



Wide World

Governor Pinchot (extreme right) before the Senate committee investigating expenditures in the Pennsylvania primary

tee, which is attempting to discover and report the facts in this primary has not, as we write, completed its investigation; but it has provisionally established enough facts to make it clear that reform in our nominating methods is imperative. Mr. Pinchot, from his own funds and funds of his wife and kin, spent \$140,000 and county organizations spent on his behalf about \$30,000 more, which together with unpaid bills brought the cost of the Pinchot candidacy to somewhat more than \$195,000. On behalf of Senator Pepper there was spent a total of slightly more than \$1,087,000. On behalf of William S. Vare, the successful candidate, there was spent, at the least, nearly \$600,000. The total amount spent on behalf of the three candidates thus approached the sum of two million dollars.

Some of the testimony indicated that money was corruptly spent. It has been charged that the expenditure of money for watchers at the polls was virtually spent on a system of vote buying.

What is menacing in this expenditure of money in popular primaries is not the amount. In a campaign in which every candidate naturally and properly seeks to place his views and his arguments before every voter legitimate expenditure of money is necessarily in proportion to the size of the electorate. In a State of the size of Pennsylvania two million dollars spreads very thin. Circulars, which involve cost for mailing as well as print-

ing, constitute but one item in legitimate campaign expenditures, and yet, as Secretary Mellon (a supporter of Senator Pepper) has stated, it costs \$43,000 to circularize the registered voters of the State once under first-class postage. Other legitimate expenditures in the presentation of candidates' views are newspaper advertising, railway fares, and so on. The menace lies in two direc-

tions. On the one hand, there is danger in the naturally loose and unsupervised expenditures of large sums. Corruption is easily disguised. On the other hand, there is danger in any system which makes it virtually impossible for a man to be a candidate unless he is rich or has the backing of moneyed people.

The cure is not to be found in the limitation of the amounts spent for primary campaign expenses. Nor is it to be found merely in the punishment of those discovered in corrupting the electorate, though such punishment should of course be administered. The remedy is to be found, or at least most hopefully sought, in making the popular primary not an essential for the nomination of candidates, except perhaps for local offices, but an expedient to which the people may resort when duly chosen party committees and other representatives fail to select candidates in accord with the will of the party voters. The principle underlying the primary system which was first advocated sixteen years ago by Charles E. Hughes when he was Governor of New York is essentially sound. According to that, the responsibility in the first place rests upon committees or conventions of each party to select the party's candidates; but in case a committee or convention fails to express the party's wish the voters themselves may overthrow the party's selection by a primary vote.

## A Word About Russia

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of *The Outlook*

SINCE the Soviet Government has seized the Romanoff Empire the very name Russia is anathema to most English-speaking people. There is hardly a civilized country on the face of the globe into which it has not carried fear and suspicion. The Romanoffs were not any more dearly loved abroad than they were at home. But at least they played the rules of the game. They paid some attention to diplomatic usages and the rules of international procedure. Nobody, however, knows where or how to meet the Soviet Government. For ways that are dark and tricks that are vain it beats Bret Harte's "heathen Chinees." Just at the moment Great Britain is having trouble in trying to ferret out what insidious influences the Soviet Government exercised in fomenting the recent general strike. There are, of course, in-

dividuals in America, England, France, and the various other nations who are sympathetic with the philosophy and theories of some of the individuals who are in control of the Soviet Government. But there seems to be no common ground of understanding between that Government and the other Governments of the world, whether monarchical or republican.

The case of Russia would seem hopeless indeed if we did not stop for a moment to consider its intellectual history during the last three-quarters of a century. During that period, in spite of despotism, bureaucracy, and revolution, it has produced some of the great and influential intellects of modern Europe. Consider how widespread has been the impression made on the civilized world by such Russians as Tchaikovsky and

Rimsky-Korsakof in music, and Tolstoy and Turgenev in literature. There is an element of despondency in their work which some critics have ascribed to the inherent character of the Slav nature. It may perhaps be as reasonably ascribed to the social and political sufferings of the Russian people for centuries. But there is also an element of joy and spiritual penetration which indicates that the Slav has a creative power that may in time show itself in the field of sociology and politics as well as in the field of the fine arts.

