

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.50.
Publishers and Proprietors: The Catholic Record Co.,
Rev. James T. Foley, B. A.
Rev. Thomas Coffey, LL. D.
Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. Sullivan,
Rev. H. F. MacIntosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to be made in advance. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops Peliccioli and Siletti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and remittances for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagan, Vincent E. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Brice Saunders, Sydney; Miss T. H. Hagan, Winnipeg; E. R. C. Smith, 2550 8th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; S. J. Johnson, 511 Rochester St., Ottawa; Miss Rose McCann, 140 d'Arquillon St., Quebec; Mrs. Geo. W. Smith, 2288 St. Ursula St., Montreal; M. J. Murphy, Montreal; R. P. O'Toole, LeBreton, Sask.; and E. J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.

St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mr. A. J. McGuire, 549 Main Street, near John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S. W., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.

In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Miller, 241 St. Catherine St., West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1919

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC SOCIAL PROBLEM

The Holy Father has been quick to notice the important pronouncement of Catholic social policy issued by the American bishops and to approve of it. Writing to Cardinal Gibbons and addressing himself to the whole American Hierarchy the Pope praises their zeal and exhorts them to continue.

"We recommend you," writes His Holiness, "to extend with love and constancy your efforts in what is commonly called economic-social development, for it is a question of the greatest importance. Keep continual watch that this development does not depart from the line of Christian conduct which my predecessor fixed in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, and that it does not give rise to unrest."

As is pretty well known a papal encyclical is designated by its opening words; the *Rerum Novarum*, however, is much better known to the lay reader under its English title *The Condition of the Working Classes*, or is referred to more briefly as *Leo's Encyclical on Labor*.

We have already pointed out that the Reconstruction pamphlet of the American bishops followed closely and with scientific accuracy the principles laid down by the great Leo. Raymond Swing, a member of the War Labor Board at Washington, struck with the bishops' radical treatment of the subject, in an article in the *Nation* while giving the bishops' program generous and discriminating commendation, saw in it the adoption of Socialist principles and attributed this change of front on the part of the Catholic Church to the astuteness of far-seeing churchmen. The fact that Pope Benedict has now approved of the bishops' work might not convince the *Nation* writer that he was wrong; but let us hope that by this time he has read the Encyclical of the great pioneer advocate of the working man's human rights and has clarified his own ideas sufficiently to see that in that same encyclical the most uncompromising denunciation of Socialism is not in any sense out of place.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, recently made the interesting pronouncement that the election of 1920 would surpass in importance any presidential contest since that of 1860, and that the issue would stir to the depths the love for and appreciation of the fundamental principles of Americanism. The issue he believes to be Socialism, Socialism in domestic affairs and the Socialism of the new internationalism which will carry a million and a half voters who never before voted Republican into the Republican camp. Leaving aside for the moment the new internationalism he vigorously asserts that Socialism as opposed to private property carries no appeal to real Americans; but is alluring in its appeal to the unambitious, the lazy, the worthless and the wastrels. The abolition of private property is the abolition of the equality of opportunity and all else worth while that true Americanism stands for. And he therefore holds that the same American working man will be a bulwark against Socialism.

The line of reasoning and even the language is so similar to that of Leo XIII. that we subjoin here a couple of extracts from the encyclical on the Working Classes where the subject is treated most exhaustively:

"It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labor the impelling reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and

thereafter to hold it as his very own. If one man hires out to another his strength or skill, he does so for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for sustenance and education; he therefore expressly intends to acquire a right, full and real, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of such remuneration, just as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and, for greater security, invests his savings in land, the land, in such case, is only his wages under another form, and, consequently, a workingman's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his full disposal as are the wages he receives for his labor. But it is precisely in such power of disposal that ownership obtains, whether the property consist of land or chattels. Socialists, therefore, by endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community at large, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, since they would deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thereby of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

"And not only is such interference unjust, but it is quite certain to harass and worry all classes of citizens, and subject them to odious and intolerable bondage. It would throw open the door to envy, to mutual invective, and to discord; the sources of wealth themselves would run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality about which they entertain pleasant dreams would be in reality the levelling down of all to a like condition of misery and degradation."

Hence it is clear that the main tenet of Socialism, community of goods, must be utterly rejected, since it only injures those whom it would seem meant to benefit, is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth.

"The first and most fundamental principle, therefore, if one would undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This being established, we proceed to show where the remedy sought for must be found."

