

The Williamstown Institute of Politics. The eighth annual session of the Institute of Politics was held in Williamstown August 2-30. Attention this year was turned more generally than ever before in non-European directions, indicating, probably unintentionally, the relative indifference of Americans to affairs not directly of American concern. Only three of the leaders this year concerned themselves with matters European. Count Carlo Sforza, former Italian minister for foreign affairs, conducted a general conference on "Problems of Peace in Europe," and gave a lecture on "The Responsibilities for the World War: Personal Recollections." In general, his outlook was optimistic for the continuation of peaceful conditions, despite the Polish corridor and the question of Austro-German union. He contended that the revisionist efforts to exonerate the Central Powers were not calculated to help the cause of democracy in Germany. Immediate responsibility for the war he laid on the Austrian autocracy, and general responsibility on the European system of equilibrium in 1914. Dr. Louis Pierard, head of the Belgian Labor party, gave a course of lectures on "Current Political Problems in Belgium," which dealt largely with conditions among the workers; and Dr. Otto Hoetzsch, of the University of Berlin, member of the Reichstag, gave a similar course on "Germany's Foreign and Domestic Policies."

The rest of the program provided a consideration of large ideas and basic facts combined with present-day policies and current events. The approaching presidential election increased the interest in the questions of political psychology and method, in the farm problem, in the Nicaraguan question, and in the Kellogg multilateral treaties. At the same time, the general subject of economic imperialism, and the clash or accommodation of widely different civilizations in Latin America, Asia Minor, Africa, and the Far East, came up for extensive discussion.

Under the leadership of Professor Graham Wallas, of the London School of Economics, a round table was conducted on "Methods of Social Direction," supplemented by three lectures on the same subject. In these Professor Wallas emphasized the "new social dimensions" produced by modern science and industry, and the necessity of bringing under the deliberate control of human reason the social problems hitherto left to chance. He urged the abandonment of eighteenth-century notions of natural right and divine providence, and the development of trust on the part of the voter toward his representative, coupled with a sense of responsibility by the latter and his

non-political expert advisers. To function under modern conditions, democracy must learn how to utilize scientific knowledge, how to choose experts. The objective, rational, scientific approach to current problems is essential. Intensified thinking in political life must be developed and combined with creative imagination. Unfortunately, as Professor Wallas was beginning to discuss concrete political mechanisms he was suddenly recalled to London and the meetings were discontinued.

"Agriculture and the Agricultural Surplus: an International Approach" was the topic considered in a round table directed by Professor C. R. Fay, of the University of Toronto. His theme was, in the main, that agriculture must attend to its own salvation, through organizing coöperative marketing associations large enough to reach the terminal markets. The Canadian wheat pool, the California fruit growers' exchange, and the new livestock commission agencies were described as examples of successful coöperation in America. The McNary-Haugen bill was analyzed and criticized unfavorably, and reserved comment was made on the proposals put forth by Hoover and Smith in their acceptance speeches. Professor Fay remarked "that both parties have seriously underestimated the power of coöperative organization as a force slowly to pull around the agricultural situation. People do not seem to be aware of the dynamic work that coöperatives are doing in this country."

The relations of the United States with Latin America were considered this year more extensively than ever, being taken up in their political, economic, and legal aspects in three round tables. Professor Charles W. Hackett, of the University of Texas, in a round table entitled "Recent Inter-American Relations and Problems," gave consideration to events in respect to Mexico, Nicaragua, and the Havana Conference. The conduct of negotiations with Mexico by the State Department was criticized for resorting to diplomatic pressure before an appeal to the Mexican courts had been made. It is perhaps significant that the representative of the oil companies expressed dissatisfaction with the present diplomatic settlement. Dealings with Nicaragua were called bungling, vacillating, and inconsistent. It was assumed that the canal rights secured under the Bryan-Chamorro treaty were at the bottom of our intervention there. It was alleged that the Coolidge-Hughes doctrine of intervention was an open repudiation of the Pan-Americanism advocated by Blaine and Wilson.

"Inter-American Economic and Commercial Relations" were discussed under the leadership of Professor Harry T. Collings, of the University of Pennsylvania. With political considerations in the background, and with mutual economic needs to the fore, the relations of the United States with Latin America appeared to be much more satisfactory. The growing need for Latin American products by the United States was emphasized. In regard to imperialism in the Caribbean, it was asserted that American policies are natural and inevitable; that, despite mistakes, they have been carried out with moderation and forbearance in the face of difficulties and provocations, and that they compare favorably with the policies of other nations.

