

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XL

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1924

NUMBER 516

Contents

The Week	186
Editorials	
British Labor Steps Out	189
Programs and Periodicals	191
Wasting Votes	194
General Articles	
What the Dawes Plan Will Do	
..... John Maynard Keynes	195
Scholz of Reed	C. E. Ayres 197
Why I Shall Vote for La Follette—VI	
..... Felix Frankfurter	199
Personæ Mutæ (Verse)	Kate Buss 201
One Flesh (Sonnet)	Rolfe Humphries 201
The Umpire State	Felix Ray 202
Correspondence	203
Subversive Miss Alcott	Elizabeth Vincent 204
Reviews of Books	
“You Takes Your Choice”	Robert Littell 205
The Wings of Science	C. E. A. 206
Something Childish	Richard Aldington 207
Two Books on the Far East	E. E., N. P. 208

The Week

THE New York Times, as in so many similar instances in the past, has performed a conspicuous public service in making so promptly available to its readers the text of the League of Nations proposed new Agreement to Outlaw War. The Protocol is a long and exceedingly complicated document which will need to be exhaustively studied before it can be unreservedly approved; but it looks on the first reading like a long stride in a salutary direction. It is for the most part an elaboration of the Shotwell-Bliss draft treaty published by the New Republic in its issue of July 16, 1924, and it is obviously an honest and capable attempt to pledge the nations of the world to adhere to an anti-war compact while at the same time leaving them free to use different means adapted to their different interests and conditions, to give effect to the pledge in particular instances. It certainly seems to go far towards removing the legitimate American misgivings about the original covenant. If this first impression is confirmed by a more careful examination the Protocol will, we hope, heal the dissensions which have hitherto existed among American pac-

ifists, and enable them to carry on a united struggle in favor of ultimate American adherence thereto.

BUT a struggle it will undoubtedly be. Not only adherence to the Protocol, but any action, such for instance, as an acceptance of the forthcoming invitation to the Disarmament Conference which may be interpreted as a movement towards ultimate adherence will incur bitter and unscrupulous opposition. The violent American nationalists will carry on an agitation against it which will be no less irreconcilable than the agitation that they formerly carried on against American participation in the League. Newspapers such as the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Ledger, the New York Evening Post and the various Hearst publications have already declared war upon it. They denounce it as a conspiracy to take away from America the control of her own destiny and to force submission on her part to the dictates of a European super-state. They will interpret the provisions which are creating a general and a compulsory machinery for adjudicating or arbitrating international disputes as equivalent to the annihilation of the sovereignty of the American nation. They will be joined by the spokesmen of American national violence in Congress and elsewhere, and they will do their best by terrorizing tactics to prevent any government from moving towards the adoption of the Protocol or from participating in the European discussion of the ways and means of preventing war.

THE opponents of the Protocol may well be successful in preventing the reconsideration of the official American attitude towards European organization for peace unless American pacifists unite to carry on a powerful and effective agitation in the interest of the new plan to outlaw war. They can hardly get this agitation fairly under way until after Election Day. It would be extremely unwise to start anything which might result in interpolating the pending difference of opinion about adherence to the Protocol and participation in the Disarmament Conference into the controversial atmosphere of the present campaign. But as soon as the campaign is over, they should gird their loins for what will certainly be a long, uncertain and fierce struggle.

Their immediate objective should be to make sure that the American government is fully represented in the coming conference, but they should not disguise the fact that their ultimate aim is the adhesion in some form or other of the United States to the Protocol. The political strategy whereby this aim may best be realized is a matter for future consideration, but in the meantime, American pacifists should above all try to get the Protocol analyzed, discussed, explained and domesticated in the house of American opinion. If the American people adhere to it, their adherence will result not from propaganda and exhortation but from an increasing understanding.

