

Deputies, a co-defendant, and now under arrest in Italy, was also sentenced to death. The conviction of Cavalini is certainly ominous as to the fate of ex-Premier Caillaux, whose relations with Cavalini, it is alleged, have been very close.

Another co-defendant, Darius Porchère, an accountant, business agent, and intermediary, was sentenced to three years' imprisonment.

Bolo's propaganda, now known throughout the world as "Boloism"—a word quickly acclimatized—consisted in buying interests in newspapers or founding new publications with money supplied by Germany. How much it took to "float" Bolo is not known, we suppose. But at least \$2,500,000 has been located. The greater part of this was transferred from Berlin to Paris by way of New York. As a result of the discovery of this manipulation the New York authorities were able to obtain information which they forwarded to Paris.

Bolo's trial was as sensational as even sensation-loving Paris would wish. Bolo's two wives were on the stand, as was M. Panon, Bolo's partner in various undertakings in Marseilles. Bolo had swindled Panon out of 100,000 francs and disappeared with Madame Panon, leaving her husband to settle debts of 50,000 francs. Extravagant statements which reminded one of Tartarin also marked the trial, as, for instance, the fanciful allegation that Bolo had prevailed upon Mr. J. P. Morgan to subscribe for \$12,000,000 of the capital for a bank to be established in Cuba—certainly evidence of a fertile imagination on the part of the witness; and the testimony to the effect that articles praising Mr. W. R. Hearst had repeatedly been taken to Senator Humbert's paper, the "Journal," in which Bolo had bought an interest.

But the actual facts were clear cut, and conviction was inevitable. The handsome, plausible Levantine-Frenchman went to pieces in the trial. As he said of himself: "The thin veneer of cultured refinement was promptly rubbed off and I, Bolo, stood out unscrupulous and vulgar."

But France has not gone to pieces. Persons who do not know the French may think them merely pleasure-loving, mercurial, volatile, if not decadent. Persons who do know the French are glad that this image has now been replaced in the minds of others by the real French—a thrifty, virile, prompt, precise, relentless folk when it comes to elemental matters. This people has shown itself stern to foes abroad. It is showing itself equally stern to traitors at home.

JOFFRE AN IMMORTAL

Marshal Joffre will stand "under the Cupola." So the French say when a man is elected to the French Academy, and on February 14 Joffre was so elected.

The "Cupola" is a dome-covered and somewhat clumsy but not unimpressive structure, situated on the left bank of the Seine, opposite the Louvre on the right bank. Visitors to Paris will remember the façade on this dome-crowned edifice as shaped like a crescent. It is the Palais de l'Institut. The highest ambition of every literary and scientific Frenchman is to be "Membre de l'Institut." The Palais houses five academies, namely: the Académie Française, the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, the Académie des Sciences, the Académie des Beaux-Arts, and the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques. Each of these has forty members except the Académie des Sciences, which has sixty-six. Each member receives a yearly salary of \$240. While the Académie des Inscriptions is chiefly devoted to the study of the ancient languages and to archaeological research, while the Académie des Sciences cultivates the study of mathematics and natural science, while the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques exists for the study of philosophy, history, and political economy, and while the Académie des Beaux-Arts promotes painting, sculpture, architecture, and music, the Académie Française is mainly occupied with the French language.

It may seem surprising that a soldier, no matter how distinguished, should aspire to distinction in a selected assemblage of literary men. The truth is that those men have always aspired to have among them such a soldier. One of the Academicians, M. Alfred Capus, recently remarked in the Paris newspaper "Excelsior" concerning Joffre, "His election is certain in

advance." M. Capus was perhaps thinking of what Renan said in 1885 concerning a somewhat similar candidacy, as quoted in the "Excelsior": "The person who is sure to become one of us is the general who will bring victory back again to us. We would nominate him by acclamation!"

Marshal Joffre is the seventh Marshal of France to be elected to the Academy. The first was Marshal Villars, elected in 1714; then followed Marshal d'Estrée, Marshal de Richelieu, Marshal de Belle-Isle, Marshal de Beauvau, and Marshal de Duras. As the last named was elected in 1775, a long period of time has thus elapsed "between Marshals."

The French like to poke fun at their great men, and the Academicians have become known as "Immortals."

