

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXIII

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1920

NUMBER 291

Contents

The Week.....	134
Editorials	
Progressive Twilight	137
The Democratic Party: Lest We Forget.....	140
The Railway Dilemma.....	141
General Articles	
With the Original Cast.....Edward G. Lowry	143
China's Nightmare	John Dewey 145
The Allied Triumvirate.....H. N. Brailsford	147
A Ghetto Poet (Verse).....Marya Zaturensky	150
Keynotes	150
From the Massachusetts Federation of Churches..	151
Correspondence	153
Reviews of Books	
Guild Socialism and the State.....H. J. L.	154
Kipling's Pet Panic.....Rebecca West	155
The Hesitant Heart.....Louis Untermeyer	156
Mrs. Warren's Daughter.....S. C. C.	157

The Week

PRESIDENT WILSON'S interview makes it perfectly clear that there is to be no quiet substitution of a new management and new policies in the Democratic party, if he can prevent it. Wilsonism must be the chief issue. The Democratic Convention will have to find in the Treaty and the League Covenant, unamended, a perfect fulfillment of American war aims and of American promises to the world. It will have to stand for the administration of the Espionage law, for Palmer and arrests without warrant, for Burleson and arbitrary mail censorship, for Baker and sales on dubious credit of war material to bolster up Polish imperialism. It will have to stand for a record of unauthorized war upon Russia and a blockade which continues in force when the only European countries not opposed to it are France and Poland, and these for reasons with which America can have no sympathy.

IF the Democratic party must come before the voters glorying in all the sins of commission and

omission of the Wilson administration, there is no reason why the Republicans should make any special effort. They will win without raising a hand. The American people want a new deal. They do not intend to give up another four years of their history in order to enable any group of politicians to show how consistent they can be, in their vices as well as in their virtues. The only hope for the Democrats lay in the possibility that under the old name of the Democracy new forces might appear, powerful enough to break with the administration. A break, or utter defeat; that is the logic that confronts the Democratic leaders.

McADOO'S withdrawal from the race for nomination can be readily understood, in the light of conditions in the party. We may ignore his official explanation, that he cannot afford the financial sacrifice involved in running for the Presidency. There is no American who would not somehow manage to endure the financial sacrifice, if he had a chance of putting up a good fight for what he considers the most exalted office in the world. But McAdoo understands perfectly that whoever may be nominated on a platform of fulsome approval of whatever the administration has done or failed to do will serve only as a funereal sacrifice. And McAdoo is willing to let somebody else have that honor.

THERE was another possible course of action: to enter the fight for a more hopeful program. It is certain that McAdoo is not a thick and thin supporter of all the policies of the administration. He did not approve of the premature restoration of the railways to private control. His telegram on coal profits showed how completely out of sympathy he was with Palmer's idea of handling a strike. In published interviews he has exhibited himself as a liberal beyond the comprehension of the group around the President. But the circumstance of his personal relations with the President

makes it out of the question that McAdoo could lead the forces of reform within the Democratic party.

THE Wisconsin Nonpartisan League, under La Follette's inspiration, has adopted a platform which is as nearly as possible the diametric opposite of the Republican platform. It is definite and precise throughout. It favors the immediate conclusion of peace and resumption of trade with all countries; it opposes the League and denounces the Treaty "as a violation of the pledges made to the world and a betrayal of the honor of this nation"; it demands the restoration of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly; it favors the repeal of the Espionage law and Sedition act; opposes laws conferring on the Postmaster-General power to deny the mailing privilege without a judicial hearing; opposes deportation except for crime fixed by law; it demands the abolition of injunctions in labor disputes; it advocates ultimate public ownership of railroads and the gradual acquisition of stock yard terminals, large packing plants and all other monopolies; it condemns conditions which generate war millionaires, denounces usurpation of legislative powers by the federal courts and proposes an elective federal judiciary; it favors amendments to the Constitution extending the initiative and referendum to federal legislation and the recall to Senators and Congressmen. It proposes a readjustment of the pay of ex-soldiers making it at least equivalent to civil wages, and urges a deep waterway from the great lakes "thus making the primary markets on the great lakes equal to those of New York."

IT is understood that the vague Mexican plank of the Republican platform would be interpreted under Harding in a "forward looking way," satisfactory to the sponsors of the Fall resolution. Mexico will be expected to amend her constitution to suit our desires, and to give evidence of conservatism in the personnel and policies of her government. That she is apparently trying to do, at present. The men whom the government of de la Huerta trusts, and who apparently trust the government, are as a rule known as sane and level-headed. De la Huerta gives no promise of amending the Mexican constitution to the taste of American investors, but does give assurances that the clause in the constitution which has caused the most trouble, that relating to nationalization of the subsoil, will not be interpreted retroactively. That is all we can reasonably ask. To demand more would be to give aid and comfort to the factions opposing the government, which already exhibit formidable strength in the northern states.

