

ADMINISTRATION-PROOF.

THE Herald gives credit to "the Washington Administration" for the "wise monetary course" it has followed in reducing the Federal Reserve discount rates which induced a recovery in the market for Liberty bonds and Victory notes.

The Herald is humorous. After damning the Tax Bill passed by Congress and signed by the President last week, the Herald evidently wanted something to praise, something that looked like "normalcy."

As a matter of fact, the Federal Reserve Board is almost as "Administration-proof" as the Supreme Court. It is designed so. When things were booming it resisted the strongest political pressure to keep the rediscount rate low and so encourage speculation.

If the Washington Administration had followed a monetary course half as wise as the Federal Reserve Board we should be nearer to normalcy. Productive capital would not be scuttling to tax-exempt cover and so booming the bond market.

We gather from directors of the Interborough that the more the public knows about the inside finance of the company the more the company's interests are jeopardized. It seems to have been a long standing theory. But these are some of its last, expiring moments.

A SICK GOOSE.

THE theatrical "crisis" the managers are asked to consider is doubtless real. There are any number of causes for the situation.

Railroad rates, salaries and other costs are serious. Opposing organizations in the theatrical world have engendered hard feeling. The managers here in New York have plenty of troubles and managers on the road are in even worse plight.

Let us have sympathy—but not too much of it. The managers are themselves to blame in large measure.

New York theatre patronage has been shrinking. Why? Very considerably, we believe, because of managerial collusion with ticket speculators.

Thousands of New Yorkers no longer attend the theatre for the reason that they cannot afford it. They cannot bid against out-of-town spenders for seats in the theatres.

The managers have played in with the speculators so long that they have grievously wounded the goose that lays the golden eggs. New Yorkers have become so accustomed to hearing "We have no seats nearer than the seventeenth row for to-morrow, next week or next month" that they have become actually suspicious of the quality of a show if good seats for it are obtainable from the box office.

This has made the New York goose sick. If the theatrical men are seeking a tonic for the business they must first try to cure the goose. One way would be to limit the activities of the speculators. The managers can do this if they will. They might at least save alternate rows of seats and honor mail order requests for good seats far in advance.

They could put a check on open speculation in seats if they would. It is the first step in wooing back a New York patronage which, against its will, either goes to the movies or stays at home.

Miss Evangeline Booth is concerned over the continuing trend of population from farms to cities. She wishes every member of Congress would "lend a hand toward encouraging the ambitious youth of this day and age to stay on the farm or to go in for ranching, or to see the profits there are in fruit raising."

We supposed all that had been attended to in the last year. The Agricultural Bloc has been in the saddle at Washington and if that were not enough Miss Booth has only to turn to the Republican platform and read:

"The farmer is the backbone of the Nation. National greatness and economic independence demand a population distributed between industry and the farm, and sharing on equal terms the prosperity which is wholly dependent upon the efforts of both."

A FOOLISH CHARGE.

MILLE SUZANNE LENGLEN is considering action for libel against some of the American critics of her sportsmanship, according to a special cable to the Times. The French tennis champion also charges that American criticisms of her conduct in this country were "actuated by pro-Boche sentiments."

Bringing pro-German charges in a matter of sportsmanship is silly. It is probably designed more to enlist French support than to alter the American judgment. If Suzanne can make it appear that she is the victim of a German conspiracy she will be assured of the loyal support of patriotic Frenchmen.

But the mere raising of such a question is in itself the strongest sort of confirmation of Mil-

Lenzen's low conception of sportsmanship. We do not recall that Georges Carpentier made any reflection on Jack Dempsey's war record when or after he was floored. He took his licking like a sportsman and a French gentleman.

Suzanne's attitude is not a reflection on France. It is a reflection on Suzanne.

POOR TRIBUTE.

DISCUSSING what he declares to be undeniable—"the power of the American influence toward a world peace"—H. G. Wells writes:

"George Washington's advice to his countrymen to avoid 'entangling alliances' has been interpreted too long as an injunction to avoid any alliances, entangling or dis-entangling. The habit of avoiding association in balance-of-power schemes and the like has broadened out into a general habit of non-association. But alliances which are not aimed at a common enemy but only at a common end were not, I submit, within the intention of George Washington."

How many Americans to-day have ever read Washington's warning against "entangling alliances" in the light of what he wrote to Monroe in August, 1796:

"I have always given it as my decided opinion . . . that if this country could, consistently with its engagements, maintain a strict neutrality and thereby preserve peace, it was bound to do so by motives of policy, interest and every other consideration that ought to actuate a people situated as we are, already deeply in debt and in a convalescent state from the struggle we have been engaged in ourselves."

