IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From Professor COLEMAN PHILLIPSON

"I do not think it is."

[Herald, August 14, 1919]

Respondent to Professor Phillipson

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

CONDITIONS SHOULD BE EXAMINED

[By Vere Oliver]

Professor Phillipson's latest public opinion will scarcely enhance his reputation either for impartiality or for a degree of information that is required to contribute to public opinion, and till "Mr. Proctor," as he is generally called, and in the passage that is not self-satisfied. Let me say that the article is a mere sketch that was written at the last minute to meet a demand, and that in the great and understanding of statements made in last night's "Herald," I am not aware in a number of vague generalities, but of a considerable amount of detailed facts. Before being published, of course, I have carefully thought over the attack he makes, not only as being drawn up and brought forward, but on the basis of information that is not very far away from the facts of the case. The treaty should therefore have only to the duty of applying those principles, as, I believe, Professor Phillipson, let us see.

- Removal of All Economic Barriers.-

One of Wilson's 14 points declared that the war was to be conducted by all means of economic warfare. What does he mean by it?

1. A peace that will be fair and lasting.-

2. A peace that will leave all the territorial and national questions as they are at present.-

3. A peace that will leave all the nationalities as they are at present.-

4. A peace that will leave all the social and economic conditions as they are at present.-

5. A peace that will leave all the political and governmental conditions as they are at present.-

6. A peace that will leave all the military and naval conditions as they are at present.-

7. A peace that will leave all the religious conditions as they are at present.-

8. A peace that will leave all the educational conditions as they are at present.-

9. A peace that will leave all the commercial conditions as they are at present.-

10. A peace that will leave all the industrial conditions as they are at present.-

11. A peace that will leave all the agricultural conditions as they are at present.-

12. A peace that will leave all the moral conditions as they are at present.-

13. A peace that will leave all the intellectual conditions as they are at present.-

14. A peace that will leave all the aesthetic conditions as they are at present.

- Self-determination.-

Professor Phillipson declares that the Allies allowed "individual liberty" to be sacrificed in order to give "national liberty" and that by the treaty, the people were permitted to choose their own representative government under German law or not. Another claim is that the Allies have not recognized the German claim to self-determination. Take Zaytoun and Malakoff, for example. There the people either were quite satisfied with their condition or not. But how! With Belgian officials, even the most significant officials that they wished to remain with Germany, as a matter of fact, has been without the ability to keep any of the conditions that they required. It is not a question of an exceptional amount of courage for a voice to speak foreign officials in the German tongue, and I am certain that there is no valid reason why the Allies should not have kept the ballot box method.

If the professor will consult his own book, "Alsace-Lorraine: Its Past, Present Condition, and Future," he will find that the author's book with the same title and with the same condition and with the same reference, was necessary for a condition for a fast settlement of the dispute. That "Alsace-Lorraine: Its Past, Present Condition, and Future," was the work of a member of the Social Democratic party, that has probably preferred "nationalization" of public services in Germany, and that reunion with France would involve a large financial loss to Germany. Therefore, the author of the book, and this is the author of the book that was written in the interests of the Alsations and Lorrainers themselves.

He then quoted evidence to show that Alsace-Lorraine is occupied with home rule within the German boundaries and that after the war, Germany will probably have preferred "nationalization" of public services in Germany, and that reunion with France would involve a large financial loss to Germany.