New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1922

Owned by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Published daily. Ogden Reid, President; Helen Rogers Reid, Vice-President; Howard Davis, Secretary; R. E. Mayfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including postage, IN THE UNITED STATES:

By Mail, Postpaid.	One Year	Six Months	One Month
Daily and Sunday.....One week, 25c.	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
Daily only .....One week, 20c.	10.00	5.00	.85
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.45
CANADIAN RATES			
Daily and Sunday.....	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
Daily only	10.00	5.00	.85
Sunday only	5.50	2.75	.50
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday.....	$26.00	$13.30	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.15	.86

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We refund promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

Dodging the Record

Opposition to the passage of the shipping bill is becoming more and more tinged with partisan insincerity. Democratic newspapers and Democratic members of the House and Senate are working to defeat the pending measure not on its merits but as a matter of party strategy. "We can't miss such an opportunity," they say, "to drive a wedge between the Western farm bloc and the Harding Administration."

In so doing they turn their backs completely on the Democratic party's shipping record under the Wilson Administration. Mr. Wilson believed in creating and maintaining an American merchant marine. He saw even back in 1913 and 1914 that the United States could no longer afford to let the great bulk of American exports and imports be carried in foreign bottoms. He discarded absolutely the earlier Democratic doctrine, to which many of his followers are now returning, that it is better to let the foreigner do the carrying because he is able to do it cheaper. That is the apology of a dependent and slothful maritime nation for not assuming its own tasks on the seas and drawing from them additional economic power and national security.

This abject argument meant nothing to Mr. Wilson. He was so impressed with the need of quick correction of the blunders of the past that he vaulted over all intermediate remedies and planted himself squarely on the emergency program of government purchase, ownership and operation. He sought to avoid subsidies because of the prejudice against that term. But he committed the Treasury to a policy of government expenditure vastly more burdensome than any possible promise of subsidies.

The Democratic party followed Mr. Wilson in offering the most paternalistic form of assistance to shipping. It fostered government control and operation. It created a Shipping Board. It expended $3,000,000,000 in building the merchant marine, which most Democratic newspapers and Congressmen now seem to want to write off a total war loss.

This colossal confession of failure was never contemplated by the Democratic party when it was in power. Government ownership and operation were defended by Mr. Wilson as a necessary short cut to the revival of American shipping. But he did not have in mind either permanent government ownership, whatever the loss in it, or the scrapping of the fleet when the monopolistic experiment should collapse of its own extravagance and unwieldiness. He said in his message of December 8, 1914:

> "It is not a question of the government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the government ought to withdraw."

Government ownership has failed calamitously. The pending bill offers a means of attracting private capital into shipping, thus enabling the government to withdraw. But those who got the country into the mess will give no help in dragging it out. It is a sorry exhibition of partisan triviality and inconstancy.

A Maker of Mischief

It may discourage Mr. Hylan to find that there is no demand in the Middle West that William Randolph Hearst lead a third party in the Presidential race in 1924. But it will not discourage Mr. Hearst. That perpetual candidate for the Presidency is discouragement proof. No snub, however crushing it might be to other politicians, will persuade him that his aspiration to sit some day in the White House is hopeless.

If Mr. Hearst were not a proprietor of many newspapers this ambition of his, being wholly without any chance of fulfillment, would be comparatively harmless. Many men, among them William Jennings Bryan, have been lifelong Presidential candidates without in the least menacing the peace and prosperity of the nation.

But Mr. Hearst is, unfortunately, a newspaper proprietor, and he is building his candidacy on an active propaganda of discontent and unrest, hoping that if all the dissatisfied people of the country can be organized he, who is more dissatisfied than any of them, will be accepted as their leader.

This effort in a nation-wide newspaper campaign to make people believe that whatever is is wrong and that the only remedy is to put William Randolph Hearst in the White House is provocative of infinite mischief. It will never bring Mr. Hearst the Presidency, it is true. He lacks the faculty of leadership. He never inspires confidence or trust in those who follow him, as people do follow him in brief campaigns.

But the by-product of his candidacy is unrest, which is deliberately spread about wherever his newspapers are published, and unrest is always dangerous to peace and security.

It is apparent to all observers of national politics that Mr. Hearst will not abandon his candidacy while he possesses any means of keeping it alive. His effort to capitalize the result of the last election is sufficient proof of that. As long as public men can be found who will attach themselves to him, either because of hope of his praise or fear of his attacks, he will continue to be a mischief maker in America.

