

is called self-determination is more important than health, education, justice, and family life.

These self-determinationists, therefore, began to fight the British governmental administration by assassination. They murdered in 1910 Boutros Pasha, the Prime Minister of Egypt, who was himself a native Egyptian. Fortunately, Great Britain suppressed this Bolshevik uprising with a firm hand. We say fortunately, because if the revolutionists had got control Egypt would have been successfully invaded by the Turks under German leadership during the World War, the Suez Canal would have been cut, the East would thus have been separated from the Western theater of war, and the war might have been won by Germany.

Recently, with most commendable motives, English Liberals have been urging a greater degree of self-government for Egypt, although it has now a very large degree of self-government. Viscount Milner, who has been exceedingly successful as a colonial administrator of South Africa, was therefore sent to Egypt and reported a plan to the British Foreign Office for a very large withdrawal from Egypt of the English Government administration. Because this plan was not radical enough to suit the ideas of Egyptian visionaries and Egyptian revolutionaries a protest has been made against it in the form of the riots and uprising which have recently been taking place. The rioters, like the extreme Sinn Feiners in Ireland, want a republic or nothing, ignorant or forgetful of the fact that republics are not made by the stroke of a pen, but are the product of long evolutionary processes.

The Cairo riots indicate how dangerous it would be for Great Britain to withdraw wholly from Egypt, for some civilized Power of experience and wisdom must protect the Suez Canal, to say nothing of protecting the mass of Egyptians from injustice, disease, and ignorance. There is a lesson in this experience for the people of the United States in their relations to Santo Domingo and Haiti. One principle, however, must be always and constantly borne in mind. A Power like the United States or like Great Britain, if it has to administer the affairs of a less-developed people, must perform the task for the benefit first of the people themselves, second for human society at large, and not at all for the selfish interests of the trustee. England has followed this principle in Egypt with great sincerity and patience, and its perplexing and unprofitable problem in that benighted country should command for the British statesmen who are trying to solve it the sympathy of all well-intentioned people.

A NEW YEAR'S CARD TO THE OUTLOOK

A HIGH executive of a large Pittsburgh coal company in presenting his brother with a year's subscription to The Outlook wrote him as follows:

I hope you will like The Outlook. I do not always like it, or rather I might better say that I do not always agree with it. In fact, I disagreed with it so strongly a few months ago that I shopped around in earnest to try to get something to take its place. However, I could not get anything that presented the news in better form. I feel that by reading all the news items, I can keep well informed without wading through a lot of rubbish. Generally the editorials are well worth reading. The contributed articles are sometimes fine; usually they are interesting; occasionally they are downright poor. On the whole, though, The Outlook is the best weekly published, I think.

THE EXPLOITATION OF "CONFIDENTIAL" RECORDS

THE New York "Times" has announced a series of articles by Ray Stannard Baker dealing with the inside history of the Paris Peace Conference. It is stated that this story will be based upon the private records of the Conference which are in ex-President Wilson's personal possession. These records were kept in a carefully guarded steel box which contained, according to the announcements of the "Times:"

The secret records of the Big Four in Paris;

Documents and letters seen only by Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Orlando, and a few confidential advisers;

Minutes carefully guarded from public view by the Government chiefs;

Personal memoranda signed by the great leaders of the Peace Conference;

Confidential reports from statesmen and military men;

Europe's secret treaties which have been mysteries for two generations.

What use Mr. Baker will make of these records is of course not yet evident, nor is it fair to say that ex-President Wilson has released for publication documents which by all standards of honor should be kept confidential. Perhaps at the present time strictures should be confined to the manner in which the New York "Times" has announced its proposed series. It is

always the aim of the advertising headline writer to prepare copy which will have selling punch. In the present instance he has obviously violated those standards of good taste for which the "Times" has been notable. We hope that Mr. Baker's articles will prove that good taste alone has been violated and not those requirements of trust and honor which make confidential relationships possible.

If the documents to be published are correctly described in the "Times" advertisements, although they may be in the physical possession of Mr. Wilson, they are not his personal property. They belong in the archives of the State Department.

PRESERVE THE FORESTS

THE Creator provided the United States of America with some of the most magnificent forests and woodlands in the world, but failed to provide the Americans with sufficient intelligence to take proper care of them. The result has been that until about fifteen years ago we treated our forests with prodigal wastefulness. Even so late as March, 1919, Mr. Arthur D. Little, a well-known chemical engineer of Boston, wrote a paper in which he said:

The wastes in lumbering are proverbial, and, as Mark Twain said about the weather, we all talk about it but nothing is done. With a total annual cut of forty billion feet, board measure, of merchantable lumber, another seventy billion feet are wasted in the field and at the mill. . . . But the wastes in lumbering, colossal though they are in absolute amount, are trivial compared to the losses which our estate has suffered, and still endures, from forest fires.

Under the Forest Service this kind of thing has been radically changed. The United States, having formerly been perfectly ignorant and callous about forestry and having had to learn the science and art of tree protection and tree cultivation from Europe, has now become one of the foremost countries in the world in the scientific and economic use of one of the most valuable natural resources of mankind. We have only to turn to China to see what devastation and suffering follows the ignorant and careless handling of forests.

