

20 per cent of the total vote, and they elected 20 per cent of the members.

That proportional representation affords freedom of choice and a certain independence on the part of the voter is indicated by the Winnipeg balloting. An outstanding instance of this was given in the transfer of the surplus of Dixon, the Labor candidate. Dixon received 11,586 votes, being 7,274 more than he needed. As a result Dixon's ballots were reexamined to ascertain the second choices marked thereon. The result was as follows: Second choices for Labor candidates 1,075, second choices for Liberal candidates 368, second choices for Conservative candidates 310, second choices for Independent candidates 768 and non-transferable 67. This clearly shows that over 1,400 voters who originally voted Labor marked their second choices for non-labor candidates.

Another instance is found in the elimination of Jacob, another Labor candidate. Jacob's votes totalled 2,347 and were distributed as follows: Ninety-one votes went to Labor candidates, 147 votes to Conservative candidates, 1,770 votes to Liberal candidates, 188 votes to Independent candidates with 151 votes non-transferable. This result showed unmistakably that 18 per cent of Jacob's votes went to candidates other than Liberal.

The transfer of votes credited to Christie, a Conservative candidate, at the time of his elimination showed that 33 votes went to Labor candidates, 145 to Liberal candidates, 1,354 to Conservative candidates, 157 to Independents, with 37 non-transferable. From this it will be seen that nearly 20 per cent of the Conservative votes left the party at the time when the transfer was made.

In the last count, 1,867 ballots were non-transferable, or, in other words, exhausted. This simply meant that 1,867 voters lost their votes because they did not mark sufficient choices on their ballots. Many of them were content with just marking the figure one. With forty-one candidates it was necessary to mark at least ten choices on the ballot. Those who did not do that ran the risk of having their ballots used up—each of the candidates for whom they had marked having possibly been either elected or defeated. The result of the test of proportional representation by the electors of Winnipeg has created a demand for a further enlargement of the system throughout the Dominion of Canada and it is possible that this may be instituted in several cities when the next federal election takes place.

OWEN E. MCGILLICUDDY.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Tsar on the American Menace

SIR: I discovered in the attic the other day an old file of Harper's Weekly. In one issue (June 26, 1875) was an editorial comment on a Memorial Day oration delivered by somebody or other, in which the orator alludes to the hostility of Louis Napoleon of France to the United States during the Civil War, and to his attempts to persuade the other European Powers to recognize the Confederacy and thereby weaken our Government, which he regarded as a standing menace to the European theory of government.

Louis Napoleon approached the Tsar of Russia in this connection, "but," as the orator remarks, "the great-hearted Emperor was our true friend. He said to his Minister, 'You do not go far enough. Tell Napoleon that the republic has freely chosen its own form of government, and does not attempt to interfere with ours; tell him that they have as much right to their form as we have to ours; and tell him further, Prince, that if he attempts to interfere with them, *I will strike him!*'"

MERRILL ROGERS.

Westport, Connecticut.

The Two Andersons

SIR: What a difference between the two Andersons. the judge in Boston and the one in Indianapolis.

NICHOLAS KLEIN.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Anti-German Prejudice

SIR: Allow me, please, to submit an excerpt from a letter, written by the manager of one of the largest teachers' agencies in the country.

"I appreciate your frank letter. It is a matter of regret that I have been unable to render you more effective assistance. The fault has been neither yours nor mine, but, in my opinion, due to the fact that it would be generally supposed that you are of German descent. This I find to be an insuperable barrier, a stone wall against which one may throw his energies unavailingly. I am aware of the fact that there are many excellent gentlemen and most competent teachers who are of German ancestry, but the war is too soon over for anyone to expect prejudices and animosities to have subsided. I have had a number of men who were evidently capable and who, like yourself, presented splendid testimonials and record, but failed utterly to secure any recognition from places for which they applied. Only in rare instances where I had an opportunity to talk personally with the presidents did they give the reasons for the rejection of these men. In most cases they would say: 'I have no prejudice myself, but simply cannot afford to employ anybody of German birth or ancestry on account of the criticism which might arise.'"