Our Voice at Lausanne

Ambassador Child exploded the idea that because an American diplomatic agent at a European conference may bear the infelicitous title of "official observer" he is thereby debarred from rendering any useful service to his country. Mr. Child did not act the part of a superfluous looker-on when he presented to the Lausanne gathering the American view—the view of Secretary Colby as well as Secretary Hughes—that the United States, as a former belligerent, ought not to be discriminated against in any of the peace settlements on the ground that it signed but did not ratify the German, Austrian and Bulgarian treaties.

Our Ambassador to Italy told the conference that the United States opposed an execution of secret agreements made by others of the Allied belligerents—Great Britain, France and Italy, for example—for a parceling out of zones of special commercial and economic influence in former Turkish territory. This country, while not in the war with Turkey and therefore not in a position to oppose the outright allocation of Turkish territory, feels, nevertheless, entitled to ask for equal economic opportunities in mandated countries and in mere spheres of influence. All that we seek is recognition in our interest of the "open door" policy.

In the case of Germany we have undone most of the wrong committed by the Allied Supreme Council when it sought to dispose of the Island of Yap and to lay down the rule that the United States, not having ratified the treaties and joined the League of Nations, could not enjoy commercial privileges in former German overseas possessions which were to be granted to league members formerly neutral, and even to league members formerly enemy.

That battle was won in part at the Washington conference a year ago, when our interest in the former German islands of the Pacific was admitted. It is still to be fought out so far as Mesopotamia and other portions of the former Turkish Empire are concerned. We were never consulted as to the Turkish mandates or as to the secret agreements, though one of the major Allied and associated powers. We reserve the right to insist on a square deal in territory not actually annexed and to resist any attempt to put us for commercial purposes in a category inferior to that occupied by League of Nations countries.

This is a fundamental conception of present-day American diplomacy. It will have its weight at Lausanne, even though the agents who elaborate it do not sit as full-fledged conference members.

A Jesse James Revival

The bandits are revising their classics and bringing them out in new editions. Jesse and Frank James surely were among the immortals of their academy, yet their art failed them on occasion. When they raided the First National Bank of Gallatin, Mo., in 1869, the first daylight robbery they had attempted, Jesse shot the cashier through the heart, but then they showed a yellow streak and were driven off without getting a red cent.

The outlaw fraternity must have brooded over that failure. Bright and early one morning last week half a dozen of the current Jameses descended on the same little bank at Gallatin and blasted the vault to smithereens while they held off the townsfolk with high-powered rifles. Then, laden with gold and securities, they jumped into their waiting motor, said "Home, James!" and were off. Gallatin knows now what the James boys look like in a *de luxe* edition.

A few months ago it seemed that the wild West had moved to Manhattan. The outlaws were holding carnival up and down Broadway and in the side streets from Manhattan to the Bronx, with excursions to Queens and Brooklyn. Perhaps they have grown homesick and returned to their old stamping grounds. But it will be well to look up the works of the old robber masters in this vicinity and take care that the new crop of Jameses adds no footnotes to them.

Stock Sale Publicity

Unremitting publicity is the one force that can check the sale of fraudulent and other undesirable securities, and Seymour L. Cromwell, president of the New York Stock Exchange, does well in suggesting laws requiring sworn financial statements. He advocates enforced filing of such documents, including facts about operations and earnings, before securities may be offered to the public, and would thereafter require statements semi-annually.

Mr. Cromwell says that the Stock Exchange would support such a law, but is opposed to ordinary "blue sky" laws, because, though they do some good, they create red tape and are easily evaded. The Tribune recognizes that the so-called "blue sky" laws are at best crude attempts to prevent individuals from being foolish and from being fooled. Yet they have the advantage of creating a special agency charged with watching the details of new security offerings.

In its quest for essential facts about corporations whose securities are being peddled our financial staff is frequently able to get from commissions in other states information which is unobtainable in New York. In the case of the alleged bankrupt Manhattan Piggly Wiggly Corporation, whose operations centered in this city, a balance sheet and income account were obtainable only through the Public Utilities Department of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which requires basic financial facts before securities of a corporation can legally be sold within the state.

