The Evening Star

With Sunday Morning Edition.

THEODORE W. NOYES, Editor.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
TUESDAY.....June 25, 1940

The Evening Star Newspaper Company.
Main Office: 11th St. and Pennsylvania Ave.
New York Office: 110 East 42nd St.
Chicago Office: 435 North Michigan Ave.

Delivered by Carrier—City and Suburban.

Regular Edition.

Evening and Sunday 75c per mo. or 18c per week
The Evening Star ... 45c per mo. or 10c per week
The Sunday Star ... 10c per copy

Night Final Edition.

Night Final and Sunday Star ... 85c per month
Night Final Star ... 60c per month

Rural Tube Delivery.

The Evening and Sunday Star ... 85c per month
The Evening Star ... 55c per month
The Sunday Star ... 10c per copy

Collection made at the end of each month or each week. Orders may be sent by mail or telephone National 5000.

Rate by Mail—Payable in Advance.

Daily and Sunday...1 yr., $12.00; 1 mo., $1.00
Daily only ...1 yr., $8.00; 1 mo., 75c
Sunday only...1 yr., $5.00; 1 mo., 50c

Entered as second-class matter post office, Washington, D. C.

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 published herein. All rights of publication of special dispatches herein also are reserved.

Republican Keynote

The keynote sounded last night by youthful Governor Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia was sharp, vibrant and arresting. In its broad tone, it was in consonance with the theme of the Democratic administration now in power. There was general harmony on the score of national preparedness, on fifth-column defense, on the need for farm and unemployment relief, on the importance of governmental reorganization. But the discord came when Governor Stassen began to explain the differences between the Republican and the New Deal approaches to these problems and to enumerate the weaknesses and the failures of the Roosevelt administration in seeking to solve them. Governor Stassen deserves credit for confining his arraignment of the New Deal to criticism that, on the whole, was constructive, not carping—and he thereby has served to strengthen the cause of the somewhat bewildered Grand Old Party.

Governor Stassen was emphatic in denying any idea that the Republican party is or will be a party of blind isolationism. The future welfare of the country, he said, "cannot best be served by simply burying our heads in the sand" when the world is "constantly changing." He freely admitted that situations may arise which cannot now be anticipated and that it would be foolish, therefore, to "tie our hands before meeting them." That is an eminently sensible position to take and to adhere to in these times of international turmoil, when anything can happen and when flexibility of diplomatic or military action might forestall graver crises.

The Republican keynoter was not disposed to quarrel with the administration's present program for building up our national defenses, but he did not make clear the Republican stand on compulsory military training, although he criticized as too totalitarian Mr. Roosevelt's suggestion of universal non-combatant training for young men and women. The G. O. P. platform should include a plank pledging the party to support legislation setting up immediately a system of universal military training if there is any intention to deal realistically with our new problems of national defense. Governor Stassen's reference to the "American way" of raising and training an army of workmen as well as an army of soldiers was not realistic and left his hearers puzzled.

The Governor, as might have been expected, aimed many of his darts at familiar shortcomings of the New Deal. He assailed left wingers in the administration or in its good graces, restrictive regulations and punitive taxes on business, deficit financing, the increase in administrative agencies and in their powers, wasteful Federal relief measures, political patronage, failure to solve unemployment and farm problems, the "let the Government do it" attitude at Washington. And he did not forego attacking Mr. Roosevelt's supposed third-term ambitions and the political timing of the appointments of Republicans Frank Knox and Henry L. Stimson to the cabinet. At the same time, he bluntly reminded the opposition party that the Nation faces critical weeks between now and the election next November and that meanwhile it behooves Republicans as well as Democrats to "rise above narrow partisanship" in co-operating with the Government in this emergency.

All in all, it was a safe and sane pronouncement of Republican political philosophy, tailored to fit the requirements of a tense and perilous era in the democratic way of life.

'Mosquito' Boats

In view of the ruling of Attorney General Robert Jackson that it would be illegal to release to Great Britain the Navy's new experimental "mosquito" boats, President Roosevelt had no alternative but to cancel the transaction. But there is no justification for the belief, expressed in some quarters at the Capitol yesterday, that this is an indication that the administration is "backing down" on its policy of giving material aid to the Allies.

