

tially revolutionary, in the sense that it is trying to divert, by every means possible, the eastern Jews from the path hitherto pursued by the Jews of the west, and to lead them into a free and productive life attached to the soil. Emigration to Palestine started 40 years ago, and was inspired originally by purely sentimental motives. The first colonists were educated Jews, who left after the pogroms of 1881. The movement draws strength from Jewish national sentiment, but its main incentive is the desire to remodel completely the social structure of the Hebrew people. In fact, notwithstanding the unfavorable physical conditions existing in Palestine; notwithstanding the obstacles placed in the way of Jewish immigration, first by the Turks and later by the British

authorities; notwithstanding the hostile distrust of the Arab landowners, and notwithstanding the indifference of the rest of the world, even of the international proletariat, Hebrew workingmen and peasants in that country have already partly succeeded. They have constructed in Palestine, with their own blood and efforts, a new Hebrew community, which is guaranteeing them complete freedom of initiative and progress, and simultaneously redeeming the wasted country. To-day, more than 50 per cent of the Jewish residents are engaged in agriculture; 15 per cent in manufacturing, and less than eight per cent in commerce. That is a grand change, for example, from the less than one per cent of farmers, nine per cent of industrial workers, and 50 per cent of traffickers in Italy.

[*Manchester Guardian* (Liberal Daily), *December 2*]

AMERICA AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE

BY J. M. KEYNES

[In this article a notable book just published in the United States is discussed by Mr. J. M. Keynes, author of the *Economic Consequences of the Peace*, a member of the British Delegation at the Peace Conference, and the most distinguished British authority on the whole question of 'reparation.' The American book is by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who belonged to the American Delegation at the Conference, and now throws a great deal of light on the 'reparation' sections of the treaty.]

THIS book is of a different character from any of those which have been written hitherto about the Conference of Peace. First, it is the work of one who played a considerable part at the Conference, who was in a position to know the true facts, and who feels himself free to make use of any of the secret documents in his possession

which he deems relevant. But further, it is the *apologia* of one who (to my way of thinking at least) held during the Conference broad and enlightened views, and did his best to uphold them (though not to the death), and now explains without temper, with much candor (that is to say, if we sometimes substitute for the printed words what

one can discern between them), and with a singular freedom from personalities, why he finally acquiesced in something so very far from what he himself thought wisdom. Mr. Baruch's book is intended to be an explanation of how and why the American Delegation, without being themselves either foolish or dishonorable, came to accept a treaty which was both. It is written in a colorless manner, and a business man's lack of easy penmanship is eked out with copious extracts, the contribution of the author himself barely exceeding a hundred exiguous pages. But this does not detract from its significance as a human and historical document. Mr. Baruch seeks to explain, rather than to defend — which is the more enlightening method. His simplicity, candor, and restraint let the reader into an apprehension of the true facts as he sees them.

It is worth our while, therefore, to try to understand exactly what Mr. Baruch is saying, and to discover at what points we part company with him. The outline of his story is as follows.

1. It is not fair to criticize the American Delegation for what they yielded without making allowance for what they withstood. Mr. Baruch discloses some of the more extravagant demands of the Allied leaders, and hints what sort of a treaty might have come to birth if the American Delegation had not been here at all. I agree with him. He urges this without bitterness or complaint against these leaders or their adjutants personally. But 'though the peace delegates individually were able and high minded, they were bound to the wheel of their national aspirations.' The reader should attend to this sentence, because it is a central doctrine of Mr. Baruch's philosophy of life that 'able and high-minded' persons can, through force of circumstances, become

the instruments of misguided and disastrous passions without ceasing to be able and high-minded. Indeed, it may be a proof of their ability and high-mindedness that they should so acquiesce, because it may give them an opportunity unobtrusively to moderate the passions. 'If the ideal peace, which some demand,' he continues, 'had been actually undertaken, with all that it seemingly involved of sacrifice and unselfishness, the result would have been the overthrow of at least three of the major governments.'

It would be easy to smile at the air of *reductio ad absurdum* with which the conclusion of the sentence is introduced. But it would not be fair to overlook the next sentence, which claims that in this event the new governments succeeding them 'would have come into power under a popular mandate requiring them to be even more exacting in their terms.' In short, the passions of the hour were in the ascendant, and it would have been neither sensible nor useful to have shown oneself unduly heroic. The true friend of humanity took a middle course, obeyed the Doctrine of the Mean, and did as much as circumstances let him. 'The treaty,' he concludes, 'may not embrace all Woodrow Wilson desired, but I believe that it embodies all that could have been obtained' — thus echoing the words of Solon, who, when he was asked whether his laws for the Athenians were the best he could have given them, replied: 'No, but the best they could receive.'

