that he started his weekly "John Bull," which ran up to a circulation of two million and a half. Of this weekly Mr. Wilson writes:

> What Bottomley offered was the pointed paragraph, the impudent but amusing sneer, the exposure of petty scandal, and great swelling words of discontent, denunciation, and vague aspiration. For his enemies he had a morgue, where week by week he published their epitaphs. Among the first whom he buried, if in modesty I may recall the fact, was myself; more illustrious corpses were soon discovered, for instance, Lady Astor. Any one, indeed, who loved America had to die. The neutrality of the United States was to Bottomley "a monument of infamy," and to all anti-American sentiment he pandered without scruple.

Of his power as a speaker Mr. Wilson says:

> Short and thick-set, Bottomley, like Spurgeon, the preacher, is endowed with a voice of exquisite timbre. It is soft, resonant, musical, a voice equally effective in a court of law, the Albert Hall, or the House of Commons. Beyond question, Bottomley is among the greatest orators of our day. He is persuasive. He always seems to be lucid. He can explain any point that he wants to make clear. But he has also humor, sarcasm, and a command of rich eloquence, which may be and doubtless is mere acting, but reveals none the less the actor's sincerity in his art. Bottomley is neither ill-read nor inaccurate. He displays all the skeptic's knowledge of the Bible; and in the choice of words, at any rate, his taste is unerring.

Bottomley's downfall came from his personal extravagance and his expansive financial imagination. He established bond clubs in which people of limited means invested their all to the extent of some $3,000,000. Complaints as to the difficulty of securing money owed to investors resulted in Bottomley's suing his critics for libel. One critic was acquitted, and this acquittal was the beginning of the end. Mr. Wilson says that the decline of Bottomley was speeded by the continuous comments of "Truth," the journal which still carries on the tradition of its founder, Labouchère. Bottomley was tried and found guilty of a misdemeanor. Mr. Wilson justly says:

> Investing the money of soldiers and their dependents was, of course, an enterprise too mean to be tolerated unless the investments proved to be sound. In Bottomley the workers of England have had a severe lesson, and his conviction by a jury cannot fail to be salutary.

At least Bottomley has one advantage over some men of similar stripe in the United States. He was loyal in the war. Our demagogues have not hesitated at disloyalty to the Nation in their efforts to further their personal ends. They have sought to arouse blood against blood. They have sold the birthright of the Nation for a mess of alien votes.

IRELAND'S QUARRELS

The troubles of Ireland continue to occupy a disproportionate amount of the world's attention. Ireland's population was only 3,242,670 at her last census (1911), not much more than half the population of the State of Illinois or a third of that of the State of New York. The quarrelsome spirit, the lack of recognition of minority rights, the ancient bitterness between religious zealots, the habit, so to speak, of war by assassination, are largely responsible.

Neither the London agreement as to the Irish Free State nor the recent pact between Sinn Feiners who want the Free State and De Valera's irreconcilables who will not stop their outcry for a Republic has settled the trouble. The pact's main point was that the anti-Free-State leaders should have four Cabinet Ministers in the Government to be formed after the coming election. This would be a minority of the Ministry. The agreement was a great concession by Collins and Griffith, of the Free Staters, and was defended by them in their recent conference in London with Winston Churchill on the ground that it was the only way to avoid a clash that might entail another state of guerrilla war in Southern Ireland. But Churchill pointed out that Article XVII of the London treaty requires that every member of the Free State Ministry must sign a written pledge of modified allegiance to the King—a thing which De Valera and his associates positively refuse to do. It is thought that some way may be found of adjusting this difficulty. The vitally important thing in Southern Ireland is to get an acceptance by the people at the polls of the Free State plan, which makes of Ireland a self-governing Dominion like Canada. The exact terms of the Constitution to be adopted thereafter may well be left until after that election and later submitted in a referendum election. The one thing that stops the way in Southern Ireland is the obstinacy of the minority in refusing to accept what the majority of their Sinn Fein body has approved.

