

on the grounds of the Wilmington Country Club, Wilmington, Delaware.

Dr. John Duncan Spaeth, Professor of English at Princeton and coach of the University crew, must have been somewhat surprised at the interpretation placed upon his recent remarks by a reporter, or perhaps a "headliner," of the New York "Tribune." Dr. Spaeth, as readers of The Outlook will remember, has in his work at Princeton made a notable contribution to the athletic traditions of American colleges. Without sacrificing efficiency of instruction, he has worked to inculcate in his charges the best phases of the amateur spirit. In accordance with this purpose he gave the following advice to the students of Princeton as a prelude to an approaching race on Lake Carnegie: "Do not bet on the Princeton crew in the race with Yale," he said; "but if you are good Princeton men, back up the crew in other ways." When this admirable, yet moderately comprehensible, sentiment appeared in the "Tribune," it was sheltered under the following illuminating caption:

**PRINCETON NOT HOPEFUL OF
BEATING YALE CREW**

Don't Bet on Eight Next Saturday is
Advice of Coach

By what process of logic the "Tribune" reporter reached his conclusions as to the reasons which prompted Dr. Spaeth's advice it would be hard to say. Perhaps by syllogistic inference he decided: "All men bet when they hope to win. Dr. Spaeth does not bet; therefore he does not hope to win." Or perhaps by analogical inference he concluded: "Dr. Spaeth does not hope to win. If I did not expect my crew to win, even at the expense of being called a 'piker' by my friends, I should not bet. Therefore, fear of defeat is the only possible reason within the bounds of human understanding why Dr. Spaeth should advise his students to refrain from betting."

We do not pretend to have given more than a rough outline of the mental process by which the heading in question might have been evolved. It is quite possible that we may be entirely mistaken. There may have been no mental process at all. In a mind possessing a purely empirical knowledge of the (vanishing) code of sporting ethics, the

headline in question may have resulted from mere galvanic reaction.

Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty in the Liberal Ministry of Great Britain, who has his father's genius for making dramatic suggestions in a dramatic way, has proposed that England and Germany take a naval holiday for one year by an agreement on the part of England to put off building four battle-ships, providing Germany will agree to put off building two battle-ships for the same period. Such an agreement would secure a complete holiday for one year so far as the construction of great ships is concerned, and would save the expenditure of nearly thirty millions by Germany and nearly sixty millions by Great Britain, and the relative strength of the two countries in the end would be absolutely unchanged.

Mr. Churchill's invitation, which must seem to Americans to embody the dictates of common sense and to be free from all possible objections, has not been officially met by Germany. The maker of the suggestion declared that he expected it would arouse a great deal of ridicule; but it is not easy to see at what point ridicule can attack it. It changes nothing so far as the relative strength of the two countries is concerned, and saves ninety million dollars. It is, in other words, a measure of economy without any sacrifice to either people of pride or of safety. Mr. Churchill spoke of the objections that would be raised by manufacturers of armaments and munitions of war, and added, "They must be our servants and not our masters." It would be interesting if some one would make a thorough and trustworthy study of the great business interests involved in keeping up irritation and misunderstanding between different countries. Precisely as women in this age of enfranchisement are the servants of tailors, dressmakers, and the manufacturers of many kinds of fabrics, so great nations are the tools of an enormous capital invested in the continuance of present methods of warfare. The rivalry in armaments has ceased to be comic because the burden it imposes is fast becoming intolerable. Another member of the Liberal Cabinet, Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster-General, commenting in New York last week on English competition with Germany in building war-ships, said: "If present conditions go on, we

shall be spending all our wealth to protect our wealth, like the child who was given sixpence and spent sixpence to buy a purse to put it in."

Reference was made last week to the trial now going on in Kiev, Russia, of the Jew Mendel Beilis, who was arrested in August, 1911, upon the charge of murdering a Russian child for the purpose of getting Christian blood to use in the ritual services of the Jewish Passover.

A statement of additional facts follows. In due time Mr. George Kennan will contribute to *The Outlook* a special article dealing with this extraordinary development of fanaticism and race hatred.

On the 25th of March, 1911, a thirteen-year-old boy named Andrew Yushchinski, living in Kiev, disappeared mysteriously while on his way to school. Nine days later his disfigured body was found in a cave in the suburbs of Kiev, together with his school-books and everything that he had with him when he started from home. The body, when found, was partly undressed, was almost bloodless, and had been stabbed or pierced in more than forty places with some sharp-pointed instrument like a poniard or heavy awl. There were no traces of blood in the vicinity, and the boy had evidently been killed elsewhere and brought to the cave some hours after life was extinct. No attempt had been made to prevent identification of the corpse; on the contrary, the boy's school-books had been placed beside him, and a belt bearing his name had been laid across his legs. The nature and great number of the wounds, together with the bloodless condition of the body, suggested a crime of an unusual nature, and the Jew-haters of the Black Hundreds at once raised the cry of "ritual murder," and declared in proclamations in the anti-Semitic press, and even in the Duma, that the Jews had killed the child, as they had previously killed many other Russian children, in order to get Christian blood to be used in their diabolical ceremonies. This "blood accusation," as it was called in Russia, led to a bitter and passionate controversy, which was carried on for two years or more by the Society of the Double-Headed Eagle, the Archangel Michael Society, the Union of Real Russians, the Reactionists, Monarchists, and Black Hun-

dreds on one side, and the Jews, the Liberal press, the opposition parties in the Duma, and the enlightened people of the Empire generally, on the other.

This controversy soon attracted the attention of the whole civilized world; and protests against the "blood accusation," as a revival of a mediæval myth, were made not only by eight hundred Jewish rabbis and perhaps a thousand representative citizens and leaders of thought in Russia, but by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Liverpool, London, Glasgow, and Dublin; by the International Congress of Orientalists and the International Medical Congress; by associations of psychologists and psychiatrists; and by many thousands of the world's most distinguished scholars and statesmen in Germany, France, England, and the United States.

The Russian Government, meanwhile, arrested the Jew Mendel Beilis—an ex-soldier and a worker in a Kiev brick factory—threw him into prison, and devoted two whole years to a search for evidence that would at the same time incriminate him and convict the Jews of using Christian blood in the making of unleavened bread for their Passover. But for the personal initiative and insistence of the Czar, the prosecution would have abandoned the "ritual murder" theory and set Mendel Beilis at liberty two years ago; but the monarch, the Court, and the Ministry of Justice were determined to make out a case against the Jews. That case is now being tried, in the Kiev Chamber of Justice, before a bench of four judges and a duly impaneled jury. But it is not really the case of *The State vs. Mendel Beilis*; it is the case of *Nicholas II vs. the Jewish race and the Jewish religion*.

Sir Rufus Isaacs, British Attorney-General, has been appointed Lord Chief Justice in succession to Viscount Alverstone. One reads of this appointment with something of a shock. Lord Alverstone's eminence at the bar has been international in its reputation. It was notably accentuated some years ago in London at the meeting of the Joint High Commission, consisting of three members each from Great Britain and the United States, to decide the Alaskan boundary question, when Lord Alverstone accepted the justice of our contention. Sir Rufus Isaacs is of course well known in England, but has not yet made an international reputation.