

invade the United States (in the headlines) was on December 30th of last year. Then headlines over a special cable from Riga declared: "Reds Seek War With America"; and promptly in its editorial the next day the Times asserted: "Mr. Lloyd George has announced that the Allies are going to keep their hands off Russia; but Russia will not keep her hands off us."

What happened upon this, the occasion of a second threatened invasion of America?

"Tall Talk on the Borders" was the title of the Times' editorial; and that editorial went on to say:

There is trouble enough in Poland and parts adjacent without giving full faith and credence to all the large language used by Bolshevik Commissars and Generals near the East Prussian frontier, as reported mainly by German newspapermen. . . . Bolshevik officials say that when they have finished their war with Poland they will demand from Germany the right of passage for their troops to attack France. This will be refused; they will then start a revolution in Germany, enthrone Spartacus at Berlin, break down the Rhine barrier, cross the Channel to explain to British labor the metaphysical differentiation between regular Communists and "lackeys of the bourgeoisie," and finally clean up America. This is a dark prospect, and there are doubtless Bolshevik enthusiasts who would like to make it a reality. But there are probably not enough of them to get very far, even in topsy-turvy Russia. . . .

In other words, don't take our news too seriously.

This is a good sample of that note which it seems to us is now appearing on the editorial page of the Times. Let us take another instance.

On August 26th the Times carried an Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw, under the heading "Defeat Fails to Move Red Envoys." Negotiations at Minsk were being delayed. Whose fault? Clearly Russia's. That was decidedly the tone of the dispatch. "Polish victories over the Soviet armies which invaded Poland apparently have not affected the Bolshevik delegates at the peace conference being held in Minsk. . . . The Foreign Office announcement said the Soviet delegates are continuing to put difficulties in the way of Polish communication with Moscow. . . ." That the Poles had any share in delaying negotiations, the correspondent did not even remotely suggest. The Poles, it seemed, were altogether ready to go ahead, if only the Russians would let them. But the Times, apparently, was unwilling to leave this impression with its readers. Editorially, the next day, it said (*italics ours*):

Nobody concerned in the peace negotiations at Minsk seems to be in any great hurry about stopping the war. The Russians, despite the changed military situation, apparently still insist on talking as if they were the

conquerors; the Poles, encouraged by brilliant but not necessarily decisive victories, are seemingly inclined to forget that one campaign may not be final. . . .

In the sort of editorial comment upon news dispatches which these quotations typify perhaps many readers will find nothing unusual. To those, however, who have followed carefully the Times' handling of the news from Russia they mark what may fairly be called a development of recent date. Sporadically in the past the Times has weighed and judged its own news dispatches; the practice, recently, has become almost a habit.

What it indicates, we do not know. Perhaps the Times, reviewing the dispatches it has printed, has itself turned sceptic. Peace with Russia it still opposes. That is not what interests us. We have discussed not the editorial policy of the Times, but the policy of editor towards reporter. And here we note a change. On its editorial page the Times is increasingly wary. It points to the sources of news dispatches; it sometimes brands them as unreliable; it implies that here and there is propaganda—puts a pinch of salt on the most sensational of stories. It is, in other words, using its editorial page to evaluate its news. That is the next best thing to raising the standard if the news itself.

The Shipping Board Welches

SINCE Attorney General Palmer procured an injunction against the striking coal miners, nothing has happened which has as seriously impugned the good faith of the administration in its dealings with organized labor as the recent announcement of Admiral Benson that the Shipping Board would withdraw from the National Adjustment Commission.

During the war the 100,000 dock workers in the ports of the United States were in a vitally important strategic position. They controlled the neck of the bottle through which supplies and munitions must be poured into Europe. A longshoremen's strike of magnitude might well have been fatal to the Allied cause. They were largely casual workers, badly paid, many of them aliens, and it was highly doubtful to what extent either appeals to patriotism or compulsion would be effective.

In this emergency the government took what was then a bold and revolutionary step. It enlisted the aid of the longshoremen's union in maintaining free transport through the Atlantic ports. The National Adjustment Commission was set up, in August, 1917, by agreement between the International Longshoremen's Union and private ship-

owners, and the government departments interested in shipping. The chairman was appointed by the Shipping Board, the union president was a member; the War Department was represented and the private steamship owners were represented. By the agreement all parties pledged themselves to submit all disputes which might arise to this Commission, to accept its decision as final, and in all events to continue work uninterruptedly pending action by the Commission.

The agreement was a signal success. In a time when labor shortage, rapidly advancing living costs and a general ferment of unrest combined to render the labor situation precarious in all industries and all countries, the docks were all but immune. During the war and armistice period there was only one strike, involving the piers of one steamship company at New York, and lasting only a few days. There were disputes, some of them acute, and oftentimes strikes were barely averted, but the disputes were fought around the Commission table, and when a decision was reached, the union officials became the strongest ally of the government in getting the men to go on with their work.

To persuade the longshoremen's union officials to join in this far-reaching arbitration agreement was not at first easy. The government was asking them to surrender their position of temporary strategic advantage, and forego the immediate gains which a more aggressive policy might have achieved. It had done little to improve their lot in the past, and hence had slight ground to appeal to their sense of gratitude. Those were the days, therefore, of fair promises for the future. Today, the longshoremen were told, you have the whip hand, but you realize that conditions are abnormal. The intense demand for ocean transport is a transitory one. Soon the war will end, peace-time conditions will return, and perhaps prolonged commercial stagnation and unemployment. Then the shipowners will have the whip hand. There will again be a chronic surplus of dock labor, wages will again relapse to the starvation level and you will be helpless. If you now agree that wages and working conditions shall be based upon considerations of justice and fair dealing, rather than upon economic force, you may be temporarily the losers. But later on, when the tables are turned, you will be the gainers, for the employers will not then be able to use their improved economic position to destroy the gains you will have achieved.

