CURRENT MAGAZINES

Eight Years of Irish Home Rule:—Prof. M. D. O'Sullivan, in the *Quarterly*.

The End of the House of Austria:—Mr. J. Redlich, in *Foreign Affairs*.

The Palestine Report:—Mr. H. Charles Woods, in the *Contemporary*.

A Week-end in America:—Mr. Wickham Steed in the *Review of Reviews*.

AFTER eight years of Irish Home Rule, Professor M. D. O'Sullivan—whose name is a sufficient index of nationality, and whose title ought to be a guarantee of intellectual detachment—has tried to sum up in the *Quarterly* a total impression of what those years have brought. Some at least of the results are instructive.

He points out, for example, that proportional representation has been in use in the Free State from the first, and that the benefits its advocates had promised from it have been accompanied by the curse of multiplying parties. There has been the consequent "log-rolling" that a Government with no independent majority must always practise. Adult suffrage, no doubt always the ideal, but in this case practically disastrous, has provided Mr. De Valera with his strength; for the supporters of that extraordinary man are in the main young people in their early twenties, who can afford to be reckless because they have no stake in the country. That young generation, too, it should be remembered, grew up during the horrors of war, and its adolescent years were passed in a social climate wherein chaos was the rule. How can such youths be expected to develop all at once a sense of the values of order?

What about finance? The present Free State Government was born to a fearful heritage of debt, owing compensation for damages to the countless host of people whose property and persons had been injured in the "war against England". Just as it was beginning to get its head above water, it was submerged again in the similar flood of claims for injury done in the "civil war", that is, the war against fulfilment of the Treaty. Add to this the necessary cost for maintaining an army adequate as a guarantee against recurrence of the like! No wonder "money is scarce", and the taxation imposed has made the Free State one of the most expensive countries in Europe to live in. A result is the alarming flow of emigrants, and—marvellous to relate about the Irish—at length they have to record one of the lowest birth-rates in Europe.

These are by no means cheerful reflections, though it is impossible to overlook the obvious satisfaction they give to not a few who prize, above all, the delight of saying "I told you so". But Professor O'Sullivan adds to his candid acknowledgments some heartening facts that are no less apparent. In the first place, there is a blessed truce to the old political strife:

> Present-day leaders of all parties to a great extent have even given up talking of politics, and are turning their attention to the many social and economic problems, the solution of which is vital to the national well-being.

First and foremost, to the re-establishment of law and order, which by this time is sure. Next, to the completion of that scheme of land transference which has now made the Free State a nation of small farmers, each owning his own farm. "It is estimated that about 600 landlords have gone for ever, and in their stead there are 300,000 tenants who own their holdings". Inspired by this sense of property and security, in such contrast to the days of long ago which Gladstone compared so aptly to those of land tenure in Poland, the small farmer has taken up methods of improved cultivation which the Minister of Agriculture has been tireless in bringing to notice. The value of the co-operative system has been appreciated, and with State aid in the form of loans for buildings and machinery, improvement of seed and stock, and other purposes which scientific agriculture suggests, a new era seems to be opening. In a country so little manufacturing and so overwhelmingly one of farms, this change is long since overdue. But it has come at last. And without self-government, all thought of it would no doubt have remained submerged by concern with "politics".

Professor O'Sullivan proceeds to recount much more that has been done—drainage schemes on a large scale, land reclamation and afforestation, housing projects, better roads, and many another enterprise cheerfully undertaken by the public Treasury. Most notable of all, the great electrification of the Shannon, faced with such courage—amid not a few gloomy warnings—by a country whose debt was already so great, but now completed, and rendering the whole country independent of outside sources of power! "There is no reason now why, in this country, as in Denmark, every farmhouse should not be fitted with electric light, and even small holdings equipped with electric power". And the writer, reflecting on what this may ultimately mean, ventures to suggest a coming time when the Free State, like France, will be a land of no unemployment.

But he is by no means so well satisfied with another aspect of recent changes. He is annoyed by the spectacle of compulsory Irish language, and by the literary censorship. The revival of the ancient tongue of the Gael, so ardently pushed by a few people of intense national sentiment a quarter of a century ago, is now an object of faith which the Government thinks it must at least affect to cherish if it would compete for public favour with the Opposition:

> No one is any use to the country unless he believes, not merely in the revival of Irish for cultural purposes, but also in making the language compulsory under heavy penalties in all spheres of life.

