

BRAZILIAN ADDRESSES

BY SECRETARY CHARLES E. HUGHES

[November 15 is the anniversary of the overthrow of the Empire of Brazil and the establishment of the Republic. It is also the date on which the new President is to be inaugurated. This gives additional timeliness to the following addresses, which may be regarded as the greeting of our country to Brazil on the centennial of her independence. The first was delivered at the dedication of the site for the American Centennial Monument in Rio de Janeiro, on September 8. The second was spoken before the Brazilian Bar Association, at a luncheon to our Secretary of State, on September 12. Both were reported in full in the *Jornal do Commercio of Rio de Janeiro.*]

I

It is fitting that this monument should be erected as a memorial to the historic friendship between Brazil and the United States. Our Government was the first to recognize the independence of Brazil and from that moment the bonds of esteem and amity have been unbroken. The cry of Ipiranga, 'Independence or death,' cannot fail to remind us of the memorable words of our own Patrick Henry, 'Give me liberty or give me death.' And amid all the vicissitudes of one hundred years there has been an abiding appreciation of a community of ideals and interests that has blessed both peoples with a sense of peaceful and mutually beneficial relations.

But this memorial is even more significant. It not only attests our enduring friendship but it expresses the admiration of the people of the Republic of the North for the vast achievements of our Sister of the South and of what has been here wrought in the development of a great people.

The celebration of this Centenary brings up memories of the past: of the first intrepid voyagers; of the *bandeirantes* pressing into the interior and obtaining a glimpse of the extraordinary resources and potentiality of this land of promise; of the early colonial organization which first gave institu-

tional basis to the activities which were to civilize a continent; of the establishment here of the seat of governmental authority of the mother country; of the inevitable assertion of a vigorous independent national life; of the long and beneficent reign of that most liberal and high-minded ruler — the scholar and statesman, Dom Pedro II; of the free spirit of the people of Brazil crushing slavery and erecting republican institutions; and most recently of our association in the momentous struggle which saved the cause of liberty itself and put an end, as we hope, for all time to the pretensions of brute force.

I take pleasure in recalling that Thomas Jefferson, the first Secretary of State of the United States, gave instructions in the year 1791 to David Humphreys, Minister to Portugal, to 'procure for us all the information possible as to the strength, riches, resources, and disposition of Brazil.' Those of us who, with speed and every possible comfort and modern convenience, have recently made the journey from New York find fascination in the endeavor to imagine the experience of these mariners of Salem, Massachusetts, of Providence, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and other ports, whose vessels were frequent visitors to this harbor and other harbors of this

coast in the opening years of the nineteenth century. I am informed that as early as the year 1802 eight of the thirteen maritime States of North America were trading with almost all of the ports of the South American Continent, and scores of our vessels were trading here.

But this fortunate land of Brazil is one of constant revelation, and to-day, more than ever before, we are appreciating the limitless possibilities of its development, of the prosperity that the future has in store for its people, and of the extraordinary promise of their service to humanity. This, my friends, is unquestionably the land of the twentieth century, and in providing for the erection of this monument we are expressing not only our tribute to what has been wrought in the past but our confidence in the future and our earnest desire that the brightest hopes of Brazil may be abundantly realized.

We shall also be glad to have this monument associated in the thought of our friends with a true appraisal of our North American ideals and aspirations. You, my fellow countrymen of the United States, know full well how sincerely we desire the independence, the unimpaired sovereignty and political integrity, and the constantly increasing prosperity of the peoples of Latin America. We have our domestic problems incident to the expanding life of a free people, but there is no imperialistic sentiment among us to cast even a shadow across the pathway of our progress. We covet no territory; we seek no conquest; the liberty we cherish for ourselves we desire for others; and we assert no rights for ourselves that we do not accord to others. We sincerely desire to see throughout this hemisphere an abiding peace, the reign of justice, and the diffusion of the blessings of a beneficent coöperation.

It is this desire which forms the basis of the Pan-American sentiment.

