

ble. All Presidents are apt to fall short of what is expected of them during their first year and a half of office. Every time the party of opposition returns to power its adherents expect its Presidential nominee to bring about a political millennium. This was so when Mr. Wilson was elected; it will prove to be so in the case of Mr. Harding, and especially because he was elected by such an overwhelming and unprecedented majority. We may therefore fully expect to find partisan Democratic papers on November 8 pointing out that Mr. Harding and all his ways and works have been repudiated; and equally we may find partisan Republican papers proving how astonishing it is that so many Democrats who voted for him in 1920 have stayed by him. We do not think that mid-Administration elections are very significant thermometers regarding the political temperature produced by Presidential policies. The real test in this respect will come two years from now.

More decisive conclusions may be drawn from the vote on the prohibition question. In Ohio there will be a popular referendum on the modification of the State liquor law by raising the legal alcoholic content of beverages. The "Wets" thus propose to relieve State officers from any responsibility in the enforcement of the Volstead Act. If the proposal is carried, it can have no other effect than registering the sentiment of the majority of the people of Ohio upon the Prohibition Amendment and the Volstead Law; for Federal officers will still possess the same authority that they possessed before. As a means, however, of registering public opinion the proposal has been shrewdly drawn by those who wish to modify or weaken the Prohibition Amendment, and the result will be significant. In New Jersey the issue is very clear cut. Senator Frelinghuysen is running for re-election as an avowed supporter of the Prohibition Amendment and the Volstead Enforcement Act; Governor Edwards is running against him for the Senatorship in avowed opposition to prohibition in all its phases. If Senator Frelinghuysen should win, it would be reasonable to make the deduction that the sentiment on the Atlantic seaboard is favorable to prohibition. In California Mr. Richardson is running for the Governorship as a "Dry" candidate, and while his campaign turns to some extent upon questions of taxation and economy, if he should be elected it would be a distinct triumph for prohibition sentiment. In Nebraska Senator Hitchcock, the Democratic nominee to succeed himself in the United States Senate, has come out

openly as favoring prohibition, although he has heretofore been counted among the "Wets." It is said that Mr. Bryan is now supporting him, while in the past he has opposed him because of their differences on the liquor question. We look upon these various tests of prohibition sentiment with some concern. Now that the Amendment is a part of the Constitution it should be given a fair trial, and it cannot be given a fair trial with some of the country half-heartedly wet and some of the country half-heartedly dry.

In New York State the chief and perhaps the only contest of National interest is that between Governor Miller, the Republican nominee, and ex-Governor "Al" Smith, the Democratic nominee. Governor Miller has never made a special feature of his views on prohibition, but ex-Governor Smith is avowedly for "light wines and beer." The contest is, however, really between an extraordinarily magnetic personality, on the one hand, and a candidate who makes his appeal not through personal popularity, but through the highest standards of efficiency in political administration. If Governor Miller wins, it will be because the voters of New York have resisted the temptation to vote for the candidate whom they thoroughly like, in spite of his association with Tammany Hall, in order to place again in the Governor's chair a man who has shown as scrupulous honesty and as high standards of efficiency as perhaps have ever been displayed at Albany.

The Middle West, as Mr. Davenport's articles and some of the political correspondence elsewhere in this issue have pointed out, is seething with dissatisfaction about more economic and social conditions than can be catalogued and tabulated. In Wisconsin Senator La Follette and his organization are appealing to all those who for one reason or another dislike certain American traditions. Unfortunately, pro-Germanism in the worst sense of that word still flourishes in this country. In Iowa the candidacy of Colonel Brookhart for the Senatorship is the result of dissatisfaction of the farmers of the Middle West, who feel that everybody but themselves has had political consideration in the economic readjustment following the war.

In spite of the confusion of issues, we are inclined to think that the candidates and the platforms and the policies of the coming election are on the whole better, both morally and intellectually, than they might easily have been in such a period of complete disorganization as the world finds itself in at the present moment.

## LLOYD GEORGE IN ECLIPSE

AS no man can live wholly unto himself, so no nation can change its government, or even its policies foreign or domestic, without affecting other nations. In one sense, whether Great Britain chooses to displace Lloyd George from the head of the British Government is no concern of ours. Certainly Americans have no right to ask the British people to consider their wishes in the matter. And yet decisions affecting the interests of America as well as of France, Russia, Italy, and Germany, the peoples of the Balkans, the Near East, and even possibly nations on the other side of the globe, will be affected by the fact that the man who came into power in Britain when Britain was fighting with but a fraction of her strength, turned the resources of the Empire over to the cause of victory, guided the nation not only through a military triumph but through a diplomatic triumph even more notable, virtually banished the Irish question as a plague of English politics and as an American bugbear, and diverted into normal channels of protest revolutionary sentiment that was making the labor problem an international one, has now been dismissed. In another sense, therefore, the change in the British Government is very much our concern. We are not responsible for it. We can do nothing about it. But we shall be undoubtedly affected by it.

Though the cause of Lloyd George's retirement as Prime Minister was chiefly, if not wholly, one of domestic politics, its effect will nowhere be felt more definitely than in Britain's foreign affairs.


