

The Wallace Miner

Entered at the Postoffice in Wallace, Idaho, as second class Mail Matter.

Published Every Thursday by WALLACE PRINTING COMPANY

Elks Temple Building
606 Bank Street
Wallace, Idaho.

A. J. DUNN, Editor

Subscription price, per annum, \$2.00

Foreign, Canada and all countries
in Postal Union, per annum, \$2.50



Thursday, May 15, 1919.

WILL THIRTY-NINE SENATORS STAND BY AGREEMENT?

Soon after the first draft of the league of nations covenant was made public, and while President Wilson was in Washington for the purpose of influencing senators to support it, thirty-nine republican senators signed a statement declaring that the covenant in its present form should not be accepted; that it was the first and imperative duty of the conference to make peace with Germany, and that after that was accomplished the matter of forming a league of nations could be taken up and given the serious and deliberate consideration which it merited. Since that statement was signed the league covenant has been modified in some respects, but in the opinion of those best qualified to analyze its meaning and application, it is not essentially different from the original draft, and certainly no more desirable from the American standpoint. The document is so interwoven into the peace treaty that it is doubtful if one can be acted upon independent of the other, and the question is what are the thirty-nine republicans going to do, since they have not only declared their opposition to the covenant, but also that the peace treaty should be disposed of before taking up the league?

The joining of the peace treaty and the league of nations was of course the work of the president for the purpose of forcing the senate to accept both, or if they reject the combined instruments, to make political capital out of the situation by attempting to hold the republicans responsible for further delay in ratifying peace with Germany. We cannot believe that these senators will submit to this measure of coercion. The senate has been wholly ignored both in the matter of representation in the peace conference and in consultation regarding the terms of the treaty, to say nothing of the league of nations which was foisted upon the conference by President Wilson, albeit the constitution confers no power on the president to negotiate treaties without the consent of the senate.

So far as the treaty itself is concerned, taken alone there is no doubt that it would be quickly ratified by the senate. But it is evidently the belief of the president that it cannot be acted upon independent of the league of nations covenant. It is possible that the senate may find a way to segregate the two and approve the treaty of peace, leaving the league of nations for future consideration. In any event, since the power to declare war is vested in congress, it follows that congress also has the power to declare peace. But whatever may be the power of the senate or of congress, those thirty-nine senators have it within their power to save the nation from becoming a party to the league of nations as now proposed, and since they have unqualifiedly expressed their disapproval of it, the people expect them to record their votes against it. It is a matter so grave in its consequences as applied to our country that no consideration of political expediency should be entertained for a moment.

END OF THE WAR FINDS THE SAME OLD WORLD.

In a series of cartoons in the Chicago Tribune the famous artist, John T. McCutcheon, shows how the selfish human instincts are dominating the peace conference without regard to the high ideals of democracy professed while the great battle was being fought. First is the idealist orator surrounded by the acclaiming multitude, giving expression to such sentiments as "we are fighting that justice may reign; that greed and oppression may be overthrown; that peace may prevail upon the earth, and that peoples may determine their own destinies." The adjoining picture shows the

peace conference around the table where self-interest and expediency crowd out the principle of self-determination.

Again he pictures war being scourged and driven from the field by the sword of Justice, symbolic of the people fighting to a victory which they hope will put an end to the war. Beside this picture is the farmer in the guise of the peace conference planting the seeds of future wars at Danzig, Fiume, Shantung and Saar valley, while War, leaning upon the rail fence, views the process with complacency.

Last he pictures Prussian autocracy holding the helpless forms of Alsace-Lorraine in one hand and Shantung in the other, while advancing upon the autocrat with fixed bayonet are allied forces of democracy determined to overthrow Prussian autocracy and the rule of divine right. Against this is the prostrate form of Autocracy, while above him the peace conference hands the struggling form of Shantung to Japan, the only great existing autocracy, where the ruler reigns by divine right.