Mr. Cromwell's proposal for a law making such publicity obligatory would mark a step forward in this state. A more distant objective would be to induce or require statements of earnings, even from established publicly owned corporations, as often as is feasible. The Stock Exchange requires of all companies whose shares are listed under its jurisdiction at least an annual financial statement. Many corporations issue voluntarily quarterly, and even monthly, reports.

Without waiting for legislation, the Stock Exchange might well insist on at least semi-annual, instead of annual, reports from all corporations on which it can impose rules. Publicity not only helps to prevent misrepresentation when new securities are being vended, but also makes possible an intelligent judgment regarding the fluctuating values of shares of older reputable, going concerns. Frequent announcements regarding earnings tend to place all shareholders on an equal footing respecting needful information with officers and directors. The effect of fuller and more frequent publicity would be less mystery and less hokum in finance.

Paring Alien Quotas

The sponsors of immigration restriction propose to cut still further the number of immigrants to be admitted annually. Instead of the 3 per cent at present admitted it is suggested to allow less than 2 per cent of the various nationalities here in 1910 to come in. At the same time more rigid mental and health tests also are contemplated.

Reports from Washington indicate an overwhelming sentiment in favor of drastic restrictions. The arguments of racial groups anxious to have the bars lifted so that their fellows may come to this country in large numbers have apparently fallen on deaf ears, just as have the complaints of representatives of the big business interests that immigration restriction means a labor shortage and increased wages and higher costs of production. The supporters of restriction care little for such arguments, and claim that a halt in immigration is imperative unless the country is to be swamped by aliens.

The anti-alien cry is, of course, an old one in American history. A century ago it was voiced as loudly as to-day. But there is more justification for this cry to-day than then. In 1822 there were still vast areas of undeveloped lands. There were essential industries to be built up. The country was growing at a rapid speed and needed and could absorb large quantities of aliens. To-day we suffer not from too much, but from too little land; not from underdeveloped, but from overgrown industries.

A century ago the flux of population was such that amalgamation was achieved with comparative ease except in the few big centers where aliens colonized and formed their own separate groups, transplanting the ideas and traditions of a European fatherland to American soil. To-day the tendency of aliens everywhere throughout the country is to segregate, and in their own communities live their lives apart from the rest of America. So long as these groups are not too many or their numbers too great they will ultimately be absorbed, just as were those who came over a hundred years ago.

But the policy that aims at restricting the size of these groups by keeping down the number of immigrants is essentially wise. It works hardships on certain races and many individuals. It may well cause higher wages in many occupations. But in the long run it is for the good of the American nation as a whole, and this, after all, is more important than the interests of any group.

Ex Post Facto Prohibition

That is a strange demand of a Christian Endeavor convention at Reading, Penn., for the removal from a public park of a monument in honor of a brewer, which was placed there a generation or more ago. It suggests some extraordinary results which might come from a general application of the same principle.

For example, one of the oldest and most noted colleges for women in this country was founded by a great brewer, largely if not entirely with the money which he made in the brewing industry. Is that loved, venerated and immeasurably useful institution to be condemned and destroyed because of that fact?

Some leading church organizations, now zealously committed to prohibition, were founded or formerly directed by men who habitually drank wine. Are they for that reason to be disbanded? Many of the best books in our literature were written by wine-drinkers, and in some of them wine-drinking is mentioned as an entirely permissible custom. Are they to be destroyed?

It will occur to thoughtful men that the problem of suppressing more or less poisonous "hooch" in our own time is grave enough and onerous enough to occupy all attention, without conducting a campaign against the perfectly legitimate non-prohibitionists of generations ago.

More Truth Than Poetry

By James J. Montague

To a November Mosquito

When lusty was your youthful blood,
When joyfully you sang,
While winging from the brookside mud
From which you lately sprang,
With many a light and lively leap,
You frolicked 'round my bed
And drove the last fond hope of sleep
From out my frantic head.

But ah! stern time has changed you now,
You limp across the wall;
The mark of age upon your brow
Is hanging like a pall.
You dully watch my upraised hand
Nor even bate your breath,
You cannot even understand
How near you are to death!

But would it be good sportsmanship
Were I to lay you low,
Now you no more can nimbly skip
From underneath the blow?
Though in my face you've often thrust
Your predatory beak,
Would I be fair or kind or just
To punish one so weak?