IN one of the most important speeches of the campaign Senator La Follette has outlined the foreign policy he would pursue as President. His statement is a sufficient answer to the charges of John Spargo and others that he is a reactionary in international affairs. He would coöperate with other nations to abolish conscription, would reduce armament to the utmost limit compatible with purely defensive purposes, would urge the revision of the 1919 treaties, and would "seek to free all subject peoples." He would put an end to secret diplomacy, would take the profit out of war and if the United States were forced to fight in self-defense, he would adopt a pay-as-you-go policy, leaving no burden of debt for future generations. Except in case of an actual invasion by armed forces, he would conduct a referendum before going to war, and would be guided by its results. Perhaps most important of all, he would refuse to have the flag follow the investor, and would not run the risk of armed conflict to safeguard the money of our capitalists wherever in the world they may choose to invest it. Specifically, he would withdraw our marines from the Caribbean and Central America; would fulfill our promise of independence to the Philippines, and would refuse to join in any future exploitation and dismemberment of China by the powers. No one can say that this foreign policy is not concrete and constructive. No one can say that it does not contain the necessary elements for greatly reducing the likelihood of war. Most of it, of course, is to be found in the platform of the Cleveland convention; but for the benefit of those who have forgotten or have never read that platform it is well that Senator La Follette should repeat its declarations.

THE Senate Committee to investigate campaign expenditures was designed to look into exactly such charges as those Senator La Follette recently brought against the Republicans when he charged them with seeking to secure a fund of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 with which to influence the election result. The sums mentioned, of course, represent only a very broad approximation; and it is not yet known what success has been achieved in collecting.

The situation is important enough, however, to warrant the immediate calling of the Senate committee, and the fullest searching of the records to find out how much money the Republicans are spending and where it comes from. Senator Borah is well justified in the personal sacrifice involved in halting his own campaign in Idaho for the purpose.

THE Republicans are in no position to protest that to single them out for investigation is an injustice. Their party is the only one definitely committed to a policy which takes billions of dollars out of the pockets of consumers for the benefit of a comparatively small group of capitalists who are beneficiaries of the high tariff system. The recent revelations about tariff-profiteering in aluminum, the results of which go directly to Secretary Mellon and his brother, give some hint of what this process means. The Republicans could well afford, assuming that they could "get away with it," to spend \$100,000,000 in buying this election and insuring another four years of high tariff. There are, of course, plenty of honest men in the Republican ranks who would indignantly repudiate any such endeavor; but the one fact history teaches above all others is that when a considerable body of individuals are exposed to a great temptation there are always some who succumb. When protected industry can gain another four years' immunity by expending three or five or eight percent of its prospective profits, it is an immoral certainty that these expenditures, in one form or another, whether surreptitiously or not, will be made.

A YEAR ago no one would have imagined that American investors would be scrambling for a share in any kind of German loan. It seemed then that nothing could endow any promise of the German government with international value. The reparations charge, with its capacity to absorb every mark of revenue Germany could raise, lay with crushing weight upon the government's credit. This charge has been jacked up sufficiently to permit the credit of the German nation to be good for the modest sum of \$200,000,000. This is effected by the purely artificial means of giving the loan a priority over reparations. Any additional credit requirements of the German government are in the same position as before. Nor can it be said that the private credit of Germany has been materially improved by the arrangements for the loan. The Allies are still attempting to exact from Germany more than she can pay, and so long as this condition obtains there will always be danger of internal disorders and war. The Dawes plan loan is no doubt a safer investment than most international loans yielding so high a return. But as matters stand it is about the only German investment that is really safe.

IT is not denied that the loan will somewhat improve the position of Germany. It will insure the

stability of the currency without the extreme concentration of financial resources on this end that has been involved in the protection of the Rentenmark. The burden of financing reparations in kind will be lifted from the German treasury for a time. No part of the loan, however, will be applied to the supplying of liquid capital for the needs of German commerce and industry. Those needs are pressing, and unless some way can be found for supplying them German economic recovery will be a matter of decades, not of years. It is, of course, possible that after the Dawes plan has been put into operation the Allied governments will come to a realization of the necessity of a further lightening of the reparations burden. Unless they do, the prospect of German recovery is too slight to justify any hope of substantial payments by Germany after the proceeds of the current loan have been exhausted.

