

hypocrisy of their pets? . . . An old saying states that it takes one Jew to fool two Christians, one Armenian to fool two Jews, and one Greek to fool two Armenians." In business the Turk claims to have found this true. "As commerce, finance, and industry developed, the non-Turkish elements of the country obtained a solid economic grip and used it in their endeavors to choke the Turks."

Is there polygamy in Turkey? Or slavery? Zia Bey finds neither. Says he:

This is a true narrative of Turkey and the Turks as they really are, so I have to speak the truth even at the risk of shattering many legends. I am bound, therefore, not to fall in line with the traditions established by other writers who never fail to refer to a servant in a Turkish household as being a "slave," and to the ladies of a Turkish family as being "wives." The truth is that slavery was not generally practised in Turkey even before the Civil War in America, and the "wives" referred to by most of the foreign writers either exist only in their imagination or else are the sisters, sisters-in-law, daughters, or cousins of the head of the family which foreign writers innocently or purposely represent as his wives. Of course there might be several wives in the same household—but not the wives of the same man.

Indeed, the status of women in Turkey is now all that any rational feminist could demand, for "the daily contact of Turkish women with the public during the war years resulted of course in tearing down the social walls which had so far secluded them. . . . The emancipation of Turkish women became complete."

Apparently Zia Bey has read "Haremlik," by Demetra Vaka (Mrs. Kenneth Brown), for, after paying his compliments to "the higher-class Greeks," who, though "not Venizelist enough to don a Greek uniform," maintain "a cunning and insidious propaganda," he remarks:

To obtain the sympathy and the moral support of certain nations which, like America, are imbued with the spirit of fair play, some of their women write sweet articles where the keynote is the loveliness of the Turks individually, their innocence, their dearness, and their romanticism, cunningly interwoven with stories—supposed to be personal experiences—which emphasize in descriptions, if not in words, the ignorance of the Turks, their administrative or business incapacity, how they still practice slavery and polygamy, and how they commit political murder and atrocities. The broad-minded but misinformed public believes in these camouflaged false accusations because of the hypocritical profession of love interwoven with them.

The "broad-minded but misinformed public" should instead read Pierre Loti,

he contends, and "if there is any one whose talent is equal to that of Pierre Loti and has the courage to publish his opinion, he can thoroughly count on all the help, assistance, and gratitude of the whole Turkish race, much maligned in American literature."

Confusedly broad-minded is Zia Bey himself. In his chapter on Robert College he deplores its sectarianism and tells us, "Recognizing the one Almighty God and all his prophets, I never hesitated to go into any church of any denomination and raise my thoughts in prayer."

Coming from a "terrible" Turk, this may seem a bit odd, but are Turks in reality at all terrible? Says Zia Bey:

An American lady—it being her first day in Constantinople and her imagination being full of all the horrid things she had heard about the Turks in America—was rather nervous until she met my wife, who breezed in to greet her in a perfectly American way. Needless to say that a short while after she was laughing with us at the reputation of being "terrible" which the Turks have abroad.

Queer logic this—as queer, almost, as that by which massacres become inventions of the Near East Relief, polygamy and slavery a "legend," the emancipation of Turkish women "complete," and Loti's romances a contribution to knowledge. Throughout "Speaking of the Turks" he proves too much, leaving the impression that he is aware of having his hands full and rather more. One cannot help wondering what was his sensation on again beholding Turkey after ten years' residence in America. Perhaps shame!

HOW HISTORY IS MADE

THE story I have to tell is not of any particular importance except in showing how history is made by the daily newspaper. Hundreds of thousands of modern readers get their sole impressions of political events and political characters from the daily press. They have no means of referring to original documents or state papers. There is a moral here for editors, which, however, I do not propose to draw. I merely wish to relate an incident of editorial misinformation which has come under my own observation. It is as significant, perhaps, as it is amusing.

