

REVIEW

Constantinople. When Turkey dropped out of the war in 1917, a treaty was signed at Sevres, by which Constantinople was to be internationalized, and Greece was to have certain portions of what had hitherto been Turkish territory. By the Treaty of Versailles still other areas, largely inhabited by Greeks, on the old Anatolian coast, were mandated to that country. In these arrangements the Porte, the nominal ruler of Turkey, who was virtually a prisoner to the Allies at Constantinople, acquiesced: but all Turkish troops did not lay down arms in answer to his proclamation. At Angora sections of the army refused categorically to obey the order, and Kamel Pasha, who had distinguished himself in the war, was sent by the Porte to enforce it. Kamel found the sentiments of the dissidents more to his liking, adopted them, and became leader.

They set up a nationalist Government at Angora, repudiating the Porte as being a tool of the Allies; rejected the two treaties, or at least such portions of them as alienated Turkish territory, or infringed Turkish sovereignty; and called on the Young Turks of a few years ago to rally to the national cause. The Porte was powerless to suppress them; to send troops to Angora were but to send recruits to the Nationalists. The Allies, that is to say England and France, whose commissions were controlling Constantinople in the interest of internationalism, could gain nothing and might lose much by putting pressure upon the satrap Porte.

The British were heavily handicapped at the very first; for when, in the earlier days of the war, levies had been made in India, the Moslems were assured that Turkey would be dealt with leniently in the final adjustment; and they now regarded the treaties as a gross violation of those pledges. Kamel knew his advantage, and was astute enough to raise the spectre of a holy war and the vision of a restored Eastern Caliphate. Now, as England and France had carefully provided for the exclusion of Papal influence and the Ten Commandments from the Peace Conference, Wilson and the Fourteen Points being considered more adaptable to modern Civilization, they could

not count upon the Crusader temper of Europe. There was no Urban to invoke God's blessing on the cause. Lloyd George would undertake it perhaps, but Kamel could show a clearer commission from Allah: there was no Peter Eremita to cry out that the virgins of Christ were oppressed by the Moslem in the city of God; for in Zion, Christian, Turk, Arab and native Jew, were calling out in harmony against the oppression of a new pest called the Zionists, who were engaged in "developing" Palestine under the omen of British guns and American dollars; France had indeed a Godfrey, in the person of Foch, who could still have found men to follow him, even to the detail of refreshing their souls at Rome before going to break lances with the Paynim; but France's eye was not single. Even at Constantinople they were not in understanding with the British Commission; the latter, owing to ancient alliances, having been able to use the Porte to manouvre themselves into a position of control, while the French were expected to execute arrangements the drift of which was not clear to them. Now France had received from the League of Nations a mandate for a belt of territory lying around the North East end of the Mediterranean, part in Syria and part in Asia Minor, everywhere contiguous to Turkish territory, and everywhere open to Kamel. Consequently France entered into negotiations with the Kamelists, and signed a treaty with them, Britain not being consulted. The treaty was of no international importance, but Britain condemned the French action, and spoke of requiring a consideration of the covenant, although they had themselves made a trade arrangement with Russia without stopping to consider France's objection to regularizing the Soviets.

A gleam of hope now came from the ambition of the Greeks, who, under the restored Constantine and without special regard to the limits assigned them by the Treaties, began operations for the recovery from Turkey of all areas of Greek population. Of course England and France, as signatories of the Treaties, were supposed to prevent this; and they both warned Greece of the possible consequences her action. Nevertheless Greece persisted, and England, in the way of trade, furnished equipment for the campaign.

When the Greek offensive, having almost reached Angora, was halted, and broke down, and the victorious

Kamelists swept them back to the sea, and beat upon the gates of Constantinople, France could not see her way clear to make sacrifices for Greece, for the satrap Porte, or for the neutral zones; and while British war ships were crowding into the Dardanelles, the French troops were withdrawn to the European side of the strait. It was only when it became evident that the Turks meant to pursue the disorganized Greeks into Thrace that the French joined with the British to prevent it. At that point an armistice commission met at Mudania, and arranged for a conference to be held at Lusannes.

