

"It is difficult to find words to describe one of your kind."

It is Judge D. J. Leahy of the San Miguel county court speaking. He is speaking of the defendant, Carl C. Magee, editor of the New Mexico State Tribune. It just happens that Judge D. J. Leahy is a Republican. It just happens that Magee is a Democrat. It just happens that the State Tribune is the leading Democratic paper of the state. It just happens that for more than a year Magee, through the Tribune, has been making a drive on what he terms the corruption of the San Miguel county court as represented by Judge D. J. Leahy.

The judge proceeds in leisurely fashion with his epithets. He digresses to refer to a group of Las Vegas citizens as a mob. The citizens welcomed Magee at his hotel the night previous. He characterizes the leader of the band who met Magee as a pro-German. Judge Leahy digresses leisurely to a reading of letters of recommendation, all reciting the personal integrity of Judge D. J. Leahy. The letters are from prominent Democratic leaders. Each of them emphasizes the estimable qualities of Judge D. J. Leahy.

It happens that each of the letters of recommendation is written by a prominent enemy of the prisoner. At last the judge is through. The prisoner is sentenced to from three months to six months in the San Miguel county jail and the sheriff is instructed to take him in custody.

"I have three requests to make," declares the defendant. "I ask three days in which to prepare habeas corpus proceedings."

"It is denied."

"Some of my friends fear for my safety. I ask that a deputy to be selected from my friends be stationed inside the jail with me."

"You will be perfectly safe and the request is denied."

"I ask that I be placed in a separate cell and not be compelled to live with the other prisoners."

The judge swivels slowly in his chair.

"Although there is some merit in what you request—I should like to see the other prisoners kept from contamination by one of your kind—the thing is not in the function of the court. The request is therefore denied."

The judge then rises from his chair and disappears from the court room. A hundred pairs of eyes centre on the tall, gray haired prisoner with the steely gray eyes. A brown-skinned sheriff, with wide-brimmed hat, approaches.

A hundred guns sit tightly in a hundred hip pockets. A hundred trigger fingers itch. A hundred hands move slowly toward a hundred hip pockets.

The prisoner smiles amiably at the sheriff. The tension is broken. Friends of the prisoner flock to his side, extending hands. They flock behind him and the sheriff to the doors of the San Miguel

county jail. The jail doors open and the tall gray haired man enters. He is taken to a cell.

An editor has upheld the freedom of the press.

* * *

Justice has liquidated and Carl C. Magee, editor in contempt of court, is in a cell of the San Miguel county jail. While he sits on an iron cot and writes an editorial for tomorrow a dozen scrawny natives with stodgy shotguns are following orders. They are carefully guarding their prey. A dozen armed men in dirty overalls, with unshaven faces, and with brown paper cigarettes lolling from their lips, are guarding the lone six footer with the iron gray hair. They are guarding his pencil and his pad of paper. They are opening his mail. They scan its contents as avidly as though it were not in English.

* * *

An executive pardon is rushed from Santa Fé over perilous roads by the adjutant general. The pardons are presented to the sheriff in the murky corridor of the San Miguel county jail. The sheriff views them carelessly and shakes his head. He cannot honor them. They are incorrect. He has glanced at three type-written pardons from the governor and has pronounced them incorrect.

The gray-eyed editor remains in jail. The dozen guards scatter in skirmish formation about the crooked winding streets in San Miguel county.

Justice is upheld.

Two days later the sheriff is served with a writ of habeas corpus issued by the Supreme Court. On the morning the prisoner is to leave for Santa Fe another pardon is handed to the sheriff. It is a memorandum from the governor ordering the sheriff to release Carl Magee from custody. The sheriff views it casually and announces he must consult his attorneys.

* * *

The editor is not in jail. He is at liberty under \$2,500 bond while the Supreme Court decides whether the governor may pardon him for what Judge Leahy has termed direct contempt of court.

Meanwhile, the editor writes and the state reads.

EDWARD H. SHAFFER.

Lull Before Storm

The winds . . . that slay all color as they run:
Pale lilac, gold of marigolds, bright hues
Unnumbered petals drain out of the sun . . .
Lie down with naked lilies in white truce.
No leaf nor flower trembles in the noose
Encircling its doomed fragileness . . . but one:
Petunias . . . bend quivering . . . like nuns
When marching dawns bring rumors of near guns.
Not yet shall pansies . . . darker than a bruise . . .
By torn-out scarlets of hibiscus lie
In gaudy deaths . . . festooning the bleak ground . . .
Nor faded pinks that have no more to lose:
Petunias will be the first to die
And go down quietly without a sound.