At the Presbyterian General assembly, again, we have a rather remarkable reminder that Leo XIII., dealing with principles that must apply the world over, is much more scientific as well as more illuminating than the Canadian Presbyterians, in dealing with present conditions in Canada. Indeed Dr. Scott, one of the Commissioners, objected that the Resolution "was too much on a level with editorials and correspondence in the newspapers during the past few weeks." Another, Dr. McKinnon, "proposed that the Assembly tear up the Resolution asserting that it could not be patched up to meet all cases."

The Resolution, however, was changed and amended and finally adopted. In both the original and amended Resolution the Assembly assert that:

"Organized labor should maintain the inviolability of agreements." Now we submit that Leo XIII. put that much better when he stated that:

"Religion teaches the laboring man and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely entered into."

But the great Pope who studied the labor question in the light of the moral principles of which he was the supreme guardian did not overlook the fact that circumstances sometimes made agreements inequitable and unjust when they ceased to be inviolable.

Leo thus deals with this subject:

"We now approach a subject of great and urgent importance, and one in respect of which, if extremes are to be avoided, right notions are absolutely necessary. Wages, as we are told, are regulated by free consent, and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond."

This mode of reasoning is, to a fair-minded man, by no means convincing for there are important considerations which it leaves out of account altogether. To labor is to exert one's self for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and chief of all for self-preservation. "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread." Hence a man's labor bears two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal*, inasmuch as the exertion of individual strength belongs to the individual who put it forth, employing such strength to procure that personal advantage on account of which it was bestowed. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary*; for without the result of labor man cannot live; and self-preservation is a law of nature which it is wrong to disobey. Now were we to consider labor insofar as it is *personal* merely, doubtless it would be the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatsoever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration or even none at all. But this is a

mere abstract supposition; the labor of the working man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary*; and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all, and to be wanting therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than through work and wages.

"Let it be then taken for granted that workmen and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to the wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that remuneration ought to be sufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner."

So on the matter of "inviolability of agreements" the Pope is not only more advanced but gives evidence of deeper study of the questions he treats; his paramount object being to keep ever and always intact the eternal principles of morality and justice he hews to the line though the chips now strike popular labor movements or again hit the interests of capital.

The Hon. Mr. Crerar gave in the House of Commons the other day a striking illustration of the fallacy of computing wages exclusively in terms of dollars and cents regardless of their purchasing power.

He is thus reported in the *Globe*:

He referred to the increase in the cost of clothes. In 1914, he said, the invoice price of a suit of clothes coming from England was, say, \$10. The duty on this amounted to \$3. Adding profits for the various persons who handled the clothes, it was ultimately sold for \$22.50. In 1919, however, the invoice price of the same suit was \$25, and the duty had grown to \$8.75. The result of this was that when all profits were added the wearer of the suit had paid more than \$58.

Mr. Middlebrooke interjected: "Will the hon. member tell us how many bushels of wheat it will take to buy a suit of clothes?"

Quick as a flash Mr. Crerar replied: "With wheat at 53 cents a bushel in 1914 the farmer could purchase a suit of clothes for 28 bushels. In 1918, with the added cost, he requires to get \$2 a bushel for 29 bushels to purchase the same clothes. Furthermore, the wage earner could get a suit of clothes for nine days' work at \$2.50 a day in 1914. Now he has to work nine days at \$6.50 a day to get the same clothes."

It is quite evident to the least thoughtful that the purchasing power of the dollar must affect agreements to work for so many dollars a day. So well is this recognized that writers on the subject advocate a standardized dollar, that is the dollar expressed in terms of its purchasing power in the necessities of life and governing the wages paid as the rates fixed govern the exchange between countries. At one time the rate might be \$1.33, which would indicate that because of increased prices of necessities it now takes \$1.33 to buy a dollar's worth at the time when the agreement was made. The wage of \$3 a day would then automatically become \$4.

In any case it is interesting to note that in the deluge of remedies now offered there is nothing, when grandiloquent generalities and irrelevances are set aside, that has not been clearly traced in that *Magna Charta* of the rights and duties of labor set forth by Leo XIII. in *Rerum Novarum*.

EX-SECRETARY OF STATE KNOX'S RESOLUTION

It will be interesting to follow the developments of the movement of which former Secretary of State Knox's Resolution, given elsewhere in this week's *RECORD*, is a significant manifestation.