On the wisdom of the change from the British point of view American comment is not likely to be helpful. In the first place, it is not likely to be adequately informed; an ignorant comment is likely to be irritating even to those whom it favors. Even English comment is not altogether clarifying. It is not by any means certain that the English people themselves understand what has been done or why it has been done. Some of the old-time distinctions between Liberals and Conservatives have been obliterated by the effects of the war and by the subsequent, if not wholly consequent, social and economic changes in England. Now that the Coalition has broken up, the old Liberal party seems still feeble, while a Government conducted, as Bonar Law's Government seems to be, by those who used to be recognized as the governing class seems somewhat incongruous at a time when

the old-fashioned Tory method of sitting on the safety valve is particularly dangerous.

If England ever needed liberal leadership she needs it now. Will the Labor Party force the Conservatives to become Liberals in self-defense? Will Lloyd George convince the people that they must choose between the Conservative Party and the Empire? Is there any other leader in England that can command a following that Lloyd George can? Britain, as it has been remarked, is sound financially but rotten economically. To restore economic health to a country cursed with unemployment as England is will require something more than a die-hard conservative or a politician with a captivating personality.

Whatever the cause of the overturn in Britain, the effect on Britain's foreign policies has already begun to be seen. Lloyd George's instability has irritated and disconcerted the statesmen of other countries, but especially those of France. In particular, the unreliability of his course in applying the terms of the Peace Treaty with Germany has been one of the important factors in the European situation. Sir Edward Carson has been quoted by the Oxford students who have recently visited America to debate with American students as describing the peace established by the Treaty of Versailles as "the peace which passeth all understanding." Certainly as applied by Lloyd George no one could be expected to understand it. Perhaps it is because he modified its terms by his own interpretation that he was the longest to last of the "Big Four" who negotiated it. Perhaps he had to seem uncertain to his foreign neighbors in order to keep his power at home. Perhaps the friction that has accompanied his negotiations ever since the Peace Treaty was signed was the inevitable product of England's economic turmoil and political instability. Nevertheless it is impossible to relieve Mr. Lloyd George of the responsibility for much that has happened in the fostering of misunderstanding over the enforcement of the German reparations, as well as the negotiations concerning the Near East. It is impossible for the foreign observer to ignore the fact that in Europe, except with Germany and her allies, Lloyd George's retirement has been greeted mainly with expressions of relief.

Nothing that has occurred in connection with the change in the British Government indicates, as far as we can see, any reason for a change in the attitude of America toward Europe. We have every reason for continuing to give our aid to those who are helpless, though those very helpless ones may have



**ALASKA  
THE  
MISUNDERSTOOD**

**D**o you know that Alaska is the most misunderstood territory on earth to-day? The popular notion that Alaska is composed entirely of blizzards, icebergs, and Eskimos is a mistake. Nearly one thousand miles north of where Alaska begins there are enormous wheat-fields, vegetable gardens, and scorching summer days when the mercury climbs to 90°. An Eskimo on the streets of Fairbanks would be a seven-day wonder. If you think that Alaska is still the land of the "rough-neck," it will interest you to know that a dinner-jacket is as useful in Alaska as in New York, and that modish fashions in dress reach Alaska almost as soon as they reach Boston and Philadelphia.

Sherman Rogers has just returned from Alaska, and in a series of articles soon to appear in *The Outlook* he punctures hundreds of our illusions about the Land of the Midnight Sun. He describes in full exactly what Alaska is and what Alaska needs. He describes its neglect by Congress, and outlines the remedy.

Mr. Rogers's report on Alaska is likely to excite much controversy. It is the story of billions of dollars' worth of potential wealth and opportunities of social and political development which at present lie fettered beneath crushing masses of administrative red tape.

neighbors whose obligation to them is more direct than ours. We have every reason to look with sympathy upon every effort towards liberty and true self-government, even when we have no means of giving material aid. But for intervention or for interference in the

general political or economic situation there seems to us to be no present necessity. The time may come when a more active policy than we are now pursuing may be effective; but if it is to be effective then, we must be careful not to do what would be ineffective now.

## THE THIRD DEGREE

**I**f published reports are to be credited, legal officials and detectives in the New Brunswick murder case have furnished another example of the futility as well as the un-American cruelty of "third degree" methods. One person thus treated, not under arrest, already questioned repeatedly, was called out of his back door early in the evening by mysterious men, taken to a room where lawyers and detectives were waiting, and subjected to a rapid fire of interrogation that lasted for many hours and well into the early morning. He had no counsel, no friend to guard his interests. Under these circumstances the "grilling" was peculiarly an outrage. The result was apparently negligible. Another man, whom events proved to be untrustworthy, was supposed to know something he had not told. He was bullied and cross-questioned and threatened until he broke down nervously and accused of the murder a friend of his who, events showed, was innocent and who was discharged soon after his arrest. In this instance the result was a good deal worse than nothing.

There is such a thing as moral and mental as well as physical torture. It is repugnant to Anglo-Saxon ideas of personal liberty. There should be wide latitude offered to keen-witted investigation of crime, but the examination of accused or suspected persons should be conducted by a judicial officer under such circumstances that coercion and physical breaking down of the questioned person should be prevented. Scientists and lawyers agree that coerced confessions or testimony are frequently false; when admitted as evidence at all, they are regarded as the poorest kind of evidence.

Pride in the fine traditions of Anglo-Saxon law and judicial procedure should not lead us to ignore the merit in some other traditions. In respect to the examination of suspected persons or of reluctant witnesses, the French follow a method much superior to the "third degree" both in its efficiency and in its justice. Such examination is conducted openly by the judge who exercises great liberty in his questions but is restrained from excess not only by tradition and by the dignity of his office but by the very publicity of the procedure.