

almost complete failure of Mr. Asquith since his return to Parliament has alone prevented the total eclipse of the Labor Opposition. In an article already published in *The Nation*, I explained the unfortunate attitude of the cotton operatives in filling in a candidate for the Nelson bye-election. The selection has since been made and a candidate was chosen so ill adapted for the position that during the contest he failed completely to rouse any interest and his election meetings were a series of dead failures. This is the secret of the weakness of Labor in Parliament. The Conference was greatly disturbed by this, but it could not censure its parliamentary representatives without damaging the movement and the press was there for spicy tit-bits. It resolved, however, by 1,813,000 votes to 832,000 that "the time had arrived for developing a greater efficiency on the part of the Parliamentary Labor Party" and requested "bodies affiliated to the party to make such arrangements as will permit their parliamentary representatives to give continuous attention to their duties in the House of Commons." The academic advocates of industrial Parliaments would do well to study the experiences of the British Labor Party. The recommendatory ending of this resolution does not touch the real point, though, if carried out, it would bring a minor improvement.

Unsatisfactory as the parliamentary party may be in breadth of vision and in resource, the Conference itself was lacking in neither. No matter what was the subject under discussion there were delegates present who were masters of it and whose contributions to the debates kept the discussions on an admirably high level. Men who had been in Russia, in Hungary, in Poland, in Germany spoke on the international resolutions; men who had been in India, in Egypt, in the Dominions, spoke on the imperial ones; men who were leaders of trade unions, chairmen of municipal bodies, responsible for administration, spoke on industrial and domestic ones. No other British political party could have brought under one chairmanship such a body of delegates. From the opening on Tuesday morning till the closing late on Friday afternoon, I sat looking upon a crowded and an intent hall and listening to debates kept upon the highest possible level of importance and to speeches rich in their matter and accomplished in their delivery. Applause was given generously to what was nothing but sentiment; votes were given rigidly to what was nothing but common sense. There was no narrow class interest displayed; the subjects were related to world affairs and were in proportion to their importance; a unity of idea ran throughout.

The Scarborough program was a Labor manifesto to the nation and the world. In the forefront were International concerns—the revision of the Peace Treaty so as to settle the conflicts of Europe and put the nations on their feet again; the recognition of the Russian Government; the ending of all intrigues directed against foreign states and of interference in their affairs by military missions; the denunciation of all secret agreements; economic arrangements to deal with the famine in Central Europe; the reconstruction of the League of Nations. It resolved to send a deputation to the Prime Minister to bring before him the results of the investigation which the party's representatives have made in Hungary, Russia, and Finland. In the affairs of Empire, it pinned its faith to self-determination as a fundamental, though not absolute, principle and ac-

cepted as a rule of statesmanship that governments, whether in India, Egypt, or Ireland, should have national assent. It condemned the Amritsar shootings, but insisted that the civil authorities were responsible, that the military criminals should not be made the scapegoats to carry the sins of others, and that the Viceroy should be recalled.

On domestic matters it made declarations on several minor matters important here but of no interest abroad, but it reaffirmed its belief that the continued existence of an enormous debt was a menace to national placidity and a means of grievous oppression and that the debt could be dealt with only by the conscription of wealth. It stood by nationalization of industries and services like mines, railways, canals, and electric power, but it rejected the nationalization of the liquor traffic. Curiously enough, the body which brought about this defeat was the Socialist Independent Labor Party. We are no dogmatists here, and whatever may guide us it is not the mental servility of verbal consistency. A battle royal raged round this question, the Independent Labor Party speakers dealing the decisive blows, and prohibition was rejected by 2,603,000 votes to 472,000, public control by 1,672,000 to 1,352,000, while the Independent Labor Party resolution in favor of an extended form of local option was carried by 2,003,000 to 623,000. On housing the Conference called for the resignation of Dr. Addison, the Minister of Health, state loans for building, the control of building material, and the encouragement of direct labor, together with an increased hygienic standard of houses. One of the greatest difficulties which face housing projects was pointed out by a Glasgow delegate who produced official figures showing that on a typical working-class house built before the war the interest on capital was £8 per annum, whereas the same house built now would have to bear £60 for interest.

Sanity and courage, practical capacity and well-defined principle ruled the Conference. Its voice was the voice of constitutionalism and organic change speaking in the midst of revolutionary conditions. From beginning to end it was the deliberations of men who are largely responsible for municipal government and who are ready at a moment's notice to take over the control of national affairs.

## Epigrams

By CLARA SHANAFELT

It is easy for you, daffodil,  
For you, young cherry with your polished stem;  
In me was not set so clear a sense  
Of my identity.

Leaning over the curb  
With a gesture of supreme grace,  
And of supreme indifference,  
An ash tree remembers the forest.

By EDA LOU WALTON

Your mind  
Is not the clear spring  
I thought it,  
And though its waters  
Are blown clean again  
By hill-winds,  
I am ashamed  
Of my reflection.

