

READERS of the New Republic will remember the article A Deportation and the Aftermath in the issue of August 2nd. The subject of the deportation, John Yerob, after being taken to Germany, made his way to Mexico and thence to Portland, Maine, where he made application for repatriation, and where he is now in jail awaiting the pleasure of the federal authorities. Those interested in securing a reversal of a decision which seems to have been stupidly and cruelly wrong, should write to Mr. E. J. Henning, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Washington.

IN Massachusetts Henry Cabot Lodge is a candidate for a sixth term in the Senate. He is peculiarly opprobrious to the Wilsonians because after committing himself to the idea of the League of Nations, he became the chief instrument in defeating its practical realization. The course of the campaign will give evidence on the vexed question of the present hold of the League on the voters, and its availability as a future campaign issue. It is open to Mr. Lodge to present himself as a sincere friend of the League and to throw upon Wilson the burden of its defeat, owing to his stubborn refusal to accept reservations which were acceptable to the other powers. He may pride himself upon the defeat of the covenant, accomplished through his alliance with the Bitter Enders. He may seek to ignore the matter altogether. If the Democrats have the wit to nominate against him Sherman P. Whipple, leader of the Suffolk County Bar, he will have an opponent relentless and remorseless, who may be trusted to see that the campaign is fully significant of its issues.

ACCORDING to the Times of August 15th, when the paragraph of the tariff bill taxing rosaries, chaplets, etc. was reached it became apparent that a determined effort would be made to place those articles on the free list. Consideration was therefore postponed to the morrow. It might profitably be adjourned sine die. There are many more pernicious paragraphs in the tariff bill, but none that is quite so disgusting.

CERTAIN French publicists are coquetting with the notion that in the event of a break with England, France would be able to form a continental bloc with the Little Entente nations, thus leaving England isolated. But history shows that England never permits herself to be isolated. France was isolated once before, and dragged down to ruin. Germany isolated herself, and fell. But England has the instinct of coalitions. Suppose that France attaches to herself all the new nations created by

the war, where would England look for a counterpoise? Necessarily to Germany and Russia.

THE General Conference of the Fellowship of Reconciliation will be held from September 7th to September 11th at the George School, Pennsylvania. The situation of the school near Newtown, twenty-five miles from Philadelphia, is admirable for the meeting. The general subject, "Creating the Cooperative Life," will be opened by Jerome Davis of the Department of Sociology, Dartmouth College, in an address on "How People Are Educated." The problem of cooperation in the school, the home, the church and the community will be considered in further meetings. "The Building of the International Mind" is the subject of a report by John Haynes Holmes and J. Nevin Sayre. The conference promises to be useful and inspiring.

Who Blocked Railway Settlement?

ON MONDAY, August 14th, the New York Times headed its strike column: "Rail Peace Fails. Unions Reject Harding's Plan." On the same morning the New York Call carried as its heading "Roads Again Block Peace. Rail Executives Won't Set Up Joint Tribunal." Between these two views of the situation the other newspapers occupy a neutral position, contenting themselves with describing the situation as a deadlock and predicting a fight to a finish. In these circumstances it becomes of some interest to review the moves on the chessboard since August 1st and see in precisely what relation the pieces stand to each other.

The President's proposal of August 1st, it will be remembered, consisted of three conditions:

- 1st. Both parties to recognize the validity of all decisions of the Labor Board.
- 2nd. The carriers to withdraw all suits growing out of the strike; and Labor Board decisions made during the strike to be submitted to the Board for rehearing.
- 3rd. All employees now on strike to be returned to work with seniority and other rights unimpaired.

These proposals were accepted by the strikers but the third condition was rejected by the rail executives, who referred to the resolution of the Labor Board on July 3rd definitely annulling rights of seniority of the men on strike.

