

# The Outlook

Volume 146

July 6, 1927

Number 10

## The Naval Conference

**A**T Geneva John Bull is playing a different rôle from that which he played nearly six years ago at Washington.

After the first surprise of Secretary Hughes's announcement on November 12, 1921, of the American plan to stop the naval race where it was John Bull became the cordial backer of Uncle Sam. There were reasons for this. Uncle Sam was in a way to outdistance John Bull on the sea, and John Bull was glad to accept a proposal that Uncle Sam should stop where he was. Then, too, Jean Crapaud was toying with submarines, and John wanted Sam's backing—moral backing—in discountenancing that. Also there was the Dominions' distrust of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. So John Bull was very glad to concur with Uncle Sam in any sacrifice he might make. But since then affairs have changed. Now John Bull finds Uncle Sam's proposal not to his liking at all.

So the first week of discussion at the Three Power Naval Conference at Geneva has ended with the British interposing the chief obstacle to real reduction of naval armaments.

Again there are reasons.

The largest naval vessels below the capital ships are the 10,000-ton cruisers. Of these Great Britain has built or has appropriated money for the building of fifteen. She has some of them under construction. The United States, on the other hand, has but two such cruisers under construction and has authorized the building of only six more. Moreover, the Government of the United States has shown little disposition to strengthen the American Navy's cruiser fleet. There seems, therefore, no prospect of Uncle Sam's outdistancing John Bull in this class of vessels. Besides these Great Britain has twelve cruisers ranging from 7,500 to 9,700 tons, while the United States has only ten of 7,500 tons. Great Britain also has naval bases all over the world, which enables her to keep her cruisers where they can be of use without steaming great distances. Though nominally Great Britain and the United States are on a parity in respect to battleships, Great Britain has just completed two battleships of 35,000 or 36,000 tons that are the most powerful ships afloat. In that situation Great Britain suggests, first, that battleships

hereafter should not exceed 30,000 tons, and, second, objects to any real and genuine reduction as to cruisers except by limiting the size of every cruiser hereafter to be built to 7,500 tons.

As the Geneva Conference was not called to consider battleships, which were settled at the Washington Conference until 1931, nor to encourage the building of cruisers, which it would do if Great Britain's proposals were accepted, the American delegation has found the attempt to bring auxiliary ships to the 5-5-3 ratio adopted for capital ships obstructed.

## Hugh Gibson's Cool Head

**I**N this situation a good deal depends upon the ability and common sense of those who represent the United States. It would be easy for the American delegates to adopt a policy of bluster. The only obvious answer to such a position as that which Great Britain has taken is the answer of the shipyard. We may not have the ships, but we have the men, and, what is more, we have the money. If we wanted to, we could build more ships than Great Britain could, for our resources are greater and we are not saddled with external debts, with a dole system for the unemployed, with the cost in men and morale of a general strike.

But Mr. Hugh Gibson, the chairman of the American delegation, has made no threats, has issued no warnings. He has heard patiently what the British have to say. He has made it plain that nothing in the world can prevent and no one in the world wants to prevent Great Britain from discussing battleships as much as she wishes; but he has also made it plain that there is nothing to require and nothing to induce the United States to discuss battleships.

If Great Britain can be satisfied with nothing less than a program that would simply mean giving the United States liberty to build as many cruisers as Great Britain has now, a liberty which the United States already has, there is not much prospect that the real object of the Conference for the reduction or limitation of armaments can attain its object. The only plan so far that really would limit naval building and reduce the burden of naval armament is the American plan to apply the 5-5-3 ratio to auxiliary vessels as it is now applied to capital ships.

Japan has made it clear that she would like a little higher ratio than three-to-five in cruisers, and the United States has not been deaf to her arguments. The question whether the ratio should be 5-5-3 or 5-5-3.5 with reference to cruisers as distinct from capital ships does not seem beyond the pale of discussion, as does seem the idea that a conference for limitation of armament should be turned into a conference for increasing it, or the idea that a conference for considering cruisers and other auxiliary ships which are subject to no ratio should be turned into a conference for reconsidering the question concerning capital ships that has already been settled for at least four years to come.

Already news about the Naval Conference has begun to recede from the first page of the daily press. The Conference is reaching, or has reached, the stage when the most profitable discussion will be by naval experts. In the meantime the American people can profitably exercise patience. It is only fair to remember that Great Britain is an island that depends upon the sea for her supplies and cannot afford to weaken her defense of the highways of the sea. There is no reason in the world why either the United States or Great Britain should fear the other's navy. There is every reason in the world why both should co-operate as far as possible in making the cost of the support of protective navies as low as practicable.

## M. Daudet Escapes

**M.** DAUDET has added another act to the exciting drama which all Paris has been watching with unrestrained joy. Just as the Government was about to respond to his gesture of surrender by magnanimously pardoning him he quietly escaped from prison. The Government was astounded and Paris delighted.

In enabling him to escape his ardent royalist supporters employed one of the most clever ruses imaginable. Taking the noon hour, when most French officials are away from their offices, one of the Camelots du Roi, the militant band of royalists formed by the inspiration of Daudet, gained access to the Ministry of the Interior, and telephoned to the director of the prison in which Daudet was held. Announcing himself as the Minister of the Interior, he ordered the

release of Daudet, one of his royalist lieutenants, and also—to add spice to the occasion—a prominent Communist prisoner. He then waited for the expected return call in which the prison director sought confirmation of the unexpected order. The ruse worked perfectly, and the three prisoners were immediately released. Daudet disappeared into Paris while his excited and enthusiastic followers foregathered at the office of “L’Action Française” to drink champagne to the glory of royalism and the discomfiture of the Republican Government.

