

defect in the arrangements for the Conference in terse and guarded language. He said:

Perhaps before this Conference was held there was not the preliminary careful appraisal by each conferee of the necessities of the other. Perhaps too exclusive concentration by each conferee upon the necessities of his own nation resulted in predetermined ultimatum before a comparison of views; perhaps the public announcement of respective programs early in the Conference produced fears of domestic public repercussion if they were reasonably modified, as would be necessary to effect an agreement.

For this lack of preparation, if lack there was, the responsibility rests upon the Government that called the Conference. No other Government could well take the initiative in sounding the views of other Governments except as it might seek guidance in deciding whether to accept or decline the American Government's invitation. France and Italy evidently satisfied themselves that the Conference at Geneva, to which they were invited, would not be productive of good, and they declined the invitation. Great Britain is not wholly free from fault in this matter; for she understood the general basis—the 5-5-3 ratio—on which the negotiations would rest, and yet she entered the Conference knowing she could not or would not accede to any plan for applying the 5-5-3 ratio to cruisers.

Of the three countries that participated in the Conference, the one that comes out with the least reproach is Japan. Fortunately for her reputation in this case, Japan is poor, and in her poverty finds the best of reasons for keeping her navy to a minimum. She had every reason, therefore, to second any proposal by either the United States or Great Britain which would tend to keep navies from expanding. Japan has come out from this Conference with an added score of good will. But even Japan has suffered with the rest of the world from the failure of this Conference.

What prevented the Geneva Conference from drafting and signing a treaty was the inability of the conferees to find a way of reconciling the points of view of the United States and Great Britain. The United States thinks of its navy in terms of battle fleets and coast-defense vessels and heavily armed cruisers with large cruising radius. Great Britain thinks of her navy primarily in terms of the defense of her network of marine communications, and that means, not

cruisers of limited radius with easy access to fueling stations. Great Britain is entirely willing to apply the 5-5-3 ratio to battle fleets, including both capital ships and fleet auxiliaries; but she evidently is not ready to apply that ratio to all naval vessels. This, in the last analysis, was the obstruction which the Conference could not overcome.

With apparent candor W. C. Bridgeman, First Lord of the Admiralty and head of the British delegation, remarked: "Although we have stated our reason for wanting a number of small cruisers, we do not understand what are their [the American delegates'] reasons for demanding so many large cruisers or so many with such high offensive weapons as the eight-inch gun." Thus the British delegation attempted to make the American delegation appear as if wishing to develop an offensive or aggressive naval power. Of course, there is no real distinction between a navy of offensive and a navy of defensive power. The only power that is adequately defensive is one that can take the offensive. But the real reason for the American delegation's insistence on liberty for America to build large cruisers, a reason repeatedly stated, is to be found in the fact that America has not, as Britain has, fueling stations scattered all over the world, and therefore must depend upon the power and cruising radius of the cruisers she has.

In dealing with this impossible task of reconciling apparently irreconcilable views without adequate preparation and with nothing to offer in return for concessions demanded, Ambassador Gibson, head of the American delegation, acquitted himself well. He was patient, resourceful, heedful of the advice of experts, caustic when the sharp word was needed, courteous, skillful, clear.

In regard to our liberty of action the Conference leaves us where we were. We are free to build cruisers, destroyers, and submarines to our hearts' content. It would be silly for us to build cruisers just because Great Britain builds them. Naval war between the United States and Britain is so far removed from probability that it would be a waste of money to build a fleet in competition with Great Britain's. But we ought to have an adequate navy for any duty which a navy is called upon to perform. Our navy at present is deficient in cruisers. Congress ought to make up the deficiency. We ask the naval officers, bluejackets, and marines to trust themselves to our ships of war and to their armor and armament. We ought to provide them with the best. A feeble navy is a men-

those who use it. History shows that power of itself is neither right nor wrong; the rightness or wrongness depends upon the way it is used. We cannot insure benevolence by equipping our naval force with inadequate instruments. In recent years we have neglected our navy. It is time that we put it in shape.