On August 7th, the President made a second move for peace. He called on the striking workmen to return to work, and on the carriers to assign them to work, and on both to take the question

in dispute (the single question of seniority) to the Railroad Labor Board for hearing and decision. It is the replies to this proposal which constitute the ground of divergence between the Times and the Call. On August 13th the executives of the carriers returned two answers to the President, one representing the control of 151,824 miles, and one a control of 57,222. The majority are reported by the Times as accepting the proposal "unconditionally." On reading the text, however, it appears that the executives accept the President's proposal to leave the question of seniority to the Labor Board "understanding that such acceptance involves no surrender of the principles with respect to seniority adopted by the carriers on August 1st." These principles were, as noted above, embodied in the resolution of the Board to the effect that the strikers had forfeited seniority rights. It would be interesting to discover whether the use of the word "unconditional" by the Times has any more subtle explanation than the conclusion of the old story: "The little boy lied." The executives representing a minority of the mileage rejected the President's proposal in essence by refusing to agree to take all striking men back. The reply of the representatives of the striking unions has not been made public. It is understood to have been a rejection, but since the President proposed to submit the question of seniority to the Labor Board, and the Board had already committed itself to an annulment of such rights, the refusal of the strikers to accept its good offices can hardly be wondered at. By its premature and threatening utterances on this subject the Board, as we have already pointed out, has rendered itself useless as machinery of mediation.

On August 12th, however, another proposal was made to end the strike. The representatives of the four Railroad Brotherhoods, in conference in Washington with the railroad executives, suggested that the question of seniority be referred to three arbitrators, one appointed by the executives, one by the strikers, one by President Harding. The railroad executives refused. While this proposal is given prominence on the first page of the Herald, only diligent scrutiny can find it at all in the Times.

So the matter stands and the public can make up its mind as to the apportionment of blame among the three parties concerned. The government is anxious to settle the strike on almost any terms, provided its prestige is recognized through the Labor Board. But that Board has already made itself impossible as an organ of conciliation. The executives are eager to settle the strike if the seniority issue is to be decided according to the resolution of the Labor Board on July 3rd. This

would in effect be a triumph for the railroads by discrediting the leadership under which the craft unions went on strike and perhaps breaking the unions themselves. The failure to return all men to work would wipe out the unions on the minority roads, which include the New England railroads and the Pennsylvania; and the failure to protect the seniority of their members would deal a heavy blow to unions on the remaining lines. Thus the unions and their leaders are fighting for their lives. But in the issue of unionism the whole body of railroad employees is vitally interested. The four Brotherhoods cannot remain indifferent to it. The situation as respects the deterioration of equipment and the employment of armed guards by the roads affords opportunities for local action on the part of their members, and with the principle of the union at stake such action may easily develop into a broader movement by which the chiefs of the Brotherhoods would be swept into leadership of a general railroad strike. Such is the danger which threatens the country. Only by cutting loose from the discredited Labor Board and insisting on a settlement which will leave the unions intact, according to his original proposal of August 1st, can President Harding avoid it.

India and the Empire

MR. LIONEL CURTIS made his final address at the Williams College Institute of Politics an apology for imperialism, and specifically for the British Empire as a practical contribution to that ultimate political ideal, a supernational state. Quite properly he gave a large part of his time to India, for there the Empire is most seriously on trial. One reason which Mr. Curtis gave for regarding the British Empire as a practical step toward the new organization of the world is that it already embraces one-fourth of the human race. But of this fourth more than half is in India. And the system by which India is held as part of the Empire has nothing to do with that which unites the group of free self-determined dominions. Mr. Curtis admitted that unless the principle of the commonwealth replaces that of empire the whole structure will fall. He further declared that "the relations of the people of Europe and America to those of Asia and Africa are the ultimate problem of politics." The future, then, of the British Empire as a foundation of, or model for, a world state, and the value of its contribution to the solution of this "ultimate problem of politics," depend on the inclusion of India as a willing partner in this commonwealth.

The British Empire is now engaged in the task