Ulster is still under British law. She has the Home Rule Government, Cabinet and Prime Minister she put in power under the provisions of the Home Rule Bill. Southern Ireland elected Parliamentary representatives under that bill, just to show that the Sinn Fein could carry the elections; but they refused to organize. The men elected have practically made up the Sinn Fein's Dail Eireann. But Ulster has been unable to keep the peace within her own borders. Therefore Great Britain has done her plain duty by driving back from Ulster's borders invaders of the so-called Irish Republican army and their Ulster Sinn Fein adherents. There was a miniature battle last week about the little town of Pettigoe in which several thousand British troops were used; infantry, cavalry, artillery, and whippet tanks are said to have taken part, not so much in actual fighting as in clearing the territory. The casualties were slight; only one of the British force was killed; the insurgents' loss is put variously at from seven to fifty. Hereafter the border will be held by British forces against sporadic invasions from either side, all made under the guise of retaliation for injuries inflicted. Irresponsible fighting and local rioting have brought Ulster, and especially Belfast, into a pitiable state of anarchy. Only a strong hand can put down the semi-political crimes that are committed from day to day by lawless men of both factions.

BELGIUM AND AMERICA: AN INTELLECTUAL EXCHANGE

Few people are aware of the fact that a quite extensive system of fellowships exists between Belgium and America. The plan of an exchange of intellectual ideas between two free countries brought into such close sympathy during the war drew its origin from the fact that when the Commission for Relief in Belgium closed its five years of work unspent balances were in the hands of the Commission. Mr. Hoover and all concerned agreed that these balances really were the property of the people of Belgium. What should be done with the money? The Belgian Premier, M. Delacroix, urged that it should be so used as to be of lasting benefit to the people and at the same time should commemorate worthily the relief organizations of the war. Mr. Hoover in turn suggested that the extension of education in Belgium was exactly such a method. It was decided to apply the money to the needs of Belgian universities and technical schools and also in enabling sons and daughters of those without means to undertake such higher training. Thus grew up what is formally called the C. R. B. Educational Foundation, and out of that in turn developed the Fondation Universitaire.

A most interesting work has been the plan for exchange fellowships. First, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, California, and Stanford Universities agreed to receive each two Belgian fellows for graduate study, while the four Belgian universities in turn offered to receive an equal number of Americans. This plan has increased and broadened. We have

before us a list of the Belgian exchange fellows for the current year, which is quite surprising in the variety of subjects which these Belgian scholars propose to study in America and in the wide choice they have made of American colleges. From fifteen to twenty different American universities have been indicated as the choice of these young men.

There is also an exchange of American and Belgian professors under the same general plan that has grown up between the United States and other foreign countries. One such American exchange professor is now in Belgium—Professor Millikan, of the California Institute of Technology; he is lecturing on physics in the four Belgian universities; Professor Pirenne, former Director of the University of Ghent, is to lecture in exchange in America this fall on mediæval history.

Evidently there is practical value in this interchange of intellectual ideas and intellectual scholarship. There is also a pleasing and gratifying indication of permanent friendliness and helpfulness as between America and Belgium.

HOW MUCH OF AN ASS IS THE LAW?

From very early times the law has been an object of derisive comment and of criticism as an instrument of injustice. A dictionary of quotations affords any inquirer examples. Bacon's statement that "one of the Seven was wont to say: 'That laws were like cobwebs; where the small flies were caught, and the great brake through,'" is paraphrased by Swift. Goldsmith puts it in a line:

> Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.

Mr. Bumble is not the only one who has thought that "the law is a ass—a idiot," and has said as much; and though perhaps there be few except rogues who would go so far as Jack Cade's follower, Dick the Butcher, who when confronted with a vision of England reformed and made glorious shouted, "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers," yet there are many perhaps who in their hearts are sure it would not be the last thing they would do.