It was all a wonderful joke on the Government, but one rather difficult for the Government to appreciate. The Paris press lost no opportunity of dwelling upon the ridiculous position in which the Cabinet had been placed by a band of youthful royalists, and in a more serious mood asked how it could be possible that the Camelots du Roi could obtain so easily the release of an important political prisoner. “Corruption of the whole Government,” “incoherence, anarchy, and ridicule,” “disintegration of our régime,” were among the phrases bandied about.

As this issue of The Outlook went to press there was a distinct feeling in Paris that something should be done about it. No one, including Premier Poincaré and the members of his Cabinet, seemed to know just what. But in the offices of “L’Action Française” the royalists were still celebrating, and somewhere M. Daudet must have been grinning sardonically at the efforts of the Government to retain its dignity.

### Europe Worries Over Fashions

WHILE America has accepted with complaisance current fashions in women’s clothes both on the street and on the beaches, there seems to be some agitation in Europe as to the moral significance of skirt lengths and bathing-suits.

Recently one faction of the Queen Louise Association in Germany declared that short skirts were a sign of moral degeneracy and began a campaign for long skirts. For some reason, it developed into a rural *versus* urban conflict, and the women of Berlin banded together in defense of prevailing fashions. On another front we find Italian women protesting against current brevities and carrying their campaign to an insistence upon skirts below the shoe-tops for all Italian girls. In some districts the movement for dress reform has met with considerable success. In Bologna children with short skirts are barred from the schools, while throughout Italy stricter

regulations are in force for modesty on the beaches.

But it is in Turkey that the most drastic movement is under way. Numbers of Moslem women are supporting a campaign for a uniform dress for all women. Extravagance and feminine jealousy are

## “Twenty Questions” on General Information

Answered in this issue of The Outlook

1. Who is Emile Vandervelde? (P. 310.)
2. From what country does France import most of her coal? (P. 318.)
3. Who wrote “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner”? (P. 322.)
4. What is “rigging” in rowing parlance? (P. 312.)
5. Who wrote “The Apostrophe to the Ocean”? (P. 314.)
6. Who was the founder of the “Little Order of the Brothers of Our Lady of Poverty”? (P. 321.)
7. Who is pastor of the Park Avenue Baptist Church of New York? (P. 306.)
8. Who composed the opera “Parsifal”? (P. 324.)
9. What is the oldest university in America? (P. 306.)
10. Who is Hugh Gibson? (P. 299.)
11. What are the largest naval vessels below capital ships? (P. 299.)
12. Whose home run won the Yale-Harvard baseball game for Harvard? (P. 306.)
13. What is the Irish name for the Parliament of the Irish Free State? (P. 300.)
14. Who founded the University of Louvain? (P. 303.)
15. Which university won the Yale-Harvard boat race? (P. 305.)
16. What was the political status of Belgium before it became a kingdom? (P. 303.)
17. What is the purpose of MacMillan’s expedition to Labrador? (P. 304.)
18. Who is coach of the Syracuse crew? (P. 328.)
19. What is the first name of Marx, the founder of modern Socialism? (P. 305.)
20. Who wrote “Eugénie Grandet”? (P. 307.)

the evils this movement fights, rather than moral degeneracy, and its program is for the adoption of some universal costume, neat but not gaudy. Perhaps this would solve many problems, but we somehow doubt the success of the movement. Women will dress pretty much as they desire despite all attempts at reform or standardization, and we may safely leave even skirt lengths and bathing-suits to their own sense of propriety.

### Pouting Irish Patriots

RATHER than give that modified allegiance to George V which is perfectly satisfactory to other parts of “Great Britain, Ireland, and the British

Dominions beyond the Seas,” as the sovereign’s title now runs, De Valera and forty-three followers have withdrawn from the Dail Eireann—the Irish name for the Parliament of the Irish Free State. The recalcitrant members made only such a formal show of force as to give legal color to the claim that they were ousted.

The Dail now has left about ninety members, and, as Mr. Cosgrave was re-elected Prime Minister by a vote of 68 to 22, it is evident that constitutional government will be carried on regardless of the anti-governmental members who form the minority and regardless of De Valera’s campaign against the least shadow of Irish dependency to Great Britain.

Mr. Cosgrave is usually called President Cosgrave, and sometimes by American papers “President of Ireland.” He is actually President of the Executive Committee of the Dail (as the Premier of France is by title President of the Council of Ministers), and as such exercises the functions of Prime Minister of the Free State.

It is to Ireland’s credit that neither the recent election nor the verbal rebellion of the extreme advocates of Irish independence has been accompanied by violence. In fact, Dublin despatches point out that the election was freer from drunkenness than any in recent Irish history. Temperance is said to be making great gains in Ireland. Sobriety in politics as well as in drink may come in time.

### More Power to the British Peerage

GREAT BRITAIN appears to be headed toward a revival of the authority of the House of Lords. This development in the policy of the Conservative Cabinet under Prime Minister Baldwin has surprised and interested no one more than the members of the House of Lords themselves. Talk of the need of some reform to strengthen the upper chamber of Parliament has been current for months past, but until lately it has not been taken seriously. An announcement that the Government proposes to put a measure through the present session of Parliament has suddenly aroused widespread discussion.

In contrast to ordinary sessions, when the House of Lords is almost deserted, there was a crowded meeting of the body which formerly ruled the destinies of Great Britain to hear the Government’s proposals—with interested peeresses gazing from the balconies. The Cabinet’s plan was not announced in final detail. But the discussion of principles