

those elements in China which draw their inspiration from Russian "communism" rather than from the free democracy of the West.

China's troubles and sufferings, and the world's difficulties over China, do not come so much from faulty Western diplomacy, however, or even from any present lack of Western power to aid, as from the fact that China is still, in the international political sense, a virtual vacuum. With the threat of conquest from one direction eliminated, a threat from the other direction immediately develops.

If the government which at present seems to be slowly forming can fill the vacuum, that may be a positive gain wherever the immediate ideological inspiration may come from, for there remains the hope that the Chinese "Reds" are, first of all, Chinese.

America is not interested in winning for itself the control of China, and never was. Adams' statement that the struggle for the control of China must decide the control of the world, is to be doubted. Hegemony is not determined by areas or populations, but by power. But America is deeply interested in China being controlled by the Chinese rather than by the Russians, acting for themselves or through puppets.

If the Chinese "Reds" are not puppets, then perhaps America in due time could take certain measures,—of friendship and aid, to keep them from ever becoming an advance guard for further Russian penetration, imperialistic or ideological.

As in the days of John Hay, fifty years ago, are we too prone to consider ourselves impotent and to accept in advance a prophesied result of current developments, seeing no way to prevent this?

Is there today a John Hay who, through some bold stroke, will wrest another chance for the Chinese people out of the welter and ruck of the present confusion?

Indian Home Minister Patel at New Delhi recently pointed a distinction that may prove of value in clarifying the present world contention over communism.

Communism and Communist parties In warning the Indian communists that the Government would suppress violence, he said that it would not seek to exterminate the ideology underlying communism, but that it would have no alternative to suppressing the Communist Party "if it persisted in exploiting every situation in order to cause chaos."

There are no doubt numerous idealistic people in the world, outside of Russia (perhaps more outside than in), who, if not believers in the whole communist system, see a possible social gain in the abolition of the private ownership of the "means of production,"—a gain in exchange for which they would assume the risks of the consequent tremendous increase in the arbitrary powers of government. Many would favor such a development outright if the change from private to public ownership were progressively and always legally and ethically effected, as seems at present to be happening in Britain.

But even these people,—not hostile to communism as such and even convinced or half-convinced that a communist economic system would be preferable to capitalism, are outraged and rightly execrate the means adopted by present-day Russia allegedly to promote world communism, and deeply distrust and

flatly impugn its motives and aims, as a world power, as well.

By what right, under any code ever lawfully framed by man, may the Russian oligarchy, through the conspiracies it foments everywhere, sap and destroy the chosen institutions of other peoples, creating dissention and tumult and riot, disloyalty, betrayal, crime, and treason?

Is disintegration and chaos the road to a new and better order? Can hatred prepare the way for love? Does evil turn to good?

Is not the Russian so-called communism plainly the satanic thing which its measures at home and abroad, show it to be?

The ideology of true communism we can study and reason about. Present-day communist parties should be dealt with for the criminal organizations which they are.

President Quirino, in his remarks on March 4 before the conference of the 81st District of Rotary International at the Manila Hotel, **Investment Risks—Natural and Otherwise** designed to make a good-natured reference to the editorial in the February issue of this Journal in which we spoke of his wearing rose-tinted glasses when he delivered his address on the State of the Nation before Congress.

He admitted that he was an optimist. He declared that he does not propose to be a crape-hanger and that in addressing Congress he was not presiding at a wake or leading a funeral.

That was good rhetoric.

He honored and pleased the assumed writer of the editorial by dubbing him a "very good friend of our people," but implied in his speech that this writer was among those who are sour seekers of disaster, frightened by bugbears largely self-created.

We are hesitant about taking advantage of Mr. Quirino's condescension to enter into public argument with him. We would take no pleasure in proving him wrong, especially on the topic which he chose to speak on to the Rotarians,—conditions in the Philippines as they relate to American capital investment. We wish he were right and that our fears, so-called, were only self-created. But a wish is not a conviction, and we are sorry to say that Mr. Quirino's arguments were not convincing.

Dropping all idea of arguing with the President, may we not simply advance a few reflections that occurred to us in reading a report of what he said?

In the first place, we do not believe the country is doomed because of import control. We do not believe that the country is doomed at all, though we do think that the country's advancement is being seriously retarded and that we may all come in for much needless suffering as a result of this. And not alone because of import control, but because of the ever-extending autocratic government control over every phase of the country's economy. And not only because of that, but because of the discrimination throughout much of this control against so-called alien enterprise, which, only to mention the Flag Law, goes so far as to deny the right to ownership of the smallest tract of land to aliens. Enacted legislation has been definitely handicapping established business and much of the projected legislation threatens to handicap it further, especially in the fields of corporate organization and of labor-capital relations.