THE AMERICAN LEGION STARTS OFF RIGHT.

A large representation of soldiers of the world war met in St. Louis last week and effected an organization which will be known as the American Legion. An organization which will eventually include millions in its membership, men who have rendered loyal service to their country in war and who are imbued with a patriotic ardor that will make itself felt in the support of the government in peace, is bound to wield a tremendous influence in shaping the destiny of our country. They are men drawn together through ties of comradeship experienced during their country's peril, and now that the victory is won through their heroic devotion and sacrifice, it is natural and right that they should combine as a means of social pleasure and to promote the welfare of members and their dependents. The meeting in St. Louis made it clear that the first aim of the organization is to preserve our free and liberal form of government by combating anarchistic propaganda in its various forms, and to urge upon congress the enactment of laws that will free the country of those who would undermine its institutions while claiming its protection. The attitude of the American Legion toward the lawless and seditious element found expression in the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, there is an element living among us . . . who mistake liberty for license, free speech for anarchy, and who by their actions and speeches would revolutionize this government and make this land of freedom a land of free love; . . . be it resolved

That this convention petition congress that all members of radical organizations, such as the I. W. W., Bolsheviks and kindred organizations, be deported . . . that a stop be put to the printing of their literature, and that anyone found guilty of distributing their literature be guilty of a criminal offense.

That is real Americanism, the kind for which these soldiers fought and for which they will continue to stand in civil life.

WHERE WAS WILLARD WHEN THE WAR WAS ON?

The enterprising sportsmen of Pocatello who offered to put up \$160,000 as an inducement to get the Willard-Dempsey fight staged near that city may have reason to congratulate themselves that their offer was not accepted. It is now recalled that Willard, if he was not an outright slacker, is without anything to his credit in helping to win the war, unless it is a large investment of his easily earned surplus in Liberty bonds, and in that event his motive might be subject to question. If the impression gets abroad and firmly fixed that Willard evaded his patriotic duty during the war, and that he was in effect if not in fact a slacker, the promoter of this great fistic contest for world championship, Tex Rickard, may find that the patriotic sentiment of the country will rebel to an extent that may bring failure to his enterprise. The spectacle of handing over a great fortune to Willard whether he wins or loses the fight, while American soldiers are performing services for their country which he has managed to escape, and while every day ships are returning with men who have borne the brunt of battle while he has refused to even lend his services to the Red Cross at home, will not be pleasing to the millions of patriotic citizens who have

made every sacrifice to win the war, and particularly it will be resented by the soldiers themselves who are now confronted with beginning anew the life they left in response to call of country. The Stars and Stripes, the paper that voices the sentiment of the soldiers in France, refers to the fate of Les Darcy, the Australian prize fighter, who left his country to escape from military service, and who died recently in Memphis because the brand of "slacker" broke his heart. Applying the lesson to Willard, Stars and Stripes says:

"Think of it! The man who refused to spar a few rounds for the benefit of the Red Cross during war time is to get a fortune for one bout. The present heavy-weight champion never did anything toward helping America win the war, as far as we care, and he has never done anything to elevate boxing since he entered the ring. Les Darcy, an Australian, died in grief because he was not permitted to box in a neutral country, but the present heavy-weight champion—American born—who has already waxed rich from the ring, is going to be permitted to emerge from his dugout for another clean-up."

TERSE REPLY TO A DEMOCRATIC COMPLAINT.