On September 30 the New York "Times," a responsible and careful newspaper of the first class, published an editorial commenting on the surrender of the notorious Moroccan bandit, Rai-

suli. In the course of its editorial it made this positive statement, which on its face bears all the earmarks of being based on accurate and official knowledge. I have italicized the most important assertion:

President Roosevelt may be said to have introduced the humorous knave [Raisuli] to the American people. Who can fail to remember that droll gesture of Mr. Roosevelt to the Republican party in convention at Chicago, "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead"?—a telegram prepared for transmission to the Sultan at Tangier, *but never sent*. It fixed attention upon the Republican Convention, it roused the country. "Just like Teddy!" was the admiring comment.

If the statement were true that President Roosevelt deliberately wrote a telegram, never intending to send it, for the purpose of bamboozling the American people in a Convention which he hoped would nominate him, the fact would automatically assign him to the most contemptible class of pot-house politicians. A friend of mine, holding a responsible official position in one of the most important financial institutions in this country, called my attention to this editorial statement of the "Times" with considerable anxiety. He is an admirer of Roosevelt's achievements and character, but if the statement by the "Times" were a historical fact he felt that it would shake his faith in a great American. I told him that I knew nothing more about the incident than was current in 1904, but that I would see what I could discover.

My first step was to go to George B. Cortelyou, now President of the Consolidated Gas Company of New York, and Secretary of Commerce, Postmaster-General, and Secretary of the Treasury under President Roosevelt. As a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet I thought he might remember the circumstances under which the Raisuli telegram was written. He did remember, of course, the Raisuli episode, but could not, naturally, speak definitely of dates or details after a lapse of eighteen years. He suggested seeing William Loeb, Jr. Mr. Loeb was Secretary to President Roosevelt from 1903 to 1909; was later Collector of the Port of New York; and is now an executive of the American Smelting and Refining Company. Somewhat later, at a Committee meeting of the Roosevelt National Memorial Association, of which Mr. Loeb and I are both members, I told him of my quest. He recollected the incident very well, and remembered Roosevelt's asking Mr. Hay in his presence to cable to the American Consul at Tangier, "We want Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." Mr. Loeb added that he always supposed the

cablegram was sent, but it might be conceivable that before it was coded and despatched Perdicaris was surrendered. Mr. Loeb further suggested that Mr. Adee, who has been Assistant Secretary of State since 1886, and who is probably as familiar with the historical records of the State Department as any living man, might be able to furnish exact information. In the meantime, at this Committee meeting of the Roosevelt Memorial Association, its Executive Secretary, Mr. Hermann Hagedorn, suggested that the "Life and Letters of John Hay," by William Roscoe Thayer, would undoubtedly refer to the Perdicaris affair. We got a copy of the "Life of Hay" from the Association's library, and found in Volume II, on page 383, the following:

One example of Secretary Hay's success in securing immediate attention to an ultimatum occurred in June, 1904, when an American citizen, Ion H. Perdicaris, was seized by Raizuli, a Moroccan bandit, and held for a ransom. After much shilly-shallying, and threats by Raizuli that he would kill his prisoner unless the money was speedily paid, Hay cabled to Gummeré, the American Consul at Tangier, June 22: "We want Perdicaris alive or Raizuli dead:" adding that "he [Gummeré] was not to commit us about landing marines or seizing custom house."

"June 23. My telegram to Gummeré had an uncalled-for success. It is curious how a concise impropriety hits the public.

"June 24. Gummeré telegraphs that he expects Perdicaris to-night.

"June 27. Perdicaris wires his thanks."

So speedily did even a brigand, apparently safe in the depths of Morocco, recognize the note of command in the voice from overseas.

What Mr. Hay meant by a "concise impropriety" is probably an allusion to

the very undiplomatic but very delightful and effective language of the phrase, "We want Perdicaris alive or Raizuli dead."