That Conference is now in session, and Ticherin, whom nobody thought of at Mudania, is present and "dominant;" for whether the Dardanelles and the Black Sea be open or closed to the navies of the world is a question of first importance to Russia. The Turkish attitude is almost disdainful. There must be no infringement of Turkish sovereignty, no humbugging about neutral zones, the capitulations must go, and perhaps, to forestall the possibility of their being revived, all non-Turkish residents of the recovered territories as well. Greece must bear the odium for the burning of the Anatolian towns, and must pay reparations in addition to the loss of all the territory awarded them by the two ill-omened treaties mentioned above. And the allies must submit to the repudiation of their own treaties, and let Greece take the count, if only they can secure the freedom of the straits. But Russia does not desire an open Black Sea, and up to the present Ticherin and Kamel have been as hand and glove. Will the allies be able, in the interest of peace among neighbors, to drive a wedge between them?



France and Reparations. The meeting of Allied Premiers which was convened at London, to prepare material for a Conference soon to be held at Brussels, has just broken up without any approach to understanding, or perhaps, I might better have said, without any approach towards unanimity between England and France on the question of German Reparations. This question has bored the world so long that people get hot at the mention of it, and

want to know why France persists in blocking the return of Europe to normalcy, stabilized currency, etc., with nagging about their blessed reparations.

A bankrupt merchant compounds with his creditors, to one of whom he owes more than to all the others together.

When the smaller creditors are satisfied, and are ready to resume trade with him, he raises the plea that to continue liquidation on the scale agreed upon will put him out of business. It is now to the interest of the satisfied creditors that he remain in business, and with the largest possible capacity for purchasing from them. The major creditor becomes a nuisance, his claim begins to look a little unreasonable, a little old; and they say to him, in effect, "Give the man a chance, since you have waited so long, wait a little longer, or cut the claim in two, and let us all make a fresh start." Is the case like that? Just so.

At Versailles England obtained the Germain shipping to repair her losses by the submarines, she had the German navy put out of commission and Heligoland dismantled,—an enormous indemnity for her, and she received the German colonial possessions, though in all fairness they should have been pooled. These things England has in hand; France, who suffered most, has got nothing but Alsace and Lorraine. And now England says to France; "You are too insistent, too grasping; give Germany a chance to come back to normalcy, to balance the budget, to stabilize the mark. If you exact all, you will handicap Germany so heavily that we shall all suffer from her diminished purchasing power." And the press of the English-speaking people the world over is very largely occupied with re-echoing these paltitudes in news items, special correspondence, and editorial; till old Clemenceau comes over to America to find out what it all means, and Frenchmen at home begin to revive an old saying about "perfidious Albion." We may as well see these things clearly, for Canadians may be called to fight with France about them.



"Standardized Education." A certain Major Ney, preparing the way for Sir Henry Newbolt, who comes in January to inaugurate the National Lectureship Scheme, told

his hearers at St. John, on the eleventh of December, that consolidation of purpose among the educational forces of the Dominion is necessary. "If Germany could evolve an ideal, based on Prussianism, by utilization of the school system to dragoon its people into a mental attitude and purpose," says the report, "what might Canadians be able to do by a similar process but with a Christian intent and a truer goal?" Asked if the National Council of Education aimed at bringing about uniformity of curricula throughout the schools of Canada, Major Ney replied that the Council dealt in principles, etc.

This is the National Council of Education which created itself at Winnipeg, Nov. 1919, and which endeavoured to have itself entrenched in a federal bureau for the exercise of some measure of superior control over educational matters in Canada. They were ready incontinently to make an onslaught on the revenue of this country to further a purpose in subvention of the constitution of the country. Some plain speaking by Mr. Parmelee, Superintendent of Protestant Schools of Quebec, and by Father McMahon of Regina, called a halt. Thereupon it was decided to choose a commission from their own body who should, at the expense of the Council, function as a bureau of reference for all the Provinces. It does not appear that this pale ghost of voluntary jurisdiction was much requisitioned in the interim; but now they are going to make themselves felt, and Sir Henry Newbolt is coming from England to inaugurate the educational campaign, as preliminary to the political campaign, for the subversion of provincial rights; and the best face Major Ney can put upon it is to say that we can do it as well as the Germans. That is to say, by selecting, or preparing, for the schools text-books in which our own dominant ideas would be illustrated and enforced, and by excluding all light but the one in which we desired our offerings to be viewed, we could, in the course of two generations, succeed in stamping whatever of mentality was left in the land with the stamp of our own obsession. Sir Henry will have to decorate this skeleton a good deal to take away its indecency.