Can I, in this triumphant hour,
The while you feebly gasp,
Exert the stern and awful power
That lies within my grasp?
Can I regard that trembling shape
And basely strike to kill
A creature who cannot escape?
Yes, sir! I can and will!

Genuinely Antique

The bones of a camel, said to be a million years old, have been discovered in Nebraska. This animal was roaming the Platte quite a time before William J. Bryan began running for the Presidency.

A Lesson to Them

A method of killing flies by electricity has been adopted in New York. Any one familiar with flies knows that hanging is too good for them.

Nothing To Be Familiar With

"$100.00 WORTH OF WHISKY FORMALLY SEIZED" — Headline. The amount certainly justified all the formality possible.

(Copyright by James J. Montague)

The Broader Vision

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One short sentence in the latter part of President Harding's able address certainly hits the nail on the head: "In individual exchanges of opinion not a few in House or Senate have expressed personal sympathy with the purposes of the bill and then uttered a discouraging doubt about the sentiment of their constituencies."

It is on this vital point that our legislation of recent years has hinged and is the main reason for the failure of proper legislation.

The men who are sent to Congress to represent the people as a whole, seem to be unable to understand that the interests of the whole country are far in excess of any interest of any little particular group by whom they are elected.

It was never more necessary that we elect representatives with broader vision and with less selfishness.

M. W. ROLLINS.

New York, Nov. 22, 1922.

The Lantern

Copr., New York Tribune Inc., 1922

The Ku-Klux Klan appears to be making appreciable inroads into the membership of certain church organizations. — Aunt Prudence Hecklebury, as we announced the other day, is thinking of joining the Klan, if they will take her in.

* * *

Perhaps there is a Klansladies' Aid Society that Aunt Prudence can join. —One trouble with regard to Aunt Prudence in this country is that she has never been thought of before as a Dangerous Character. — Aunt Prudence is going to be our own particular Bogie Woman.—We intend to hold her responsible for everything that happens and doesn't happen.—When the Ku-Kluxers were hunting up flossy names for their order why didn't they think of Caliban?

* * *

There should be a Chief Caliban of the Ku-Klux Klan. . . .

Klink! the Kuky-Kully Kan!
Hail to the Kaliban
Of the Ku-Klux Klan!

* * *

The society seems to be founded on Assonance, Asininity and Alliteration.—And we are sure that such a moral order as the Ku-Kluxers pretend to be is set stubbornly against Alcohol.

* * *

Indeed, the Klan, in some of its aspects, is merely an expression of Illegal Puritanism.—The Lawless Uplifters.—If there isn't one, there should also be a Klan-Kuckoo.

* * *

Wasn't its founder somebody by the name of Klark?—Probably the gentleman's regalia was embroidered with some such device as:

I am the Klark of the Klan,
Kink, Kuckoo and Kaliban!

* * *

Captain Peter Fitzurse looks with scorn on the Ku-Klux Klan. "Sir," he told us the other day, "it is merely a childish, disgusting imitation of the real thing.

* * *

"I was one of the founders, sir, of the real Ku-Klux Klan, the original Ku-Klux Klan. It had a purpose to serve, and it served it. A danger threatened this fair land of ours, and we removed it. We struck a blow, sir, for hearth and home, and the safety of our glorious womanhood. . . . I give you the ladies, God bless them!"

* * *

This latter exclamation was merely automatic on the Captain's part.—When he gets a little excited about anything he says: "The ladies, God bless them!"—Edom, his colored body servant, says that whenever the Captain sits down by the fire in the evening, with a jorum of rum at his elbow and the ghosts of the past . . . of all his pasts, for the Captain has had more pasts than any other man living . . . circling about him, the last thing he says before his eyes become set in his head and he falls out of his easy chair is always: "The ladies, God bless 'em!"

* * *

But these various preachers that are rooting for the Ku-Klux really interest us more than Captain Fitzurse.—One would think that a minister, having dedicated himself to a church organization, would find his hands so full that he would not have much time for other organizations. —Or perhaps these particular preachers do not take their church organizations very seriously.

* * *

We always had a hazy sort of feeling, without knowing very much about it, that one purpose of a church organization was to spread a general feeling of good will and loving kindness throughout a community.—It is difficult to see exactly how the Ku-Klux Klan fits in with that program.—But then we don't pretend to know much about such things.

