

CARTOONS OF THE WEEK

Marcus in the New York Times



"DAMN THE TORPEDOES! GO AHEAD!" (Farragut)

From the Chicago Evening Post



"DER TAG" (A TAG MADE IN GERMANY)

Greene in the New York Evening Telegram



THE KIND OF BAGGAGE UNCLE SAM IS GOING TO TAKE WITH HIM TO EUROPE

Kirby in the New York World



THE ONLY ADEQUATE REWARD

in The Outlook of February 21 which commented upon General Carranza's proposal that the neutral nations, including the United States, place an embargo on all munitions and supplies sent to the Allies. We pointed out that "if the United States should be foolish enough to fall in with Carranza's proposal it would find itself at once facing the alternative of neglecting the Monroe Doctrine or of opposing England in Mexico. What could be more to Germany's pleasure?" And we added the further comment, "Let Carranza not deceive himself. As a German catspaw he could undoubtedly help Germany, but in so doing he would obliterate himself."

Mr. Simpson objects to the word catspaw. He says: "It is an unjust reflection on a man whom, if you knew him personally, you would in every way esteem, especially as a man. Carranza has never been the 'catspaw' of men or nations, and never will be. He will never be used as the tool of designing interests. His whole record shows this."

In speaking of Carranza as a possible catspaw of Germany we meant no reflection upon his personal honor. But unfortunately there is too much evidence that Germany is bending every effort to employ the Mexican Government as her tool. The plot of Germany in Mexico discovered and announced to the world by the President of the United States proves this. The best thing that the friends of Carranza can do for him now is not to make vague and general statements in the press about his qualities, but to urge him to clear himself by his attitude and his actions from the grave suspicion which the German note, combined with his advocacy of an embargo upon all aid to the Allies, casts upon his attitude both towards the United States and towards the European war. Foreign Secretary Zimmermann does not write notes to the Canadian authorities proposing to give them Alaska and the Northwest Territory if they enter into a plot to invade the United States. The fact alone that the Foreign Secretary of Germany could write such a missive to the Mexican Government as he has shows that he at least believes that it would not be resented as an insult. The Japanese at once so resented a similar suggestion. Has Carranza yet, over his own signature and with all the authority of his position, announced that Germany has insulted him in supposing that for one minute he could entertain such an alliance with Germany? The fact is that the financial support which Germany is giving and proposes to give in larger measure to Carranza makes him very reluctant to reject any overtures from the German Government.

The German menace in Mexico is, in fact, much more serious than that of a mere political threat. Under the new Mexican Constitution, reported in these pages last week, Carranza might, with apparent consistency, lease every oil well in Mexico to German operators, on the ground that British, Dutch, and American concessions are nullified. In the past the physical power of England, Holland, and the United States would have prevented this, but to-day if the Germans and German military officers in Mexico should combine with the military forces of Carranza they can easily seize the oil fields, and thus enable Carranza to ratify his new leases. Thus a vitally important supply of crude oil and gasoline would be cut off from Great Britain and the United States. The eventual effect might be twofold. First, if Germany were beaten she might destroy the oil wells in a few hours by the use of dynamite in order to prevent their falling into the hands of her enemies. If she sues for and enters upon peace negotiations, her possession of Mexican oil territory could be used in peace bargaining exactly as she has proposed to use the territory of Belgium and northern France in peace bargaining.

If Carranza is not an accomplice of Germany in some such plan as this, he should come out in the open. The oil menace in Mexico, moreover, is so serious that we hope our Government is taking some active steps regarding it.

THE MEXICAN ELECTIONS

Because the election of Venustiano Carranza to the Presidency of Mexico had for some time prior to the event been taken as a foregone conclusion the extent of the personal triumph of the First Chief ought not to be overlooked. Carranza's elevation to the supreme Constitutional position in his country

took place just four years and twenty days after he launched his revolution against General Victoriano Huerta in the thinly populated hills of northern Mexico.

Whatever one may think of Carranza or of the cause which he represents, every one must admire the man's perseverance. A dozen times since February 19, 1913, the cause of the First Chief has seemed a pitiful dream, but the determination which his enemies call "stubbornness," and which is Carranza's best asset, has carried him to his goal.

To judge by available reports as we go to press, the Mexican elections were conducted in a way to deserve not a little praise. Even ardent Carranzistas would hardly claim that anything like a fair and free poll of the country was taken, yet no election ever held in Mexico so nearly approached the aspect of a fair election in a civilized and democratic republic as this one. The total vote for President is variously reported as between 800,000 and 2,000,000. At any rate, more Mexicans went to the polls than in any previous election in the history of their country.

Carranza is the first constitutional President that Mexico has had since Francisco Madero was chosen in 1911. Madero received more than 300,000 votes. The candidates who opposed Carranza—Fernando Iglesias Calderón and Francisco García—were able to make no serious opposition. One interesting feature of the election was the victory of Señorita Herlinda Galindo, a woman suffragist. Miss Galindo was elected to the lower house of the Mexican Congress and is the first woman ever chosen for the Mexican Chamber of Deputies.

WAR AND LABOR

Here in America we are practically in a state of war. What is the attitude of labor?

In this connection two events of last week deserve comment. The first was the meeting in Washington of representatives of 147 trades unions, comprising about 3,000,000 workers. After many hours of debate, in which the final action was vigorously criticised by large pacifist groups, the meeting approved a document perhaps the most remarkable of its kind ever issued in this country. The document includes a protest against militarism and a distinct statement that "the power and use of industrial tools is greater than the tools of war, and will in time supersede the agencies of destruction," and that organized labor should have representation in all agencies determining policies of National defense and controlling publicity. The concluding paragraphs of the statement should be quoted. They are:

We . . . hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

In this solemn hour of our Nation's life it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war.

But, despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for National policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies, whosoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow-workers and fellow-citizens in the holy name of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service.

The second event, in contrast to the first, was an ominous one. It was a conditional call by the four railway brotherhoods for a strike, beginning on the night of March 17, of the freight engineers, firemen, conductors, and trainmen of certain railway systems. This is admitted to be the beginning of a plan of strikes all over the United States to give at once to train, engine, and yard employees the benefit of the Eight-Hour Law.

The fight began last summer when the four railway brotherhoods succeeded in intimidating the President and Congress into passing an Eight-Hour Law, September 2, 1916. As they also succeeded in preventing the passage of other labor measures asked by the President, one of which was an act making a strike illegal while it is being investigated, and as the next Congress unfortunately does not meet until April 16, they have