Again and again this argument was used by government officials. It was indeed the keynote of the whole campaign among the dock workers. Yet

today, when the conditions which were forecast are in process of realization, the government announces that it will scrap the machinery so elaborately set up.

The private steamship owners are willing to keep faith. They have recognized that it is better to deal with a strong, organized group, pledged to observe a treaty of peace, than with a disorganized horde of workers free for guerilla warfare. The employing deepwater steamship owners and stevedores of New York have gone on record as favoring a continuation of the agreement. But Admiral Benson, who has brought with him to the Shipping Board the autocratic traditions of the Navy, cannot brook the idea of submitting a dispute to an impartial tribunal. He has nothing to arbitrate. He has announced that he will henceforth deal by negotiation with the longshoremen, free from any obligation to arbitrate. Such a negotiation rests ultimately on economic force, and no doubt Admiral Benson realizes that today, with ships lying idle in our ports, the balance of economic force is on the side of the employers.

The situation is one in which President Wilson should intervene, if he still has a particle of authority over his administrative subordinates. Admiral Benson was not in office when the pledges to the organized dockmen were made, but President Wilson was. It is his responsibility to see to it that the government departments keep faith in their dealings with organized labor. Promises are promises, and the government cannot escape them by merely changing the personnel of its administrative departments. If the government establishes a reputation for bad faith in industrial matters its authority is at an end, and organized labor will inevitably be driven into rebellion against constitutional and orderly methods.

The New REPUBLIC *A Journal of Opinion*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1920, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN JOHNSON

CHARLES MERZ
WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL

SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS, CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

California and the Japanese Problem

BECAUSE the question of Japanese immigration has been agitated chiefly by California, there is a tendency to regard it as a local California question, whose importance Californians exaggerate, from a too-near perspective. As to its local aspects, this may be conceded. The Californian who would risk the peace of the world because he is annoyed by too many Japanese neighbors at Florin or San Gabriel must not expect sympathy except from the few others similarly situated. And of course any pretense that Occidental civilization is staggering under the burden of one or two hundred thousand industrious and generally law-abiding Japanese is too absurd to be regarded as anything but hysteria. If this were all, Californians would deserve the serene condescension with which their appeals are too often met.

What thoughtful Californians contend is that this is not all, and that in its larger aspects the Californian, not the provincial eastern view, presents the truer perspective. In this we are joined by all the English-speaking white peoples bordering the Pacific—by Washington, Oregon, British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand. These peoples are only a small part of the white race of the world. But they are its vanguard and its whole representation on the shores of the Pacific. And they are unanimous in demanding the support of the American Union and of the British Empire in excluding Japanese and Chinese immigration.

They all need immigrants, and they all reject those immigrants who are nearest and easiest to get and whose labor, if admitted, would produce immediate and great prosperity in their several commonwealths. Whatever the abstract merits of this race question, at least there is only one concrete opinion on it among the outpost peoples of the white man's world.

In California the situation presents itself under various aspects, some of which are confessedly local and temporary. There are perhaps a hundred thousand Japanese in the state (no one knows the real number) mostly industrious and useful people. Some of them are engaged in business or professions and some in skilled mechanical trades, but most of them are farmers. As farm laborers they scatter everywhere, but as farm owners or renters they tend to concentrate in a few districts, and to Hawaiianize these. As laborers and as renters the larger land owners welcome them. As land owners, nobody wants them, and as land renters

nobody wants them for neighbors. The reasons are partly economic. They underlive and overwork their white competitors. But they are mostly racial.

Right or wrong, our people will not live with those of a physically different race except on the basis of that race's inferiority. Since the Japanese are not inferior, and are in some respects superior, there is friction. Seven years ago California passed an alien land law, forbidding land ownership by "aliens ineligible to citizenship" (which means Japanese) and restricting their right to lease land to three years. Ingenious lawyers found ways of getting around these inhibitions by putting title in the name of native-born minor children and naming their parents as guardians. So there is an initiative law now before the people, limiting guardianship over real-estate to persons eligible to own real property, and abolishing the leasing privilege entirely. The initiative will undoubtedly pass, but it will have little effect. Leases will be changed into contracts ostensibly for personal employment, and other forms of guardianship will be devised. Nothing will have happened except the impressive declaration of the people of California that they do not want the Japanese.

So far as the Japanese now here are concerned, this is all; and it is not much. Willingly or unwillingly, we shall have to make a place for them in our industrial structure, and they will fill it well—too well to suit us. If this is all, we can stand it, and it may even be good for us. Certainly it is California's business whether we face the problem wisely and reap the benefits or foolishly and take the consequences. Either way, if the Japanese do not increase we can take care of those who are here. The only great thing is to be sure that there shall be no more of them. And over that not California, but the nation, has jurisdiction. On this our appeal to the nation at-large is based.

The possibilities of increased numbers are three—the birth rate; smuggling in violation of the "gentlemen's agreement," and a letting down of the immigration bars, under the plea that whatever laws we pass must not discriminate between races.

Statistically, the birthrate looks startling. Mr. V. S. McClatchy has presented figures to show that in a few generations the Japanese will be most of the population of California. To which Mr. John