2. Among the facts with which the American Delegation had to reckon, Mr. Baruch especially emphasizes the following. The British Prime Minister had been 'returned to power on the basis of an increase in the severity of the terms of the peace, especially those of reparation,' beyond those to which the Allied leaders had previously

pledged themselves. 'Relief from burdensome taxation had been promised from time to time by the leaders in the various countries. These promises in many instances were based upon false and exaggerated ideas of Germany's capacity to pay.' The French government maintained that the Fourteen Points, and so forth, were not binding, and that the Armistice Agreement gave the Allies a free hand. The English and French Delegations argued for many months with persistence and some skill that Germany was liable to pay the whole cost of the war, a position which the American Delegation held to be untenable and dishonorable. Mr. Baruch records the arguments of those who spoke for England and her Dominions, and an Englishman must be ashamed to see them here set forth for the first time in cold publicity. So acute had the position become that, in March, 1919, when the President was on his way back from America, the American Delegation transmitted a full report to him by wireless. Mr. Baruch's account of the President's reply is a new historical fact of high importance. 'The President replied to the effect that the American Delegation should dissent, and if necessary dissent publicly, from a procedure which "is clearly inconsistent with what we deliberately led the enemy to expect, and cannot now honorably alter simply because we have the power."' This is the authentic voice of the President in the plenitude of his powers. When the tenacity of the American Delegation had saved the Allies from so ruinously dishonorable a procedure, when they had strained so successfully at a camel, is it fair to blame them, Mr. Baruch contends, for swallowing gnats in the interest of reaching an agreement?

3. What were these gnats? In the main, the inclusion of pensions and separation allowances among our

claims for civilian damage. The American Delegation contended that on a strict interpretation we were not entitled to these claims. But the Council of Four (not so, apparently, all the American Delegation) were eventually persuaded that an argument could be produced plausible enough to save the face of honor. This was set forth in a secret memorandum prepared by General Smuts for the four heads of states, which Mr. Baruch feels himself at liberty to print in full. Put briefly, General Smuts's argument maintained that, whereas we were not entitled to claim for damage done to a soldier, but only for damage done to civilians, a soldier may at some later date, after the war, revert to being a civilian, and that any damage suffered by him as a soldier which persists up to the date when he becomes a civilian again can properly be classified as damage to a civilian. Thus was the honor of the victorious nations saved, compatibly with their demanding from the enemy at their feet double as much as they would have been entitled to otherwise.

'The English were reluctant,' Mr. Baruch explains, 'frankly to adopt a policy of moderate reparation, which, however much in the real interest of Great Britain, would have involved a direct repudiation of election pledges. . . . The President and his financial advisers passed days and weeks vainly endeavoring to convince their colleagues in the Allied and Associated governments, that it was impossible for Germany to pay anything like the sums required under the categories,' that is, to say, under the clauses of the treaty as finally drafted.

4. But Mr. Baruch has further lines of defense. Our legitimate claims against Germany were almost certainly more than she would be able to pay. To add on to them, therefore, further claims, possibly not so legiti-

mate, could have no practical consequences. The additional demands meant words, not money. Incantations are cheap. 'In the reparation clauses the conference was not writing a mere contract of dollars and cents; it was dealing with blood-raw passions still pulsing through the people's veins.' If a mad bull can be stopped with a handkerchief soaked in red ink, is it the part of a wise and humane man to spare the ink? The American Delegation, however, would not 'consent to demanding any fixed sum from Germany, unless satisfied of damage to at least that amount,' this being one of the reasons why in the end no definite sum was fixed. Besides, there is the Reparation Commission, and the drafting of that section of the treaty contains many loop-holes which may be more useful in the future than they were obtrusive at the time. There was also one other consideration of a different kind. If the American Delegation had gone too far in pressing the Allies to abate their claims on the enemy, they might have laid themselves open to awkward pressure from the Allies to be allowed corresponding abatements in what they themselves owed to the United States. If Germany could pay so little, could the Allies pay so much? Mr. Baruch twice alludes to this consideration as being present to the minds of the American Delegation. He would have the American public know that although the gnats were chiefly swallowed in the interests of securing a settlement, there may have been money in it too.

'One must be either ignorant, vicious, or an impractical idealist,' Mr. Baruch concludes, to contend that a sound solution of the Reparation problem was possible in the circumstances of Paris. This is indeed to turn the tables — when it becomes a sign not only of wisdom but of virtue and practical idealism to accept an un-

sound solution! But one sees what he means.

Like many others who are secretly ashamed of the treaty, Mr. Baruch pins his hopes on the Reparation Commission. But it is not by that route, in my judgment, that escape will be found. If Mr. Baruch were in as close touch with Europe as he used to be, he would know that that body is not functioning, and that in all probability it never will. Its complicated, sometimes inconsistent, and often unintelligible Constitution gives opportunities to obstruction but not to constructive action. It has few friends and admirers even among its own members, although it is temporarily valued by the French government as a pawn in their political game. So far from its being the instrument of release, its dissolution (at least in its present form and with its existing powers) is an early necessity of progress.