Legal questions came up in the round table on the "Protection of Citizens Abroad," led by Professor Edwin M. Borchard, of Yale University. He stressed the obligation of citizens to submit abroad to the local law and local courts until they have actually suffered injury through denial of justice. He regretted President Coolidge's recent allusion to American property abroad as part of the national domain, because such an assertion is "capable of misrepresentation." He pointed out the inability of our own government in some circumstances to protect aliens in this country. He made clear the way in which individual claims can be influenced in their settlement by policy rather than right and law. He particularly advocated an international court of claims to which individuals could appeal as of right, with or without the support of their government, against a foreign government. In a special conference Professor Borchard also discussed the Kellogg treaties outlawing war, contending that the reservations advanced by France and Great Britain actually sanction every readily conceivable war. Considerable disagreement with this interpretation as too legalistic, and as ignoring the psychological factors in the situation and the force of public opinion, was expressed by other members of the conference.

Most of the rest of the program dealt with the clash of Western culture and imperialism with Eastern nationalism in Asia. The successful struggle of an Asiatic people against the West was described, both in lectures and in a round table, by Halide Edib Hanum, the exiled Turkish feminist and nationalist, who took up "Modern Turkey and its Problems." She particularly emphasized the background of the modernization of Turkey, showing in what respects it is not a recent or sudden development. She also considered the emancipation of Turkish women, the secularization of the Turkish state, and the ways

in which the problem of non-Turkish nationalities has been advanced toward a solution.

Some of the more fundamental aspects of the clash of cultures were taken up by Professor R. D. McKenzie, of the University of Washington, in his round table on "Population Problems on the Pacific Rim." This was one of the most illuminating discussions of the session. It was here demonstrated that economically the Pacific area is a cooperating rather than competing unit. The idea that the Occidental peoples are essentially superior to Orientals was combatted. The working of economic forces to form regional interrelationships among the Pacific regions was emphasized, and the effect of industrial development was considered. It was shown that Orientals really migrate very little, and that emigration is no solution for Japan's population problem. The relations of population movement and so-called "exploitation" of native peoples to economic progress were considered objectively and optimistically, and the ways in which race prejudice has clouded certain issues were made clear. In regard to the alleged more rapid breeding among Orientals, the leader asserted that fears based on this idea are groundless, declaring that the process of urbanization, education, and the rising standard of living which comes with the spread of industrialization will decrease the birth-rate among Orientals as it has among Occidentals. The difficulties, he said, arise more from cultural than from racial differences, and many even of the former are being levelled through economic contacts. On the other hand, he made clear that population control by government action can be justified, and is becoming more general. He advocated that such policies be approached scientifically and with international good-will.

Political events were taken up in Professor George H. Blakeslee's round table on "Problems of the Pacific," and discussion there was supplemented by two lectures by Dr. C. C. Wu on "The Domestic Program of the Kuomintang" and "The Foreign Program of the Kuomintang," and by a lecture on "The Task of Educating China's Millions for Citizenship" delivered by Dr. Y. C. James Yen. The cultural phases of the Chinese revolution were brought out, as well as the political. Most of the discussion, however, centered upon Sino-Japanese relations and the question of Manchuria. This quickly resolved itself into a clash between "rights" and "vested interests." While it was made clear that neither China nor Japan wants to fight, it became equally clear that no immediate accommodation seems likely. If enough time can pass for popular feeling to cool, it seems probable

that, with the growth in China of really effective government, Japan's vital economic interests can be safeguarded without impairing China's sovereignty.

Four special open conferences on "The Problems of Africa" were conducted at the end of the session by Dr. Raymond L. Buell, of the Foreign Policy Association. These were notable for Dr. Buell's indictment of recent actions by the Firestone Company and the United States Department of State in Liberia. His assertions were vigorously combatted on the spot by Dr. T. Jesse Jones, of the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, and in the public press by the State Department, the President of Liberia, and the Firestone Company.¹

At the close of the session President Garfield, chairman of the Institute, announced that continued financial support had been provided, and that, pending the working out of plans for permanent endowment, the program for next year will be substantially as heretofore. He intimated that some suggestion had been made that the various institutes now in existence coordinate their efforts in bringing speakers from abroad. The feasibility of this suggestion is being studied.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

Williams College.

Reapportionment in California. One of the most perplexing problems facing California today is that of legislative reapportionment. The present constitution provides (Art. IV, Sect. 6) that the state shall be divided into forty senatorial districts and eighty assembly districts "as nearly equal in population as may be and composed of contiguous territory," and that every ten years the legislature, at its first regular session after each national census, shall adjust such districts and reapportion the representation. In other words, the constitution of 1879 makes it mandatory for the legislature to redistrict the state after each federal census. During the past twenty years, however, proper adjustment of legislative representation has been so difficult a problem that the state is still districted on the basis of the 1910 census. The magnitude of the problem is explained partly by the sectional diversities of the state, and partly by the growth of city populations, with the resultant fear in the rural sections of urban domination.

Throughout its history California has been the scene of keen sectional rivalry, and each general state election and each legislative

¹ See pp. 999-1004 below.