

The Ford International Weekly
THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT

Published by
THE DEARBORN PUBLISHING CO.
 Dearborn, Michigan

HENRY FORD, President.
 C. J. FORD, Vice President.
 E. B. FORD, Secretary-Treasurer.
 W. J. CAMERON, Editor.

Twenty-first Year, Number 29, May 14, 1921.

The subscription price in the United States, its dependencies, Cuba, Mexico and Canada is \$1.50 a year, payable in U. S. funds; foreign countries, subscription rates on request. Single Copy, Ten Cents.
 Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Post Office at Dearborn, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

To receive your copy without interruption, please observe the following:

1. Notify us at least two weeks in advance.
2. Give both old and new address.
3. Write clearly.

An Hawaiian Situation

THE House Immigration Bill enacted by the last Congress and which failed to become a law through President Wilson's pocket veto, was a thoroughly good bill. It was passed after full and exhaustive hearings in which were such opposed interests as the steamship companies which find this immigration so profitable, the mining corporations eager to exploit cheap labor, and the Jewish Committee which is so strenuously exerting itself in the interest of the immigrants from Eastern Europe.

The bill is again under discussion in Congress and day by day it has been mutilated, so that in its present state it bears little resemblance to the original Johnson measure that fairly met the imperative need of proper restrictions. First, all immigrants having relatives in this country were exempted; then all "refugees from racial, religious or political persecution." At last advice, a joker seems to have been slipped into the measure under which many thousands of French, Swiss, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Austrian, Hungarian and Portuguese immigrants are barred while admitting all the Poles, Rumanians, Galicians and Germans who may apply. The bill, thus scissored and patched, is said to be slated for prompt passage by the Senate. President Harding will undoubtedly feel called upon to veto it, and then we shall have the whole long-drawn-out business all over again. Of course, this is precisely what the "organized racial minority" representatives are after. Despairing of blocking a bill squarely meeting the country's instant need, they are shrewdly maneuvering to prevent restriction until they can get into New York the several hundred thousands of their congeners being herded at Danzig and other European ports.

Perhaps legislators distracted by propaganda bombardment may find a gleam of light in the resolution introduced the other day in the territorial legislature of Hawaii. It requests that Congress permit the importation into Hawaii of 25,000 Chinese laborers, so that they may have an opportunity to work and earn money to send to relatives in the famine-swept districts of the Chinese Republic.

The proposed measure specifically stipulates that Chinese entering Hawaii under such permission shall engage only in agricultural pursuits, that they come under rules and regulations promulgated by Congress and the Department of Labor, and that they remain for a period of not more than five years, then returning to China.

The only difficulty about a solution on similar lines of the problem of Jewish immigration is that the Chinese are able and industrious agricultural workers, while the bulk of the Eastern Jews are not producers. Then Hawaii wants the Chinese; but apparently no country wants the scourgings of Eastern European ghettos.

Bolshevism's Oriental Offensive

EVIDENCE accumulates that an important part of the Bolshevik scheme to extend its "Proletarian Dictatorship" over the whole planet is related to a revival of the old Muscovite dream of detaching India from the British Empire. The Russians were at the gates of Herat in 1878. Today, the Red Armies of the Jewish dictators seem not only to have affected the

Afghans, but also to be preaching revolutionary unrest throughout India itself. Those responsible for the "Berlin to Bagdad" policy of German Junkerdom have made it plain by their aid and support of the Turkish "Nationalists" under Mustapha Kemal Pasha, as by their success in winning over the Armenians to Bolshevism and their present activities in the Balkans, that the ancient lure of India's wealth is proving a powerful incentive to the devastating march of the arch-looters of the modern world.

That Britain is well aware of these designs, is shown in the communication transmitted by Sir Robert Horne, president of the board of trade, to Leonid Krassin, Soviet commissary in London, simultaneously with the signing of the trade agreement between the British and the Soviet governments. In this letter it is openly charged that the Soviet government's policy in the East and the Near East aims at "the overthrow of British rule in India." Activities on the part of the Bolsheviks on the Indian border are characterized as "inconsistent with the stipulations in the trade agreement." Sir Robert also cites the employment by the Bolsheviks of "self-convicted traitors" like Natu Rey for the instruction of Indians in revolutionary tactics and the sending of emissaries into India with the avowed purpose of "investigating the possibilities of revolutionary work" in that country.

Notice is served on Lenin and his associates that if they desire the trade agreement to continue in force there must be an immediate cessation of these antagonistic activities. It is probable, under all the circumstances, that Lenin's masters will call off his Eastern offensive. Why should they seek to overthrow British rule in India, when they can use that rule to mask their own very real dominance?

Keeping Up the Old Ruins

THERE is hope for the British Empire! In the midst of miners' strikes and Irish and Indian insurrections, complications with France over German reparations, speculation on the Oxford-Cambridge boat race and anticipations of the football season, to say nothing of the crisis threatening Lloyd George's coalition government, the British Government is considering the restoration of the ancient Abbey of Whitby. Considering its venerable age—it has been standing for more than a thousand years—the ruins of the famous Benedictine monastery are in a fair state of preservation, so far as the chapel is concerned.

