

minds of people otherwise unsympathetic with the establishment of an international basis of justice and the enforcement of international law is seen in the effect of the Ruhr occupation on the minds of the British. This effect is unconsciously, and therefore the more effectively, revealed by what British officials have said to Elbert Francis Baldwin, of The Outlook's staff, as reported in Mr. Baldwin's special correspondence on another page. They frankly say that they think France is making a mistake, and is getting no returns measurable in francs, or shillings, or dollars; they point to the unhappy effect that the occupation of the Ruhr has had upon the feelings of the Germans; but they acknowledge that at least it should teach Germany that she was really beaten in the war, which the Germans have not even yet learned, and they acknowledge too that the force of facts must compel Germany at last, under the pressure of the Ruhr occupation, to take the initiative and offer guarantees, in the practical and tangible form of mortgages, for reparation and measures for French security.

Incidentally, the French in the Ruhr are in a position to save the world from possible unimaginable suffering. In an address to the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, R. M. Bryan, a coal-trade writer, recently returned from Europe, has pointed out that Germany, though deprived of other munitions, was in full possession of the most deadly kind of munitions—the materials of high explosives and poison gas. The chemical industry of Germany has its seat in the Ruhr. Now France is in a position, as Mr. Bryan says, "to put her fingers on the machinery that gives Germany a vast world monopoly of potential organic chemical munitions." If the French occupation of the Ruhr will enable the world to find some means by which the Germans may operate the industry for peaceful purposes, but prevent them from operating it for purposes of war, that of itself will place the world under a new obligation to France.

Fears have been expressed lest France occupy, or attempt to occupy, the Ruhr and other German territory permanently. Of course it would be folly for the French to attempt to do that. It would involve them in difficulties of which the least would be the political problem of dealing with a large hostile population incorporated in the Republic. If there are any French that have planned for this, they should disabuse their minds of the idea promptly; at any rate they can represent only a small and insignificant minority. The Government of France has committed itself to



International

ALEXANDER KERENSKY

the withdrawal from the Ruhr progressively according to what Germany actually does to meet her obligations. Americans and British who do not want to see France possessing the Ruhr too long had better put their minds to devising some plan for assuring to France the reparations and security to which she is entitled.

### SOVIET RUSSIA

A good deal of pressure is being brought upon the Government at Washington to "recognize" the Soviet Government of Russia. The pressure comes largely from two sources: Those who think trade will be stabilized and developed by such recognition; and those who have a sentimental feeling that the Soviet leaders are working for human liberty and freedom.

Secretary Hughes and Secretary Hoover have recently officially replied to these two groups. In a personal address to a delegation of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Secretary Hughes, on March 21, reiterated the statement that the American Government will not recognize the Soviet Government of Russia until that Government gives satisfactory guarantees that it will protect life, private property, and international obligations. He said:

Not only would it be a mistaken policy to give encouragement to repudiation and confiscation, but it is also important to remember that there should be no encouragement to those efforts of the Soviet authorities to visit upon other peoples the disasters that have overwhelmed the Russian people.

While expressing sympathy with the

Russian people, and a satisfaction that the American people have made generous efforts to help starving Russians, Secretary Hughes pointed out that only last October Trotsky publicly said in Moscow:

Revolution is coming in Europe as well as in America, systematically, step by step, stubbornly and with gnashing of teeth in both camps. It will be long protracted, cruel, and sanguinary.

It ought not to take much reason to convince an intelligent mind that American institutions, principles, and traditions are totally opposed to any government which systematically encourages protracted and bloody cruelty.

At about the same time when Secretary Hughes reaffirmed the refusal of the American Government officially to recognize Soviet Russia, Secretary Hoover, of the Department of Commerce, in a letter to the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A., asserted that there is no economic reason for supposing that recognition of the Soviet Government stimulates or develops trade:

It is a hopeless illusion that there will be a flow of foreign savings, business, or skill into Russia by the simple act of official recognition by our Government. Indeed, there has been no appreciable investment in Russia from the several countries which have extended recognition, although some of them are exporting capital in other directions.

Mr. Hoover is of the opinion that the Soviet Government is slowly retreating from the policy of extreme Communism and of creating a government to be controlled solely by the industrial or manufacturing proletariat. It is his view that agriculture must be the basis of any development of the permanent prosperity of Russia. The farmers or peasants of course are opposed to Communist government.

It is either the explicit or the implicit opinion of Secretaries Hughes and Hoover that as soon as a responsible Russian Government will acknowledge its debts, protect life and property, and assume proper international relationships, instead of trying to destroy other national governments, it will then be recognized.

We wish that the other foreign policies of the Harding Administration were as definite and were expressed as clearly and publicly as the policy with regard to Russia.

