

## CURRENT MAGAZINES

---

**The Condition of Germany:**—Major Lindsay Bashford, in the Feb. *Nineteenth Century*

**Anarchy in India:**—Sir Michael O'Dwyer, in the *Fortnightly Review*, February.

**Parties and Policies in India:**—Mr. H. E. A. Cotton, in the Feb. *Contemporary*

**The Nationalist Spirit of India:**—Mr. L. F. Rushbrook-Williams, in the Apl. *Atlantic*.

**American-Japanese Issues and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**—Mr. T. Okamoto, in the *Contemporary Review*, March.

**The False Pride of Japan:**—Senator Phelan, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, March.

**California and the Japanese:**—Professor Payson J. Treat, in the Apl. *Atlantic*

**Australia for the White Man:** Mr. C. Freeman Murray, in the March *Nineteenth Century*

**The Economic Significance of Forestry:**—Professor Gifford Pinchot in the *North American Review*, February.

---

IN the February number of *The Nineteenth Century* Major Lindsay Bashford writes about "The Condition of Germany." The article is by a journalist, part of whose early education was received in German schools, and who was for some time lecturer at the University of Bordeaux. He has spent the last year in "almost continuous travelling throughout Europe," with a keen eye for the altered state of things. Major Bashford finds that "idolisation of Lenin is the most marked social phenomenon of Central and Eastern Europe." But he thinks that the Bolshevism just now rampant among the German working classes is, for them, a fitful and transient impulse. The temperamental orderliness of the German character is against it. Some would bring back the imperial family; here and there ex-soldiers are being surreptitiously trained on estates where they are disguised as farm labourers. But this movement seems limited to "North German squireens, generals out of employment, and a few university professors(!)" Monarchism has a hold on the older people, while the younger are much embittered against the late régime. On the whole, Major Bashford thinks a dissolution of Germany into its former separate states more probable than a restoration of monarchic rule. The existing republic commands little respect. Plebiscites, under which various countries—like Silesia—are being asked to "determine themselves", are interfered with by such dodges as artificially stimulated immigration, or the refusal of passports. The prevailing judgment about the late war lays all the blame upon the Hohenzollerns, and the average German whom Major Bashford met could

not understand why—now that the Hohenzollerns have been deposed—he himself “cannot at once step back into his old position of commercial and social intimacy throughout the world.”

SIR MICHAEL O'DWYER, late lieutenant-governor of the Punjab, has some mordant criticisms to offer upon the recent reform in the government of India. Last New Year's Day witnessed there a political experiment on a splendid scale. India has held a general election, for the first time in her history. She has now a popularly chosen parliament for each of her provinces, with control by her own people over such vital matters as public works, sanitation, agriculture, education. Only a few services are “reserved”.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer is a vehement defender of the old régime which has been disturbed. The India of his description is a place where ninety-nine per cent. of the people care nothing for *self-government* provided they have *good* government, and where every intelligent native knows that Great Britain has brought security, light taxation, developing agriculture and commerce, equal justice for all. But, he explains, there is a small yet vociferous class of “the politically-minded”, who inflame the rest about responsible government, self-determination, and other formulæ quite alien to the Oriental mind. If it was judged expedient that natives should be more closely associated with the administering of affairs, this according to Sir Michael should have been done by confidential instruction to the civil service, rather than by publicly proclaiming a policy that was sure to be interpreted as British withdrawal. The doctrinaire politicians in England cannot see the need for trusting the men on the spot, and they are rushing into all sorts of peril. Not more than one in sixteen of the natives can write, only five millions out of the total two hundred and fifty millions could be put on the electoral register, and of these only one quarter went to the poll. The new scheme is a premature attempt to force the machinery of the ballot-box on a race not yet ripe to receive it.

