the conditions that confront us. Even making that extra money, \$50 a month since the signing of the armistice, I have not been able to keep my family and give my children the schooling and the education they should receive. I only wish that the wives of these men could appear before you, and I am confident that our case would be fully and completely settled to our satisfaction.

Samuel Borowitz is a post office clerk in Station D, at 13th Street and Fourth Avenue, New York. He has been employed there for ten years. His present salary is \$1,500 a year. He has a wife and two children, one nine years old and one three years and three months. Four chief items of his expenses are rent, food, milk for the children, and carfare. He keeps an accurate account and finds that these four items cost \$118.80 a month, to be taken out of a salary of \$125. In addition, he has to buy his lunches. He goes to work in the post office at three o'clock in the afternoon and works until twelve o'clock at night. In the forenoon he works as a paper hanger. He found that he had to get some outside employment to make enough money to keep himself and his family alive. He gets up in the morning at eight o'clock and by nine o'clock he is leaving his flat. He does not get back until one o'clock the following morning. Between nine o'clock every morning and three o'clock every afternoon, when he must report at the post office, he earns about three dollars hanging wall paper. Then he goes to work in the post office at three o'clock. He says:

I am a pretty active fellow and can't be idle, but many a day when I am fixing up my accounts in the post office I will be falling over asleep. My eyes just close up on me. My record in the post office has been 100 per cent efficiency record. I had one of the highest efficiency records in the post office when I first entered. But I never did anything outside at that time. My record is not impaired yet but my health is impaired, because I have got to continue—I must continue working the same way.

W. L. Baldwin, a superintendent of the Tompkins Square Station of the New York City post office, whose salary is \$2,000 a year, plus the temporary bonus of \$200, is the head of the financial department of the postal station. On the day on which he was interrogated last September he had in his care \$5,168,000 representing the postal savings of 14,000 and some odd depositors. This station is on the East Side of New York. Pants pressers in sweat shops down there are paid \$48

per week for a 44-hour week. Mr. Baldwin is paid by the government \$38.75 a week for taking care of over five millions of dollars of savings. Mr. Baldwin and his clerks, with an aggregate annual salary of about \$12,000, take in for the government and pay out each day such sums as to give a balance of upwards of five millions of dollars. The station does a postal savings business of about \$20,000 a day. His station serves a postal population of about 250,000. Mr. Baldwin has been in the service forty-two years and nine months. He has had no increase of pay since 1898. He is now getting as much as it is possible for him to get under the law. He is sixty-six years and eight months old. He is hoping that Congress will pass a retirement law.

I take these stories out of scores because they are familiar to me, at my hand, and vividly illustrative. Apparently nothing can be done about it all until next year, when a new crowd with new brooms comes in.

It will be proudly said on the stump next autumn that Congress gave the postal service an additional \$34,375,087 in pay. So it has. That sum has been spread out among 300,000 men. But the core of their dissatisfaction has not been touched. Money alone can't cure the ills of the workers in the post offices. It is a bigger problem than that. Morale and efficiency must be restored.

EDWARD G. LOWRY.

Our State Department

“POLICY, policy, who has the policy?”—such is the cry one hears reechoed in the corridors of the Department of State these days as secretaries search for the magic diplomatic button left by their predecessors.

Lansing comes and goes, and Polk functions ad interim, and Colby enters for a brief spell, extending not later than March 4th.

What wonder that upon the interchange of notes with Chile only a few days after the assumption of office by Secretary Colby that *La Prensa*, of Buenos Aires, should admit in editorial despair the notes to be “the fruit of diplomatic inexperience.”

“The State Department,” the great South American daily remarked in a profound burst of logic, “never cultivated a diplomatic mode of procedure and does not possess a diplomacy.”

Thus inspired, it is not surprising that the same newspaper should further note that the State Department “is an organ of internal politics, rather than international.”