CONDITIONS IN HOLLAND

According to the New York "World," travelers who have been in Germany recently report that there is increasing privation in Germany; but, what is still more important for the time being, that the people of Holland are threatened with starvation. More than one of the travelers quoted attributed the danger of starvation in Holland to the embargoes insisted upon by the United States. As we have already told our readers, the United States has taken steps to prevent food from this country going through neutral countries into Germany. In the process of doing this it has unquestionably made it difficult for Holland and other neutral countries to get goods that they need from Germany, because Germany will not send her goods to these neutral countries unless the neutral countries send to Germany in return goods which they have got from America and other enemies of Germany.

As a consequence, Holland is in great difficulty, and one of the purposes of the newly arrived Minister to America from Holland, Dr. Philips, is to bring about such an understanding with the United States that the Dutch may be able to get the food that they need. Several of the travelers quoted declared that the present situation, if continued, would drive Holland into the war on Germany's side. There is no way, they said, by which Holland can get food, if we cut off our supplies, except from Rumania, and Holland can get it through Rumania only by permission of Germany. She will be able to get that permission only by becoming Germany's associate in the war.

Pro-Ally as most of the Dutch are, it is said that they cannot much longer endure the physical suffering consequent upon their maintenance of neutrality unless the Allies see to their relief. This testimony, of course, is not conclusive, and is at best only hearsay; but certainly we do not want deliberately to use terrorism or constraint upon any neutral country or hamper its freedom of action in any way, except as the safety of the cause for which we are fighting and the rights of ourselves and our allies as belligerents bring on others incidental and unavoidable hardship. The people of Holland surely must understand that we cannot afford to send food and other supplies through their country to our enemy.

THE SHIP-BUILDERS' STRIKE

What has been called in the daily newspapers "the ship-builders' strike" was really the strike of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. But when that strike was threatened it was generally regarded as only the overture to a still more widespread strike among the mechanics in steel ship building. The strike of the ship carpenters and joiners was ostensibly over the question of wages. But it also involved, as all labor strikes do in one form or another, the question of a recognition of the unions and as far as possible the establishment of the "closed shop." Although shipyard wages are now higher than they ever have been before, it was claimed by the men that the prevailing increase in the East was not as great as on the Pacific coast, and, moreover, was not sufficient to meet the greatly augmented cost of living. The Shipping Board is now engaged in the problem of establishing a National shipyard wage, standardized for the entire country, which shall be acceptable both to the Government and the workmen.

The strike of the ship carpenters and joiners was abruptly

brought to an end last week by a message from President Wilson to their leader, William L. Hutcherson, in which the President stated with his characteristic felicity of expression the fundamental issue at stake:

I feel it to be my duty to call your attention to the fact that the strike of the carpenters in the shipyards is in marked and painful contrast to the action of labor in other trades and places. Ships are absolutely necessary for the winning of the war. No one can strike a deadlier blow at the safety of the Nation and of its forces on the other side than by interfering with or obstructing the ship-building programme.

All the other unions engaged in this indispensable work have agreed to abide by the decisions of the Ship-Building Wage Adjustment Board. That Board has dealt fairly and liberally with all who have resorted to it. I must say to you very frankly that it is your duty to leave to it the solution of your present difficulties with your employers and to advise the men whom you represent to return at once to work pending the decision. No body of men have the moral right, in the present circumstances of the Nation, to strike until every method of adjustment has been tried to the limit. If you do not act upon this principle, you are undoubtedly giving aid and comfort to the enemy, whatever may be your own conscious purpose.

I do not see that anything will be gained by my seeing you personally until you have accepted and acted upon that principle. It is the duty of the Government to see that the best possible conditions of labor are maintained, as it is also its duty to see to it that there is no lawless and conscienceless profiteering, and that duty the Government has accepted and will perform. Will you co-operate or will you obstruct?

No better statement could be made of the paramount present-day duty of every American citizen from the President down to the youngest office boy. Every American must do his utmost to help win this war. While questions of domestic economy, National efficiency, and individual justice may be discussed, they must be discussed in such a way as to aid and not to interfere with victory. A man who strikes at a time of National emergency simply because he sees a chance selfishly to increase his income, whether he be a profiteer or a day laborer, is really an enemy to his country. That this is recognized by many of the ship carpenters themselves is indicated by the fact that at least in one shipyard of which we know many of the men not only refused to go out but themselves posted up placards urging their fellow-workers to "build ships and beat the Germans." Even before the President's intervention the number of workers who actually went out on strike was much less than some of the sensational accounts indicated.