Do you believe that a people which thus boycotts a class of fellow-citizens, and intellectuals at that, is really ripe for the "league of nations"? Do they not show themselves ripe for the continuation of idiotic hate?

PH. S.

Liberties Won by Our Fathers

SIR: There is evidence that the United States is about to deport a number of aliens who were rounded up as communists in the January raids. Among those liable to be deported are nation's of Poland and Austria, countries now suffering the horrors of starvation and diseases induced by the prolonged ravages of war.

The methods of the United States Department of Justice up to date in dealing with aliens under suspicion of being communists have been the grossest affront to every principle of American constitutional liberties. This may seem an over-bold statement. But it is supported by The Report Upon the Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice, which is signed by twelve reputable lawyers, among them Roscoe Pound, Dean of the Harvard Law School, and two other Harvard Law School professors, while the decision of Judge George W. Anderson, of the District Court of Massachusetts, on application of a writ of habeas corpus in the case of certain aliens and for a reduction of bail in certain other cases, corroborates the findings of these twelve lawyers. Judge Anderson's opinion, which was handed down on June 26th is reviewed in the New Republic of July 14th. This decision the New Republic declares, "will stand as one of the permanent landmarks in the history of human freedom."

Over and above the "illegal practice" of the Department of Justice in its dealings with the "Red suspects, of which the twelve lawyers and Judge Anderson give crushing proof, and which indeed were acknowledged to the Court by Government officials, Judge Anderson found a complete lack of evidence that the Communist Party or any of the communist suspects who were taken in the January raids advocated the overthrow of the Government by "force or violence" or had attempted or committed any overt act. They believed in "propaganda by words, not by deeds," so Judge Anderson declared. They met openly in halls, not secretly; not in armories, not in laboratories where explosives might be compounded. No weapons of "the cutting or exploding kind with which modern wars, insurrections and revolutions are carried on," were found on their persons or their premises. They did not advocate bombing or the destruction of property.

A further affront to American traditional and constitutional practices of fair play, attested by the twelve lawyers and by Judge Anderson and confessed to by Government officials under oath, lies in the swarm of "under cover men" (in effect agents provocateurs) who were let loose upon an unsuspecting public by the Department of Justice, and in the inspired propaganda alleging the discovery of a plot for revolution by force and violence, with which the Department of Justice filled the press.

In view of the above facts, Judge Anderson concluded that the Departments, both of Labor and of Justice, have committed an error of law in holding communists to be deportable under the statute enacted by Congress on October 16, 1918.

Until the decision of Judge Anderson is reversed by the Supreme Court, it would seem that the deportation of aliens upon the sole ground that they are communists should be stayed. And to this end proceedings are being instituted.

Already over and above large sums raised for bail an

expense has been incurred of over \$13,000, collected from the nickels and dimes of wage earners, in defending fellow workers threatened with deportation, and in caring for the families of deportees, left dependent in a strange land. The claim that the Department of Justice sees that adequate relief is given the dependents of deportees is asserted by the twelve lawyers to be without foundation in fact.

It is estimated that several thousand dollars may be needed for the new legal proceedings recently instituted. Once the facts are known to the public it should be easy to collect this sum from persons outside the ranks of the so-called workers, who love the good name of America and who resent a wrong done to a stranger within our gates, as a violation of America's most sacred obligation.

And copies of the Report of the Illegal Practices of the Department of Justice will be mailed upon request and the receipt of fifty cents.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS.

Boston, Massachusetts.

For the Women of Armenia

SIR: I want to write you an appeal to the Christian conscience of the women of America to come forward and use their influence to liberate the thousands of Armenian women and girls and little children who, two years after the cessation of hostilities, are still being kept in captivity in Turkish harems. This is not only an outrage to Armenia proper, but it is an offense against the honor of women throughout the world. I want to ask the Christian people of this country if the Gospel of Christ has ever allowed these outrages to be left unnoticed and unprotected?