Newspaper names are sometimes very misleading with respect to their political attitude or affiliation, but this charge will not hold against the National Republican, published at Washington, D. C. That paper is all that its name implies, and then some. Its mission is to expound the principles and policies of the republican party which necessarily involves denunciation of the principles and policies of the opposition, whether it be democracy, socialism, bolshevism, or just plain anarchy. The enemy gets no aid and comfort from the National Republican. Recently a democrat in the middle west, who is evidently trying to find a reason for the faith that is in him, complained to the editor that the National Republican is "one-sided." To this charge the editor promptly pleaded guilty in a leading editorial which explained why the paper is one-sided, and from which the following extract is taken which indicates the editor's sound line of reasoning:

"The National Republican is only on one side. And the man or the publication believing itself to be on the right side, can fight on that one side without compunction. This paper does not accept the doctrine that for every two words said for the republican party in a republican paper, one should be said for the democratic party as a means of showing that one is not 'biased.' The successful general does not order his troops to fire one volley into their supporting forces for every one delivered against the enemy. Lincoln never presented 'both sides' of the slavery question; Clay and Blaine never spent much time explaining the merits of free trade; McKinley did not give up a certain amount of every speech in the campaign of 1906 admitting the good in the sixteen-to-one theory. No sane preacher of the gospel thinks he has to throw in a few compliments to Satan in every argument he makes against him. Imagine Colonel Roosevelt spending any of his time in the campaigns of 1900 and 1908 throwing bouquets at Colonel Bryan! How often does Colonel Bryan flatter the republican party?"

It is evident that this delicate issue with Italy has been handled in a bungling manner. Italy was overrun long ago with American press agents, who so successfully advertised Mr. Wilson that candles were burned before his picture in the Italian trenches last fall. He made a triumphal tour of Italy, appealing to the crowds in the streets, and winning an ovation which the presidential press agents interpreted to mean that he had but to speak the word and any government in Italy which might oppose him would fall. President Wilson has done much talking about appealing over the heads of governments to the masses of the people. The Italian incident is a sufficient commentary upon the wisdom of that publicly proclaimed policy. Mr. Wilson's public statement concerning the issues involved in the Fiume controversy, on the eve of the departure of the Italian representatives from the peace conference, was calculated to make the situation more, rather than less, difficult. It is evident that the Italian people sustain their representatives at the peace conference with substantial unanimity. We have come out of this conflict with the hostility of a people who were intensely friendly to everything American before the episode occurred. It has been demonstrated that we cannot safely undertake the settlement of European questions, whose roots are centuries old.

SIMS AND THE CRITICS OF GENERAL PERSHING.

When the final story is written it will probably be found that whatever failures are to be charged against the work of General Pershing were due to the disadvantage under which he worked through the incompetency and lack of proper support from the secretary of war, and to the lack of trained and experienced officers upon whom the execution of his plans depended. But when we consider, now that the war is over, the vastness of the task to which General Pershing was assigned and the difficulties under which he operated, we believe that the final verdict of the American people will coincide with the conclusion expressed by Admiral Sims in a recent speech in behalf of the Victory loan. Admiral Sims' position in the navy during the war corresponded to that of General Pershing in the army, and when he speaks of the work of the general he knows what he is talking about, and the American people know that Admiral Sims does not indulge in unmerited and meaningless praise. Here is what he says of Pershing:

Now just a word about John Pershing. He has had 2,000,000 men over there. No one of those men has been able to see one one-thousandth part of the operations. They run across a great many disagreeable things. They may

have been charged five cents too much in a canteen, or they may have run across a Britisher or an Italian or a Frenchman that they had a row with. They come back with all sorts of small criticisms. For the Lord's sake, don't pay any attention to that and don't pay any attention to the people in this country that are yapping at John Pershing's heels.

No military commander since the world began has had to do the stunt he has had to do. If he should have done that without any mistakes he would be the greatest military commander the world has ever heard of. He will tell you himself he has made mistakes. So have I, but I am not going to tell you about them.

THE CASE OF FIUME.

National Republican.