This writer frankly disbelieves in the view that the Government has taken of its supposed necessities. Mr. Cosgrave, he thinks, owes his sustained tenure of office to the very people who do not believe in compulsory Irish; and if he persists in thus enforcing it, he will lose far more than he will gain. At present, Irish is compulsory in the elementary schools, it is practically compulsory in the secondary (what are called in Canada "high-schools"), and it is essential for admission to the Civil Service. It was lately made compulsory for everyone who should be admitted to practise law! One of these days it may be a pre-requisite for every other profession.

See what this means. The blessings of bilingualism are irrelevant, for true bilingual countries are those in which two languages are spoken in the hearing of children from their earliest years, not countries in which the acquisition of an additional language is compelled by statute. This attempt is to revive by law a tongue which has been extinct, except in a few western parts of Ireland, for several centuries, so that it is now to all intents and purposes "foreign". Think of the handicap thus placed on children at school, so much of whose all-too-limited time must be given to acquiring a difficult language which will never be of any use to them outside their own country. To urge that it will at least be of use for getting jobs in Ireland reminds one of the community in which people's sole occupation was to take in one another's washing! It seems, too, that the time compulsorily devoted to Irish is being withdrawn from the study of continental languages such as French, and to the serious burden of the cost it involves one must add the fact that so long as this fanatically Nationalist requirement is continued in the South, union with the North will be impossible.

Professor O'Sullivan's case is powerfully presented, and his concluding plea that the "Moderates", now sunk in despairing in-

difference when an election comes round, should bestir themselves at the polls, is obviously wholesome. It is indeed good and timely advice everywhere, but just now it seems to have special force in the Irish Free State. The historically-minded will reflect on how long and how dreadful is the price which has to be paid for the savage suppression of national spirit. In Ireland they are still paying in countless ways for the obstinacy and stupidity of the hundred years that began with the Act facetiously called "Legislative Union". National enthusiasm, long crushed and derided, has to reappear—as George Meredith said about suppressed Nature —"with by no means the best side uppermost".

One would have liked to find in Professor O'Sullivan's article a detailed account of that literary censorship whose impropriety he indicates in passing. I confess I can see much ground for the Free State embargo upon a good deal of newspaper material that now, to the disgust of many Englishmen, circulates in London. And certain books, which I shall not advertise by naming, written by Dubliners, have had such a character that decent-minded people will rally to the support even of that objectionable thing, a censorship. This, however, is becoming a world problem, with which before long it may be needful to adopt quite new methods of grappling everywhere, unless the stream of pornography is to go its demoralising way. Nothing is easier than to show difficulties and disadvantages in interfering with the liberty of the press. But the disadvantages and difficulties of the other alternative have of late been showing themselves to all except the wilfully blind. And to him who thinks that "public opinion" will always act as a sufficient check, nothing better can be said than the reflection of John Huss when he watched an old woman apply a torch to the faggots around him—*O sancta simplicitas!*

THE present year will see a centenary that must call up very different feelings in different European breasts, but with the same historical interest and historical suggestiveness for every imaginative mind. It was in November, 1830, that the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph was born. Fourteen years have now elapsed since his death. Mr. Joseph Redlich, who lived many decades under his rule, has contributed to *Foreign Affairs* an article which this approaching centenary has inspired, under the title "The End of the House of Austria".

"I still see him as he stood on the entrance of the open stairs leading up to his rooms in the old Castle of Schoenbrunn, on the

afternoon of the day of his return from Ischl after the war declaration had been promulgated." It was the Austrian Emperor's ultimatum to Serbia that began the tragedy of July, 1914. And at that date Francis Joseph was already eighty-four years old! He had reigned sixty-six years. The same man for whom Radetzky had conquered Venice and Milan; the same to whose heritage—when he was just ten years of age—Nicholas I of Russia had restored the rebel Hungary of Louis Kossuth: the same who had fought against Garibaldi and Cavour, Napoleon III and Bismarck! Even without a forecast of the horror he was initiating on that July afternoon, the onlooker must have recalled—as he looked at that bent figure—how it epitomised world changes, and what tremendous events in the history of Europe had been incidents in that single reign. Mr. Redlich remembers how the German members of parliament were crowding round, to hail the Emperor that day. "He listened to the words of the President of the House of Deputies and nodded, saying: 'You are satisfied with what has happened?' Then he turned and walked up the stairs."