Or in the light of what Washington had written to Gouverneur Morris the previous December:

"My policy has been, and will continue to be while I have the honor to remain in the Administration, to maintain friendly terms with but to be independent of all the nations of the earth; to share in the broils of none; to fulfill our own engagements; to supply the wants and be the carriers for them all; being thoroughly convinced that it is our policy and interest to do so. Nothing short of self-respect and that justice which is essential to a national character ought to involve us in war; for sure I am, if this country is preserved in tranquillity twenty years longer, it may bid defiance in a just cause to any power whatever; such in that time would be its population, wealth and resources."

The italics are ours.

Do not these words show that Washington himself viewed his foreign policy as one fitted to the special needs of a new-born, debt-burdened nation of less than 4,000,000 people, with a tough economic struggle ahead and no prospect of cutting any figure in world politics for decades to come?

Americans of to-day who are forever parading the Washington dicta against "entangling alliances" take care not to quote the above passages.

Nor do they do the mind of George Washington the justice of admitting that after a hundred and thirty years' development of wealth, population, resource, trade, communication, international interdependence and co-operation he would be the first to set forth a new view of what is "entangling" and what is not.

Washington was no visionary. But they pay him poor tribute who pretend he had no vision—that he meant his foreign policy for an Eighteenth Century America to hold his country forever rigid, insensible to change or progress.

TWICE OVERS.

"I HAVE repeatedly signed waivers of immunity before legislative committees, so, speaking as one of the Commissioners, I am not asking you to do anything that I would not have done myself."—Transit Commissioner Harkness to August Belmont.

"I CANNOT understand the lassitude, the indifference, which has surrounded many of the crises in America—until it is too late."—Dr. Lorenz.

"WHEN matters of common interest arrive regarding the schools, those most concerned, the parents, are the least heard from."—Robert E. Simon.

"THE mother who smokes before her children need not expect to have the slightest control over them."—Dr. John D. Quackenbos.

"YOU get down off that wagon and come with me."—Lieut. Eva Mitchell, reserve policeman, to a deliveryman.

The Route of the Interborough

Copyright, 1921, by The Press Publishing Co., New York, N. Y.

By John Cassel



From Evening World Readers

What kind of letter do you find most readable? Isn't it the one that gives the worth of a thousand words in a couple of hundred? There is fine mental exercise and a lot of satisfaction in trying to say much in few words. Take time to be brief.

Room for Babies.

To the Editor of The Evening World: Referring to "E. L. L." letter in your paper to-day, stating he was refused an apartment only the other day on account of having a baby, I wish to state that a year ago a law was passed in New York prohibiting landlords from refusing to rent apartments to people with children and providing fine and imprisonment as punishment for the offense.

If "E. L. L." cannot get an apartment where he is, let him come out to Jackson Heights, near Elmhurst, L. I., and buy his apartment. Then he can bring all the babies he wants. It is one of the healthiest places for children that ever was. It boasts living in New York City 100 per cent. I have lived out here seven weeks and my six months' baby has gained over five pounds. MRS. M. L. S. Jackson Heights, Nov. 29, 1921.

"A Baby in Jail"

To the Editor of The Evening World: Maybe more than one person besides myself enjoyed a laugh from the letter written by J. L. L. and printed on Saturday, Nov. 25. He writes about landlords and dogs, and ends his letter: "My wife and I were refused an apartment the other day because we have a baby. Yet the same apartment was rented to a woman with two dogs. Isn't it time there was a law to place landlords who refuse apartments to families with a baby in jail? Where does he want to place those landlords? He does not say. I am very sorry, Mr. or Mrs. J. L. L., to read that you have a baby in jail, and will be happy when your baby has paid for his or her crime and is discharged and returned to you. If you can print the name of the jail your baby is confined in I am sure that I can raise a fund large enough to buy your baby a few rattles and toys to make his Christmas enjoyable. Well, J. L. L., I too have a baby, but thank the Lord he is at home and not in jail. Hoping you will soon have a reunion, I will close. H. H. R. Brooklyn, Nov. 26, 1921.

The Old Place.

To the Editor of The Evening World: Would it not be possible for the play of "The Old Homestead" to be revived? Let us also have a minstrel show. Both would be drawing cards and are greatly missed by many people.