The development of the United States Forestry Service has practically all come about in the last fifteen years. It was established on its present basis in the Department of Agriculture during the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. It is now proposed to transfer the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture to the Interior Department

in connection with the reorganization of the Federal Government departments. A reorganization of these departments is greatly needed, but reorganization in itself is useless, and sometimes worse than useless, if it is not done reasonably and wisely. The transfer is advocated by Secretary Fall, of the Department of the Interior, but is opposed by practically every forester and every forestry association in the United States.

The chief argument in favor of the transfer is that the Interior Department deals with public lands; that many of our great forests are on public lands; and that all questions connected with public lands should be centralized under one department. At first blush this seems a sound argument, but a little examination of the question will show that it does not fit the case.

In the first place, the Forest Service in fifteen years under the Department of Agriculture has grown to be one of the great successful and beneficent bureaus of the Government. This growth is partly due to the intimate relation of forestry to agriculture. The essence of forestry is raising crops of trees, and it is therefore an agricultural work. For-

est Service activities are closely connected with those of other branches of the Department of Agriculture. Tree diseases must be studied and combated by the pathologists of the Department of Agriculture. Insect pests must be controlled by the Bureau of Entomology, which is a branch of the Department of Agriculture. Eradication of poisonous herbs and the improvement of forage grasses in forest tracts which are used for grazing depend upon the work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, which is in the Department of Agriculture. The control of predatory animals, such as mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, which are injurious to the grazing tracts of forest, requires close contact with the Biological Survey, which is a part of the Department of Agriculture. A very important part of the Forest Service, which is perhaps not generally known, has to do with the management of the grazing land in forest tracts of the Western mountains, and this work must be in close contact with the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, which is a part of the Department of Agriculture.

Thus it will be seen that the research work of the Forest Service, which is

essential to the development of sound forestry methods, depends on close relationship with the scientists and scientific atmosphere of the Department of Agriculture—the greatest department of biological science maintained by any government in the world. To sever this connection would destroy the very purpose for which the Forest Service exists, with resultant deterioration or destruction of the productive capacity of the National Forests.

The Forest Service has been managed for fifteen years in a non-political and efficient manner, and has steadily grown in the respect of men and communities who at first were suspicious of it. If its efficiency is weakened or curtailed by a transfer made ostensibly in the interests of efficiency, it would be as unwise and as unbusinesslike a thing as the Government could possibly do.

We hope that the President, who has deeply at heart the reorganization and revitalization of Government efficiency, will not indorse the proposed transfer without the most careful consideration; for if he gives it the most careful consideration we believe he will not indorse it at all.

BRITISH "PROPAGANDA" AND FRENCH "IMPERIALISM"

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE ARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT WASHINGTON

BY ERNEST HAMLIN ABBOTT

"WE cannot disarm in an armed world."

When these words came from the lips of a British spokesman who was addressing a large group of press correspondents during Christmas week at the Armament Conference, they occasioned no stir, aroused no antagonism, set no special writer to preparing an article on British ambition.

Why is it, then, that words to the same effect when used by French spokesmen raise an outcry at once against France as an obstacle to the restoration of the spirit of peace?

It is certainly not because Britain is in danger, while France is secure. On the contrary, Britain to-day is obviously much freer from foreign peril than France. It is simply because Britain has taken the pains to create a friendly audience, while France has not. Britain has been well served by her diplomatists, while France by hers has been served ill.

When the British argue that they cannot disarm in an armed world, and are commended for saying so, those unfriendly to Britain call it British propaganda.

When the French argue that they must be armed in an armed world, and are reproved for saying so, many even

of those who are friendly to France call it French imperialism.

Briand pictures in words a Germany still morally armed, whose outrages against civilization are fresh in the memory of mankind, and declares that France must still guard herself, and people shake their heads and call France militaristic. Then Balfour pictures in words an imaginary France, planning some future submarine warfare against Britain, though the real France, still prostrated by war, is before the very eyes of mankind, and people shake their heads again and call France imperialistic.

In America at least France has been speaking to an audience of skeptics; Britain, to an audience of believers. This is not by chance. Each country has created its own audience, or rather, the diplomats of each country have. Apparently the French diplomats have assumed that their business was with diplomats alone, that diplomacy was something still to be carried on by professionals, and have consequently made little effort to make their case understood by the peoples of other countries; while the British diplomats, without discarding the proved canons of their profession, recognize the fact that to-day diplomacy engages not merely the

professional diplomatists themselves but masses of people. In this respect diplomacy has followed the development of war. It is no longer confined to the regulars, but is extended to the citizenry.

As that country would be surely beaten in war which ignored the conditions of modern warfare, so will that country be beaten in diplomatic negotiations which ignores the conditions of modern diplomacy.

At Washington all the machinery of the Conference has been built for the use of a diplomacy of the modern kind. The facilities for connecting the delegates with the peoples of the nations involved, so that information may go from the Conference to the people and knowledge of public opinion may be conveyed in return to the delegates, included meeting-places for conferences between representatives of the delegations and the press correspondents. In the New Navy Building, where these meeting-places are grouped, the British Empire is bounded on the south by Japan, on the west by China, and on the north by Belgium, Italy, and the Netherlands. Instead of finding their way from hotel to hotel in various parts of the city to get information, the press correspondents have found it for the