### READY TO SUFFER

THE startling announcement was made recently that Alexander Kerensky, head of the Russian Government overthrown by the Bolshevik

movement; Catherine Breshkovsky, now seventy-two years old and engaged in splendid work for the Russian children in Carpathia; Zeminoff, three times a prisoner in Siberia and once condemned to death by the Czar; Tchernoff, once Cabinet Minister and the leader of the peasant party; and other members of the Socialist Revolutionary party, have offered to surrender to the Russian Government as hostages in order to set free temporarily other members of their faith and party who have long been imprisoned by the Soviets and who are slowly dying, so that these poor sufferers may have a chance to recover health before returning to prison.

The facts in the case are not very clear. The offer was based on a statement coming from Russia attributed to Krylenko, the Soviet Minister of Justice, that he would accept such exchanges. In reply the noble men and women who have signed the offer declare: "We are ready to become in their stead hostages in the full and strict sense of the word. We shall come and go to prison for them." The letter in which this offer was made is not signed by Kerensky or Madame Breshkovsky, but reports state that they have joined the movement.

The friends of those now in prison quote a despatch of some length from Krylenko which distinctly offers to release for a year three prisoners named, "provided that in place of them there will come to Russia voluntarily other members of the Central Committee of the party who are now living abroad."

Whether the proposal is feasible or not, and whatever the exact facts leading to it may be, the incident has brought out the devotion and comradeship of those who make the offer. They are revolutionists, to be sure, but they are not Anarchists and mob absolutists as are the Bolsheviks. One of the volunteers declares that they are offering themselves for the elementary principles of liberty—freedom of the press and universal suffrage. It appears that a large number of members of the Socialist Revolutionary party are held in Moscow jails in wretched conditions and with breaking health. What is most significant of all is that they have steadfastly refused to accept release unless these principles were recognized by the Soviet, although they stood ready when such recognition came to work with the Soviet.

One despatch from Moscow states that one section of the Socialist Revolutionary party has disbanded in the belief that gradual change in the economic and political policy of the Soviets will make their efforts needless. However this may be, the offer just described



MME. BRESHKOVSKY

is one of beautiful self-abnegation and proffered sacrifice.

#### SUGAR AND RUBBER

**T**HE connection in the public mind just now between sugar and rubber is that both are abnormally high in price. The public in both cases naturally asks, Why? and, What can be done about it? The world's production of sugar is remarkably good this year; why, then, should the housekeeper pay several cents more per pound than she did a few months ago? There are two answers to that question, and there may be some truth in both. One answer is that the sugar growers of Cuba are holding back their product in order to make prices high; the other is that our Tariff Law puts such a high rate on sugar importations that the home producers are able to raise their prices despite competition from Cuba.

Secretary Hoover, of the Department of Commerce, is making an investigation to find out whether the recent rise in the price of sugar is due to a combination in restraint of trade. In reply to an intimation that the Government had favored a combination between American and Cuban sugar producers to restrict the production of sugar, Secretary Hoover properly points out that nothing of that kind could be done without the consent of Congress, that he told those who wanted to make such an agreement that this was the case, and that they of course failed to get any such action from Congress.

One check to the rise of sugar prices

might come from President Harding. He can, under the present law, with the support of the Tariff Commission, cut the tariff down on sugar even by fifty per cent. Probably the discussion that has followed the sudden rise in sugar will bring about relief in one way or another.

The rubber question is somewhat similar to the sugar question in that we cannot prevent the Governments of foreign countries from restricting the trade to this country. It is very doubtful whether that is a good general policy, and this has been shown in the past by Brazil's efforts to drive up the price of coffee by holding back the product. The rubber consumed in America comes chiefly from British rubber plantations on the Amazon. The world consumption of rubber is increasing enormously, and the restriction of rubber importation is a very serious thing for American industry. The British rubber growers claim that the United States wants to buy rubber below the cost of production, but that is denied by the Rubber Association of America, the largest consumers of rubber in the world, and is not probable in itself.

The result of this discussion about rubber has been to stimulate our Department of Commerce and the Rubber Association to begin efforts to find out whether rubber cannot be cultivated to advantage elsewhere than in the Amazon Valley. Experiments in the Malay Peninsula have already yielded good results. It is now proposed to look into the possibilities of the Philippines, and of Ecuador and Peru. Ecuador is believed to be particularly well suited for this purpose, and is much nearer to this country than the present source of supply. An appropriation was granted by the last Congress for investigations of this sort. It would certainly be of immense benefit to the world if the rubber product could be doubled or trebled.

#### HENRY KREHBIEL

**I**T is not often that a professional man, especially in the field of the fine arts, receives at his death such tributes from his colleagues as have been paid to Henry E. Krehbiel, who died in New York on March 20, after having served on the staff of the New York "Tribune" for forty years.

He was born in Ann Arbor, Michigan, the son of a Methodist circuit rider, about seventy years ago, and became a newspaper reporter at twenty years of age. In 1879 he was brought to the New York "Tribune" from Ohio by Whitelaw Reid. On that journal he not only did musical reporting, but reporting of other kinds, so that to the end of his