A LOVER OF THE OLD PLAYS.

Nov. 28, 1921. I F.

Married Women as Workers.

To the Editor of The Evening World: Of all the good sensible letters I ever had the pleasure of reading in the last twenty years in your valuable paper, the one by "A Bookkeeper" of the 25th was the most sensible. Why should married women hold jobs when hundreds of men who wives and little children depending upon them are walking the streets? I have a friend who lives in the Chelsea district. One partner of the house has no children and her husband owns a barber shop in one of the best paying districts of the city.

Disarmament.

At last, at last, the day has dawned; The golden bells are ringing. Peace on earth, good will to man. The nations now are singing. The roaring of the gun has ceased. The animals are slain. The understanding hearts and master minds Will from now on reign. Ring out your bells, ye golden bells. The world's jubilee has begun. Peace on earth, good will to man. By a billion voices sung. C. S. Glen Morris, L. I., Nov. 30, 1921.

With a Descriptive Signature.

To the Editor of The Evening World: I have read your article "Women Traffic Cops." May I ask you to say by what "statutory" authority these 2,200 uniformed, Sam Brown-belted females have been turned loose on the streets of our city? I am perfectly aware that under certain circumstances any citizen, male or female, even without being in uniform, may make an arrest and that the Sheriff can call on any citizen to aid him; but I do not know whence comes the authority of Police Reserve, male or female. Perhaps you will enlighten me. I do not operate an auto, but if I did I wonder what Magistrate would issue a warrant for my arrest if I disobeyed a summons issued by one of these females. Nov. 28, 1921. IGNORANT.

Police Pay and Hours.

To the Editor of The Evening World: I for one certainly do agree with "Policeman's Wife." It is a great shame for the city to treat these men so. At the rate of four they are working their salaries do not amount to \$20 per week of fair hours, out of which they have to feed themselves, buy uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc., and like all human beings when run down and become ill, they have to forfeit half pay. Why not be reasonable and treat these men like other human beings? New York, Nov. 26, 1921. I F.

A Rained Overcoat.

To the Editor of The Evening World: I am also the wife of a patrolman and my husband works sixteen hours every second day, along with eight hours reserve, which means twenty-four hours, and he is away from home all this time and consequently I am alone with my children. The other night he came home after

Company for Protecting the Strike-Breakers?

No, only abuse. I think a month has been long enough for either strikers or the milk company to think of the other fellow, who is duty bound to stand pat at every strike. To read "P. P." letter one would think it was a policeman's duty to be on milk wagons, etc. Far be it from such. Give them back their feudal system. That's all they ask, and let the public remember they are human beings and not slaves. A POLICEMAN'S WIFE.

His Expenses for a Day.

To the Editor of The Evening World: His expenses for a day, including extra meals and shave, are \$1.75. Why aren't these large corporations that demand this protection be made to pay for this? If such was the case we wouldn't have so many strikes. PATROLMAN'S WIFE. New York, Nov. 25, 1921.

UNCOMMON SENSE

By John Blake

(Copyright, 1921, by John Blake.)

THE EASIEST WAY.

It is possible to slide along through life with a minimum of effort. People are easily imposed on. The clever liar often makes his boss think that he is a pattern of industry when really he is a loafer.

In your own acquaintance are men who steal the credit for what others do, and who pass to other shoulders the blame for their mistakes.

They get along. Some of them get along well. But they are cheats and thieves just the same.

Worst of all, they cheat themselves. For by continually avoiding the work that they ought to do they lose the pleasure in achievement that is the real pleasure of life.

There is a magazine which publishes every month brief biographies of the men who have done notable things in America.

These men tell honestly and as well as they are able to how they got where they are.

Without exception they testify that they have not only avoided hard work but have gone out of their way to find it.

They have taken cheerfully the tasks that lazier men have unloaded upon their shoulders.

And in doing that work, in carrying what other men would call an overload, they have found the development that has enabled them later on to do big things.

You can, if you choose, live with very little exertion. Tramps do it continuously. So do many men who are content to play very small parts in the world's affairs.

But if you have any ambition to be counted as a real producer the easiest way is not for you.

Not even great talent will enable you to get along by loafing. For talent to be developed requires continuous and unremitting effort.

Dodge hard work, seek by conversation to make up for industry, claim credit for things that others have done, and if you are gifted as a rascal you may get along.

But you will get along only for a limited time. And you will be extremely lucky if you do not end your days as a wretched dependent on the grudging charity of your relatives or of the State.