* * *

We are something like Captain Fitzurse in that respect. He once remarked in our hearing: "I don't know anything about ethics, but I know what I like."

* * *

We consider it a candid and noble declaration—and one that it is possible to live up to.—Returning to the preachers who are in favor of the Klan: We don't really worry about them much.—They can be safely left to the other preachers who think differently.—Leave a preacher to a preacher, and he will get his'n.—Which you possibly understand, though it may not be as grammatical as some sentences you have seen.

* * *

There is a feeling in France, we read in the cable reports, that Clemenceau "will not shake the policy of America."—But perhaps he will find out what it is.

* * *

And that would be no small service.—Tiger, Tiger, burning bright, Won't you cast a little light?

* * *

We see by some of the papers that the Reds are a menace to this country.—Great Guns! why flatter them that way?—They live on it!

DON MARQUIS.

MODERN EQUIPMENT FOR YOUNG COUPLE GOING TO HOUSEKEEPING, JUDGING FROM THE NEWS

Copyright, 1922, New York Tribune Inc.

What Readers Are Thinking

"Guilty or Not Guilty?"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I would like to ask the writer of your editorial "Guilty or Not Guilty?" whether, in all of his life, he has done nothing for which he could have or should have been put in jail? Now I have never been in jail, nor arrested, nor even summoned into court—and I have driven motor cars for years—but I'm afraid it's because I haven't had my deserts. Who among us can search his soul and then declare he has never committed a penal offense?

However, I don't hold with the Rev. Dr. Stires. The great majority of men and women in jails are habitual criminals, shut up for the preservation of society.

G. R. SARGENT.

Boston, Mass., Nov. 25, 1922.

How He Hates Them

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read with great pleasure your editorial on the growing so-called "insurgency" in the Republican party. But do you go far enough? Most of us must admit that there is a strong and growing tendency in many who call themselves Republicans to repudiate the old Republican doctrine of respect for property and the rights of others. But are these demagogues really Republicans? In their mad and frantic efforts to gain and hold votes they appeal to that basest passion of unscrupulous men—the desire to loot another's goods.

Why do not all these shallow thinkers like La Follette and Howell and Brookhart and Johnson and Borah come out in the open, where their principles can be known and assayed? Let them organize an anti-railroad and anti-property party and then we could have a straight up and down fight on the question whether a man is entitled to what he earns and saves, or whether he must share it with those whose chief constituent is envy.

Back of it all is that catering to two classes—the farmers and the labor unionists.

The inhabitants of some states like California or Idaho or Wisconsin or Iowa or Nebraska may be well meaning and just, but I do not believe so. If it were otherwise they would not send to Congress such men as they do, whose chief campaign cry is "Let us bedevil the railroads." They know that the majority of the owners of railroad stocks are humble citizens who are bravely trying to bear up under the assaults made on the railroads. These politicians know all this, but they know that the owners of railroad stocks cannot help themselves, cannot fight back. So the politicians yell that "Wall Street" owns the roads and that therefore they may be kicked about with impunity and robbed to fill the pockets of farmers and labor unionists.

Mr. Wells thinks that civilization is riding to a fall. It may be so, but if it is so then it will be men like Brookhart and Howell and La Follette and Borah and Johnson who will pull the props from under and let the skies fall.

JAMES McKIRDY.

Pittsburgh, Pa., Nov. 22, 1922.

Elevated Hats

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For a long time I have been wondering at the unreasonable hat etiquette as practiced in elevators. And now you dilate editorially on the Cleveland Mayor's manifesto to the effect that men should keep their hats on as they share the ups and downs of the elevators with women—in order to increase efficiency.

It seems, and I think we all know it, that hat etiquette applies only to hotels and apartment houses. In office buildings no man considers removing his hat in elevators shared by ladies, the inference being that a woman who travels in an office building is only a worker and therefore not in the same class with the women who enter elevators in a building which is lived in, or one who visits fine shops.

With hats men have by far the worst of it; they have the etiquette to remember and very often feathers to taste, particularly in congested elevators.

HENRY FINLAY.

New York, Nov. 25, 1922.

The Surprising Mr. A. B. See

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In reference to the misguided letter of Mr. Alonzo B. See, in reply to a request that he contribute toward the Adelphi College endowment fund, I want to enter my protest. I am only surprised that as fine a business man as Mr. See is should make such foolish statements.

