

tion, he sent twelve hundred dollars back to Croatia for his wife and the other five children. According to the law now in force, which permits only a certain quota of aliens to enter this country every month on a percentage basis, the mother and three of these children were permitted to join the farmer husband and two older sons, and two of the children were deported or returned to Croatia. What must be the feeling of this Illinois farmer and of his wife toward a Government which forcibly separates them from two of their children, who are sent back without parents or guardians to nobody knows what fate in a land torn by dissensions and threatened with starvation! This piece of Americanization was performed under a law which attempts to settle the immigration question by mathematical percentages. Americanization is not a mathematical process; it is a human process. Pigs may be imported by mathematical calculation. Ought we to be surprised if piggish methods of regulating immigration produce brutish resentment and hatred of law and government?

## THE WRONG WAY WITH VETERANS THE RIGHT WAY WITH LEGISLATORS

**N**EW YORK STATE on election day will attempt to deal with two problems which are of National importance. The citizens of that State will be asked to vote for or against veteran preference in the Civil Service and for or against raising the pay of the State legislators. The Constitutional amendment which would grant to the veteran a prior right to employment in the service of the State over men who might be better equipped for the task at hand would be a direct injury to the State and a hardly less direct injury to the great body of veterans themselves. The Constitutional amendment proposed for New York State provides that soldiers, sailors, and marines who are citizens and residents of New York State shall be entitled to preference in appointment and promotion without regard to their standing on any list from which such appointments or promotions may be made. Such an amendment would doubtless be a benefit to individual veterans, but the real interest of all veterans is to protect and maintain the highest possible degree of efficiency in the Government which they sacrificed so much to defend.

Cities and States have already experimented with the same form of misguided

generosity towards the veteran which is proposed for New York State, and their experience has not been happy. The Department of Civil Service of Seattle, Washington, is of the opinion that the Veteran Preference Law has not been satisfactory and has frequently resulted in lowering the efficiency of the city service. The Civil Service Commission of the State of Illinois has stated:

It is the personal opinion of all the officials, who do not want to be quoted, that the war veteran preference is a detriment to the service. The members of the Legislature would not act on this principle when applied to themselves. For example, if a member of the Legislature were stricken with appendicitis, he would not hire an inexperienced interne who had served in the World War in preference to an experienced surgeon. Yet this is the situation voted upon the helpless inmates of the State institutions.

The members of the Legislature who voted for war veteran preference did not apply this rule for political appointments where their own relatives and political associates are appointed.

The phrase which reads, "who do not want to be quoted," provides perhaps a suggestive explanation for the demand for the passage of such an amendment as it is proposed to add to the New York Constitution. The published arguments may be generous and philanthropic. The real arguments are political.

The second amendment which will confront the voters of New York State likewise deals, as we have said, with a matter of National concern. It is proposed to increase the salaries of the State legislators from \$1,500 to \$3,000 a year. The reason for this proposal may be found, in part, in the belief that the legislative body of New York is at present unable to draw into its service the type of man most needed in a democratic government.

James Bryce in his latest volume, "Modern Democracies," speaks of the decline of legislatures in standing and dignity throughout the world, and he deplors this change because the efficient legislative body is an indispensable part of the machinery of popular government. Of course it is an open question in the world at large whether the best results are obtained from the payment of legislators at all. But that is not an issue in America, as the tradition here is that members of the legislature are not to be merely country gentlemen or persons of wealth but representative of the average of the American democracy. And representatives of the average of our democracy cannot spend a considerable portion of their time every year at the seat of government without being reasonably compensated for it. The effect of exceedingly low and insufficient salaries has

been unwholesome. It is true that there have been those all over the country who have sacrificed time and money in the parliamentary service, but an unworthy stipend has brought to the seat of government many legislators of light caliber who are fit neither for public place nor for anything else. Those of better quality use a term or two in the legislature as a stepping-stone to more profitable areas of activity. Charles F. Murphy, in commenting upon the tendency of some legislators to profit on the side, once remarked that the salary of a legislator was nothing but "chicken feed," anyway. And it is unquestionably true that the State has lost immeasurably not only in the quality of a great number of its legislators but also through the temptation to eke out a subsistence by ill-gotten gains in a position of power where easy money can so readily be obtained. The salaries of legislators have not been altered in large parts of the country through a long period of years, and while the financial rewards of public service can never be on a parallel with those of other fields of usefulness, they may be and they should be raised to a plane of worthiness. To be sure, this is only one step towards halting the decline of legislatures, but it ought to have an immediate effect in increasing the competition of good men for legislative office and in decreasing the servility of legislators to party machines and powerful interests and temptations of all sorts which beset them in the public service.

## WHITE TERROR AND RED TERROR

**T**HE bomb which was exploded in the American Embassy in Paris in an attempt to assassinate Ambassador Herrick must make the blood of every believer in orderly government boil. It is alleged, and the allegation is substantiated by written boasts, that the bomb was exploded by Communists as a protest against the conviction in Massachusetts of two Italian radicals, Sacco and Vanzetti, who were recently tried and found guilty of murder. It is not denied even by their friends and sympathizers that these two Italians were ultra-radical, disseminators of so-called Red literature, and evaders of the draft; but there are some Americans, the editors of the "New Republic," for instance, who claim that they did not have a fair trial and that judge, jury, and prosecuting officials were swayed by passion and prejudice against Red radicalism. Even if this were true—even if the judge were tyrannical, the jury prejudiced, and the witnesses perjured—assassination and bomb

throwing is not the remedy. The convicted men had at least had the justice of a trial before a jury of their peers, in open court, with their own witnesses, and with the benefit of counsel. The fact that their friends and sympathizers are of a mentality and spirit which led them to attempt to assassinate in a sneaky and cowardly fashion a perfectly innocent man as a protest against what they allege to be injustice indicates that, whatever their acts may have been, their associations and mental processes are undesirable in a free democracy. The White Terror of despotism is a lesser evil in a democracy like the United States than the Red Terror of violence and assassination. For unjust judges and corrupt or insincere prosecuting officers can be removed by the instrument of the ballot; while assassination and terror only breed violence and repression under which constitutional government is sure to disintegrate.