Mr. Rushbrook-Williams, formerly Professor at Allahabad, thinks differently. He points out that by a curious paradox the Indian national sentiment is itself an outcome of the British connection, for this has brought to a heterogeneous mass of hostile races improved channels of mutual intercourse, a common language for interchanging ideas, and a basis of racial solidarity over against the European settlers. But there is still political inexperience, social backwardness, little habit of subordinating the interests of the individual or the small group to those of society as a whole,

and "the all-pervading mastery of religion and the ecclesiastic." India, he tells us, is rather like the Europe of the Middle Ages, more ethical than civic, cherishing the ascetic contemplative virtues more than those of active citizenship. Thus her poverty-stricken masses give willing support to some six million devotees, mainly able-bodied, who live a life of civic uselessness. Mr. Rushbrook-Williams reminds us, too, that about ninety-three per cent. of those under direct British rule are country folk, only seven per cent. urban. To the agriculturist the great problems are not political, and it is a question how far western notions should or could be diffused in rural India. The problem of the farmer is concerned with such matters as the rain-fall, irrigation from wells or canals, price of grain and cloth, repayment of advances to the village banker, health of cattle. But it seems that "the middle-class bureaucracy," which has so far guided Indian affairs, has been far too careless of the need to enlist active cooperation by the masses in furthering these great rural interests. "Its members did their job," says Mr. Rushbrook-Williams, "but it never occurred to them to ask what was the end and purpose of this work." He thus thinks the new constitution has been a notable reform, and quotes with enthusiasm the words of the Report under which it was inaugurated, that in India a new life has been called forth, and that such changes must be made in the existing order as will meet the needs of the more spacious days to come.

A similar spirit pervades the article by Mr. Cotton, who practised for thirteen years as a lawyer at the Calcutta bar, and has acted as correspondent in India for some leading English newspapers. He points out that the "non-cooperation" campaign by extremists like Mr. Gandhi has had the result of keeping that type of member out of the new Legislatures, and thus putting power in the hands of moderate men determined to make a success of the Act. Mr. Cotton does not endorse in the least the view of the ex-Governor of the Punjab, for he tells us that the mischief done in India by Sir Michael O'Dwyer himself is probably beyond repair! One is startled to learn that at present three-fourths of the native villages have no school-house, that some thirty million children of school-going age are growing up totally ignorant, and that until quite recently leave to establish compulsory education was refused even to those municipalities which were willing to bear the cost. Mr. Cotton lays the blame upon the bureaucratic civil service, and, while he hopes a great deal from the new Act, warns us that some "men on the spot" will try to defeat it in practice. "The autocrats of yesterday must definitely abandon the idea of being

the veiled despots of today." Lord Reading, he trusts, will shake himself clear of the bureaucratic distrust of Indian capacity. To the *Morning Post*' complaint that the British are by the reforms made servants of the natives, Mr. Cotton finely replies that there is nothing in the appellation "servant of India" of which an Englishman need feel ashamed.

---

FOR English readers the chief concern about Japan is centred on Australia and British Columbia, for American readers on California, but the crux of the racial difficulty is everywhere the same. Mr. T. Okamoto tells us that Americans are constantly asking, "Is Japan going to fight the United States?" He replies that, if she does, this will be from no imperialistic ambition, for his countrymen have never yet had recourse to arms unprovoked. He explains the wars with China and Russia as clear cases of self-defence. Mr. Okamoto agrees, however, that his people, with the blood of the old *samurai* in their veins, might be stirred for their national "honour". Within the last few months California took sharp action against the Japanese by barring from ownership of agricultural lands all persons ineligible as American citizens. It is the burden of this article that limits to immigration are fair, but that insistence on racial inferiority for those now on the spot is highly dangerous. Mr. Okamoto feels that there is no quarrel between Japan and the United States which a spirit of give and take on each side cannot assuage, and he thinks the idea of a Yellow Peril is fostered in the main by American yellow journals.

On the other hand, U. S. Senator Phelan supports the maintenance of a sharp "colour line," on the ground that the Japanese have proved themselves incapable of being assimilated into American citizenship. He says that in Hawaii, where they constitute 44 per cent. of the population, they have rigidly segregated themselves by separate schools, newspapers that preserve the vernacular, and a priesthood which inculcates loyalty to Japan alone. In thirty-five years there has been practically no intermarriage. Senator Phelan quotes the advice given by Herbert Spencer to the Japanese to stay by themselves, as it is a biological law that "when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree the result is inevitably a bad one in the long run." The problem, in short,—as this writer sees it— is whether the people of the Pacific Coast will become quickly submerged or mongrelised by a race with no American ideals, and notably Oriental in such matters as individual freedom, family life, and status of women. "Come what may," con-

cludes the Senator, "we will make our stand, like Sobieski at Vienna and Charles Martel at Tours, against 'the rising tide of colour'."