LOLA RIDGE.

Oil and American Foreign Policy

THE manner in which business interests become identified with the national welfare and the national welfare identified with business interests is well set forth in these two books. If one may judge from the work of the authors, we are in for an era of oil imperialism and oil wars, for, M. de la Tramerye * informs us, "even the most powerful political alliances are subordinate to the question of oil, and he who has oil has empire." Having seen the handiwork of predatory oil interests in our domestic politics, we Americans should at least be open-minded regarding oleaginous influences in international relations.

At the bottom of the oil problem, as it is viewed by business men and diplomatists, are two generally accepted facts: first, the enormously increased importance of oil in commerce and in war; second, the exhaustibility of the world's oil resources. M. de la Tramerye has three excellent chapters upon these fundamentals. He analyzes, for example, the economy and efficiency of oil-burning as compared with coal-burning ships, indicating that sea-power ultimately must depend upon oil-power. Industrial prosperity and military strength being dependent upon adequate and uninterrupted supplies of petroleum, M. de la Tramerye reproaches the French government for failure to obtain its full share of the unappropriated oil resources of the world. To him the world struggle for oil is being carried on between Great Britain and the United States, with France unwittingly becoming a tail to England's kite. One rejoices in hearing Briand and Poincaré accused of being modest in their foreign policies but questions the validity of the author's conclusions. This book is frankly written from the point of view of a doctrinaire mercantilist. It is more valuable as a presentation of interesting and important facts than as a constructive contribution to a solution of the international oil problem.

Messrs. Davenport and Cooke * emphatically do not believe that the rights and wrongs of the Anglo-American oil controversy can be judged on purely national lines. They are Englishmen, but they wield their cudgels vigorously without much regard to whether it be English or American heads that are cracked. Winston Churchill is their enfant terrible and the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey their bête noire. They roundly denounce the British government for going into the oil business, but they are obviously unimpressed by the pious pronuncia-

mentos of the Department of State regarding the sacred American principle of the "open door." The numerous, although comparatively unimportant, errors of fact are apparently the result of carelessness rather than bias. Making allowances for minor faults, theirs is the best book which has yet been written upon the influence of oil in international politics in general and Anglo-American relations in particular. It is less credulous and far more critical than the work of M. de la Tramerye.

Americans will find much material for sober contemplation in the story which the authors relate regarding the liaison between the petroleum industry and the various government departments at Washington. Two important questions of public policy immediately come to the fore. The first is a domestic question concerned with the conservation of our oil resources; the second is a question of foreign policy—whether business men shall have the right to expect and the government shall be permitted to render diplomatic support to the activities of American oil prospectors abroad. In a sense, of course, these questions of conservation at home and oleaginous diplomacy abroad are two sides of the same question. The depletion of our petroleum reserves may be due as much to prodigality as to scarcity. Although there is produced within the territory of the United States about 70 percent of the world's annual output of oil, it is said that this production is inadequate for the demands of the American market. Assuming that this be so—and there is evidence to the contrary—it serves to call attention to the fact that no other nation in the world approaches ours in wastefulness in methods of production, distribution, and consumption of petroleum products. A well known British oil magnate has stated that Americans have dealt with their oil resources "in the pioneer spirit of unmitigated pillage, have recklessly squandered and in sixty years run through a legacy which, properly conserved, should have lasted for at least a century and a half." This well may be contrasted with a statement made by Mr. Herbert Hoover in August, 1921:

"Unless our nationals reënforce and increase their holdings abroad, we shall be dependent upon other nations for the supply of this vital commodity within a measurable number of years. The truth of the matter is that other countries have conserved their oil at the expense of our own. We must go into foreign fields and in a big way."

Vigorous prospecting abroad, not intelligent conservation at home, has been the concern of the Republican administration since it took office in March, 1921.

The oil policy of the United States since the Armistice has been based upon two bogeys: the bogey of the rapid exhaustion of our domestic sup-

The World Struggle for Oil, by P. de la Tramerye, translated from the French by C. Leonard Leese. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.75.

The Oil Trusts and Anglo-American Relations, by E. H. Davenport and S. R. Cooke. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.