The American missionaries did a great educational work in Turkey. This work resulted in the general progress of the Armenian people, and this progress made manifest in different lines resulted in the envy of the Turks, and in due course of time this envy gave way to massacre. It seems to me that here lies a responsibility of the American Board and the American people, as long as they are in a sense responsible for the conditions created, they are duty bound to do something to save the situation.

This question if left to be decided by men in Congress will not be settled to the satisfaction of the Christian conscience of the country. These men, under the influence of business interests, are apt to allow the American people to relapse into gross selfishness, without any concern for the miseries and terrors of the trembling hopes of humanity. Their patriotism, which cannot see beyond its own frontiers, is not sufficient to decide great issues. Edith Cavell said truly that even patriotism itself is not enough. Never in all history have the individual courage, the devotion and self sacrifice of the common man and common woman shown out so splendidly as now, but the great tragedy is that all these noble qualities have been ignobly used. Now that the influence of women is dawning, I expect a new era to begin for the United States and for the world, and as a test issue of this new era I propose the liberation of the Christian women of Armenia to be the first illustration of this change of attitude in the history of humanity.

Boston, Massachusetts.

DAVID LUKASIAN.

Hamlet on the Polish War

SIR: Hamlet, the Dane, for some years back, seems to have thought of the greatness of war and its value, human and commercial. The following from Scene IV, Act IV, might bear reprinting even at this age of the world:

Hamlet: Good Sir, whose powers are these?

Captain: They are of Norway, sir.

Ham: How purpos'd, sir, I pray you?

Cap: Against some part of Poland.

Ham: Who commands them, sir?

Cap: The nephew to old Norway, Fortinbras.

Ham: Goes it against the main of Poland, sir, or for some frontier?

Cap: Truly to speak, sir, and with no addition, We go to gain a little patch of ground. That hath in it no profit but the name.

To pay five ducats, five, I would not farm it; Nor will it yield to Norway or the Pole A ranker rate, should it be sold in fee.

Ham: Why, then the Polack never will defend it.

Cap: Yes, 'tis already garrison'd.

Ham: Two thousand souls and twenty thousand ducats

Will not debate the question of this straw: This is th' imposthume of much wealth and peace, That inward breaks, and shows no cause without Why the man dies. I humbly thank you, sir.

. To my shame, I see
The imminent death of twenty thousand men,
That for a fantasy and trick of fame
Go to their graves like beds; fight for a plot
Whereon the numbers cannot try the cause;
Which is not tomb enough and continent
To hide the slain.

J. L. K.

Venizelos and the Allies

SIR: As a Greek who loves his country and who has been distressed beyond any telling by the events of the past three years in Greece, I cannot refrain from expressing my gratitude to the New Republic for its editorials on Greece in recent issues. In this feeling I am certain that fully eighty per cent of the Greeks in the United States agree with me.

For five years, now, it has been a matter of despair for us that the world has been filled with the most far-reaching propaganda about Greece giving an utterly false picture of the temper of the Hellenic people, of their ambitions and their political intentions. This propaganda was launched by Venizelos in 1912, when he paid heavily certain French newspapers and certain British writers to present Greece's side of the Balkan conflict, and incidentally to advertise him as the one real statesman of the Near East. With men like Crawford Price and women like Demetra Vaka already enlisted as his propagandists, it has been simple for him to enlarge the field of his misrepresentations of the Greek state of mind, and to conduct a veritable campaign for the imperialistic policy through which he has hoped to perpetuate himself in a dictator's rule over Greece.

In this, of course, he had the full assistance of the London and Paris press so long as his policy fitted in

with the British and French designs to force Greece into the war whether the Greek people desired to go to war or not. But now even these supporters, both by their censorship of impartial dispatches from Greece and by their active spread of false news about Greece, are beginning to waver in their allegiance to Venizelos. The *Revue de Paris* on December 15th last published an article by General Sarraill which revealed a change in the French point of view toward Venizelos. The *London Evening Standard* of June 22nd contains an editorial entitled Greek "Help," which shows a shifting of British sentiment toward the purely imperialistic policy of the present Greek government.