ON foreign affairs the American Federation of Labor may be willing to have its thinking done for it by Mr. Gompers; but on domestic affairs it is not so tractable. By a vote of 29,058 to 8,348 it adopted a resolution declaring for "government ownership and democratic operation of the railroad system and necessary inland waterways." That is the Plumb plan, put in general terms. Mr. Gompers fought the resolution, but in vain. He might take what solace he could in his unanimous reelection to the presidency.

REACTION is the outstanding characteristic of the new German government. The Majority Socialists, while agreeing not to embarrass the government so long as preparations are making for the Spa conference, have refused to take part in it. The only alternative was a coalition of the three conservative groups, the Center party, the German Peoples party and the Democrats. The second of these is monarchist, but it has been pledged to stand by the republican constitution and not to use its official position for monarchist propaganda. Perhaps the pledge will hold, especially if the Allies recognize in Germany's drift to the extremes the result of a policy that left nothing undone to discourage and discredit the moderate democratic element in Germany. It is not too late to make a real democracy out of Germany, but time presses.

AT the Hythe conference, England, it is understood, is doing her best to bring France around to a realization of the futility of standing stubbornly on the Treaty of Versailles. The British view appears to be that important concessions in the matter of the indemnity should be offered the Germans at Spa. The peril of Central European chaos appears to the British of graver import than anything else. The French, on the other hand, appear most impressed by the danger of German military recovery. According to French reports, the Germans have much greater forces, and have retained vastly more military material, than the Treaty permitted. And the French demand first of all a military accounting. Beyond that they oppose any reduction in the indemnity that would defeat their hope of relieving their own treasury of a substantial part of its burden of debt. If they have to pay in full their obligations to England and America, they insist that Germany pay according to the letter of the Treaty. It is intimated that the French still desire to transfer part of the German indemnity to England and America in exchange for their own obligations. Apparently they refuse to recognize that such a transaction would be conceivable only if the indemnity were scaled down to bearable proportions.

LABOR internationalism is entering upon an ambitious enterprise in the transportation boycott of Hungary on account of the excesses of the White government. The world has long been familiar with international pressure applied through financial houses. That has sometimes worked. In Hungary not only the reactionaries but the political democrats are resolutely opposed to any yielding to labor pressure. They have reason to be. If Hungary yields in this instance, a precedent will have been established for a form of labor intervention that will greatly curtail the powers of political diplomacy.

POLISH forces, according to Moscow dispatches, have been retiring over a great part of the line east of Kiev. We may give the Poles the benefit of the assumption that this is merely a strategic retirement, since there was no object in remaining so deeply immersed in Russian territory after the loss of Kiev. The retirement could not have been effected, however, without the abandonment of some military supplies, which are difficult to replace, in view of Poland's lack of credit and the difficulty British labor makes about handling military supplies for Poland. We need not assume that there is any immediate danger that the Russian armies will invade Polish territory. But they exhibit sufficient force to warn the Poles that the present is not an auspicious time for grandiose dreams of the historic Polish imperial state.

WITH Belgium's adherence to the party which urges the reopening of trade with Russia, France is left quite isolated. She is not only isolated; she has been morally outgeneralled by Krassin. France is holding out for the assurance that the Russian government will pay the obligations to French nationals contracted by the old government. That is not in itself an innovation in international policy. The moral ground is not strong. Much of the money borrowed by the Tsar was employed to keep down the revolutionary movement from which the present Russian government claims descent. But there is a precedent in the time-honored practice of the Powers in saddling regions liberated from Turkey with a share of the Ottoman debt, contracted largely with evil design. The most serious weakness of the present position of France is that while she is asking Russia to validate those doubtful obligations she is egging on the Poles to keep up their war on Russia. Quite properly Krassin refuses to talk Russian obligations until France is ready to talk peace.

IN Turkey matters are going badly for the Allied peace makers. There is no Turkish government

really competent to give force to the terms of the treaty. England, France, Italy and Greece may claim Turkish soil, but the Turks mean not to give it up except under the pressure of overwhelming military force, and none of the western Powers is inclined to raise large armies for the purpose. The Greeks exhibit a willingness to provide the armies, at a price, but the western Powers are extremely doubtful about the fighting quality of Greek armies. For Greek imperialism is a highly artificial mood, imputed to a pacific people by Venizelos and the British and French foreign offices. As it now appears, the Turks are likely to get off with terms much less drastic than those originally drawn up.

ARMENIA will remain through the generations as the final proof of the exclusive devotion of Allied policy to Allied interests, not to the interest of humanity. Armenian assistance was eagerly sought by the Allies when the Turks threatened Russia in the rear. Armenian volunteers helped to win Palestine for British imperialism. When it came to the final settlement it was agreed to reward the Armenians by giving them just so much of Armenia as the French did not want, or as the British did not feel ought to be returned to the Turks. The final proof of disregard of the fate of Armenians is registered in the armistice negotiated between the French and the Turkish Nationalists. That armistice did not apply to the Armenians, who had fought by the side of the French. But we Americans have no right to throw stones. What did the Republicans at Chicago have to offer Armenia? Hollow words. It is said that when the subject of Armenia was pronounced in reading the platform, a cynical grin overspread the faces of the delegates. And we used to pride ourselves on American generosity, American humanity.