The *New York Times*—an out-and-out supporter of President Wilson as well when he was the eloquent mouthpiece of democracy as well as when he became the arrogant exponent of autocracy—tells the Senate that its powers are not so equal with those of the President during the negotiation of the treaty but only when its ratification is in question. But the *Times* forgets that the President just before sailing the last time openly asserted that into the Treaty of Peace the League of Nations would be so interwoven that it could not be disentangled and the Senate would be compelled to swallow the League with the Treaty or take the consequences of keeping the country in a state of war when it ardently desired peace. The most rabid of speakers or writers appealing to anti-German prejudice could not put more Italy than Germany would have to sign any terms offered her. The President's language was

not the language of democracy, not the language of one who recognized in the Senate powers co-equal with his own, but the language of an autocrat or a conqueror to his subjects or his defeated foe. The Senate evidently resents this attitude, and moreover believes that the uneasiness amongst Americans over the League of Nations is hardening into distrust, suspicion and opposition, despite the active propaganda in its favor.

We repeat, it will be interesting to watch the developments. To put Republican opposition—reinforced at every move by Democratic support—to mere party politics is in itself the cheapest of party clap-trap. Everything points to the Presidential election of 1920 as likely to be a momentous one.

AN INCIDENT DEFINITELY CLOSED

Loving consideration for the little ones of the flock and a fatherly interest in their welfare, temporal and spiritual, are characteristic of a good bishop; therefore for disappointed hopes, if such there be, in a pastoral visit the well-prepared Confirmation classes afford the most consoling of compensations. Common as are such episcopal experiences it is rare indeed that a bishop meets with anything so consoling and gratifying as Bishop Fallon experienced during his present visitation of the diocese.

Our readers will remember the agitation a year or two ago in the parish of Ford on the appointment as parish priest of the present incumbent of that office. The impious mischief-makers sought to arouse such feeling against the Bishop of the diocese as to make parents refuse to allow their children to be confirmed by Bishop Fallon. In a printed circular distributed prior to the recent pastoral visitation of this parish "The Committee"—otherwise nameless—repeated this appeal in the most virulent and inflammatory terms. How groundless was their agitation in the first place and how superficial was their influence on the people concerned, in spite of the impression created by the grotesquely exaggerated newspaper reports of their success, was shown by the result. On Sunday evening, June 3rd, when His Lordship, Bishop Fallon, visited the parish of Ford, the church was crowded to the doors and beyond them; two hundred and fifteen children were confirmed; Bishop Fallon preached in French and English; both before and after the ceremony parishioners called on His Lordship and after a heart to heart talk the most cordial relations were established. Nothing more gratifying, more consoling, or more edifying could be desired by the most devout Catholic perturbed by the dead and gone scandal. The formal and final closing of the incident reflects infinite credit on all concerned.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out—that what must be obvious to all—that by his quiet devotion to duty, by his charity, his justice, his zeal, by his qualities as a priest and as a man Father Laurendeau had proved his eminent fitness for the unsought charge imposed upon him and had convinced his people of the baselessness of allegations to the contrary. As for "The Committee" there is none so poor as do them reverence—and they are ashamed of their own names.

THE PASSING OF THE CLASSICS

By THE GLEANER

We like to read the "Letters to the Editor" in the daily paper, for various reasons. First of all because they are, as a rule, an honest expression of opinion such as is not always to be found in other columns. Again because there is much more humor in them than the "cap and bells" section contains, which humor is all the more enjoyable because so blissfully unconscious. Lastly for the reason that they afford an insight into human nature as it exists around about us. These letters generally fall under three heads, the populace clamouring for "panem et circenses" that is, bread and amusement, patriots bursting with heroic rage, and sanctimonious reformers demanding that we be deprived of the few mundane pleasures that we have so far enjoyed and that our personal liberties be still further restricted. The sentiments expressed seldom transcend the domain of the material and the commonplace. Seldom is any intelligent reference made to real culture or the higher things of the soul. We consequently experienced re-

cently a real surprise and pleasure in reading a letter entitled "Value of Latin Lessons" and signed "Student." It was to us like an unexpectedly discovered oasis in a desert of intellectual aridity. If it had been one of the old school professors of Latin syntax that had come to the defence of orthodox culture we would have simply murmured "Love's Labors Lost" but that a youthful champion should, in the face of that popular sentiment that has swayed the judgment of the heads of so many of our universities, enter the lists as the defender of a forsaken cause, stirred us with a desire to emulate the example of Diogenes, light our lantern, seek out this hero and discover him to the world.

The gist of the writer's contention was that while the present system of coaxing a poor translation of Caesar or Virgil from an indifferent scholar does not arouse a keen intellectual appreciation of the beauties of the classics, still in the teaching of English grammar the study of Latin syntax is a factor in building up a working knowledge of our own language, so necessary to the clear expression of original, logical thoughts. Latin should not be eliminated from the curriculum or be allowed, as was the case with Greek, to degenerate to the status of an "option." If this be done, only such parents as realize its intrinsic value will urge their children to study it. The result would be that a knowledge of the classics would be restricted to a small number of the elite, and that few would read even the translations that are in our libraries. "Better," he concludes, "a scholar should know only a line or two of the time honored text commencing 'All Gaul is divided into three parts' than that he should look upon the works of 'the noble Greeks and Romans' as though they rested upon Olympian pedestals, separated from the ordinary mortals by a gulf never to be bridged. Whereas in truth, the only gulf which really lies between the zealous aspirant and the literary gems of the classic ages is good honest industry."