I happen to be one mother whose three children all have college degrees—my eldest son a Yale man, my youngest son a Stevens man, my daughter a Vassar graduate. She is a lovely wife and mother and her college education fitted her to take her place alongside of her brothers. She never painted nor smoked nor swaggered, nor ever saw the type Mr. See refers to at Vassar or in any other college, and she has visited many.

No, no, Mr. See, we women of the United States must rise in protest and tell you we are not going to the dogs. We do not need to do manual labor to make us fit. Rather we are ready and taking our places alongside our college fathers, brothers and sons. Many of us are doing magnificent work, and we are more respected to-day than ever before, all because we are having the advantages of our women's colleges. Most of us started long ago to persuade our less fortunate, poorly educated sisters to give up the foolish habit of painting, swaggering and smoking.

We laud our noble professors who have molded us into splendid thinking women and denounce any one who dares say college professors have anything but superior brains, which have helped to form the highest and best our beautiful world has achieved by women. And psychology has done and will continue to do as much as any other science.

I. H. M.

New York, Nov. 24, 1922.

Another Job for the Police

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your paper seems always willing to lend its voice toward improving conditions and has shown interest in the subway problem.

Crowding at the Grand Central platform of the Lexington Avenue subway in the mornings has become intolerable. It is quite evident that to regulate the crowds by keeping them in line, as is done at the Chambers Street station of the B. R. T. subway, would be difficult, but there is one thing that can be done by the police. They can break up the selfish crowding and pushing.

This morning I saw one woman hurt. Her escort had to help her from the station. Policemen in the crowd would soon stop the needless pushing. I have known of other instances of people being hurt, and yet conditions go worse. The subway guards cannot remedy this phase of the problem. It is a police duty and should be handled by the police—a duty so obvious that one marvels at its not being performed.

E. J. B.

Scarsdale, N. Y., Nov. 20, 1922.

Clemenceau's Visit

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is not Clemenceau's visit in a way as much our opportunity as it is his or that of France? At heart we all somewhat know the real trouble with the world to-day. Of course, it is not unmixed. Few human things are. Lord Bryce spoke almost hopelessly, and we in America largely agree whether it is our affair or not, about the Treaty of Versailles, its bewildering indemnity and its Peter the Czar-like fixing of the boundaries of Europe. And we may talk with truth of the effect of war on all standards—it breaks up civil regularity and replaces it with military what you please.

But war does something else, and we are suffering from it. It raises peoples to the height of sacrifice, raises them to ideals that, except under strain and excitement and danger, they cannot, and few individuals can, maintain. We get on the pendulum and swing back with it and then worse, for we find in the hurly burly and wreckage chance for commercial advantage and salvage. Every large nation is accused of this—the United States is as free as any from it—but behold the tariff and the fear of European entanglements! The large statesmen of any of the great nations used to think in centuries; now they hardly think in decades.

In 1914 the cause of France was the cause of civilization, and so was the cause of Belgium. They both suffered and were torn terribly in the fiend's attack.

Clemenceau puts France's loss at 5,000,000 men—about one in ten of her population—and 20,000 factories. We lost 100,000 all told, or one in a thousand of our population and no factories. We cannot measure her national sorrow or her national loss.

To-day with Russia officered from Germany, and Germany arming, and Turkey with them and halting the world, France's cause is still the cause of civilization, and unaided thus far in any great degree to recuperate she still smarts from her wounds, and still is blind from the blows she has received, and still hits out sometimes wildly. But she, more even than England, is the pivot of our civilization. We cannot hold ourselves immune, for, while reluctant to share in the work of rehabilitation in Europe, we have by poorly administered immigration laws let Europe in on us, and if we are attacked from outside confederates inside will unlock our gates. So long as the sorrows of to-day are the outcome of that brutish betrayal of national honor in 1914 we must not at our peril forget it; forgive it perhaps we may, but forget it never!

I think we need to recover our idealism, or some of it at least, for we have lost nearly all; and we need to re-recognize France. Let us turn back and re-read of the sacrifice and noble courage of France in the books of James M. Beck, who weighed the evidence so well, and of Mrs. Wharton, who so finely expressed an understanding sympathy with what France was before the war, and in the war, and may be again, heaven willing. Surely France is too great an asset to the world as we want it to be for us safely to see lost.

IRA H. BRAINERD.

New York, Nov. 25, 1922.