## Leonard Wood, Loyal Son of America

**I**N the early days of the Plattsburg camps, before the United States entered the World War, there was a certain company in which there was enrolled a man who was almost everything that a Plattsburger should not be. He considered orders a more or less personal affront. He was surly with his tent-mates. His equipment was perpetually in a mess. He discovered base and material motives in every act. Why he ever entrained for the famous military base on the shore of Lake Champlain was beyond the power of his fellow-soldiers to discover. To Plattsburg came Leonard Wood, then in the midst of his great fight for the type of military preparation which is the only true protection of a republic. The rookies watched him as he passed through their camp. They noted the effect of his presence and the friendly solicitude which he made manifest for them all. To be in camp with Leonard Wood was to be under the eye of a great leader of men.

One day the regiment, after a long hike in the broiling sun, fell out to rest along the roadside. It chanced to be the lot of a member of The Outlook's staff to find himself next to the company grouch, the slack soldier who was a stranger to the Plattsburg idea.

"Do you know," said the grouch "ever since I come to this camp I've been studyin' about General Wood. For the life of me, I can't see why he's so keen about all this preparedness racket. He's just getting himself in Dutch with Washington. What can he get out of it anyhow? He's a major-general now and he can't get any more rank. There's no chance for him to get any more pay. Why, you know, I've almost come to the conclusion that he's doing it for his country."

The bewildered testimony of this slack soldier was perhaps one of the finest compliments ever paid to Leonard Wood.

Leonard Wood had the character and mind which drew forth such tribute even from reluctant lips. His personal courage was tried in battle, his spirit



And with this physical and spiritual courage was linked the power to make other men endure both in war and in peace beyond the limits of the strength that was given them. Leonard Wood's career, from that pursuit of Geronimo, which won for him a Congressional medal, to the hour when he died in harness as Governor-General of the Philippines, was studded with achievements each of which would have made any man notable in his generation. Yet to those who knew him he was more than a great leader; he was the embodiment of those characteristics which we like best to think of as typically American.

He carried throughout his career the rank and uniform of an officer of the United States Army, yet with all the soldierly virtues he was, in the best sense of the phrase, "civilian-minded." His broad humanity encompassed and understood the aspirations of many men of many creeds in many lands. A Catholic priest in Cuba could choose him as his spiritual sponsor at his installation and win from Rome a special dispensation which permitted this Protestant American general to present him at the altar. He could fight the Moros of Mindanao and receive from this proud people a personal loyalty and affection which they have granted to no other American. He could be sent to maintain martial law in a strike area, heralded by lying statements that a Cossack was coming, and achieve the respect and regard of the men he had been sent to control. Business men and laborers alike found in the General a clear understanding of the relation between the rights of property and the rights of the individual. A realist in all things, and touched with a high imagination, Leonard Wood has been a strengthening power to the land indebted to him for a lifetime of service and love.

In the hour of Leonard Wood's death we shall not speak much of the tragedies and disappointments that came to him even in the midst of his great achievements. Leonard Wood was too good a soldier to wish his friends to voice vain regrets, yet we cannot forbear recalling the day when Leonard Wood stood on the shores of New York Harbor and saw the division that he had trained leave for France under command of another. We cannot forbear recalling his final message to the division which he had hoped to lead in battle: "The orders have been changed, and I am to go back to Funston. . . . There is nothing to be said. These orders stand, and the only thing to do is to do the best we can. . . . That is what we are here for. That is what



(C) Paul Thompson

Leonard Wood, a great American, who in peace and in war fought indomitably for his ideals. At home in martial camps and in the high councils of civilians, he represented the best flower of the land that he loved

### The Career of Leonard Wood

**L** EONARD WOOD was born at Winchester, New Hampshire, October 9, 1860; graduated from the Harvard Medical School in 1884. He was appointed an assistant surgeon in the United States Army on January 5, 1886. For his services in the Apache campaigns in that year he was awarded a Congressional medal. He was promoted to the rank of captain in the Medical Corps on January 5, 1891, and appointed Colonel of the United States Volunteer Cavalry—the Rough Riders—on May 8, 1898. For his services at Las Guasimas and San Juan Hill he was made a brigadier-general in 1898, and that same year was promoted to the rank of major-general. On February 4, 1901, he was made a brigadier-general of the Regular Army by President McKinley, and as senior brigadier-general of the Regular Army was promoted to major-general in 1903.