Beneath these attacks against "diplomatic procedure" and "internal politics" rests much the simpler and more basic deficiency expressed in the single word—"disorganization."

Confused by successive shifts in the directing head and overtaxed by the wealth of new problems created by the war, not to speak of the distracting diplomatic sideshow conducted by Congress, the disorganization of the State Department today is so manifest as to be cause for universal merriment were it not portentous of an international tragedy.

At the height of the Mexican revolution in May, a division of the Department of State was obliged to call upon the Military Intelligence Division of the General Staff to identify the Mexican official who, at the time, happened to be Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"It is characteristic of the epoch and therefore worthy of the historian's attention," said Dr. Dillon in *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*, "that not only the members of the Conference, but also other leading statesmen of Anglo-Saxon countries, were wont to make a very little knowledge of peoples and countries go quite a far way."

Dr. Dillon tells of how "during an exposé of the Oriental situation before the Supreme Council, one of the Great Four, listening to a narrative of Turkish misdeeds, heard that the Kurds had tortured and killed a number of defenseless women, children, and old men. He at once interrupted the speaker with the inquiry: 'You now call them Kurds. A few minutes ago you said they were Turks. I take it that the Kurds and the Turks are the same people?' Loath to embarrass one of the world's arbiters, the delegate respectfully replied, 'Yes, sir, they are about the same, but the worse of the two are the Kurds.'"

Such an anecdote, betraying the ignorance of those holding the destinies of the world in their hands, might be taken as typical of what occurs each day at the diplomatic sittings of our functionaries of the State Department. Not by any one man, certainly not by Lansing or Polk or Colby, for Polk has sacrificed his health in zealous devotion to the government service, and Colby, though but a short time in office, already displays extraordinary talent for grasping problems confronting the Department. It is of the Department per se and of its methods or lack of method that criticism in this instance is directed.

A new Mexican military attaché arrives in Rome and the fact is duly reported to the Department of State. Information of the officer's name is directed to the attention of the Division of Western Europe, comprising Italy. Absence of cooperation in the Department makes one forgetful that the fact

may be of some interest to the Division of Mexican Affairs.

In time the information drifts to Military Intelligence of the Army and there it is at once reported to the officers concerned with Mexico, as well as those interested in Italy.

What is an item of no significance to the Italian division becomes a matter for diplomatic negotiation once it is apparent from the past history of the Mexican officer that the "new military attaché" having formerly been a munitions expert, presumably was sent to Italy by Carranza to contract with the Italian government for the purchase of munitions.

A few days before the expiration, on April 10th, 1920, of the protocol concluded between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany on August 8th, 1919, for the occupation of the German neutral zone by German troops, Germany asks a three months extension of the time limit originally set.

The State Department concludes that in view of the disorder in the Ruhr district and the necessity for proper police protection, afforded by presence of the troops, that Germany should be granted the extension and therefore determines to make such a suggestion to the Allies.

A call is sent through the Department for a copy of the August 8th agreement. No such agreement is to be found. In the end the State Department is obliged to rely for its information concerning a protocol contracted by a State Department official, upon such of its contents as a captain in the Military Intelligence is able to recall from memory.

These are bright days for the Department. One is never quite sure that the new Holy Writ, the Treaty of Versailles, is always accessible for ready reference.

Adrianople and Kirk Kilisse, the President insists in his Turkish note of March 24th to the Allies, should be awarded the Bulgarians.

A foreign minister calls at the Department and gently suggests that the eastern boundaries of Bulgaria were definitely delimited by the Bulgarian Treaty, signed on November 27th, 1919, by Under-Secretary of State Polk.

There is a hurried search of the files of the Department. The repository of all knowledge, the newly created section of Political Misinformation is consulted.

There is no copy of the Bulgarian Treaty, signed on November 27th, 1919, by Frank L. Polk, Under-Secretary of State, to be found anywhere in the Department.