With the passing of Francis Joseph, there has also passed the whole world of old Austria, and this publicist brings before us in clear outline what a distinctive world that was. As 1918 finished what had begun at Paris in 1789, it was to be realized that Austria, more than any other power, had blocked the progress of the revolutionary wave during a century and a quarter. Its collapse occurred near in time to the collapse of two other empires, that of the Russian Tsardom and that of the Turkish Sultanate. But it was very different in character from these two quasi-volcanic outbursts. In Austria there was no bloodshed during the dismemberment, and almost no show of passion, or even of emotion. Unlike Hungary, it was torn by no frightful riots. There was scarcely even a transgression of the limits of public peace and decency:

> We watched rise, as it were, phantoms becoming flesh and blood by a miracle, the new national states heralded during the last weeks of the war. Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, Poland constituted themselves, drawing without undue haste the frontiers between their dominions; gradually they became real, designated by slender lines of customs officers and constables.

The peace-treaties prohibited any union of German-Austria with the German Republic, and so that obvious method of repairing its losses was out of the question. Thus quietly passed out of sight a House which had been so decisive a factor in the development of Europe for six centuries.

Mr. Redlich notes how Austria exemplified one of the two great contrasted and competing forces which were at work in Europe for a thousand years, viz., the principle of separate nationality and the principle of the dominant super-national empire. To Austria, the national or racial idea was always anathema, and on this account she was quite necessarily a leader in the resistance to the spirit of the French Revolution. It was the same impulse which gave such ferocity to Austria's resistance to the Protestant Reformers. In pursuit of the supernational purpose, the Hapsburgs had a well defined policy, adding new territories to old ones by treaty, by dynastic marriage, by inheritance, sometimes by war, transferring "subjects" *en bloc*. No country could be cited as in its very spirit more completely the denial of what Woodrow Wilson called the principle of self-determination. Within it, the murmur of racialism against the super-state was suppressed by an elaborate system of police supervision, so that George Meredith—viewing Austria-Hungary as an aggregate of dissatisfied peoples—well called it "a Power bound with iron hoops".

Reflecting on the old Emperor, the centenary of whose birth will soon be remembered by many and perhaps celebrated by a few, Mr. Redlich points out that he was at least in earnest, "convinced that he was doing the right thing when with all his strength he opposed all modern ideas". Above all, he opposed the plea for popular self-government, laid down in written constitutions. Events indeed proved too hard for him; and long before the final overthrow, the Austrian plan of a super-state had to be modified by many a concession to such peoples as the Magyars. Here and there too, "because of the hardness of their hearts", Francis Joseph relaxed his iron grip, especially on the German part of his western empire, but he liked to play off the very different tendencies of his Slav subjects to curb the restive Teuton. At the age of seventy-seven, says this narrator, he practically decreed for Austria "the most modern democratic franchise". But it was the old, old story. Too late, too late! One remembers how James II said he would concede nothing, because concession had ruined his father, and the day of sacrifices had been the day of dupes. Not so, said the great Whig historian. What ruined Charles I was concession too late, and the day of dupes was so called, not because it was the day of sacrifices, but because it was the day of sacrifices too long deferred!

Some day yet another Coxe will complete the story of *The House of Austria*. It was a great and dazzling splendour whose setting will have to be described. Yet another of those Vanished

Pomps of Yesterday, which the mind attuned to the new era can never regret, but upon which the keen historical imagination will none the less always delight to dwell!

THE death of Lord Balfour brought again to general memory what had been the significance of the famous "Balfour Note", and disputants began to reargue the merits of the policy which it had inaugurated in Palestine. A grim comment, too, had been supplied by the events of last fall, when 133 Jews and 116 Arabs were killed in the racial feuds there, besides the serious wounding of many hundreds of others. Commissioners appointed to investigate the disturbance have lately reported to parliament, and this report is made the subject of an article by Mr. H. Charles Woods in *The Contemporary Review.*

The sacred associations of the place still awaken world interest in every development of Palestine. Picturesque, and indeed thrilling, to all with historical aptitude or fancy, was the account of the opening of that "Hebrew University at Jerusalem" which followed so soon upon the acceptance of a British Mandate for the country, and the hopes of the Zionists have surely been much encouraged by the fact that since the Armistice the Jewish population has increased from 55,000 to 150,000. Perhaps, indeed, it has increased too much. The question whether immigrants have not been admitted with reckless disregard of their prospect of employment is one that the Commission had to investigate, and it may be urged that the returning Jews have not always been of the most desirable sort. But at least those who predicted that there would be very little immigration, and that in this respect the Balfour plan would be ineffective, have had their forecast disproved.