INVESTORS are supposed to be peculiarly level-headed people. In reality there is no class of human beings so easily taken in by magical formulas. Ever since the Dawes plan was reported it has exerted magical influence on the investing public. Czecho-Slovak municipal bonds, Italian hydro-electric shares have responded to the ups and downs of the fortunes of the Dawes plan. Irresponsible companies holding dubious properties like amusement parks and restaurants in scattered German cities have advertised and sold shares in this country on the strength of the boom that might be expected in all German values when the Dawes plan goes into operation. It is entirely possible that there may be something of a craze for miscellaneous German values after the flotation of the German loan has been accomplished. And we think the financiers owe it to their public to issue a solemn warning that no such change has taken place in the condition of Germany as would warrant any investment except on expert advice.

JUST how much importance Tory Republicanism attaches to party labels was well illustrated last week in Iowa. Senator Smith W. Brookhart is still, despite his unkind words about Mr. Dawes, the Republican candidate for senator, and his reelection is one of the few certain things in an uncertain world. This is even apparent to the "independent" Republican candidate whom the Conservatives put up against him, one L. A. Brewer. The latter has saved himself a licking at the polls by withdrawing from the race; and as he did so, he advised all God-fearing Iowa Tories to vote for—the Democratic candidate! The latter, Mr. Daniel F. Steck, got himself heard of a few days ago for the first and perhaps the last time by reading in public an alleged affidavit of a precious person named Fink, from Buffalo. Fink sought to discredit some of the testimony before the Brookhart-Wheeler committee which investigated Harry Daugherty.

Among other thrilling allegations, he declared Senator Wheeler had promised Roxie Stinson large profits on the stock exchange, to be derived by selling stock short, forcing Harry Daugherty out and taking advantage of the tumble in prices. It is hard to say whether this magnificent tale is a worse insult to the intelligence of Roxie, Fink or candidate Steck. We wonder what John W. Davis would like to do to Democratic candidate Steck, who is engaged in trying to overthrow the evidence on which Davis is making his national campaign.

ANATOLE FRANCE'S work was finished and there is none other like it. Some reporters, giving the news of his death to a wider public than will ever read his books, have spoken of his writing as the point of departure of "the modern movement." That is not quite accurate. Anatole France was unique in the modern world, great beyond the reach of envy or of imitation. In his work the widest extremes meet in choicest harmony. He combined a cloistered scholarship with the ripest worldliness. His favorite and most revisited characters were Bergeret, the professor who is also a socialist, and Coignard, the dissolute, unfrocked monk who is also a philosopher. A free-thinker, he wrote a devout history of Joan of Arc. His love of country is attested by his adopted name and all it signed; his love of justice by his defense of Dreyfus and Cailaux. He despised all honors and was a member of the Academy, an officer of the Legion of Honor, the recipient of the Nobel Prize. Many contemporaries objected to his appointment to the Nobel Prize on the ground that the terms of the award require that it be given to an idealist. Such are contemporaries.

THE resignation of Hussein as Caliph and King of the Hedjaz culminates and only partly resolves the Arabian tangle. The situation is confusing on the surface; fundamentally, it is much more confusing, since it arises, like most troubles in the East, from white man's bungling. During the stress of war the British inadvertently carried on two policies in Arabia at the same time. The India Office cherished a scheme for an Indian-Arabian state, for which it encouraged Ibn Saud, Sultan of Nejd and head of the fanatical Wahabi sect, to hold out. The Foreign office, on the other hand, opposed this with a plan for a pan-Arabic state, to be ruled by the Hashimite family, Hussein and his three sons. This so-called Sharifean policy of Churchill, Curzon and Lawrence won out. Not only did it bitterly antagonize the Indian Mohammedans and Ibn Saud; but it also failed to satisfy Hussein because, with the maintenance of the British Protectorate in Palestine and the French in Assyria, he found it incomplete. Disaffection of local populations in the various emirates added to the unlikelihood of peace.

