

adequate guarantee of our interests and theirs than would any individual action on our part.

These are, indeed, but material considerations based upon our own self-interest. More impressive by far is the moral argument that relief from the present state of anarchy into which international relations have fallen can scarcely be hoped for unless the United States lends its aid to the movement for constructive reform. Not from any inherent virtue of our own, but from the circumstances of our origin and from our geographical position have we been able to set up an ideal of liberty and justice, to which we may not always have been true, but which has nevertheless been a standard of conduct for us and one which we may well contribute to the reconstruction of Europe. President Wilson, in his address of January 22, stated this ideal in fairly definite terms—the equality in respect to rights of all nations, great and small, the right of every people to choose the government under which they wish to live and to pursue their domestic policies unhindered, the freedom of the seas, and the limitation of

the armaments which have hitherto made a mockery of the elaborate plans of arbitration adopted in one treaty after another. To stand apart under such circumstances would be to defeat the one hope for the future peace of the world.

A league of peace may, indeed, not prove feasible; the forces of disruption may prove stronger than the forces making for union, and national policies may refuse to yield to the higher interests of the world at large. As in the case of every association of individuals for the welfare of the whole, the success of the league will depend upon the extent to which its members are willing to impose upon themselves the self-restraint essential to co-operation; material interests must no longer be the absolute rule in the trade rivalries of nations. Whether the nations are willing to make the necessary sacrifices is for the future to show; but at least the United States, which has proved the success of federation within its own borders, can contribute its experience and its influence to the establishment of that same ideal among the nations.

## What Does Ireland Want?

SHANE LESLIE, M.A.

**T**HIS is an exceedingly difficult question because neither Ireland nor her friends nor her enemies can agree, even among themselves, what she wants for herself or what they want for her.

At present only vague abstractions which sound better to wild music than to mild common-sense are being used such as "Coercion for Ireland" "Coercion for Ulster," "An Irish Republic," "Twenty Years of Resolute Government." These are all wanted by different groups in Ireland, but they all imply failure or threaten confusion worse confounded.

The colonial solution, that is, a workaday gift of autonomy based on the free dominions in the Empire, has the merit of being acceptable to more groups at one time than any other. What Ireland wants is not so much any particular system as the recognition of her nationality.

The trouble is that only extremists can make themselves heard in Ireland. The majority are not asking for the impossible. Ireland does not wish to hitch her wagon to the moon. Her people are not clamoring for revenge or republics. Vengeance anyhow belongeth to the Lord and republics are for countries like Russia and France which have discovered the art of putting up successful revolutions. The world we live in is one which believes more in success than in principles. Ireland is a country which has staked so much for principle that she has failed—of success. A humdrum, practical, cooperative, unromantic home administration is what Ireland needs whatever her most impulsive and

gifted sons have demanded and continue to demand.

The time has come for the dead to bury their dead on both sides and for the bitterness of the past to be engulfed in the peace of the future. If Ireland wants anything she wants peace at home and abroad. To ensure peace at home the cessation of internal strife is not only a desirable expediency but an absolute necessity if Irish nationality is to be carried into the next era.

Agonized by the war, distraught by the insurrection and menaced by the submarine, Ireland is not the buoyant, irreconcilable nation some of her absent partisans imagine. She is sad and a-weary. She is just as prepared to make peace with the Ulsterman within her gates as the liberal majority of Englishmen are to give terms to Ireland herself. And it is time surely. For Ireland is no longer young. Even her lovers and her poets personify her as a poor old woman. She is not qualified for a republican adventure. There is no older, no more traditional, no more conservative people in Europe. Ireland only asks to conserve her nationality.

It is remarkable that every movement which has agitated Ireland in the past century has been a conservative movement to conserve land, language and religion. The supreme and outstanding movement has been one to recover an eighteenth-century parliament out of the past. Home Rule is not a hazy experiment or political phantasy. It is a fixed idea round which many proposals and solutions have gathered. It is the national yearning for a visible and central sign that forming part of an Empire does not preclude Ireland from being a

nation. As the Jews treasured their temple in a nationalist as much as a religious sense, so the Irish still look to the desecrated buildings on College Green, and even if the latter were razed to the ground as utterly as the former, the Irish race scattered over the world would never cease dreaming and planning some such restoration as lies at the root of the Zionist movement.