There is, however, another phase of the Greek question which interests me particularly as a ship owner and a business man. I have taken the matter up in two editorials in *The Loyal*, which I send you. Greece today is ruined. There is no way that Greece can emerge from her financial difficulties save through a moral mortgage of everything Greek to Great Britain. It is, I believe, with full knowledge of this fact that the British government has supported the Greek claims in Asia Minor—knowing that even if Smyrna and Thrace and the Dodekanese Islands are ceded to Greece, Britain has only to put on the pressure of Greece's debt to British bankers to make these territories British colonies under the camouflage of Greek sovereignty, or better still, to make Greece what General Sarraill called it—a British dominion.

To any Greek who loves the independence of his country and who dreams of its future as a prosperous state, depending on its own resources moral as well as economic, there is tragedy in the prospect of a Greece mortgaged to a foreign power, no longer free even to choose its nominal rulers.

New York City.

D. J. THEOPHILATOS.

Russia's Motive Power

SIR: As far as I have seen, the writers about Soviet Russia, both friends and enemies, have failed to tell us the most important facts.

The Soviet Republic is a new venture—or experiment in social organization. Its success or failure will depend, on how well, and how rapidly, Russian industry can be developed to serve the needs of the Russian people, and if this can be done without great and permanent departure from communistic ideals. And this, in turn, depends on whether Russia, can reasonably expect trade to be so thoroughly to turn the wheels.

In the beginning of the war Russian industries, such as they were, were moved by English coal.

Not even the most optimistic advocate of "trade with Russia," can reasonably expect trade to be so thoroughly established that Russia will get enough manufactured goods from other countries for her needs, or that she can import enough coal to drive industries of her own. Motive power must be created within the Russian borders, or the Soviet Republic will fail—unless the rest of the world changes greatly.

If anything has been written on this subject, I have failed to see it. The nearest approach to the subject has been some articles about education. That Russian industries should break down, was a foregone conclusion, since they could not run without motive power. In fact, Russian industries began to break down as soon as the imported coal supply got low.

Omaha, Nebraska.

B. E. NILSSON.

A Greek Tragedy

Constantine I and the Greek People, by Paxton Hibben.
New York: The Century Company.

PERSONS well versed in world-affairs recognized from the start that, whatever its origin and whatever the issues at stake, the Great War was a life-and-death struggle, and that, being such a struggle, it would inevitably be conducted as a knock-down-and-drag-out fight, with no rules, and with gouging in the clinches. Menaced in their very existence, both sets of combatants were resolved to win at all costs, and neither set was going to jeopardize its chances of victory by respecting hindrances like neutral rights—if it thought the game was worth the candle. This may be deplorable, but it is a fact. Great ruthlessness is an inevitable by-product of Great War.

This aloof viewpoint of political technicians was of course not shared by the world at large. The various warring peoples were at once overwhelmed by war psychology, whose cardinal tenet is an implicit belief that you can do no wrong and your enemy can do no right. Even the neutral peoples were more or less in the same frame of mind. The psychology of America, predominantly pro-Ally from the beginning and becoming a belligerent in the spring of 1917, approximated the psychology of the Allied nations. Accordingly, we heard all about Teutonic ruthlessness, but virtually nothing about Allied ruthlessness. But today the war is over, the ban of censorship is lifted, and we begin to see the other side of the shield. A considerable literature is springing up, revealing the sterner side of the Allies' conduct of the war. In this literature Mr. Hibben's book, *Constantine I and the Greek People*, takes a prominent place.

Mr. Hibben reveals one of the grimmest episodes of the war—the dragooning of Greece by France and England to serve their war-aims in complete disregard of Greek wishes and Greek interests. It is not a pretty story. Yet it is a story that should be told, and by telling it Mr. Hibben performs a distinct public service. Persons who criticize books like Mr. Hibben's on the ground that they are a useless and mischievous ripping open of old wounds quite miss the larger issues involved. The war has left the world in evil case. One of the prime reasons for the world's present malaise is the persistence of numerous wrongs inflicted during the war under the plea of "military necessity." These wrongs must be righted before the world can get real peace. But before we know how to right them, we must discard our one-sided war-time concepts and learn all the facts in the case. And books like Mr. Hibben's are valuable aids to the acquirement of that fuller knowledge.