Such disregard for the law's dignity and such disrespect for claims to legal infallibility may not be surprising as coming from the Bumbles or the Cades of the day; but it is somewhat surprising when criticism of the law's delays and the law's ineffectiveness is reported as coming from the mouth of one of the most conservative leaders of the bar. In the New York "Times's" report of a discussion before the Committee on Law Enforcement of the American Bar Association recently, in which Mr. Henry W. Taft, of New York, took part, it is stated that:

> Mr. Taft offered statistics showing that murder was twenty times as common in this country as in the British Empire, a fact which he laid largely to maladministration of criminal justice in this country. His statistics showed 2,200 executions in this country over a period of years for 131,000 crimes, or about one conviction for every sixty-five murders, while in England and Canada there was almost an average of one execution for every two crimes. He held this to be due partly to a sentimental attitude on the part of the community toward criminals and to such rules as that which excused the defendant from taking the stand or from being assailed by the prosecutor for his failure.
>
> "Rather than keep some of them," he continued, "I would wipe off the books every rule relating to evidence. I think we would come out better."

Such a statement as this attributed to a radical might well have aroused remonstrances from many citizens and from newspapers of both parties; for certainly the suggestion that the admission of hearsay evidence to a court of law in the trial of those accused of crime would be better than the present conditions is very little, if anything, short of revolutionary; but attributed to one of the leading lawyers of the country it apparently has aroused no stir. Whether Mr. Taft was accurately quoted or not is aside from this point. What is significant is that these words as coming from him have caused no sensation. The reason, it seems to us, is clear. Those words represent substantially an opinion that is widespread. It is very generally believed to be true that technicalities have so interfered with the administration of justice, have so obstructed legal measures for the safety of society, have so prevented the courts from acting as safeguards against the criminal, that the ancient rights of the liberty of the individual which the courts have preserved have been obscured by the practices which lawyers and judges have employed for the undeserved benefit of men really guilty.

It is not our purpose here to report the various proposals made for improving the administration of the law. Many such proposals have been made before the Committee on Law Enforcement of the American Bar Association. Some of these proposals concern rules of evidence. Some concern the attitude of judges. Some concern the methods of attorneys, including members of the District Attorney's staff. Some concern the provisions of statutes. And some of these proposals concern the unreasonable or sentimental or emotional attitude of the public. It is a long process to modify so cumbersome a machine as the law; but it is a process which should be pushed with energy; for the greatest lawyers recognize the fact that there is much in the administration of the law which defeats the law's ends. It is time that something were done to put an end to conditions which enable a city magistrate of New York to say, even though it be recognized as an exaggeration: "As soon as a man gets to be a rascal, he runs to the Constitution. An honest man that has been robbed has no Constitutional rights."

LABOR UNIONS NOT EXEMPT FROM THE SHERMAN LAW

The decision of the United States Supreme Court, announced last week by Chief Justice Taft, in the case of the United Mine Workers of America vs. the Coronado Coal Company is of Nation-wide importance because it affirms that labor unions, although not incorporated, may be sued for damages to property by their members, and that their funds, including strike funds, may be attached. But if such an action is brought (as was the one in question) under the Sherman Law, it is necessary to show that the wrongful acts committed have been part of a conspiracy to restrain or monopolize inter-State commerce. The finding as to the liability of unions to seizure of their funds and prosecution of their members was in this case a secondary rather than the primary issue. The Supreme Court found as to the facts that those accused of illegal acts had not violated the Sherman Law, because they had not interfered with inter-State commerce, for the Court held that the actual mining work at and near the mine is local in character, not part of the inter-State coal industry. This does not at all, however, affect the extent and seriousness of the ruling that now positively makes unincorporated labor organizations responsible legally and financially for illegal acts of their members. Chief Justice Taft declared as to this:

> Congress was passing drastic legislation to remedy a threatening danger to the public welfare and did not intend that any persons or combinations of persons should escape its applications. Their thought was especially directed against business associations and combines that were unincorporated to do the things forbidden by the act, but they used language broad enough to include all associations which might violate its provisions recognized by the statutes of the United States or the States or the Territories or foreign countries as lawfully existing, and this, of course, includes labor unions, as the legislation referred to shows.

In the case in question the lower Court had held that the unions were liable for over $600,000 for injury to mining property in an Arkansas strike.