I am interested to find that Mr. Baruch agrees exactly with my estimate for the maximum amount of our legitimate claims against Germany — namely, £3,000,000,000 (gold), exclusive of pensions and separation allowances. He puts Germany's capacity to pay at the same figure, as compared with my estimate of £2,000,000,000. 'One of the difficulties in the situation,' he adds, 'was that a certain great English financial expert asserted with confidence that Germany could pay \$120,000,000,000 (£24,000,000,000 gold).'

I forbear to dwell on many details of the story this book unfolds. If it were written with more art, it would tell less. It powerfully illumines history, and reveals the secret springs of human nature. It takes the private citizen of discerning mind behind the scenes of the modern world of diplomacy and tells him how 'able and high-minded persons' justify their presence there. I

wonder if Mr. Baruch is always aware how much he here discloses.

Availing himself of the different convention current in the United States in the matter of the publication of secret and confidential papers, he tells a fuller tale than any Englishman could, and on the whole a faithful one. Mr. Baruch's book is sincere, and he has done truth a service.

To a great extent, then, I, as another witness of the scene, accept Mr. Baruch's version of it. I agree with him that the American Delegation played a great and useful part in the defense of honorable and sensible courses. The addresses of Mr. John Foster Dulles before the Reparation Commission, here first published, are a defense in the finest traditions of American forensic eloquence of the claims of international good faith. It is for this very reason that the first act of appeasement and generosity would now come more suitably, perhaps, from the British than from the American government; and I hope that we, the British, will make some amends for our demands at Paris by relinquishing entirely in favor of France and Belgium our claim to such reparation payments as are forthcoming. I even concede

that the President being what he was, and the Allied leaders being what they were, then in the situation that Mr. Baruch describes the result could not have been otherwise.

Where is it then that Mr. Baruch's conception of the relations of men and nations fails us and dismays us? Because he counts too low the significance of words — of words which he believes will be empty, and of professions which are disingenuous. It is dangerous to treat the living word as dead. Words live not less than acts and sometimes longer. The war, it may almost be said, was fought for words. Our victory raised the prestige of words, and the terms we promised enthroned them. But it was as though with the expiring breath of Germany the curse which had destroyed her was inhaled by those who stood over her. The realism which taught that words were the tools of emperors, not their masters, has won after all, and the spirit which invaded Belgium triumphed in Paris. Mr. Baruch comforts himself that the parts of the treaty which he hates, not less than I do, are empty because they are impossible, and harmless because they can never happen. But they have wounded the public faith of Europe.

LIFE, LETTERS, AND THE ARTS

THE REVIVAL OF THE WOODCUT

DURING the last half century and more, as the methods of mechanical reproduction have become more and more perfected, so the older processes of engraving which had been used for the purpose of reproduction have been rescued one after another from commercial servitude and become a means of original, artistic expression. First we had the revival of etching, with Sir Seymour Haden and Whistler as prominent pioneers; then the revival of lithography, with Mr. Joseph Pennell as a champion and the Senefelder Club as a happy result. Still more recent is the revival of color-printing, culminating in the Society of Graver Printers in Color.

Last of all to revive has been woodcutting, the oldest of all known methods of engraving, for its use in Europe goes back to 1400 A.D., and in the East its history is still older. But after the golden period of English illustration in the 'fifties of the last century, wood-engraving fell temporarily into abeyance, having been supplanted by photographic processes in the realm of illustration.

Quite latterly, however, and especially since the war, woodcuts have again sprung into popularity as a means of original artistic expression. England has had no such recognized leader among wood-engravers as France possessed in the late Auguste Lepère, but here and there individual artists like Mr. Allan Seaby and Mr. Hall Thorpe, following the masters of Japan rather than the German wood-engravers of the late fifteenth and sixteenth

centuries, have done much to popularize the colored woodcut.

Clearly, then, the time is ripe for the foundation of a society devoted to the development of wood-engraving, and a hearty welcome should be given to the newly-established Society of Wood-Engravers, whose first annual exhibition was opened at the Chenil Gallery, Chelsea. The exhibitors as a group follow the traditional European technique rather than the methods of Japan, and while many of the works are impressive and scholarly it is to be feared that few will be really popular in their pictorial appeal. There is a tendency to preciousness which should be guarded against, for if the new society is to be of real service it must appeal not only to collectors, but also to the general public.

From Mr. Stephen Graham to the Editor of the 'Observer'

SIR:—I do not think Mr. John S. Steele, of the *Chicago Tribune*, reviewing *Children of the Slaves* in your columns, needs to explain to people in this country what is meant in America by the expression, 'sob-artist.' We are more familiar with American journalism than we were.

To tell a harrowing story and work up for a sob is, of course, a despicable commercial trick in journalism, and if, in telling the story of the negro, I have done so, it is a grievous fault. Mr. Steele says that the negro problem is largely an economic one, and that it can be discussed quietly without tears.

However, on the day of the news of