Mr. Hibben was well equipped for his task. Trained by long service in our diplomatic corps and in journalism, he was Associated Press correspondent in Athens from the summer of 1915 till the beginning of 1917. As the accredited representative of the chief news service of the greatest of the then-neutral nations, all doors were open to him. Politicians, generals, the King himself, welcomed interviews by Mr. Hibben as a prime means of getting their viewpoints before the outer world. Mr. Hibben was therefore very much "in the know" as to what was going on, not only in the Greek capital, but also in other parts of Greece, in Macedonia, and in Serbia, all of which regions he personally visited. Mr. Hibben's book is thus an eye-witness's account of the Greek tragedy from its early stages to its climax in the so-called "Battle of Athens" between the Greek and Allied troops on Decem-

ber 1, 1916. It is true that King Constantine was not deposed until the following June, some months after Mr. Hibben's departure from Greece, but this was merely a belated finale which previous events had rendered inevitable.

The term "Greek tragedy" is no overstatement, for the course of events in Greece during those stirring war-years 1915-17 has all the fateful urge of an ancient Athenian drama. Destiny seems to have so willed, and men move ineluctably toward a predestined goal. Two figures continuously occupy the stage—King Constantine and Greece's leading statesman, Eleutherios Venizelos. The Great War shatters their former good understanding. Once collaborators, they become protagonists of clashing policies. Venizelos urges Greece to throw herself into the war beside France and England, regardless of risks and confiding absolutely in Franco-British generosity for her reward. Constantine signifies willingness to join France and England, but only on positive Franco-British pledges of Hellenic integrity and the dispatch of enough troops to make a victory in the Near East a reasonable certainty. These pledges the Allies refused to give, and when Constantine refuses to aid them they turn more and more to Venizelos, "their man," and against Constantine, who is stigmatized as "pro-German." Gradually the drama unfolds. Venizelos tries to take matters into his own hands. Constantine dismisses him from office. Venizelos conspires against Constantine, backed by the Allies, who begin to put pressure on Greece. Allied violations of Greek neutrality, seizures of Greek territory, blockades, and attempts to disarm the Greek forces drive Constantine and his subjects into stubborn, embittered opposition, verging on hostility to the Allies. The wretched business culminates in the "Battle of Athens," where landing of Allied troops synchronizing with a Venizelist insurrection brings on bloody fighting between the Allies and the Greek loyalist troops. For the moment the Allies are repelled and the Venizelist conspirators are crushed, but the Allied vise grips Greece harder than ever, Constantine is dethroned and driven into exile, Venizelos is placed in power, and Greece submits to the Allied will.

Such, in brief, is a synopsis of the story which Mr. Hibben tells in graphic fashion and with a wealth of picturesque details. It is interesting to note that the body of the book was written immediately after the events described, in the spring of 1917, and was on the point of publication when (America having entered the war) "in certain quarters it was felt that its publication at that precise moment would embarrass our associates in the war." Its appearance was therefore postponed till the present day, though no textual changes have been made. A foreword has alone been added, explaining the reasons for its deferred publication and sketching the course of Greek events to date.

The book, as a whole, is well done. It is written in a clear, readable style, is carefully documented, and is unusually free from errors. Particularly good are the analyses of diplomatic situations, the different attitudes of parties and foreign Powers being excellently portrayed. The book's only noticeable defects arise from the reflexes of the author's own temperament. Obviously a man of strong feelings, Mr. Hibben seems occasionally to be slightly carried away by them. He makes no secret of his warm admiration for King Constantine, which sometimes appears to verge on hero-worship, while he equally does not disguise his cordial dislike to Mr. Venizelos. How-