The real difficulty has been, not that of getting the descendants of the exiles back again, but that of adjusting relations with the overwhelming majority of Arabs long settled in Palestine. A conflict of race is embittered by a conflict of religion, for both the older and the later inhabitants have their "Holy Places", and the feud developing into bloodshed over the way in which these sacred spots are to be respected makes a sad chapter in the story of Comparative Religion. Mr. Woods describes how the Jewish "Wailing Wall", a section of the western exterior of the ancient Jewish Temple, has been the scene of prayer at least since the Middle Ages, and is at the same time a place of Islamic sanctity because it is part of the "Harem-esh-Sherif". An immediate cause of the

rioting and bloodshed last August was the Jewish procession to the Wall, and the counter-demonstration by Moslems on the following day. This recalled many an old dispute that casts light on the present, for example, how Jews were forbidden five years ago to bring seats and benches to the Wall, even though for the use of the aged and infirm; how offence was given when a screen was introduced on the pavement, and this was forcibly removed by the police; how the Arabs endeavored by building operations to make this pavement before the Wall into a thoroughfare, and greatly annoyed the Jews by stationing a "muezzin" in the immediate neighborhood to call Moslems to prayer five times each day!

Though such was the immediate provocative, it is plain that the explanation of the outbreak lay further back, and that what appeared in the press last fall was largely an account of symptoms rather than of causes. Hence the Commission of Enquiry investigated such matters as immigration, land, and the constitutional arrangement under the Balfour Note. On the whole, the report is favorable to the Jews, especially in that further Note appended by Mr. Snell, the Commissioner representing the Labour Party. It finds that the outbreak in Jerusalem on August 23rd was from the first an attack by Arabs, and there was no excuse—as alleged—in earlier murders of Arabs by Jews. It finds (though here Mr. Snell rather dissents) that no blame can properly be attached to the British authorities on the spot for failure to take precautions, but it adds that the Intelligence Service in Palestine was inadequate, that the garrison had been reduced too far, and that the Palestinian police proved unreliable when used against their co-religionists. It seems to follow, since the Government has announced its fixed resolve to continue the Mandate, that better military service should be established in Palestine, and this, of course, will mean more expenditure. The shriek likely to be heard from the Rothermere press at any proposal of the kind may be left to one's imagination.

But, after all, such changes will deal only with those proximate causes of which last year's religious squabble was a sample. Is it really so that Arabs, with a long prescriptive right to be there, are being unjustly dispossessed by returning Jews? Is it so that Jewish immigrants with no probable means of supporting themselves are being allowed to swell the numbers of unemployed? What about the constitutional situation, and the view that matters would be mended there as elsewhere by self-government? In answer to these questions, Mr. Woods points out that the Zionist organization has expended about seven million pounds in Palestine

since November, 1917, and that the Commissioners rightly hold Jewish enterprise and Jewish immigration—within limits—to have brought material benefit to Palestine. He refers to the Commissioners' view that the General Federation of Jewish Labour has paid too much regard to the political creed of newcomers, and too little to their industrial qualifications, and he is prepared to agree that immigration needs sharper scrutiny, but does not hold that the faults here have been gross. As to tenure of land, it is to be remembered that a great deal of the soil belongs to absent Arab landlords, and that if they choose to sell to Jews, they must be allowed to do so, provided only that the tenant is assured of enough for his maintenance. It is to be remembered, too, that the Arabs were offered the establishment of a Legislative Council in 1922 and refused it, as they refused on two subsequent occasions to co-operate with the Government.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has announced that the British obligations assumed under the settlement after the Armistice are to be maintained, and that equal justice will be done in Palestine between races. It seems all too plain that the Arab party, like a party we know in India, will be satisfied with nothing but a complete exodus of all authority save their own, and—as in India—the impossibility of conceding this, in justice to others as well as in the interests of order and peace, may prevent reasonable claims for the Arab interest from receiving as prompt attention as they deserve. It is the historic rôle of a British Government, keeping the *pax Britannica* between warring races and creeds. Moreover, one cannot easily or altogether forget, in dealing with Moslems, how the curse of their rule, when their power was unchecked, has blasted so many of the fairest regions of the East.

MR. Wickham Steed, who has long been telling his countrymen that they should go abroad and get first-hand knowledge of the peoples with whom their country has to deal, has lately taken his own good advice and has spent "a week-end in America." To complete the terse suggestiveness of this title, he might have added—in true American idiom—that for this purpose he "concluded to cross the pond." After all, there is a stimulating vividness in slang, without which our language would be the poorer.