No principle sufficient to justify serious delay in the peace procedure is involved in the dispute over the question of whether Italy or the Jugo-Slav republic is to possess Fiume, a city of some 30,000 inhabitants on the east shore of the Adriatic. The desire to control Fiume no more exemplifies the land grabbing spirit of the Italians than of the Jugo-Slavs. The moral right to sovereignty over Fiume more clearly belongs to Italy than to the Jugo-Slav nation, comprising Austrian enemy territory liberated by the Italian armies. Fiume is a city of ancient Iberia, once a part of Italy, and naturally as much a part of Italy as the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine are of France; a majority of the present-day population of the city is Italian. Italy broke away from her alliance with the central powers, and cast in her lot with the allies at a crucial moment in the war, in order to redeem her own lost provinces. It is evident that if Italy had remained with the central powers, opening southern France to the irruption of German and Austrian armies, the war would never have reached the point where this country would have intervened to save the day; Germany would today bestride the world like a Colossus, and would be issuing orders on both sides of the Atlantic. Italy has made greater sacrifices than any other of the belligerent powers. Along with France she has expended in the war nine-tenths of her capital. She has suffered in loss of life little less, in proportion, than France.

France and England entered into a treaty with Italy, early in 1917, according to her certain territorial acquisitions, in case of allied success. This treaty is no more discreditable to Italy than to our associates, France and England. This treaty does not bind this country, but it is not surprising that since England has been given practically everything agreed upon in that treaty, and France has likewise secured every concession promised, that Italy should feel slighted in having her right to an Italian city questioned, as against the alleged right of a new nation carved from Austrian territory and populated by former Austrian subjects.

It is evident that this delicate issue with Italy has been handled in a bungling manner. Italy was overrun long ago with American press agents, who so successfully advertised Mr. Wilson that candles were burned before his picture in the Italian trenches last fall. He made a triumphal tour of Italy, appealing to the crowds in the streets, and winning an ovation which the presidential press agents interpreted to mean that he had but to speak the word and any government in Italy which might oppose him would fall. President Wilson has done much talking about appealing over the heads of governments to the masses of the people. The Italian incident is a sufficient commentary upon the wisdom of that publicly proclaimed policy. Mr. Wilson's public statement concerning the issues involved in the Fiume controversy, on the eve of the departure of the Italian representatives from the peace conference, was calculated to make the situation more, rather than less, difficult. It is evident that the Italian people sustain their representatives at the peace conference with substantial unanimity. We have come out of this conflict with the hostility of a people who were intensely friendly to everything American before the episode occurred. It has been demonstrated that we cannot safely undertake the settlement of European questions, whose roots are centuries old.

The Italian trouble exemplifies clearly the situations certain to arise in connection with American participation in a league of nations dominated by European powers. In other cases of international dispute, as in this, we would be compelled to take a hand in settling questions which do not immediately concern us, and would in time reap the harvest of ill will thus sown.

NEUTRAL NEWT.

Harvey's Weekly.

Newton D. Baker, the American secretary of war, enjoyed the curious experience of being lost in the neutral zone in Germany yesterday.—Associated Press Dispatch.

Doubtless he enjoyed it, but it wasn't a "curious" experience; not for him. He has been lost in a neutral zone most of the time since the war began.

A Kansas editor refers to an Indian as a copper-faced type.

The average man who tries heroic measures gets a misfit.

The Return.

(W. W. Whitlock in New York Times)

You who have lingered in the pleasant walks
Of changeless days from rise to set of sun.
And gathered round the fire for merry talks
And harmless laughter when the day was done;
You who have followed life's accustomed ways,
Nor watched the flash of battle light the sky,
When thundering thousands charged, with eyes ablaze,
And there was but one choice; to kill or die—
What can you know of joy so keen 'tis pain,
The joy that comes with being home again!

The nights were long beneath the starry dome,
And there was time, while Mars throned high above,
For thoughts of one dear spot across the foam,
Touched with the splendor of our early love.
Out of the past fond pictures rose to view,
Of happy gatherings round the merry board,
While memory strove each meeting to renew,
Each tone of love, each gesture to record.
"O God! to be with them once more!"
—'Twas vain,
The ardent wish to be at home again.