THEN, on the deposition of Caliph Abdul Mejid in Constantinople last March, King Hussein rashly assumed the Caliphate (the papacy of Islam) and the situation became intolerable. The Indian Mohammedans and many Arabian tribes opposed him; the Wahabis under Ibn Saud were infuriated. They took to arms. Last week their fanatical army reached the sacred territory around Mecca, and his appeals for British aid being vain, Hussein resigned the crown to his son Ali, Emir of Medina. Ali, by refusing all title to the Caliphate, was able to make an eleventh hour truce with the Wahabis which saved the holy places. Though Ali's accession relieves the situation by placating the fanatics and improving relations with England, to whom he is friendly, it leaves two large matters unsettled. One is the Caliphate, which is left hanging. In the absence of any leader upon whom the whole Moslem world can agree the Central Caliphate Committee in India has suggested that the holy territory of Mecca be administered by a representative government—an interesting echo of the Angora idea which it remains for the forthcoming all-Islamic Congress in Cairo to settle. The second problem is the loss of prestige and growing unpopularity of the Hashimite family through Arabia and Mesopotamia, where in many places the people are undoubtedly kept under only by threat of British force. Both matters promise a crop of unrest for the future.

A FEW weeks ago Mr. Raymond V. Ingersoll was appointed (by the Governor's committee) impartial arbitrator for the adjustment of disputes between the International Ladies' Garment Workers and their employers. The appointment was an excellent one, and the trade was to be congratulated on securing such service as Mr. Ingersoll was qualified to give. Now comes the astounding news that Mr. Ingersoll with his arbitrator's seat hardly warm beneath him, has taken the job of managing Governor Smith's campaign for Greater New York. The objections to this confusion of functions hardly need to be stated. On the one hand, Mr. Ingersoll's power over the needle trades, however scrupulous he may be in exercising it, will inevitably be translated into votes. On the other hand, Mr. Ingersoll's mingling in campaign politics will cast doubt on his future rulings as arbitrator. In this office he is an important figure in an experiment designed to introduce judicial methods into the relations of capital and labor. In view of the novelty of the undertaking, its delicacy and its difficulty, those taking part in it should be above suspicion. To make a state appointed impartial arbitrator a campaign manager is like taking a judge from the bench for that purpose. No claim of party loyalty, no sense of political obligation can excuse such a sacrifice. It is one which Governor Smith should not have executed and Mr. Ingersoll should certainly not have made.

British Labor Steps Out

WITH the fall of the MacDonald government one of the most remarkable adventures in British Parliamentary history comes to its close. At a time of great political confusion in both domestic and international affairs a new party, entirely without experience in the exacting art of responsible government, was called on to assume power. In the last century and a half there have, indeed, been examples enough of new parties rising to power, but they have always carried with them a fair equipment of trained personnel and of principles taken out of the common stock of middle class ideas and aspirations. Labor stands for new political objectives, a new outlook upon life, with every contrast heightened for the uses of agitation, which had been the whole of its history. Even with a substantial majority in Parliament, Labor would have had grounds for grave misgivings in accepting the responsibility for government. As a minority government its position appeared hopeless from the start. There was no possibility of realizing any part of its own program. The most the party could hope to do was to wrap the course of events slightly toward the side of Labor while governing mainly in the interest and by the consent of the middle class parties. The Labor government was essentially a political receivership, made inevitable by the incompetence of the Conservative and Liberal parties. And no receiver can hope to wind up his job with heightened prestige.

There can be no doubt that Mr. MacDonald and his associates were well aware of the risks they were running when they undertook to form a government. They knew that their more impatient followers would be disillusioned by their failure to put through any substantial part of the Labor program. It was a choice between such inevitable disillusionment and the loss of prestige that would follow upon a refusal to accept governmental responsibility when it was within their grasp. They chose the former. The pending elections alone can show conclusively whether they have won an immediate net gain in popularity. Yet they have established a record that will stand them in good stead in the future.

Their principal achievement lies, naturally, in the field of foreign affairs, where the aspirations of Labor come nearest to harmony with the general aspirations of all intelligent Englishmen. By his outspoken letter to Poincaré Mr. MacDonald went far toward transforming the dangerous suspicion that was growing up between England and France into an explicit discussion of diverging interests that might be handled in rational terms. It can hardly be doubted that the new color of Anglo-French discussion helped materially toward the triumph of Herriot over Poincaré. The acceptance of the Dawes plan without injurious modifications must be imputed chiefly to Mr. MacDonald's skilful diplo-