

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXIV

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1920

NUMBER 301

Contents

The Week.....	27
Editorials	
Cox and Harding.....	30
"A Test of the News": Some Criticisms.....	31
Ponzi's Dupes.....	33
The Common Sense of Housing.....	34
General Articles	
Woodrow Wilson: A Tragedy...Alvin Johnson	36
Meditation in E Minor.....H. L. Mencken	38
German Coal.....Sanford Griffith	40
America and England: A Literary ComparisonJohn Middleton Murry	41
Senator Harding Finds an Issue (Verse)A. MacL.	43
Proportional Representation.....Owen E. McGillicuddy	44
Correspondence	45
Reviews of Books	
A Greek Tragedy.....Lothrop Stoddard	48
Modern British Poetry.....S. C. C.	49
Lord Grey.....H. J. L.	49
Ex Cathedra.....H. A.	51

IT is the White Knight's move. And obviously Lloyd George will need to move promptly and decisively or he will find the French ahead of him. We have ourselves, via a State Department note, "expressed the hope" that the Polish Government will find it "agreeable" to abstain from territorial aggression against Russia. No Polish reply has been received. But Marshal Pilsudski declares it would be folly "to halt on the Eastern front and maintain a solely defensive attitude." What is better is to march ahead "to complete destruction of the enemy." Meantime the ever practical French have told the Poles to get the best strategic front they can, regardless of ethnographic qualms of conscience. And at Minsk the Polish delegates flatly reject the Soviet peace terms—not alone the one to which Lloyd George objected, but all of them without favoritism to any one particularly.

The Week

IF Lloyd George and Giolitti are really out for peace with Russia, events of the week have given them every reason to go on. The Premiers had objected to Soviet insistence upon the creation of a "so-called civil army to be drawn from one class" in Poland. Mr. Balfour sent a note to Moscow. Did the Soviet Government intend to adhere to its conditions? He asked for an answer by Friday evening. The answer came on Thursday. The Soviet Government, this reply declared, "will not insist upon the clause referring to the arming in Poland of a workers' civic militia." That clause was the single one to which the two Premiers had specifically taken exception. But the Soviet note went on to say, "we never considered our terms as an ultimatum and are still, as we have been all the time, ready to discuss them with the Polish Government with whom alone we are treating for peace."

NOT without a protest will the President let Lloyd George call him inconsistent in respect to Russia. Most of the Washington correspondents agree about that. "There will be echoes of Lloyd George's charge," wires Mr. Michelson to the World, "that President Wilson was inconsistent in refusing to treat with the Soviet Government now, after having favored the Prinkipo conference." Mr. George's slur was "gravely discussed" by the Cabinet, and our Ambassador in England is on his way to ask some questions. The Times explains, unofficially, the attitude of the administration. In the case of Prinkipo—"President Wilson was willing to join with the representatives of the other powers to bring the Russian factions together—Bolsheviki and anti-Bolsheviki—in the hope that they would be induced to settle their differences among themselves and re-establish a united Russia which would be able to enter into relations with the rest of the world." And now—? Well, the

anti-Bolsheviki have disappeared—save for General Baron Wrangel—and that seems to settle it. There are no longer any factions . . . we wanted a reunited Russia . . . we have it. . . . At this point the argument leaves the track. Our new policy may be for better or worse. Not many people will be impressed by the claim that it is consistent.

GENERAL BARON WRANGEL'S latest captures in the South of Russia, announced in a cable to the World, include 6,000 prisoners, 30 guns and 100 machine guns. Regularly during the last two months such reports of Wrangel's captures have been coming in. No single report has made excessive claims; but the total captures, should you take the trouble to add them, make a most impressive figure. We have looked back through the files of the New York Times; they show that from various sources there have been reported in Wrangel's behalf—since the 13th of June—captures amounting to 58,000 men, 1,173 guns and 12 armored trains. 58,000 prisoners is more than the whole Soviet army in the south was reported to muster a few days ago. If Wrangel keeps on at his present rate we may yet have the American government inviting the Soviets into conference. For Wrangel will have disunited Russia, and a consistent American policy will require a conference among the various Russian factions to put it together again.

KOLCHAK was a greater menace to Soviet power than Korniloff; Denikin was a greater menace still; and now Wrangel begins to take his place as the greatest menace ever. "General Wrangel is the most serious danger that has confronted the Soviets," some unnamed French officer tells a correspondent of the Times. And of his own accord the correspondent adds: "Just how General Wrangel is winning the sympathy of even the most independent elements of the Russian people is seen by the following terms of the agreement he has recently concluded with the Cossacks of Don, Terrek and Astrakhan." Consider a few of these terms: All foreign agreements, both political and economic, are to be "negotiated and concluded by the Commander in Chief." All railroad and telegraphic communication is "intrusted to the authorities under control of the Commander in Chief." All right to issue currency is "vested in the Commander in Chief." The Commander in Chief, in short, seems to have done fairly well for himself. There ought to be a chart to show the way in which his program wins the support of "the most independent elements of the Russian people."