# The Bolivian Revolution and Tacna-Arica

By LATINUS

THE war that Chile fought from 1879 to 1883 against the Peru-Bolivian alliance was ended with respect to Peru by the Treaty of Ancon, and with respect to Bolivia by a truce converted into a peace treaty in 1904, but the dispute with regard to the Pacific seacoast persists. It still threatens wars and causes revolutions. Peru is now appealing to the League of Nations for its settlement, while Chile stands pat upon the Treaty of Ancon and her present possession, and Bolivia is thrown into revolution by the struggle between the pro-Peruvians and the pro-Chileans.

According to the Treaty of Ancon, Chile waived all pecuniary indemnity and obtained from Peru the perpetual and unconditional surrender of the province of Tarapaca, where the Chileans had had valuable industrial interests for many years. She also obtained temporary control of Tacna and Arica, small provinces of no great value, which were to remain in the power of Chile for a period of ten years, at the end of which time a plebiscite was to decide whether the territory was to remain under Chilean control or be returned to Peru, the successful nation paying the sum of ten million "silver pesos" or Peruvian "soles" to the loser of the plebiscite. In order to effect the plebiscite, the treaty stipulated that in a separate protocol the parties should decide upon the procedure to be followed; that is to say, an agreement should be reached regarding who should vote, how they should vote, and under what circumstances.

From this it will be clearly seen that the plebiscite could take place only after the two nations, in common accord, had fixed the conditions. During the intervening years Chile hoped to be able to Chileanize the territory so that the plebiscite would result in her favor. At any rate it must be considered a diplomatic blunder and a serious misunderstanding on the part of the negotiators, not to have determined at the time the basis for the plebiscite nor provided for the provinces affected in case no satisfactory conditions for the plebiscite should be arranged.

The treaty as formulated favored Chile because it left her the recourse of legitimately maintaining Chilean control over Tacna and Arica so long as an agreement was not reached for holding the plebiscite. When the period of ten years was nearing a close, both governments began diplomatic negotiations for drawing up the additional protocol but never arrived at a satisfactory conclusion. While Peru demanded that only the natives should be allowed to vote, Chile was of the opinion that the voting privilege should be extended to the natives, the Chileans, and the foreigners, with certain common restrictions as to residence and civil rights.

Many and varied diplomatic negotiations were carried on at one time or another for twenty years. The governments went as far as signing a tentative agreement known as the "Billinghurst-Latorre" agreement which came to naught in the Chilean Parliament. They also tried to make some arrangements for compensation and determination of the boundary line upon the basis of dividing the disputed territory instead of effecting the plebiscite. Chile has offered Peru commercial advantages and in addition the construction of a railway from Santiago to Lima, with other minor compensations. She also had the idea of purchasing the provinces outright and doubling the amount of the indemnity.

All these negotiations have failed, sometimes because Peru had no hope of the plebiscite resulting in her favor and at others for the reason that Chile had not satisfied all the Peruvian aspirations. On both sides there has been an ardent desire to acquire the provinces, Chile, however, being more interested as her original intention had been to conquer them and insure her national territory against future aggression. On the other hand, Peru has staked her pride on their recovery and that ambition serves as an axis for her domestic and foreign policy. The Peruvian officials, like Billinghurst, who have shown their willingness to negotiate with Chile, have been the target of the revolutionary action of the opposing party. The people of Chile believe that these provinces must be definitely annexed to the country, or at least that their northern frontier must be secured.

The Chilean-Peruvian diplomatic relations received a serious jolt in 1909, because of an unpleasant incident brought about by Peru's refusal to accept from the Chilean Minister, Mr. Echenique, a wreath the government of Chile wished to place on a monument erected to the heroes of the war of 1879. The breach was widened when the counter propositions of the Peruvian government frustrated the efforts of the last Chargé d'Affaires of Chile in Peru, Mr. Perez Canto, and later, of the Chilean Minister of Foreign Relations, Mr. Edwards, who tried to make their plan for settlement acceptable, and the rupture in relations occurred in 1910. The immediate cause of the break was the expulsion from Tacna and Arica of some Peruvian priests who had assumed a hostile attitude toward Chile and the Chilean laws. One of the recent proposals rejected by Chile was that of the Peruvian President Billinghurst to postpone the plebiscite for twenty-one years, a period that Chile considered exaggerated and one that delayed the solution of the problem more than was expedient.

The situation created by this severance of relations has subsisted to this day, with evident detriment to both countries. Now Peru desires to have the matter adjusted by the League of Nations while Chile stands firm by her decision to comply with the Treaty of Ancon, which is to have the plebiscite take place. A new phase of the question has come up with the determination of Bolivia to interpose a kind of third claim upon Tacna and Arica and with the prevailing idea among various leading Chileans that Bolivia should acquire an outlet to the sea through these territories.

By the peace treaty of 1904, Bolivia definitely ceded in favor of Chile all her rights to the coast province of Antofagasta, which for many years before the war had been a bone of contention between the two nations until Chile withdrew her claims by the treaties of 1866 and 1874. This was done in exchange for permanent guaranties for the Chilean industrials who exploited the saltpeter in Antofagasta in the same way that the Americans work their oil interests in Tampico, Mexico. When Bolivia ignored these treaties and placed new restrictions upon the Chilean workers, going so far as to confiscate the property of the Compañía de Salitres of Antofagasta, Chile declared the pacts void and renewed her territorial claims to that region. The war which followed and which Peru entered only