Of course Mr. Steed had to write an article, on the basis of this somewhat restricted experience, but he had much in his mind to begin with, and what he wanted was a rapid survey to corroborate

or alter the conclusions of many an earlier trip. To begin with, he found it provokingly difficult for a foreigner to go now to the United States at all. "Intending visitors", he says, "are made to feel, before they start, that they are not wanted." They apply to the United States Consulate for a *visa*, and are at once told to obtain a letter "from some responsible firm or respectable person" that will guarantee them as proper to be admitted for a short time to the Great Republic. Mr. Steed has always refused to fulfil their requirement, though it may seem to most of us a quite reasonable one, and it surely would not have been hard for him to obtain such a guarantor. But what happens when the introducing letter has been procured? Next comes

> a complicated form of huge dimensions filled in, stating the exact reasons for the projected journey, and the freedom of the candidate from tendencies to polygamy, atheism, communism, or the subversion of law and order in the United States.

One remembers Lady Cathcart, and the "moral turpitude" objection! Then comes the payment of ten dollars for the *visa*, if it is granted, and a head tax, which will be refunded by the purser of the ship if the visitor's stay has not exceeded sixty days. When customs declarations have been made out, and the Immigration official has been satisfied, the visitor may be allowed to land at New York. Not exactly what we should call an aggressive tourist policy! But not all countries are looking eagerly for tourists. And if any nation in the world has reason to reconsider the freedom with which all sorts of people were admitted in the past, it is surely our southern neighbour.

Mr. Steed reflects that for every non-emigrant Briton who visits the United States, a thousand Americans visit Europe, and perhaps two hundred of these land in England. Does it follow, as it surely should follow, that European affairs are far better understood in America than American affairs are understood in Europe? Observation did not make this quick-eyed publicist agree that such was the case. Americans, he found, have a curiosity about Europe, far greater than the European curiosity about America, and the newspapers of this continent print ten or twenty times more news from across the Atlantic. Moreover, such news of America as the British newspapers make prominent refers in exaggerated degree to the vagaries of Hollywood or the outrages in Chicago. But despite praiseworthy efforts on the part of their great newspapers, the Americans misunderstand Europe at least as much as Europeans misunderstand America. One reason is

that the British press, though it publishes far less news from the other side, diffuses it far faster over its territory. An English journal published in London or Manchester can reach every important place in England on the day of publication, but such a paper as the *New York Times* takes eighteen hours to reach Chicago, and four days to reach San Francisco. The syndication of news corrects this in only a slight degree, for what is syndicated for such different places loses colour and individual authority. Mr. Steed conjectures that, for the interpretation of public events, broadcasting may well supersede any printed sheet before long.

In Washington he addressed a great banquet of "The American Society of Newspaper Editors", and with him was the famous "Pertinax", who writes so much for the *Echo de Paris*. It was a caustic paper that Pertinax read to those listeners. He congratulated their great country upon its power, in that a short time ago it was necessary only to file a request in order to get from "proud England" a fifty per cent. share in the rule of the seas! Had not the American will imposed upon Europe the Covenant of the League of Nations, to suit the politics of an American President, even at the expense of the whole post-war development of a continent? Did they not compel the evacuation of the Ruhr, impose the Dawes Plan, and—on a change of mind which made them ready for the Pact of Paris—throw back into the melting-pot their own Covenant of nine years earlier? Pertinax concluded by urging that a people with such vast power should shoulder a little more responsibility, lest patience should wear out, and their advice be no longer heeded. The American audience laughed and cheered vociferously. But, says Mr. Steed, "the face of President Hoover, who sat near the speaker, gave no clue to his thoughts." Naturally! Presidents have a habit of facial control.

After warnings that what he should say must on no account be quoted, Mr. Hoover was introduced, and—says Mr. Steed—it is allowable to report that he proved a readier speaker than one had been led to suppose him, his remarks were excellently phrased, and he showed a deeper sense of American responsibility than might have been expected.

This is an interesting and a most instructive article, but scarcely fulfils the sort of promise with which it began. That "Week-end in America" is too much taken up with general observations that might have been written at home, and less than the reader had probably hoped with the record of things actually seen and heard. But it serves one admirable purpose. It at least makes clear with what boldness European visitors, like Mr. Steed and "Pertin-

ax," are driving home the moral to American audiences, that with such vast influence in the world there is a special obligation of responsibility, and that the disavowal of this by the United States has lasted too long. American audiences, one is not surprised to learn, receive this from such visitors, not only with tolerance, but with enthusiastic approval. That gospel of "splendid isolation", which great British statesmen of the past used to preach, has been caught up with too much eagerness elsewhere. In the present state of the world, it is at least plain that isolation as a policy may be cunning, and profitable, but can never be "splendid." And however long it may take for such a thought to get hold of the Middle West, its appeal to the higher minds of the country is shown as often as it is presented at the centres of American culture.

H. L. S.