As retiring Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison pointed out yesterday, the present boats, built from British blueprints, have eighteen-inch torpedo tubes instead of the standard twenty-one-inch type used by the Navy, and it will put a strain on our already overloaded production facilities to begin manufacture of the smaller projectiles. Moreover, the larger torpedoes have a longer range and greater explosive power. The proposed transfer of the boats to Great Britain, by way of the manufacturer, differed in no way from the principle followed in releasing warplanes to the Allies. But in the case of the boats it has been found that a 1917 statute specifically forbids such a deal when ships are involved. Of course, the Navy might have saved itself this embarrassment if it had taken the Naval Affairs Committees of Congress into its confidence on the planned transaction, for it was at the Capitol that legal aspects of the matter first were explored. And while attention is focused on the old law, it might be well to consider whether it should not be modified so that the hands of the administration will not be tied in just such a situation as now confronts the Government. For it is imperative, in our own interests, that continuing aid be sent to England as rapidly as our available resources permit, provided, of course, that nothing is released that is essential to our own protection.

Unacceptable to Hitler?

An Associated Press story in Sunday's Star quoted an unidentified member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee to the effect that had a vote been taken in committee Saturday on the nomination of Colonel Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy, the vote would have been eleven to five against confirmation.

The unofficial poll revealing that sentiment was doubtless indicative of the curiously hysterical defeatism which has swept many politicians off their feet since the capitulation of France. It is hardly indicative of the final vote on the confirmation of the Knox appointment, when the Senators cool off and begin to think rationally about their responsibilities.

The hysteria following Germany's crushing defeat of France has been marked, in the pre-convention antics of the Republican delegates at Philadelphia as well as in Congress. But its effect on sentiment toward the Stimson and Knox appointments has been the more noteworthy because it is so wholly illogical.

Here is the Naval Affairs Committee, for instance, whose members have taken a prominent part in helping to appropriate over five thousand million dollars for defense within a few short weeks, thus indicating their appreciation of the seriousness of the emergency with which this country is faced. And here is the same committee giving every evidence of nervous prostration over the thought that a distinguished and able citizen, whose views on foreign policy happen to be in accord with the President's and those of a majority of his countrymen, may inject his country into war.

The Naval Affairs Committee, after going through its solemn ritual of summoning Colonel Knox and asking whether he believes in "intervention," whatever so unqualified a term may mean, will doubtless vote for his confirmation and the Senate will follow suit. A hasty examination of the record indicates that only six times in our history have cabinet nominations been turned down in the Senate; the last case, incidentally, being the second defeat of President Coolidge's nomination of the late Charles Beecher Warren of Michigan to be Attorney General. Vice President Dawes, it may be recalled, was too late to cast the vote which would have confirmed the nominee. The choice of his cabinet is a peculiarly personal privilege of the President with which the Senate seldom interferes.

Aside from that, however, and with the exception of some Republicans who may feel that party interests compel them to rise above principle, the vote in committees and on the floor of the Senate on the Knox and Stimson nominations should be heavily in favor of confirmation. After the tragic spectacle in Europe of the incredible incompetence of the politicians in their loose gambling with the destinies of their people, this country is in no mood to tolerate more pompous dilly-dallying over the absurd question whether Messrs. Knox and Stimson, on the basis of their past utterances, will "lead us into war."

Economic Defense

Strong arguments for the necessity of making economic unity of the American nations a vital part of any defense program against attempts of Europe's totalitarian conquerors to extend their sway to this hemisphere have come from Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle, jr., and the American Council on Public Affairs. Mr. Berle's address to the University of Virginia Institute of Public Affairs Saturday night served to emphasize the urgent need for promptly putting into effect this Government's proposal for a giant inter-American trading corporation to handle the exports from all the American republics, forming a powerful monopoly to deal on equal terms with the dictators' monopoly. The council made public Monday a report of its Committee on Economic Defense, on which President Roosevelt is reported to have based his trading cartel plan. The council suggests much more extensive measures, however, including the development of sources in South America for all the strategic materials we now import from other parts of the world and a scheme for distribution of surplus commodities to the needy throughout this hemisphere.

Government experts now are drafting details of the inter-American trading project to be submitted to our neighbor nations this week and it is not likely that they will overlook suggestions of the council for "total defense." There certainly will be no lack of co-operation in the main features of the program for joint protective action by all the Americas if the alternative dangers outlined by Mr. Berle and the council's report are fully recognized.