Turgenev alone is a basis of hope for Russia. A country that could produce him is capable of producing other great creative minds in other fields of human activity. He was born of a family of the gentry or aristocracy and had a university education in Russia and in Germany. His father died when he was a boy, but he got his impression of the social injustices of Russian despotism from his mother's harsh treatment of her serfs. As a young man he went into the Government service, but left it, much against his mother's wishes, to make literature his profession. His first book, which was a vivid and realistic account of the unhappy condition of the Russian peasants, is said to have had much influence with the Czar Alexander II, who was born in the same year with Turgenev and who finally emancipated the serfs in 1861.

The recent despatches in our newspapers from London about the new controversy which has arisen between the British and the Soviet Governments led me to turn to an English edition of the novels of Turgenev which was published twenty-five or thirty years ago and which has been standing on my shelves unread for a long time. In the introduction to

the novel "Smoke" I find the following significant passage from the pen of Edward Garnett:

"Smoke" is an attack, a deserved attack, not merely on the Young Russian Party, but on all the Parties; not on the old ideas or the new ideas, but on the proneness of the Slav nature to fall a prey to a consuming weakness, a moral stagnation, a feverish *ennui*, the Slav nature that analyzes everything with force and brilliancy, and ends, so often, by doing nothing. "Smoke" is the attack, bitter yet sympathetic, of a man who, with growing despair, has watched the weakness of his countrymen, while he loves his country all the more for the bitterness their sins have brought upon it. "Smoke" is the scourging of a babbling generation, by a man who, grown sick to death of the chatter of reformers and reactionists, is visiting the sins of the fathers on the children, with a contempt out of patience for the hereditary vice in the Slav blood. And this time the author cannot be accused of partisanship by any blunderer. "A plague o' both your houses," is his message equally to the Bureaucrats and the Revolutionists. And so skillfully does he wield the thong, that every lash falls on the back of both parties. An exquisite piece of political satire is "Smoke;" for this reason alone it would stand unique among novels.

Those who want to know something about the puzzles and contradictions of the Russian character, which have given rise to the most tragic political struggle of modern times, will find it interesting and useful to abandon temporarily American "best sellers" and turn to the novels of Turgenev—such novels as "Rudin," "Fathers and Children," "Smoke," "The Torrents of Spring" (a title, by the way, calmly, perhaps ignorantly, appropriated by a recent would-be "best-seller" in this country), and "Virgin Soil." While they illuminate some of

the political puzzles of Russia, they are not, in the sense of propaganda, political or sociological. They are first of all creations of the highest literary art. Turgenev had no sympathy with the Nihilists of the latter part of the Romanoff régime, or at least took no active part with them. It is indicative of his power as an artist that Stepniak, one of the ablest leaders of the Nihilist group, who defended Nihilism and Terrorism as the only recourse against despotism, was a great admirer of Turgenev. He expressed this opinion of him:

By the fecundity of his creative talent Turgenev stands with the greatest authors of all times. The gallery of living people, men, and especially women, each different and perfectly individualized, yet all the creatures of actual life, whom Turgenev introduces to us; the vast body of psychological truths he discovers, the subtle shades of men's feelings he reveals to us, is such as only the greatest among the great has succeeded in leaving as their artistic inheritance to their country and to the world.

This passage occurs in the introduction to "Rudin," one of the simplest and most perfect of Turgenev's stories. It is scarcely fifty thousand words in length and on its face appears so artless in construction that the reader at first scarcely appreciates its encyclopædic power. Rudin, the character from whom the novel takes its name, says Stepniak again, is "a man who is almost a Titan in word and a pygmy in deed; . . . but it may be truly said that every educated Russian of our time has a bit of Dmitry Rudin in him."

Is this not really the trouble with the theorists and philosophers who are trying to administer the Soviet Government of Russia?

## A Relic of Plantagenet England

Lord Curzon and Bodiam Castle

A London Literary Letter by C. LEWIS HIND

**M**ARQUIS CURZON of Kedleston rose to great eminence. He was Viceroy of India; he was British Foreign Secretary; the only great office he missed was that of Prime Minister. He was disappointed, but he never complained; he bowed to Fate.

Lord Curzon stands for prodigious success in life, and yet, maybe, in years

to come—say in a hundred years—the high offices he held may be merely regarded as symbols of his success, and his book on Bodiam Castle, Sussex, which he completed just before he died, may be the indicator which will keep his memory green.

It was a labor of love, as were his other four books on other great houses

and castles with which he had been associated, and which he did not live to finish. This most industrious man had worked upon all five, but "Bodiam Castle" was the only one of which he was able personally to correct even the type script.

The hobbies of eminent public men are always interesting. In an age when