On this auspicious occasion we are agreeably impressed with the present extent of this coöperation. The various organizations now meeting here remind us that science has no frontiers. Here are gathered those who are putting together the results of the most careful archæological researches — those who are bringing their historical studies to fruition in papers which will form an accurate and careful historical narrative based on original sources. We have also gathered here the engineers for whose precise knowledge and trained hands Nature has been waiting. And, while I cannot mention all the organizations that are now represented in this capital in connection with this centennial celebration, I should not fail to speak of the philanthropists who are devoting themselves to child welfare, the protection of humanity itself. Let me also recall to you, as an illustration of beneficent coöperation, the work which some of our fellow countrymen have been doing in Brazil, and in other parts of Latin America, in conquering the most dreaded forms of disease, while in the varied plant life of this great country we have found the means of health and healing.

I have not dwelt upon the growth of the commerce between our countries; the gratifying statistics I assume are known to you all. But even more important than the exchanges of products are those interchanges of sentiment, inspired by mutual understanding, which are constantly taking place through the presence in each country of representatives of the other. It is especially pleasing to note the far-sighted action of the Brazilian Government in providing for postgraduate study abroad for the best students in schools of agriculture and industrial training, so as to develop a body of highly

trained technical men. I understand that there are about two hundred and fifty young men of Brazil now studying in the educational institutions of the United States, and we trust that many of our North American students will find their way here and to other countries in Latin America in order that they may have the benefit of personal observation and study of institutions and economic life.

The people of the United States and the people of Brazil are alike devoted to the ideals of peace. But peace has its method as well as war. The method of peace is that of more perfect knowledge and understanding; of mutual respect for rights with the correlative recognition of obligations; of resort in all difficulties to the processes of reason; of summoning all the ability and strength of the country in the interest of peace with the sincere and intense desire to find amicable solutions instead of causes for distrust and enmity.

It is the disposition to peace that alone can assure peace. We of this

hemisphere are happy to be free from any menace of aggression. Many of the most important controversies have been solved or are in process of solution. Why should we not have enduring peace and the benefits of coöperation? We have institutions dedicated to freedom, and we desire not simply the independence of might but the independence that rests secure in a prevailing sense of justice. We have different stocks and traditions, but we cherish the same aspirations—the same longings for liberty under law. The differences are superficial, the resemblances fundamental. We derive our strength from the same spiritual forces. We have been colaborers, and united by the memory of our historic friendship we are going forward with mutual respect to the enjoyment of our varied opportunities, knowing full well that only in brotherly helpfulness shall we find the adaptations that the democratic spirit demands and be assured of the satisfactions of rational progress.

II

It would be easy to speak of the similarity of the political institutions of Brazil to those of the United States of North America. I should be glad to review the resemblances in our constitutional arrangements and especially in the provisions by which we seek to safeguard and promote the essential interests of the nation without an unnecessary sacrifice of local autonomy. You are very familiar with the work of our Supreme Court by which we maintain the checks and balances of our constitutional system. I recall that with his enlightened interest and prescience the Emperor Dom Pedro II instructed the Brazilian Minister to the United States to 'study with special care the organization of the Supreme

Court of Justice in Washington.' He added with true insight: 'I believe that in the function of the Supreme Court is the secret of the successful operation of the American Constitution.'

But in these brief remarks, as I am about to leave this most hospitable capital, I desire to refer to what is even more fundamental than any constitutional precept. The more I study government, or concern myself with problems of legislation and administration, the more thoroughly I am convinced that the essential condition of all progress is respect for law.

Liberty must have its institutions and these of necessity are institutions of law: that is, institutions for the application of accepted principles of

right conduct rather than vehicles for the exercise of arbitrary power. Such institutions rest for their final security in the self-restraint of those who love liberty too much to destroy its essential foundations.

We live in a world which has been torn, distracted, and convulsed, and we are turning with the hope that will admit of no denial to the ideals of justice. But where among men is justice to be illustrated if not in our courts and by the ministers of the law? Justice is not an abstraction; it is the most practical concern of a free people. In our courts, if anywhere, must be found an abiding assurance that neither force nor intrigue, neither corruption nor favor, can disturb the true scale of justice where sound and impartial judgment gives the decision.

It is in the administration of justice through our courts, and in the standards of the legal profession, that we find unflinching the measure of our civic success.