MEETING Governor Cox's charges of a vast campaign fund, spokesmen for the Republican party take several different tacks. In the first place they point out that instead of fifteen million or eight million, actually only a little more than one million dollars has been collected and the party has had to borrow money. This means very little. The accepted rule in American politics is to go ahead with obligations and look to the collections later. A million collected by the end of August is a substantial piece of work. In the second place, the Republican treasurer points out that Mr. Cox doesn't "know the difference between a quota and a budget." A quota, it seems, is a dream—something you hope to get, but don't expect to. There's a difference, certainly. Still, what the Republican leaders hope to get is more or less indicative of the sort of campaign they hope to run. Finally, there seems to be some distinction made between expenses national, state and local. This distinction is all right in theory. In practice money is money and votes are votes.

WHETHER Governor Cox "proved" as much as he set out to prove, and whether eight million or fifteen million is a legitimate campaign sum, does not matter immensely. The Republican leaders themselves have admitted budgets and quotas of a size sufficient to disgust most independent voters. What the present controversy has contributed to previous knowledge is chiefly more light upon the method by which Republican funds are being raised. "Harding and Coolidge," says a letter from headquarters, "have the confidence of the people; but, boys, get the money!" "The platform is sound enough to hold the weight of the nation; but, boys get the money!" Now is the time for all good citizens to come to the defense of their country. "Senator Harding's election involves just a few of the simplest principles of salesmanship." Boys, get the money.

IT is easy enough to say that these unhappy phrases come from the pen of a subordinate, and that they in no way involve the management of the campaign as a whole. The fact of the matter, in our opinion, is that slogans such as "Boys, get the money" are the inevitable result of the sort of organization Mr. Hays has built for the Republican party. Mr. Hays did not originate the idea of vast campaign funds. He had good precedents for that. What he did do, was to regularize the system and expand it. The Republican leaders imitate the modern merchant with his "scientific" technique. Vast organization, vast advertising, "the psycho-

logical approach," vast expenditures, and a made-to-order interest in the product—in the sense in which business men employ the term today the Republicans are "selling" a President to the country.

NEXT week the voters of five New York election districts will have a chance to register their faith in the processes of representative government at Albany. On Wednesday the five duly elected Socialist Assemblymen who were expelled last April from the Legislature, come before their constituents and ask for reelection. The Democrats and Republicans, forgetting for the moment the chasm which divides them when ordinarily they address the voters, have effected fusion against all five Socialists. In the face of this handicap it will not be easy to send the ousted Assemblymen back to Albany. But the special election gives the voters of a few districts an opportunity to uphold or repudiate the action of the State Assembly. The referendum should be on a wider basis. Only a small portion of the progressive voters of the state live in the five districts immediately concerned. Whatever happens to the Socialists next Wednesday, progressive voters throughout the state will have their chance in November. They can vote against every candidate who had a share in the coup d'état in April.

AFTER nearly three years of determined struggle the New York Call has won its fight for a restoration of the second-class mailing privileges. Mr. Burleson denied those privileges, and a piously democratic administration sustained him in his action. The course followed by the Postmaster General has been bureaucracy at its worst; for it has been cowardly bureaucracy. Mr. Burleson apparently lacked the courage to bring the editor of the Call into court and charge him with "sedition." He worked indirectly. Denying second-class mailing privileges was a blow at the paper's income, and it came near being a mortal one. What Mr. Burleson assumed was this: that the Espionage act gave him power to issue a blanket order operating in future upon copies of a publication not yet in existence. No assumption is more dangerous to democratic principle; and Mr. Justice Hitz of the District of Columbia Supreme Court, denies that the assumption has a legal basis. His opinion is clear and unequivocal. Mr. Burleson is taken down a peg. If he now carries his case to the federal Supreme Court he will take action in which all partisans of American liberty have an interest.

IN an early issue we hope to publish an article from England, discussing the measure and character of independence which the British Government has agreed to recognize in Egypt. For the present we have only reports in the London Times to give us information, and those reports are so brief as to be almost cryptic. Great Britain, apparently, will still maintain at least one garrison in Egypt. And Egypt is to "recognize Great Britain's privileged position in the valley of the Nile and agree, in case of war, to afford every facility for access to Egyptian territory." There is to be a British High Commissioner in Egypt, with power to veto "legislation affecting foreigners." And Great Britain must be consulted in the business of making treaties. This is about all the information, none of it specific, with which London cables have supplied us.

"IT is not generally understood," reads a statement issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, "that the number of political and industrial prisoners in the United States, sentenced merely for the expression of opinion or membership in an organization, has been steadily increasing. There are many more convictions now under state and local laws than there were under federal law." Conviction is one thing, trial before conviction another. Whatever the offense charged in any instance, the political or industrial prisoner deserves a fair chance with any other prisoner to secure legal defense and to prepare his case. He needs bail, in other words; and he needs bail if he is to have an equal opportunity with other prisoners to secure release from long imprisonment during the pendency of appeals.