There are two points here that deserve the serious consideration of our educators. The first is that the highest degree of intellectual culture is unattainable without a knowledge of the classics. To give the reasons for this would carry us beyond our allotted space. Suffice it to say that these ancient models of literary composition are the patterns for all succeeding time and the source from which our own language has been enriched. In the study of them the greatest masters of our own tongue have acquired their precision, simplicity, purity and elegance of style, in a word, their proficiency. The French Canadian members of our Federal Parliament, who learned the classics in their youth in the colleges of Quebec, and many of whom speak English more idiomatically than do those who claim it as their mother tongue, are a striking example of this truth.

No less important is the other point, viz., that honest industry is the only key which will unlock the door to the treasure-house of ancient learning. The use of another kind of key—which was called a pony when we went to school—used to be considered discreditable to the student whose too fluent translation of the Latin or Greek text would elicit a little derisive whistle from the master. But now in this age when men seem to have forgotten that original sin demands mental as well as manual toil, students are invited to scale the scholastic heights with the aeroplanes of a readymade translation. It can't be done. Money may buy some things, but it cannot purchase the keen intellectual pleasure that comes from a mastery of the original text of the classic authors and the literary preeminence that crowns the labors of the industrious student.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE *TORONTO Telegram* is responsible for the statement that "War revealed the Vatican as a German province." Which is one more proof if any were needed that lying is not a lost art on Bay Street.

WITH the growing unrest in the labor and industrial world, the increasing laxity in business ethics, and the lack of fixed principles on every hand the world may yet realize that civilization's only hope lies in return to the eternal truths taught from the beginning by the Catholic Church.

ON the subject of sacred music someone writes to the daily papers

that there are only two kinds of music, good and bad, and that "most popular hymn tunes come under the latter category." This refers primarily to sectarian hymns, but are some of the popular hymn tunes in use by Catholics entirely free from this reproach? While in this regard we have allowed many good things to be stolen from us, are we quite sure that we have not appropriated others that are not so good?

THIS is the period of annual synods, assemblies, conferences and so forth of the various bodies that go to make up Canadian Protestantism, and press reports of their deliberations are characteristically entertaining if not always edifying. While the one body is proclaiming how superior it is to the Catholic Publican, and another devotes itself exclusively to sociological and other "safe questions," yet another debates on the Ten Commandments, and thinks the time propitious for bringing them "up-to-date."

AT the same time a convention, international in character, meets in Philadelphia to determine, if that be possible, just what is "fundamental" in Christian teaching. The trouble with them all is that they have no fixed standard to go by,—no central authority to adjudicate between the conflicting schools. What other prospect can possibly lie before the sects than ultimate pandemonium? Yet, to the city seated on an hill, which holds for them the solution of all their problems and difficulties, they are as men who have eyes see not.

WITH GREAT show of knowledge a correspondent of the *Christian Guardian* writes of the "good and bad in Roman Catholicism." While believing that Protestants could learn many a lesson in reverence and humility from individual Catholics he is just as sure that the Church as an institution should be "strenuously discouraged." With his opinion one way or another we are not concerned. The quality of his knowledge, however, may be gauged by his reference to Westminster Abbey as a "Protestant structure"—that is a building erected by Protestants, and adapted to the Protestant idea of worship.

WHY SHOULD he stop at Westminster Abbey? Why not go on and include all the old Catholic cathedrals of England now in Protestant hands? They are in the same category as the Abbey—Protestant, if you will, in that they are the common loot of the "Great Pillage," but Catholic, every one of them (Westminster's Abbey Church among the rest) in that they date back to Catholic times, and are the concrete expression in stone of Catholic faith and ideals. Protestants it has been well said, have never yet erected a cathedral worthy of the name, and never will. They may occupy those they have appropriated but for the simplest and most obvious of reasons do not know how to use them.