The proof now seemed pretty complete that the telegram, which the "Times" asserts was never sent, was actually sent. But I wanted to clinch the matter. I therefore wrote to Mr. Adee on November 23, inclosing the "Times" editorial, and saying:

At Mr. Loeb's suggestion, I am writing to you to know whether there are any records to show whether the cablegram was actually despatched or not. Mr. Loeb thinks there is a very remote possibility that before the message was coded and despatched, word may have come in of the return of Perdicaris, which made the actual telegraphing of the message unnecessary. I hesitate to add to your burdens, but as a matter of historical accuracy I think these facts may be of some interest.

Apparently the question was considered by Mr. Adee of sufficient importance to refer to the Secretary of State, for on November 29 Mr. Hughes himself replied as follows:

"My dear Mr. Abbott:

"I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 23, 1922, enclosing a copy of an editorial article in the New York 'Times' of September 30, in which it is stated that the telegram containing the expression 'Perdicaris alive or Raizuli dead' was prepared but never sent by the Department. You wish to know whether the telegram was actually despatched.

"On June 22, 1904, the following telegram was sent to the American Minister at Tangier, Morocco:

We want Perdicaris alive or Raizuli dead. Further than this we desire least possible complications with

Morocco or other powers. You will not arrange for landing marines or seizing custom house without specific directions from this Department.

(signed) HAY.

"A paraphrase of this telegram is printed in the 1904 volume of 'Foreign Relations,' page 503.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES."

Perhaps it may seem that a good deal of unnecessary detail is given in the foregoing relation, but each link of the procedure is purposely presented as an indication that even newspapers, when they try to make history, can by a little painstaking get the exact facts. It may be added that the distinguished statesman who presided at the Republican Convention of 1904, when Roosevelt was practically nominated by acclamation, said to me that the "Times" implication that the Perdicaris cablegram was written for the purpose of arousing enthusiasm at the Convention is grotesque. He added that not only was it unnecessary for Mr. Roosevelt to write a telegram to arouse enthusiasm in his behalf, but that no telegram from him could possibly have stopped the enthusiasm or hindered his nomination.

Since this article is written in behalf of accuracy, it should be said that if the name of the Moroccan bandit is spelled with an "s" in one place and with a "z" in another, it is not the proof-reader's fault. The State Department and the New International Encyclopedia prefer the former spelling, while Mr. Thayer prefers the latter. The "Times" version of the incident, however, is just as dead as Raizuli would have been if he had not heeded President Roosevelt's "droll gesture" in behalf of American rights.

L. F. A.

PIERCE BUTLER, NOMINEE FOR THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE FROM MINNESOTA BY H. A. BELLOWS

FOUR or five years ago it is probable that the entire Northwest would have regarded the appointment of Pierce Butler, of St. Paul, to the Supreme Court of the United States with the kind of satisfaction that ordinarily accompanies gratified local pride. It would have felt that in thus recognizing the Northwest's foremost lawyer the President had shown both wisdom in his choice of an able man and good judgment in acknowledging the claims of a part of the country not previously represented in the Nation's highest tribunal.

Even as little as six or eight weeks ago, it seems unlikely that the appointment would have created much active protest. November 7, however, exercised a profound influence in the Northwest, less on the thoughts of men and women than on their readiness to translate these thoughts into action. The victory of La Follette in Wisconsin, the triumph of the once-repudiated Frazier in North Dakota, and, above all, the defeat of Kellogg by Shipstead in Minnesota—these things have sharply intensified the zeal of all the elements in the Northwest opposed to conservatism.

Thus it has come about that the appointment of Pierce Butler was the signal for a double outcry in his own State—an outcry of enthusiastic applause on the part of Republican and Democratic leaders alike and on the part of the State bar and bench generally; an outcry of bitter indignation on the part of those whose votes had just elected Henrik Shipstead to the Senate.

A general Northwestern estimate of Mr. Butler would unquestionably place him in the same category with Senator Kellogg. Both are prominent corporation lawyers in St. Paul, and the agri-