German and Italian domination of Europe will mean that unless the Americas present a united economic front they will be exposed individually to the "pressure trading" methods of the totalitarian system, under which "the weaker government is virtually forced to give up its political independence," Mr. Berle warned. He recalled that normally Europe takes more than half of South America's exports. This trade has been disrupted by the war, threatening economic disaster to the Americas.

On the other hand, war-ravaged Europe soon will be in desperate need of the goods which the Americas have to sell. Hitler and Mussolini undoubtedly would drive harsh bargains for those goods if they could play one country against another. Only the collective bargaining power of all the nations of this hemisphere can meet them on terms of commercial equality, as the council's report emphasized. It is to weld this power into an effective unit that the United States is asking the co-operation of the twenty other American republics.

Peace on the Continent?

If a curious reader in quest of historic parallels should care to consult the files of The Star for 1871, he would discover in the editorial page for January 27 of that year these solemn words: "France is prostrate and can no longer continue the contest with any possible hope of success * * * The situation is full of difficulties, and no one knows what the future has in store for France and for Europe."

Something similar, it is obvious, might be written now. Once more France has been forced to submit to the superior strength of her traditional enemy, aided on this occasion, as it happens, by an ally to whom a supplementary surrender necessarily was made. Again, as nearly seven decades ago, "hard terms" are inflicted upon the French people by their conquerors. The requirements of the armistice are rigorous, if not intentionally humiliating. Marshal Petain and his associates submitted to them because they had no other choice. It therefore is useless to discuss alternative procedures. The fact which looms above all possible theories of explanation is that of the thoroughness of the defeat which France has suffered. One reason for the failure in the field was an admitted weakness on the "home front"—a weakness which probably is characteristic of all democratic communities. "The living system" of the country had not been bulwarked by sacrifice. Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing in the New York Times, summarizes the trouble in this judgment: "They (the citizens of the French republic) were licked because they demanded of their political representatives only personal benefits—a local bridge, a subsidy for wheat, bigger pensions, paid vacations, the forty-hour week; they exerted pressure for social security but none for the sole basis of that security, the safety of France."

But the people who at this hour have bowed their heads in mourning for the country they temporarily have yielded are learning the bitter lesson of their experience. They know that their ancestors were obliged to kneel to alien foes, only to rise to new powers of resistance. Comfort for their present sorrows perhaps they may find in the final passage of Guizot's chronicles, where it is declared: "France has not lost, and will not lose, courage. She is laboring; she is hoping; and * * * she reckons upon the day * * * when liberty with order will forever crown the long and painful efforts of her most faithful servants of every name and every period."

Meanwhile, peace of a sort has been restored to Western Europe—a "breathing spell" of tranquillity before the opening of the long-awaited attack upon Great Britain and the beginning of the horrors which almost inevitably will characterize it. Yesterday's order "cease fire" has no meaning for which the world can rejoice. It signified merely the close of a chapter in the book of humanity's agony.

Now the Navy wants a river channel deepened so it can get the new 45,000-ton battleship out to sea. This is slightly reminiscent of the man who builds a boat in his cellar and has to knock out the end of the house.

A census enumerator out in Washington State had to swim an icy stream to get statistics from a trapper. Along about midsummer Washingtonians will think of him with positive envy.

Out in Ontario, Calif., at an all-States picnic, they spread a table two miles long for fifty thousand guests. One good point about such a feast is that the guests were spared a presiding officer and toastmaster.

As far as Britain is concerned, this period, even with its regular bombings of her shores, would appear to be the lull before the storm. The less she lets this lull lull her, the better for her.

Of Stars, Men And Atoms

Notebook of Science Progress In Field, Laboratory And Study

By Thomas R. Henry.

A strange practice of pulling two or more healthy front teeth of adolescent boys—sometimes girls also—started in the late old Stone Age and spread around the world, according to evidence obtained from the study of ancient American and Siberian skulls by Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, curator of physical anthropology of the Smithsonian Institution.

It presumably was a ceremonial rite of some sort rather than a supposed "beauty treatment" and the absence of teeth may have been a mark of distinction for the individual, Dr. Hrdlicka believes. The practice apparently was brought from Siberia by the first migrants into North America, the ancestors of the Indians, and is especially obvious in jaws from the Aleutians and Kodiak Island obtained by Smithsonian Institution expeditions. Both these were stepping stones from Asia to the New World.