Now comes a modest request in the humdrum course of the day's business, when invitations of the Minister of Lapland to a Grecian Garden Fest

have been answered, for a list of the nations who to date have deposited acknowledgments of ratifications of the League of Nations with the French government. In reply the Political Misinformation Section sends to the division requesting the information a list of nations culled from the list printed in the Treaty of Versailles with the dutiful omission of China and the United States.

Then, upon objection, one hears that Paris must be cabled for the desired information. In the year of Our Lord, 1920, and of the Independence of the United States, 144, and in the month of April, apparently it is a matter of no concern to this government whether Greece and Rumania have or have not ratified the Treaty of Versailles. Nor whether the disputants to the Tacna-Arica controversy, Chile, Peru and Bolivia, are answerable to the League's authority.

Such, after all, may explain La Prensa's contention that the State Department "never cultivated a diplomatic mode of procedure and does not possess a diplomacy."

Certainly a diplomacy must be wanting where a knowledge of elementary facts themselves are absent.

A foreign diplomat tells of calling at the Department of State and lapsing with a prominent official into a discussion of Macedonia.

"But where is Macedonia?" the American diplomatist at length unsuspectingly inquires.

Though abashed, the foreign minister with no evident loss of savoir faire observes that properly to define that Balkan bone of contention, Macedonia, one must possess a map.

After fully an hour's search, a map of the Balkans is resurrected from the caverns of the Department's archives.

But such a map! Turkey still embraces Bulgaria, southern Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Albania and the territory about Saloniki, for the map is of 1870, antedating the Congress of Berlin.

If one were formalistic it might be proper to inquire whether if in 1919 the decisions of the Congress of Berlin concluded in 1878 had not as yet been recognized by this government, when, if ever, one might expect contemporaneous international events to be brought within cognizance of the foreign department of our government.

However, each day that passes bears with it a hopeful augury. Boris Bakhmetev, Russian Ambassador (Kerensky styled) to the United States, cables on October 4th, 1919, to Sazanov in Paris that he was told "confidentially at the Department of State" that Morris, American minister at Stockholm and "especially," Hapgood, American minister at Copenhagen, "are known to the Department to be personally of radical tendencies, but that they have no influence with the Department."

Robert Lansing was Secretary of State at the time Ambassador Bakhmetev was so informed, and it was but a few months later that Mr. Lansing was notified that he himself had no authority.

"Policy, policy, who has the policy?"

Is it any wonder that the old fashioned button game is a matter of paramount concern at present to our diplomatists?

BIRRELL LEFTWICH.

America Aids the Polish Drive

WHEN General Smuts, in another hemisphere and from the tip of another continent, sees what America is doing in the Polish-Russian situation, it is time for Americans to wake up to their own responsibility. Said General Smuts, in his remarkable interview from South Africa:

Here is Poland, starving, kept going by foreign loans, making war on Soviet Russia. . . . I am apprehensive. I see only chaos in all this, no authority or restraint. . . . French missions and American munitions apparently enable Poland to carry on her offensive for the present. . . . You cannot defeat Russia. Napoleon learned that lesson, and now Denikin and Kolchak have learned it too. Sooner or later Pilsudski will likewise learn the lesson. Then when Lenin and Trotsky are marching on Warsaw he will come to the League of Nations perhaps for help.

General Smuts must have seen Doctor Stocky's statement in the Daily News. Doctor Stocky is a member of the Ukrainian delegation in Berlin, representing the forces in the Ukraine which are working with the Poles. He declared recently, in answering questions as to Poland's economic condition, that the cost of the Polish-Ukrainian drive was much less severe than had been generally realized. "Poland," he said, "has been able to acquire from America vast deposits of war material which America had in France for a relatively small sum—only 200,000,000. [He did not say whether francs or marks.] Even this modest sum Poland does not have to pay now. She will only have to find the interest on the amount, and has guaranteed this with her forests and the Silesian coal."