He was Military Governor of Cuba from December 12, 1899, until 1902, on duty in the Philippine Islands as Governor of the Moro Province from 1903 until 1906, and for two years thereafter was Commander of the Philippine Division. In 1908 he was made a Special Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, and in 1910 Chief of Staff of the United States Army. From 1910 to 1914 he commanded the Department of the East, and was later assigned to command the Southeastern Department, and organized and trained the Eighty-ninth National Army Division and the Tenth Regular Army Division. After the war he was Commander of the Central Department, with headquarters at Chicago. From 1921 until the day of his death he was Governor-General of the Philippine Islands. He was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President in 1920.

General Wood was awarded the Congressional Medal, as we have previously said, and the Distinguished Service Medal for his services during the World War. He was Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor (French); Grand Officer Order of the Rising Sun (Japanese); Grand Officer, Order of S. S. Mauritius and Lazarus (Italian); Grand Officer, Order of the Golden Grain (Chinese). He held honorary degrees from thirteen colleges and universities.





Acme

Here is the havoc wrought in one of four subway stations in New York City which were seriously damaged by bombs on August 5. The police are still searching for the author of these crimes

we have been trained for. . . . Good luck, and God bless you."

The orders have been changed. General Wood is not to go back to his post in the Philippines. His road lies through Arlington. The order stands, and the only thing to do is to do the best we can and to keep alive in America the traditions of public service which were the breath of Leonard Wood's being.

### Terrorism vs. Law

**W**HETHER or not the subway explosions in New York and other destructive explosions in Baltimore and Philadelphia were an outcome of the Sacco-Vanzetti case, as most people seem to think, it is a fact that ever since the trial in 1921 there have been similar violent demonstrations

ica, undoubtedly the work of Anarchists and extreme radicals, and accompanied by threats of the terrible things that would happen if "justice" were not done to the two men convicted of murder.

This is not agitation; it is not even revolution; it is sheer terrorism. Not until this country becomes another Russia will ordered government and the due process of law give way before anonymous threats and dastardly acts of reckless destruction.

No one needed the assurance of the head of the American Federation of Labor, William Green, that the Federation disowned sympathy with terrorism and condemned radical outbursts. The Federation is at war with the party of violence—call its members, as you will, Communists, Reds, or Anarchists. The Federation represents the substantial

and again has voted down its minority of extremists.

The statement of Governor Fuller and the report of his advisory committee have gone far to strengthen the belief in Massachusetts' firm desire to see justice done within its bounds. Even the New York "World," which has been insistent that the conviction of Sacco and Vanzetti "has never been completely and impartially reviewed by any tribunal," now comments on the Lowell committee's report: "It has the earmarks of fairness, consideration, shrewdness, and coolness. This is the first time in seven years that the case against Sacco and Vanzetti has been plausibly and comprehensively stated." It would be both presumptuous and futile for individuals to disregard the fact that Governor Fuller and his committee have given arduous study of the records, have listened to the statements of jurymen, judge, accused, and witnesses, and have dealt with the facts as they see them, with every intention of fairness. Governor Fuller took an unusual but perfectly proper course in calling upon President Lowell, Dr. Stratton, and Judge Grant to help and advise him in reaching a conclusion as to freeing the prisoners or mitigating their punishment. In view of this intensive survey of the whole case, it is almost puerile for this or that individual citizen to clamor, "Well after all, I don't believe it!" Doubts as to innocence or guilt or prejudice will always remain, but they belong in the domain of personal feeling, not of public advocacy.

One object-lesson to be learned from this case affects not only Massachusetts but the administration of law and court procedure at large. Over a year ago The Outlook commented: "The two men were convicted of murder in the first degree five years ago, but they have neither been hanged nor been released. An appeal of some kind is still pending. Those who believe that one of the difficulties of dealing with the increasing number of crimes of violence arises from the possibility of just such long delay will find in this particular case a striking illustration." Since then the complex game of appeals and motions has gone on briskly. It is stated that Judge Thayer, who was the trial judge, denied seven motions for a new trial and five supplementary motions before the Supreme Court got the case. On the day before that set for the execution he had under advisement a motion for revocation of sentence and stay of execution, having already denied other petitions the day before. Incidentally, he listened to an impassioned impeachment of his own