THE MOONEY CASE: AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

When, many months ago, cable despatches from Petrograd reported a riotous demonstration against the American Embassy in the Russian capital, and added that it was in protest against the Mooney conviction in California, not a few Americans asked in surprise who Mooney was, what he had done, and why Russian Socialists should be excited about his conviction.

The other day another unusual chapter was added to the history of the case when the Federal Mediation Commission recommended that President Wilson use his good offices with the California authorities to bring about a new trial for Mooney in case the California Supreme Court sustained his conviction. The Mediation Commission, in reviewing the history of the matter, says that "the Mooney case soon resolved itself into a new aspect of an old industrial feud instead of a subject demanding calm search for the truth."

The offense with which Thomas J. Mooney (together with others) was charged was the throwing of a bomb into the Preparedness Parade in San Francisco on July 22, 1916. Six persons were killed and many injured by this outrage. Mooney was duly convicted, but largely on the direct testimony of Frank Oxman. After the conviction letters from Oxman came to light which, in the words of the Mediation Commission, had the plain import of an attempt by Oxman to suborn perjury to corroborate his testimony in this trial against Mooney. Naturally, when Oxman was thus discredited, a stain was placed on his own evidence. Oxman was indicted, but the jury failed to

convict. When Mrs. Mooney and Israel Weinberg were tried for the same offense as Mooney, but without the Oxman evidence, they were acquitted. The other alleged accomplice, Warren Billings, had been convicted, and, like Mooney, is under sentence.

The labor leaders and Socialists in San Francisco aver that a plot existed to make organized labor bear the infamy of murder and disloyalty; justly or unjustly, this feeling grew passionately, and meetings of protest were held by Socialists from California to Russia. The Mediation Commission so far indorse this feeling as to say that the "circumstances of Mooney's prosecution, in the light of history, led to the belief that the terrible and sacred instruments of criminal justice were consciously or unconsciously made use of against labor by its enemies in an industrial conflict."

It is not quite clear how the President's intervention is expected to bring about a new trial—the case is not in Federal courts. But in view of the facts above stated, the ordinary American citizen, who has no opinion whatever as to the guilt or innocence of Mooney and Billings, and who also earnestly wishes to see the despicable perpetrators of the outrage punished, may yet feel that common fairness calls for a trial in which an alleged suborner of perjury who is also suspected of perjury shall not be the State's chief witness.

THE ADMINISTRATION, PRO AND CON

With the oratorical fire for which he has earned a reputation, Senator Ollie James, of Kentucky, continued in the Senate the defense of the war activities of the Administration. His speech was made on February 14. However biting some of his words may seem in print, it is impossible to think of them as being accompanied by anything less than the good-natured smile of this massive Senator from Kentucky. His line of argument was much the same as that which Mr. Glass followed in the speech which he made in the House and which we reported last week.

During the course of the debate there have been charges of partisanship against those who criticise certain aspects of the Administration's management of the war. This point, as well as others, was taken up by Senator Weeks in his speech on February 15. Unlike Senator James, Senator Weeks made no effort for rhetorical effect, but read his manuscript closely. The Senator from Massachusetts declared near the outset of his speech that never in his experience in the House of Representatives or in the Senate had he seen a Congressional investigation so devoid of partisanship; that the investigation had been conducted on the principle that the people have a right to examine and regulate the administration of their Government. He acknowledged the difficulties with which the War Department had to wrestle, and said that the Committee that made the investigation had just cause of pride in much that had been accomplished. But he gave facts in evidence of shortcomings, prefacing them by the following statement:

If I were to criticise the Secretary of War personally, it would be that he has undertaken to do too many things himself, some of which, at least, might have been attended to by subordinates, and that he has been too open to access to people who might have had their needs provided for through some subordinate officer, leaving him too little time to deliberate over the many larger problems coming before his Department.

If I were to make a further criticism, it would relate to his temperamental relationship to war. Doubtless he himself would admit that he is a pacifist by nature. For example, he is even now opposed to universal military training, one of the benefits we ought to get out of the great sacrifices we are making; and I cannot divorce myself from the conclusion, based on his own testimony, that he has been inclined to plan for the prosecution of the war—and this condition has to some degree permeated the Department—on the basis that we are three thousand miles from the front, instead of hastening preparation with all the vigor we would exercise if our borders were the battle-front.

In reference to the charges of political bias Senator Weeks said near the conclusion of his speech:

Not a question indicating partisanship was raised until the President deliberately injected politics into the situation by an