Ireland wants to combine the satisfaction of an ideal with the hope of economic salvation. At the root of her troubles lies the economic squalor of congested counties in the west and of congested cities in the east. These she wants to remedy by home legislation.

Ireland has asked for very little. Her demand is two-thirds sentimental and one-third economic. O'Connell's Repeal was for the restoration of Grattan's parliament which meant practically a landlord's parliament. But Protestant and landlord as it was, it had kept Dublin among the first half-dozen capitals of Europe. Had Repeal been carried we should have had a mixed assembly of old-fashioned landholders and Catholic demagogues, who between them would have held off the horrors of the "Famine." A Home Rule Parliament in the eighties would have had no place for the gentry. It would have been fiercely agrarian but would have attracted a strong element from the radical Ulstermen. Since then Ulster Radicalism has passed over to Toryism and Radicalism itself has found a strange but striking guise in Sinn Fein.

What Ireland wants is a fusion Government in which agrarians, gentry, Sinn Fein, Ulstermen and other elements can be represented to the exclusion of the fanatic. Ireland does not favor the triumph of any particular partisanship, but she does want an ideal fulfilled. She is prepared to be governed by Conservatives on condition they are Irishmen. A government of Redmondites and Ulstermen ruling for the common good with a spice of Sinn Feiners and Laborites in honest opposition would not be a hopeless opening of the new régime.

So important is an unpartitioned Ireland that Carson must be welcomed at College Green. He should be removed from naval affairs, of which he could know nothing, to Belfast, which he thoroughly understands. His ladle, more than anybody's, stirred the seething pot, and no living man has more unrest to set right in Ireland today than the original begetter of civil strife.

The kind of government Ireland wants is neither republican nor reactionary, one that need not be identified with any one of the present parties, though of course a Dublin parliament would be considered the climax of the Irish party's thirty years of struggle. Though Ireland wants a practical, she does not want a machine government. Bosses are bound to make their appearance, but free-lances can be expected to keep up a critical and healthy opposition. It would be difficult to exaggerate the loss of such a citizen as the late Mr. Sheehy Skeffington in a Dublin parliament. An even greater misfortune would be the prevention

by illness of Sir Horace Plunkett assuming the portfolio of Irish Agriculture.

All sects and classes, all the social strata left behind by Irish history should find interest, representation and pride in a Dublin parliament. The only types who may be profitably excluded are the *gombeen* men, graziers, absentee landlords and dynamiters. These are all un-economic factors. Ireland wants cooperation to succeed the disastrous effect of the *gombeen* or local money-lending class, tillage to swallow grazing, dynamiters to become absentees and the landlords to take an interest in the community of which they are part and of which they might have become leaders had they recognized the bed-rock principle of Irish nationality as Parnell.

The ideal as it exists in Ireland herself will be satisfied by what must needs be a compromise. To say so is no slight on those who gave their lives in Ireland a year ago. They rose for Ireland and not for a type of government which could not possibly have claimed a united and unpartitioned Ireland afterwards.

The ideal as it exists in many minds outside Ireland is disturbed by emotion and distance and demands more than Ireland herself wants. Ireland wants less than any other small nationality in Europe today. She asks to possess and enjoy that full colonial independence enjoyed by Canada and of which the principle is assured to the world by the entry of America into the war. She cannot ask less. She need not want more at least in this generation. For the time we must be practical and reconstructive, remembering that Ireland is immortal and that her final form and destiny is with God.

## National Defense

HAROLD HALL

THEY were watching the First New York Cavalry swing across the Manhattan Bridge. In the pelting rain this group of three men stood there, and bared their heads as the colors appeared. "It's good to see the Guard back," said one. "You're wrong," said the second, "the Guard isn't back. The men are, but the Guard died down by the Rio Grande."

There seems to be truth in that statement, if you can judge from the opinion of the men who went to the border last summer as members of the militia regiments. All but the highly-paid officers returned home with the strong conviction that the National Guard idea is obsolete. Look over the roster of the different regiments and mark the long list of members who have not reenlisted and you will realize that the remark made one day on the Manhattan bridge has a big grain of truth in it. Well, if the Guard is going what is to take its place in our military system? Since April 6 the war-drums have throbbed throughout the land, and the question of adequate defense is paramount in every mind. How is adequate defense to be secured?