For some, New England's hill of friendly green
Rose like a beacon to the inner sight;
For some, the long, low western plains, with sheen
Of rippling grain, transformed the distant night.
The broad savannahs and the craggy peak
Each called some heart among that silent throng,
Each seemed endowed with magic powers to speak—
To waft across the deep a siren song.
'Twas but a dream, a figment of the brain—
But ah! the dream's come true, we're home again!

America Would be a Sorry Litigant in Wilson's World Court-- Letter to Borah

That the stand taken by Senator Borah in opposition to the entrance of the United States into a league of nations is receiving approval from real Americans in all parts of the country is indicated not only by comment from the press, but through personal letters from people in all walks of life from every state, and also from the doughboys who are still over there and who see in the league of nations a scheme that will keep them and thousands of others in foreign service in making good the guarantees contained in the league covenant. Here is a letter from a leading attorney of the state of New York, Arthur R. Conway, of Albany, whose high commendation will be read with special pride and interest by the people of Idaho:

Borah's Sound Americanism.

Albany, N. Y., April 23, 1919.

Hon. William E. Borah, United States Senator, Washington, D. C. Sir: Honor to and blessings upon a statesman, wiser than his fellows, unshaken by hostile criticism and unfair assaults upon his motives, who, speaking the faith of his country welling from a pure American heart, foresees perils lurking in an uncharted sea over which experimentalists are seeking to propel our ship of state. As a loving mother senses danger to her children, so a true patriot has the faculty of discerning pitfalls for his country in designs pleasing upon the surface.

You fight the idea of a league of nations with such a full knowledge of the subject, argumentative force and earnestness, that only fools can not, and those who stuff their ears against the voice of reason, logic and sound Americanism will not be convinced. Unfortunately, many of your colleagues, for reasons of their own, failed to oppose the idea, and contented themselves with attacking the form rather than the principle. They have been out-manuevered, and are now in the plight that even though they step into the breach and take a bolder stand than in the first instance they will be subject to impugnments as to their motives and instability of purpose. You are still in a position to continue the struggle with unabated energy and resolution. You may be worsted, but defeat can not take from you the distinction and glory reflected upon a statesman who labors, ably and manfully, for the welfare of his country.

A reading of the revamped proposed constitution confirms all your arguments. It is worse than the first draft. There is no power in or out of that constitution that will prevent trading of votes when occasion arises for such schemes; and negotiations of that kind would be considered as legitimate methods of diplomacy by

foreign diplomats. Britain, owing to her large number of votes in the assembly, would be courted for such votes by one or both nations that might be presenting their cases before that tribunal. America, acting guilelessly, would be a sorry litigant in such a court. The main additions to the proposed covenant seem to be by way of "jokers" inserted in many provisions. For instance, a member may withdraw after giving two years notice of intention to do so, provided its obligations up to the time of withdrawal (not the time of filing notice of intention) are satisfied. It might be necessary to assume obligations and duties within the two years, or there might be present obligations, the performance of which would take such a length of time that the provision as to withdrawal would be valueless and meaningless. As to the Monroe doctrine, if there are any "regional understandings" like that doctrine, they should have been specified with equal definiteness. The league would even take supervision of the execution of agreements relating to traffic in women; whatever that may mean. A number of matters are incorporated in the covenant which do not belong in such a document. The main objections, of course, you are more familiar with than I am. When I read statements to the effect that there could be no league without the United States, I think that without the lamb the shears would be of no use.

I can not forbear testing my recollection in regard to the reservation in The Hague convention, with which you are well acquainted, and which reads:

"Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

Please accept the appreciation and thanks of an American citizen.

Respectfully,
ARTHUR R. CONWAY.

PEACE BIRD IS PREPARED.

Washington Post.

Why can't gentle peace come other-wise than as a painted vampire with a tomahawk, a stiletto, a time bomb, a vial of poison, a roll of secret treaties, an armful of masks, a bottle of invisible ink, a roll of counterfeit money and a hypodermic syringe?