Although the groined roof, the magnificent oriel windows and doors and the central doorway with their rich ornamentation have yielded to the tooth of time, the main walls, parts of the choir, the north transept and the nave are so nearly intact that the lines of the original architecture may easily be followed. Founded in the year 657 by Oswy, King of Northumberland, the monastery has a respectable antiquity. Among its monks were Caedmon, the Saxon poet and scholar, who ranks among the fathers of English literature, and whose manuscript books serve to this day as models for printers and typefounders.

The monastery was what is known as a "double" one, and its first abbess was St. Hilda. She was succeeded by King Oswy's daughter, Aelflaed. It was here that the famous council was held in A. D. 664 to determine the controversy between the Irish and the Saxon churches as to the date of Easter. About 200 years later, the invading Danes completely destroyed the monastery and dispersed the community. It was not until after the Norman conquest that it was restored by William de Percy, an ancestor of the Earls of Northumberland.

American tourists are apt to associate Whitby with the oysters for which the place is famous and of late years the town has come to be a popular seaside resort, owing to its situation on the east coast of Yorkshire.

It was only last summer that an appeal to the English-speaking world was made for a restoration fund for Westminster Abbey. The very suggestion that this ancient fane, Britain's Parthenon, was in danger of falling apart, quickly brought in subscriptions totaling more than \$500,000. This regard for the architectural heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race, with all its historic and heroic associations, is an expression of a sense of connection and continuance of the centuries, a recognition of the fact that "All of good the past hath had, remains to make our own time glad." It is also a reminder of Edmund Burke's apothegm: "A people who have no regard for their ancestry will not be apt to have much regard for their posterity."

"Gone Mad With Egotism"

IN CONNECTION with the explicit declaration in the House of Commons the other day that the British Government was in possession of unquestionable evidence of a close connection between the Third Internationale at Moscow and the leaders of the revolutionary movement in Ireland, it is interesting to note that Irishmen in this country are waking up to the game being played with Irish hopes and aspirations by the same conscienceless conspirators who are responsible for the Russian chaos. Eamonn Valera, "president of the Irish Republic," is now charged by Bishop Michael J. Gallagher, of Detroit, national president of the Friends of Irish Freedom, with being "a man gone mad with egotism and presumption," and with having "deliberately split the Irish movement in America."

Dealing with Valera's visit to this country, Monsignor Gallagher, in a statement issued in Boston, further charges that the Sinn Fein leader attempted to dictate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago and that, failing to secure control of the Friends of Irish Freedom, he started the new organization known as the A. A. R. I. R. In support of this statement, Bishop Gallagher publishes a letter from Valera to Judge Cohalan of the New York supreme court; Judge Cohalan's reply warned Valera that American public opinion would not tolerate interference in American affairs by any citizen of another country, and a letter from John Devoy, editor of the *Gaelic American*, to a colleague, declared that submission to Valera's "dictation" would utterly discredit the Irish in America and destroy the whole movement.

The bishop's statement sheds needed light on the midnight assassinations and barrack burnings so alien to every tradition of Milesian gallantry and calculated gravely to prejudice the Irish cause. All lovers of Ireland must condemn such Bolshevik tactics in Ireland, no matter how little we may regard them as justifying English "black-and-tan" reprisals. Plainly, such methods savor of Moscow, rather than of Cork or Dublin. Perhaps it would be more exact to say that the Valerian policy of "dictation" and wholesale murder, finds the same source as that of Lenin and Trotsky in the purlieus of the big money-mongers of Frankfurt and of London and Wall Street.

There is something un-Russian in the Russian revolution; something wholly un-Irish and un-English in the Irish trouble; something absolutely un-American in certain movements in America. What is it?

The French Income Taxes

THERE seems to be a growing opinion in France that the government, in its anxiety to obtain such increase in the revenue as would really bring about the necessary equilibrium between receipts and expenditures, rushed through the chamber, last summer, measures which are now being repented of at leisure. It is charged that the supertax on gross income especially has proved the sort of "bleeding" which instead of curing is likely to kill the patient.

The complications of the present system come in for special criticism. It contains a long series of surtaxes and exemptions calculated not only to hit the taxpayer according to his total annual income, but also according to his personal status. Bachelorhood is penalized; the head of a family enjoys exemptions more if he has children, less if without children. These are only a few of many variations and exemptions in the tax that make it all the more difficult to collect in a land notorious for tax dodging. It is also charged that this income tax is in the nature of a supertax and amounts to double taxation.

The farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant and the salaried employe are all called on to pay a progressive tax averaging 50 per cent in addition to taxes on profits. The inheritance taxes are said to be likely to degenerate into a confiscation ruinous to the country as to the individuals directly affected.

Although the introduction of an income tax in this country was fiercely opposed for years, we seem to have managed much better this matter of the adjustment of its burden, in so far as concerns the exemption of small incomes and the shifting of the incidence to those enjoying monopolistic privileges. But why should this whole matter of taxation be so complicated and the cause of such general discontent and complaints of favoritism and injustice the world over?

Are we not about ready for the sweet simplicity of the single tax on land values?