PROTESTANTISM, we repeat without animus, has no right sense of the purpose for which the great cathedrals of the Middle Ages were erected and endowed. As a religious system it excludes the very idea of sacrifice and sees in the material edifice, still fondly called a "church," nothing higher or more sacred than a place of meeting or an auditorium. In saying this we are not undiminished of the earnest effort made by a section of the Church of England within the past forty or fifty years to clothe the dry bones of Protestantism with the goodly garments of Catholic ritual, and to restore as much as it may of the outward expression of the worship of their fathers. To say that the effort, however piously intended and persistently made, has never grown beyond the exorcised stage is but to say that, being foreign to the genius of the Establishment it never can. Nor can the old cathedrals, erected as places of sacrifice and as the earthly dwelling places of the Most High, ever be fully adapted to other uses. Westminster Abbey and the great cathedrals stand but as monuments of a great past, and, diverted from their proper use, are rightly cherished as national possessions. But Protestant save in the way of occupation they never can be.

The most lovable heart is that which loves the most readily; but that which easily loves also easily forgets.—Goethe.

THE WORLD'S FRESH START

The peace terms have been presented to the Germans. This means, in the estimation of competent observers, that the Allies have settled almost all their own differences and that in doing so they have shown some consideration for Germany's future as well as much for their own. They have been severe, but they think that what they offer, Germany will accept. At first sight the outlook for Germany is pretty blue, but one gets a somewhat different view from a reading of articles in papers which reflect the mind of French diplomacy and the French army. The Germans, they say, are condemned to fifty years of slavery, inasmuch as all their effort for that period will be required to pay the sums adjudged against them; but, because the German unity has not been destroyed, because the German Empire has not been dismembered, France remains in the presence of a Germany from which a heavy tribute is to be exacted and which will conserve everything to enable its people to escape from the yoke. "Germany remains a great State which can hope one day to extricate itself from the situation defeat has forced it to accept. It is not wise to leave to a people, already great in its numbers and known for its bellicose spirit, a ray of hope in its despair. If (Germany) has been reduced to a state of serfdom; provision should have been made against a revolt of the slaves, against the appearance of a German Spartacus with an empire to support him." That is the view of the diplomatic school who think the treaty disposes of everything except the essential, the future.

The army view is similar. Foch voiced it at the secret meeting of the Conference held the day before the terms were delivered. "If you directed me to assure the safety of this room, I would at once arrange to hold the doors. The Rhine is the door. If you want security you must hold the Rhine." He told them that the proposal to give up, at five year intervals, first Cologne, then Coblenz, then Mayence, would be pronounced by every military authority to be ridiculous, and that the army of 100,000 organized on a twelve-year service, to which Germany is to be restricted, is what any general would pronounce to be the ideal army behind which to carry a nation into war. Adopting this reasoning, the French militarists foresee that unless France holds the Rhine, the way into France selected in 1870 will again be open, and they point out that if the Belgian route is not taken, as it is not likely to be, England's help cannot be counted upon.

The belief of the man in the street now is that Germany will accept the peace but will find a way out of the payment of tribute, but the man in the street seldom says why he thinks so. Usually his intonation carries the suggestion that this would be his own way of meeting the difficulty, if he had to meet the difficulty. The French have the merit of reasoning out their beliefs. They foresee a period during which there will be bad economic conditions in Germany, then another in which inertia will need to be overcome, then a regain of strength by Germany left united and potentially strong, then finally the possibility of a conflict, if France insist upon the literal fulfillment of the bond. It is because they envisage this possibility that they do not believe Germany will throw up her hands in despair, refuse to sign the treaty and give free rein to the Bolshevism of the East.

Another line of reproachful criticism also suggests the possibility that Germany may have saved something from the ruins. There have been intermittent complaints in the French press against American and German-Jewish financiers who are believed to have stood between Germany and peace. There was quite an outburst on this subject when Herr Warburg came here in advance of the regular peace delegation. The attack has been taken up by the *London Morning Post*, which claims that "the German-American Jews who are pulling the strings of the Peace Conference" care very little what happens to British, French or Italian industry, but are very much concerned for the survival of the German and Austrian industrial system. "The international financiers seek to preserve in Germany's hands the avenues for her trade with Russia and the East, and where that cannot be effected the place is put in hands which are judged to be most amenable to the influence of the Central Powers." This criticism may or may not be well founded, but at least it runs well with what is obvious, the most hopeful promise left to Germany. When her statesmen are ever so little inclined to optimism, they hint that what has happened to Russia is worth to Germany almost all the war has cost. It removes the hitherto ever-present dread. In the second place, the practical obliteration of Germany's mercantile marine and the loss of her colonies will be certain to prove a strong argument for concentrating attention for the future upon the trade of nearby countries to the south and east, rather than upon adventures across the seas. Finally, the fact that it was the success of the blockade by sea which really occasioned Germany's defeat, will be the strongest kind of an inducement to Germans to bring the development of the inexhaustible resources of Russia up to a point where, if those resources were in hands at once friendly and capable,