SURETY companies ordinarily refuse to go bail in the case of political prisoners; premiums are frequently beyond the means of the defendant; and it is to provide an entirely legitimate measure of protection that the American Civil Liberties Union is now proceeding to organize a national bail fund to serve in such cases. The management of this fund will be in the hands of a committee of trustees responsible for its administration. The risk involved to those who make the loans will not be great, the Civil Liberties Union asserts, since all subscribers "will share together any loss which might be entailed by the forfeiture of a bond. That would mean only a very slight risk for the individual, judging by the record so far in case of political prisoners. We know of only three bonds forfeited in the past three years, out of hundreds of cases." Not defense of any economic or political doctrine, but fair trial for every prisoner is what the Union hopes its bail fund may provide.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION reports show that the coal operators of West Virginia and the jobbers who handle their output are not suffering heavily from the profiteering hand of labor. The Commission has compiled figures based upon information obtained from sixty-one operators in the West Virginia field. The average reported sales realization of these operators was \$3.40 a ton. The average f. o. b. cost at the mine was \$2.53. The margin therefore was 87 cents a ton. For this coal the Shipping Board has had to pay \$20 a ton at Hampton Roads. Freight may add \$2 to the price at the mine, and bring coal to Hampton Roads at about \$5.40 a ton. Between \$20 and \$5.40 there is a substantial margin. Margin is not the same as profit, to be sure, since there are certain items such as selling expense and interest on borrowed capital which need to be deducted. Still, a neat profit must remain. Figures such as these are poor material with which to buck up the morale of labor.

THIS report of the Federal Trade Commission is particularly pertinent in view of the strike now threatening the coal industry. Representatives of 175,000 anthracite miners, assembled at Wilkes-Barre, on Sunday of last week, urged the President to accept the minority report of the commission appointed by him to make an award. That minority report provided for wage increases of 31 per cent. The majority report stopped with increases of from 17 to 20. The difference is substantial. In his reply to the miners the President does not contend that it is too generous. He rests his case on the fact, a convention of miners of Districts 1, 7 and 9 had "solemnly obligated the mine workers to abide by the award." "By all the laws of honor upon which civilization rests that pledge should be fulfilled."

WHAT is threatening in the situation, so far as a possible strike is concerned, is that the regularly constituted leaders of the Mine Workers have lost caste with their following. Is it any wonder? They have been flouted in their demands for an early consideration of the merits of the miners' demands, brought into court by injunctions of the federal government, accused by federal officers of being traitors to their country. Meantime the mine owners have made vast profits. If any body of workers had reason to believe their official leaders were impotent to secure them a fair hearing, those workers are the miners. It is perfectly proper to talk about laws of honor and abiding by an award. But now, at a time when confidence is badly needed, we may reap the reward of eight months' folly.

Cox and Harding

THAT Mr. Harding finds the business of thinking difficult is plain from his speech about the League. He suffers under a number of severe handicaps. He has never, for instance, mastered the English language. It is no question of style or grace or imaginative power. It is a question of using words to define ideas. Mr. Harding's words bubble and splash all around his thought, leaving the reader baffled. His intention eludes you in a spray of polysyllables and ambiguities. He is not only unable to say what he thinks, he seems at the same time not to know just what he thinks. The Senator apparently illustrates the claim of many psychologists that without language the mind cannot function.

His impediment of speech is aggravated by the conflicting interests in his own party. Somehow Mr. Harding has to reconcile views as divergent as those of Messrs. Taft, Johnson, and Lenroot. But that is not all. He has to reconcile his own votes for the League and Mr. Root's work for the League with a party position that will create a definite issue against the Democrats. All this is admitted and well understood. Mr. Harding shows signs of having worked fairly hard himself and of having listened to much advice as to how best to resolve the tangle.

His conclusion, after much "wiggling and wobbling" seems to be that the whole subject needs to be reconsidered afresh. He feels vaguely that there is something radically wrong with the settlement at Versailles, and something sinister in an executive committee of Allied Prime Ministers to govern the great affairs of the world. He has heard someone say that the core of the League is a group of politicians acting within the terms of the League when convenient, outside the League as allies when it suits them. He wants somehow somewhere in some way or other to establish an institutional procedure that will be superior to the political aims of a group of great Powers. He frankly does not know exactly what he wants; and consequently he does not know how to do it, and all that he is certain about on August 28th is that he will not accept the moral-legal obligations which he reads in the Covenant. But he does think that the Republicans after March 4th next would try hard. And behind it all there may be a plan of international organization worked out by Mr. Root, alluded to often but not yet described. Mr. Harding's speech may be the dim and confused anticipation of something worth the most unprejudiced and hospitable attention, for Mr. Root is no amateur in these matters, and the work he is undertaking at the culmination