One may remark at the beginning that whether education was as superior as the members of the National Council of Education would have acclaimed it before the

war, or as vicious as they would have denounced it during the war, Major Ney plainly knows nothing about it. So that if one were to say to him, joshing of course, that Germans were ready to fight for the fatherland because it gave them good government, splendid public service in return for the public moneys, good music and drama within the reach of all, and good beer at a price the poor man could pay and that minorities were protected in their constitutional rights against the filibustering of propagandists, he would be in no position to make answer. Further I might warn him that reference to Germany's infirmities is beginning to be in bad taste again in that very entourage in which he moves.

Now if I were arguing with a German Philosopher, I would have some assurance that I had weakened the force of his conclusions in the degree in which I had rendered his premises doubtful. Not so here, for that type of mentality which we are examining is likely to leave such gaps in its logic as render the conclusion entirely autonomous. His conclusion is this: we can force our scheme upon the public intelligence in the course of two generations. The thing, I admit, is possible and it has been done; and hence we have sectional prejudices living into hoary antiquity, and held in the best of faith. But what is the plan? Who has the right to determine it? In the name of what principle is the intelligence of the next two generations to be shackled with it? For the answer to the first of these questions I am content to await the epiphany of the National Council of Education; the others may as well be answered now. No one has the right in question save only him who has the obligation. I have an obligation to hold fast whatever comes to me solid and attested by the suffrage of humanity in its long struggle for light, and to pass it on to posterity unimpaired; and the principle from which the obligation arises is that of human solidarity, a principle, in natural things, clear to the reason, and, in supernatural, an object of revelation. But whatever liberty I may have to toy with passing fashion, I can have no right to impose it upon posterity as if it were the essential product of human endeavour. If therefore there be anything of great worth in the arcana of the National Council of Education, let it be brought frankly into light, and let it have the test of

acceptance by this age and the next and the next, and let it finally get its place and its importance in the total system of human life. There is no danger that the eternal good of it shall perish.

And here I am led to remark upon a certain squint noticeable in the mentality of those energumenic individuals who are forever badgering the world into the shape of their own doxy. For almost any one of them will answer you as to the origin and destiny of man in the language of Darwinian Evolution, eked out with monism.

"Certainly," they say, "man has sprung from the brute and by constantly adapting itself to a constantly varying environment, the divine principle within him moves forward to an ever enlarging realization and consciousness of self." Well then, in the name of Darwin and of Hackel, since by these names you conjure, how dare you attempt to clamp upon the crescent nautilus of today the calcified shell of your present prejudice to make him a hermit crab through all posterity?

The truth is that the world is badly muddled today, because it has lost the fine art of managing its enthusiasts, and they have run mad and become a menace. When that art was in flower, if a man, dreaming dreams of a higher life, got himself persuaded that the use of the flesh of animals enforced the grip of the body upon the soul, he was free, of course, to abstain from meat and say no more about it. But if the urge was strong upon him to communicate his conviction and to make disciples, his case was looked into. The idea had nothing to condemn it so long as it could be kept free of the arrogance of singularity. Therefore let those who think that way form a community and live apart; and, as they cannot hope to be saved by abstinence alone, let them toil and pray. But let them not attempt to force their view of life upon others. If the sweetness of their lives does not draw disciples, then they must go without them. If now, the Trappists of Rogersville forget their charter and forget their silence, and in a wild effort to give the Canadian people one mighty lift towards ultimate perfection, were to campaign the country and fill the halls of the new Parliament Building with the clanking of wooden shoes, until they secured legislation prohibiting the use of

flesh meat and unnecessary speech, would not the National Council of Education and Sir Henry think it amazing? Nevertheless the Trappists would have a clearer charter than they, to popularize their urge; for they have lived with it long and have tested of what spirit it is.