But not all Americans feel like this, as is shown by Professor Payson J. Treat, of Leland Stanford University, California. Professor Treat wields a very incisive pen, and takes issue at once with the charge that the Japanese are "unassimilable." He points out that most of that race now in California were born in Japan, and that from their tenacity of national custom we can predict nothing about their descendants. He reminds us that no other people in history has risen with such speed from feudal impotence to wealth and power, and that this has been due to a Japanese gift—unique among Orientals—for absorbing western culture. Like Mr. Okamoto he distinguishes sharply between measures to restrict future immigration, which he approves, and measures to discriminate racially against those already there, which he condemns. He presents a very vivid picture of the methods by which anti-Japanese agitation has been fomented, just as an anti-Chinese campaign was carried on in days long gone by. We hear how the press refused to print news on the unpopular side of the recent controversy unless it was paid for as an advertisement, and how such fantastic tales were set afloat as that the Japanese are responsible for the present famine in China! Professor Treat regards the excitement just now as due to the flood of immigrants which was allowed to come into California prior to the restrictive measures of 1908, and predicts that the laws by which this flood has since been stopped will in time reduce the percentage of Orientals to a quite reasonable figure. He calls upon his countrymen to recognize that this is not a State but a *national* problem, affecting vast interests of good relationship between East and West, and he exults in the fact that about one-fourth of the voters in the California plebiscite refused to be stampeded into racial animosity. In a contrary spirit Mr. C. Freeman Murray, secretary of the British Empire League, raises a similar problem under the title "Australia for the White Man." Mr. Murray's view is very similar to that of Senator Phelan, emphasizing the value of racial purity and harmonious standards of life. He foresees that the free admission of Chinese and Japanese might easily produce in Australia a problem like that of the negro in the United States, and he sharply combats the argument that the northern part of the continent is for climatic and health reasons unworkable by white labour. Medical authority is cited in support of this, and the writer quotes a fighting speech by the Australian Premier as showing that there is to be no compromise with the aggression of the yellow race.

PROFESSOR GIFFORD PINCHOT, Head of the Department of Forestry at Yale, tells us that for the United States the problem of preserving forest productiveness should take a place alongside the issues of the League of Nations. He bewails the fact that not only the product but the productive capacity in timber is being used up far faster than it is being restored, and that the devastations of the forest fire—combined with destructive lumbering—threaten to leave the United States bankrupt in wood. This he predicts will happen, unless means are taken to check it, "well within the active life of men now in affairs." It would mean that a great proportion of American industries would have to be abandoned or reorganized.

Professor Pinchot reminds us that while in the case of other materials wastage is stopped by law—for example by the recent "Coal and Oil Leasing Bill" passed at a recent session of Congress—the fate of timber is left for the most part to determine itself. Three-fifths of the supply which the United States once possessed is already gone. "Over two-thirds of our original forest area has been culled, cut over, or burned." About one-sixth of the virgin forests is still available, but more than eight million acres have been rendered—for productive purposes—practically desert. "We are living beyond our income, and destroying our invested capital at the same time." Nor can the remedy be found in "substitutes," which would be less effective and more costly. They could not be developed so as to keep pace with growing population and growing industrial needs. "Canada has already made it plain beyond peradventure that she purposes to keep what she has for her own development." We are told that in Pennsylvania the industries of the Pittsburgh district alone would call for more timber than that whole State provides. It is a national problem, and Professor Pinchot demands national interference with the privately owned forests to effect two things, first, systematic precautions against fire, and second, the use of scientific rather than random lumbering, so as to "save the productive capacity of the virgin forest lands we have left." The nation, he says, can no longer trust to the lumbermen, who often think their pecuniary advantage lies in forest destruction.

In Eastern Canada this article, as the French would say, "gives us furiously to think,"—the best effect that articles can have. For our forest perils, too, is not prevention better than cure?

H. L. S.