

touch of the crank in him, she branded him by secret slander—not daring to publish the alleged evidence against him—as “immoral” in a particular sense which to all informed memories merely recalled the theft of the Crown Jewels of Dublin Castle by the servants of the crown.

TO attribute what the French call “le vice anglais” to Casement was too funny. If they had laughed, it would not have been so bad; but they kept the veil of hypocrisy upon their faces, not knowing what word some rude little boy had written there.

For an Englishman not only “never knows when he is beaten”; he also never knows when he is found out. It is difficult to say how far this may be an advantage; but he has lied so long that he now lies in all sincerity; he has lost the sense of what truth is.

Therefore I do not say that the English were not sincere in their denunciation of those lofty souls who heard the clarion call of my Declaration of Independence, and sprang to arms. The tragedy of it is that they were. They had no imagination enough to put themselves in the place of any Home Rule Irishman. Let us give a sketch of the history of the movement.

1. It goes on rather hopelessly for 50 years or so after the treacherous destruction of Graham's Parliament.

2. Parnell takes hold, and forces the government to offer a measure. The government splits rather than pass it.

3. Parnell renews his efforts. This time, despite his own will, the bill goes through the Commons. The Lords throw it out.

4. Another rally. The veto of the Lords is destroyed, principally in order to pass Home Rule.

5. The bill passes. Sir Edward Carson revolts, drills men, runs guns, with the Government and the army for his accomplices. England, even the anti-Home-Rule section, is aghast.

6. The King signs the bill. General relief; “Oh well, that's done with, thank God! It's law now; but we needn't enforce it, need we?”

But now? Yes: even now a frank acceptance of the Law of England might save England. Let Dublin Castle be abolished; perhaps no other act would be necessary. Ulster and Rebel Cork have learnt to understand each other in the last two years, to some extent. Home Rule is now possible as never before. At least a fair trial would be evidence of England's good intentions.

Or is her Blind Spot “a spot that is always barred”? Oh William Schwenck Gilbert!

Major John Bigelow's Remarkable “Study in History and Diplomacy”

MAJ. JOHN BIGELOW, U. S. A., retired, has made a specialty of the study of phases of American history often buried in State papers and documents of anything but easy access. As a close student of our history he has made some valuable contributions to our knowledge of the past in his “American Policy,” “World Peace,” etc., and he has now added to the obligation under which we rest to his industry in intelligent research work, by an admirable volume of timely interest and permanent value, entitled “Breaches of Anglo-American Treaties.”

Major Bigelow's work is indeed “an important contribution to the evidence entering into the ground work and the frame work of a correct answer to the vital question of the day.” The pity is that it did not appear upon the market a year ago. It is a sincerely patriotic effort, backed by exhaustive proof, to defend the United States from the aspersions of being a treaty-breaking power so often leveled against us by English statesmen and writers.

Only a few years ago, incidentally to the public discussion of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, the United States was arraigned by the British press as lacking in the sense of honor that holds a nation to its promise. The *Saturday Review* could not expect “to find President Taft acting like a gentleman.” “To imagine,” it said, “that American politicians would be bound by any feeling of honor or respect for treaties, if it would pay to violate them, was to delude ourselves. The whole course of history proves this.”

The *London Morning Post* charged the United States with various infractions of the Treaty and said: “This is surely a record even in American foreign policy; but the whole treatment of this matter serves to remind us that we had a long series of similar incidents in our relations with the United States. Americans might ask themselves if it is really a good foreign policy to lower the value of their written word in such a way as to make negotiations with other powers difficult or impossible. The ultimate loss may be greater than the immediate gain. There might come a time when the United States might desire to establish a certain position by treaty, and might find her past conduct a serious difficulty in the way.” More recently, and presumably with more deliberation, a British author (Sir Harry Johnston, “Common Sense in Foreign Policy,” p. 89), says: “Treaties, in

fact, only bind the United States as long as they are convenient. They are not really worth the labor they entail or the paper they are written on. It is well that this position should be realized, as it may save a great deal of fuss and disappointment in the future.”

The most remarkable chapter in the book deals with the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. Major Bigelow shows how the British Ambassador spirited a spurious document into the files of the State Department. This spurious document has had an important bearing on the interpretation of our treaty with England affecting the Panama Canal.

Major Bigelow has devoted his study to determining the relative trustworthiness of two great nations as indicated in their conventional intercourse with each other. Beginning with the treaty of peace as the end of our war of independence, it considers all the treaties, conventions and similar agreements negotiated between the United States and Great Britain that may be regarded as broken by either of the contracting parties, sets forth and discusses the infraction in each case, and ends with a summarizing of the records on both sides and a balancing of the agreements.

The work is not a “war book”; it was not written with a view to forming public opinion on any phase or feature of the present world war. It was begun, and but for some revisions and amplification, was finished before this unprecedented contest commenced. The six divisions of the book embrace the first treaty of peace (1748-84) and the Jay Treaty of 1795; the second treaty of peace (Treaty of Ghent, 1815), convention for indemnity under the award of the Empress of Russia (1823), Rush-Bagot Agreement (1818), convention respecting fisheries (1819); the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850—the Mosquito Coast—the negotiations; the Protectorate under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty; the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, concluded, Belize or British Honduras, the Bay Islands; the Treaty of Washington 1871, general conclusions; Appendices, Bibliography (very full), index and three maps.

The book consisting of 248 pages is published by Sturgis & Walton Company with subtitle of “A Study in History and Diplomacy”; price \$1.50 net. Orders will be filled by VIERECK'S WEEKLY.