We do not here presume to criticise the court in which Sacco and Vanzetti were tried, although it has been criticised by some reputable, patriotic, and law-abiding citizens. But we do say that in every American court in which aliens are tried for revolutionary acts or behavior especial efforts should be made to see that the accused are treated with the most punctilious fairness and justice. There should be made the clearest distinction between revolutionary opinions and revolutionary acts. Opinions cannot be regulated by law; acts can. The Constitution of the United States in its Bill of Rights says:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

The italics are ours. The inalienable right of free thought, free speech, and a free press was so dear to our fathers that they felt it necessary to guard by Constitutional provision against a passionate or prejudiced punishment of treason, the most dangerous and the most heinous crime that can be committed against organized society. The Red Terror that followed the World War engendered in some places a White Terror—that is to say, the despotism of government officers. Those Americans who believe in the constitutional and human rights of a democratic form of government must not only protect their country from the dangers of the Red Terror, but take good care lest in their natural reaction against violence they themselves are not contaminated by the insidious prejudices and passions of the White Terror.

## BRITAIN AT THE CONFERENCE

NAVALISM is a word that has been coined in recent years to express distrust of Britain. Nobody seriously alleges or attempts to prove that the navy of England controls the policy of the British Empire. If it means anything, navalism signifies the possession and use of a preponderant sea power and implies that such sea power is an evil.

The suspicion of Britain expressed in the word navalism will prove one of the factors at the Conference on the limitation of armament. Britain's navy is not only by far the biggest navy in the world, but is the best balanced. According to a recent despatch from Washington giving what is said to be statistics compiled by "informed officials," Great Britain has 533 fighting ships, the United States 464, and Japan 99. The relative tonnage of these ships is: British, 1,860,480; American, 1,289,463; and Japanese, 528,689. Thus in number of ships Great Britain lacks but thirty of equaling the number in both the navies of the United States and Japan, and in tonnage surpasses them combined. Those who believe, as I do, that among the essentials of justice and peace in international relations are understanding and co-operation between the English-speaking peoples must recognize that there are people who fear power such as Britain's on the sea.

Furthermore, at this Conference the subject for discussion is to include the problems of the Far East, and Great Britain comes to the Conference not quite free to discuss those problems unhampered by obligations. The Far Eastern problems in a single word are Japan. If it were not for Japan, there would be no problems of the Pacific—at least no such problems as seem to threaten peace in the future. And Great Britain comes to this Conference as an ally and partner of Japan. Occasioned by the threat of Russia in the Far East, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has ceased to serve its original purpose. If there is any danger of friction in the Far East, it is evident that Japan is likely to be on the one side and the United States on the other. In coming, therefore, to the Conference as an ally and partner of Japan, Great Britain has incurred further suspicion. Her partnership with Japan would not be quite so significant if it were merely a survival of an earlier arrangement. But it is more than that. This past summer Great Britain had the opportunity of notifying Japan that she intended to terminate that treaty. According to the terms of the treaty, it would then have had a year longer to run. Though still bound by the treaty,

Great Britain would then have come to the Conference freer to speak her mind than she is. This is recognized by English observers. The London "Spectator," which is by no means radical and is thoroughly British in its feeling, has expressed its regret at the situation in which Great Britain has allowed itself to be placed. "Our readers know," says the "Spectator," "that in our opinion the first thing we should have done by way of preparation was to denounce the Japanese Treaty, not because we had any kind of quarrel with Japan—far from it—but because we ought to have made it our business to go into the Conference with our hands quite untied and without any trace of prejudice."

There are many Americans who understand why the British Government has preferred to leave the Anglo-Japanese Alliance undisturbed. Most Americans, however, will not take the trouble to go into those reasons. They will simply note the fact that Great Britain is a partner of Japan.

It does not improve the situation that Great Britain came out of the war as the greatest gainer from the war. Nobody can overlook the fact that Britain's loss in men and in morale was severe. Her labor troubles at home, her difficulties with Ireland, her anxieties concerning India, her futile attempts to parley with the Russian Bolsheviki, her failure to retain the confidence of France, are all losses due to the war, but none the less severe because they belong in a large measure to the category which Bismarck termed "the imponderables." You cannot weigh confidence. There is no yardstick by which to measure common sense. Materially, however, Great Britain's gains have been considerably more than those of any other participant in the World War. Her gains in real wealth and in potential wealth are incalculable. German colonies that have fallen to her lot have insured to her a Cape-to-Cairo route which makes her position in Africa virtually supreme. Her gains in the Near East are obvious. The threat to Egypt is removed. Islands that have been committed to her under the mandate of the League of Nations, even though nominally assigned to the Dominions, are additional resources of the Empire. Besides these and other actual gains, she has been relieved of a great naval and commercial rival. When Germany's navy was destroyed and Germany's merchant ships were scattered among the Allies, Great Britain was by all odds the chief gainer. She has come out of the war very well indeed. Compared with France, her situation is enviable. When a nation prospers in this fashion from war, it requires some charity or tolerance or exceptional intelligence on the