Blue Law Sunday

In the Light of the Bible and History By Dr. S. E. St. Amant

Copyright, 1921, by The Press Publishing Co., New York, N. Y.

NO. IX.—PURITAN INTOLERANCE

The history of the seventeenth century in our country has always presented a frightful picture in which three things are always prominent—a hangman, a gallows and a victim. When the Puritans came to America to escape persecution, they were imbued with this idea of seventeenth century intolerance. God-fearing men and women, they loved liberty and sacrificed for it; but their purpose was to establish a theocracy. The civil and religious liberty they sought was liberty for themselves and for others of like faith and practice only. No sooner had they set up a Government of their own than they began to persecute those who differed from them in religion.

When questioned about this they justified themselves by saying that the Church of England had no right to persecute them, because the Church of England was wrong in its theology and they were right in their proper, they argued, "for us to persecute the Baptists and Quakers, for we are right and they are wrong. They overlooked the great fact that in a religious controversy the persecutor is always wrong. These things continued for some time after the close of the Revolution.

It is remarkable that men who had fought for freedom still endured such an amount of religious intolerance. In Massachusetts the tithing man arrested the people of the rural districts and shut them up in the town cage. He stopped all "unnecessary" traveling on Sunday, and haled men and women off to church whether they wanted to or not.

The men in Boston strove hard to escape these barbarous rules and infringements on personal liberty, but the people of the rural districts outvoted them. They were taxed to support the State religion. The most that could be accomplished was that the dissenters could "escape" the church rate by supporting a church of their own. This latter provision reminds one of some of the modern Sunday laws, their exemption clauses for those who religiously observe another day of the week as the Sabbath. If that was religious intolerance so in this. If that was a church-and-state union, so is this.

But as the Puritans challenged the right of the British Crown to dominate their religious faith and practice, so in due time they challenged their right of domination in matters of conscience. The right to worship according to its forms was claimed by adherents of the Church of England, while Quakers and Baptists held in like manner to their simple faith, sacrificing even to the laying down of their lives. This won for them the liberty which had long been denied them. Fleeing from the heat of Puritan intolerance to the cold of a New England winter, Roger Williams found among untutored savages in the pathless forests that freedom of worship which had been denied him in Puritan Massachusetts. Williams, in founding Rhode Island, made freedom of conscience one of its chief cornerstones. The Lord Proprietary of Maryland, himself a Roman Catholic, in order to make secure for himself and his subjects a free freedom of worship, made the rules of his colony so broad and liberal that both Quakers and Baptists found refuge there from the intolerance alike of Puritanism in Massachusetts and of Episcopacy in Virginia.

But the Pilgrims bulldozed better than they knew. We know them, not so much for the narrow theocracy they designed as for the broad democracy, the foundations of which they actually laid.

WHERE DID YOU GET THAT WORD?

108.—CHESTNUT. Strange as it may seem, the word "chestnut" originated in the name of a town. The town was Kastana, in Pontus, Asia Minor, where the nut grew in great profusion. From Pontus the nut, under the name of the place where it had attained prominence, travelled westward by way of Greece, and its geographical designation spread all over Europe as the name of the nut. One of the theories to explain the use of the word "chestnut" as a protest against a stale witticism is that the usage is derived from the similarity between the staleness of the chestnuts exposed on street-vendors and the homesome quality of an oft-repeated tale.

"That's a Fact"

By Albert P. Southwick

Copyright, 1921, by The Press Publishing Co., New York, N. Y.

In the Ladies' Dictionary, 1594, it is stated that "a plumper is a fine, thin, light ball which old ladies that have lost their side teeth hold in their mouths to plump out their cheeks, which else would hang like leathern bags."

Tacitus, the Roman, upon whom the world depends for many ancient facts, finished the first part of his History when he was fifty years old.

The Island of Barbados (the only place George Washington visited outside of the United States) is called "Little England" by its white inhabitants who are of English birth.

Isle de Dabney is a sailor's name for the Island of Malin. "Cavase" ever since the world was created, the American Consul there has been named "Dabney," etc., in the phraseology of an old man who probably slightly exaggerated. "Lose the game or win the Sadie" meaning "every thing or nothing" is a saying derived from the ancient story of a man who made the bet of a horse against a trifle that another could not say the Lord's Prayer without a wandering thought. The wager was accepted, but before half finishing the person trying to win looked up and asked: "By the-by, do you mean the saddle also?"