Our expanding civilization is constantly imposing heavier burdens upon our tribunals and upon those who are called upon to aid in the protection of rights and the redressing of wrongs. We desire beneficent laws; but the statute is expressed in its interpretation, and its practical value rests upon its fair administration. There is no assurance of either save as the judicial function is faithfully performed, and it is idle to look for fidelity in the administration of justice unless the members of the Bar are inspired by the loftiest sentiments.

I have great respect for the appropriate technique which is essential to correct administration, but I have no sympathy with those who lose the spirit of the law in the worship of its garments. It is to those who are most

learned in the law that we must look for reform in its administration. It is from those who best understand all the subtleties of the law that we must expect the assistance in restoring and maintaining simplicity and directness, adequate methods of procedure, and the controlling sense of justice by which alone we can be sure that through over-refinement and technicality the law may not defeat its own purposes.

I speak also for the independence of the Bar — for the fearless ministers of the law who stand erect in the presence of power and defend liberty under law at whatever cost. Our lawyers have been prophets of liberty and its most zealous defenders. To whom is the community to look for enlightened advice if not to those learned in the institutions of government, in the development of jurisprudence, who are imbued with the spirit of the law, who know where improvements are needed, and through whose wisdom the just and necessary changes may be secured. There is no greater treachery than that of the lawyer who is faithless to the high ideals of justice; for if he fails, where shall the community look for the safeguards of free institutions? The essential basis of civilized intercourse in the last analysis is very largely in the keeping of the Bar.

We are looking to-day beyond our domestic jurisdictions in the earnest desire to establish the reign of law among the nations and to secure the peaceful settlement of controversies. But we shall be able to satisfy this aspiration only as among our separate peoples we diminish hatred, control the passions that subvert the judgment, develop the desire to be just as well as strong, and count those as enemies of the national welfare who seek to breed suspicion and distrust.

THE QUESTION OF THE STRAITS

BY KARL RADEK

[This article, which was written from Moscow at the end of September, is of course out of date in so far as the immediate crisis between England and Turkey is concerned. However, it is an interesting and presumably authoritative statement of the attitude of the Bolshevik Government toward the Dardanelles problem. It should be added that more recent and private advices from Europe assert that Reds and Whites in Russia are in full agreement upon this question.]

FROM *Die Rote Fahne*, September 27
(BERLIN OFFICIAL COMMUNIST DAILY)

THE diplomatic alignment in the struggle for the Straits exactly reverses that upon the Reparations question. The respective rôles of France and England are simply turned about. In the Reparations question England plays the part of a peace-loving, tolerant friend of Germany. In the Straits controversy France adopts precisely the same attitude toward Turkey. So just now the French press is prosing away about the folly of military adventures, the futility of sabre-rattling, and the necessity of smoothing over our controversies by negotiations and concessions.

In both cases, of course, these peaceful professions are merely hypocritical masks hiding imperialist intrigues. England wants to preserve her German market and to play off Germany as a counterweight against France. So in Western Europe she dons the guise of an angel of peace, and simultaneously plays in Eastern Europe the rôle of a Versailles Shylock. Meanwhile France seeks to make the Mohammedan world a counterpoise against England. She wishes to strengthen Turkey at the expense of English supremacy in Egypt and India, and by thus countering English imperialism in Asia to make that country tolerant of her own predatory policy in Central Europe. Therefore,

France poses as the peace angel of the East.

In that part of the world Poincaré has played Lloyd George's favorite game with unexpected talent. When France threatened to seize the Ruhr unless Germany obeyed the dictates of the Reparations Commission, England declared that she did not propose to take part in military undertakings against Germany, although she agreed in principle that Germany must fulfill the terms of the Versailles Treaty. To-day France retorts in identical language. She stands firmly — in principle — for carrying out the decisions of the Allied Conference at Paris last March. But at the same time she has withdrawn her troops from the Asiatic coast of the Dardanelles, thus washing her hands of all share in a possible war between Turkey and England. France thereby isolates England, strengthens Turkey, and aggravates the anger of those Conservatives in Great Britain who hate Lloyd George, and who believe the Entente the corner stone of English policy.

It goes without saying that this does not mean the collapse of the Entente. France is merely bargaining to get her price for helping England out of the Turkish embroilment; and she is raising her price right along. The *Berliner*