IN the case of the Michaels Stern Clothing Company against the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Justice Rodenbeck of the New York Supreme Court handed down a decision in favor of the plaintiff, making permanent the injunction against the labor organization and awarding damages to be fixed later. The decision is made to turn on the question whether violence, or its equivalent, was used by the defendants in pursuit of their object—apparently a lawful one—of seeking to unionize the plaintiff's shops. Apparently, we say, because one passage in the long, confusing decision suggests that the case would have gone against the defendants however free their action might have been of all trace of violence. "Monopolies and exclusive privileges are alike condemned whether accompanied by combinations of labor or capital." This

is à propos of the fact that the Amalgamated persisted in trying to dominate the plaintiff's shops in spite of the fact that the plaintiff had admitted the United Garment Workers (ad hoc, to be sure.) If all the Amalgamated had wanted was unionization, didn't they have it? If that is the way the law looks at the matter employers who do not want to be bothered by the effective organization have only to introduce an ineffective one in order to win the shelter of the anti-monopoly principle.

SCHOOL teachers in Lancaster, Pa., after futile appeals to the school board for a living wage, organized a union affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers. At last the board awoke. A union in a public service? Impossible. Once a public employee, always a defenceless individual, until some private employment rescues one from the work for which he has trained himself. That process, which has left tens of thousands of our schools without teachers, was sacrosanct in the eyes of the Lancaster school board. All teachers were given their choice: withdraw from the union or fail of re-appointment. The teachers, eighty-two in number, stood their ground and were dropped. This, remarks the local stand-pat paper, "should banish any hope . . . that they might be able to force the board to recede from a stand taken, in their judgment, for the best interests of *all* the people." Yes, and such action also banishes hope that our teaching profession will soon recover from the despair and lethargy that now lames its efficiency.

FRENCH and British experts, it is said, are agreed on fixing the total figure for the German indemnity. The sum, 120 billions of gold marks, looks inflated as compared with the 50 to 60 billions of marks that most competent economic authorities regard as the collectible maximum. But the discrepancy is an illusion. The greater estimate is the sum of annuities of three billion marks, payable through thirty-seven years. The lesser estimate is an interest bearing debt, with interest and amortization payments amounting to three billion marks annually. It would take about as long to extinguish the indemnity debt on the latter basis as on the former. But one hundred and ten billions looks bigger than fifty to the mass of the Allied public, who have been taught to expect large figures and are not expert in compound interest computations. The French still hold out for the right to increase the annuity—and reduce the time of final extinction of the debt—when Germany can afford to pay more. That, too, will no doubt be abandoned in favor of terms leaving no point indeterminate.

IF Senator Harding is elected President there is at least one mistake of Mr. Wilson's that he can be trusted not to make. He is incapable of putting into his cabinet men of abilities inferior to his own.

Progressive Twilight

MR. HERBERT HOOVER, in spite of his disappointment over "some tendencies that were apparent at Chicago" has decided to support Senator Harding for the Presidency. "I am convinced," he says, "that those of us, and I believe they are the majority of the party who hold more definite views (than those which prevailed at Chicago) could not, even were we so inclined, successfully effect the consummation of such views outside the party and that our duty is to bring them to realization within the party organization itself." He adds that "unity of action among the liberal thinkers of the party will insure the country against legislative reaction." The great majority of progressives so-called will undoubtedly follow his example. No former progressive leader, so far as we are aware, who has called himself a Republican during the past four years has announced his intention of bolting the nomination.

This decision is not a matter for surprise. As the New Republic pointed out in its last issue, there is nowhere else for them to go and nothing else for them to do. After their embittered opposition to Mr. Wilson, they cannot support the Democratic party; and even if they were inclined to bolt, the interpretation which they have placed upon their progressivism by their behavior in 1916 and since would render another insurrection meaningless and ridiculous. During the pre-convention campaign all the progressive leaders talked and acted as if their allegiance to the Republican party was more binding and more important than their allegiance to their progressive principles. This is only another way of saying that their progressivism has ceased to be a matter of common and distinguishable conviction. They divided their support among candidates as remote one from another in their underlying ideas as Hoover, Johnson, Lowden and Wood. If progressives could sincerely and intelligently support all these candidates, then they were separated one from another by differences at least as significant as the differences which separated them as a group from the conservatives. As a matter of fact, progressive Republicanism is indistinguishable from what would be called conservatism anywhere else in the world. Mr. Hoover proved this when he described as "constructive" and "progressive" a platform whose chief merit is that