The loss of healthy teeth, except for those obviously lost by disease, such as ulcers and scurvy, was rare among later Indians, although there are occasional instances of it. The teeth, usually incisors but sometimes canines, appear to have been deliberately pulled by tying sinews around them and yanking them from their sockets, Dr. Hrdlicka says.

Study convinces him, he explains, that the teeth were not pulled because they ached. First, it can be determined, the jaws are invariably those of young men and women. They are not those of children because the growth process has been completed. Generally the only cause of toothache would have been dental caries. This was very rare indeed among young Indians. Moreover, when the disease appears teeth other than those most seriously affected show evidence of it. There are no signs of caries in the other teeth of the jaws studied by Dr. Hrdlicka. It is doubtful if teeth ever were pulled to relieve pain.

Sometimes teeth actually fell out because of ulcers or scurvy. These usually appeared in later life. They left evidence which still could be recognized in the jaws.

Sometimes, Dr. Hrdlicka says, teeth were pulled as a punishment. This usually was suffered by older individuals. It was a practice among the ancient Peruvians. One of the most terrible punishments was to pull all the teeth. The persons suffering such a fate were essentially condemned to a slow death. Sometimes slaves were branded by removing one or more teeth. As a rule, says Dr. Hrdlicka, these would be individuals of a different race than their owners. This would be reflected in their skulls. Nothing of the sort is found among the ceremonial tooth pullers.

Among many primitive tribes it is customary to submit boys on the threshold of manhood to fortitude tests. The tooth pulling, which must have been attended by intense pain, may have constituted such a test. Loss of front teeth may have been considered a mark of beauty. This is doubted by the anthropologist. Actually mutilating the teeth as a beauty aid has been quite common the world over. It consists of such practices as filing them to sharp points or serrating or filing down the edges. It seldom involves actual removal.

When all the evidence is considered, Dr. Hrdlicka says, it seems most probable that the practice was part of an initiation rite.

It is first shown, he says, by old Stone Age jaws from Africa and Palestine. By the beginning of the new Stone Age it apparently was widespread over Africa, Australia, continental Asia and Japan and had reached some parts of Europe. It still survives, he believes, in parts of Africa, Australia, possibly Mongolia and parts of South America.

It probably has not been observed before, Dr. Hrdlicka says, because it has entirely died out among the North American Indians and the Eskimo and the skeletal evidence is scanty and likely to be overlooked unless one knows what is being sought. The practice is notable only when large collections are studied.

In presenting his evidence, Dr. Hrdlicka lists a large number of cases from American and Siberian collections.

"There is ample evidence," he says, "that non-curative removal of some to all of the front teeth has been a widespread procedure since neolithic times in Northern Asia and since the oldest known times in America. It is also probable that it was practiced not in early childhood but during adolescence; that it extended to both sexes, although not entirely equally, since it tended to predominate in the males, and that there was large latitude and individuality as to the dental units removed and their number. It shows features indicating strongly that it was essentially a ritual, sacrificial observance."

Once the essential facts are recognized, he says, it will not be difficult for trained anthropologists to detect instances of ritualistic tooth removal.

Recalls Words Of Gen. Lee.

To the Editor of The Star:

Marshal Petain said in his broadcast:

"Since our victory (22 years ago) the spirit of enjoyment took precedence of the spirit of sacrifice. We thought more of personal claims than of personal service. Our desire was to avoid effort. Today we face misfortune."

Yesterday at Harvard commencement I heard Carl Sandburg say that Freeman well chose this incident for the last paragraph of his four-volume biography of Robert E. Lee:

"A woman whose husband had been a soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia brought in a baby, a boy child, for Lee's blessing. He took the child in his arms and spoke these sacred words as he handed him back to her: 'Teach him to deny himself.'"

And Theodore Roosevelt taught by deed and by word the need of the strenuous life both for the individual and for the Nation.

DELCEVARE KING.

Quincy, Mass.,
June 21.

THIS AND THAT

By Charles E. Tracewell.

"Dear Sir:

"I read your articles about birds each day with the greatest interest and am glad to say I have learned much by so doing.

"I live in the neighborhood of Soldiers' Home and for the first time I have noticed what appears to be a mockingbird and would appreciate any information you may be able to give regarding the habits of mockingbirds, as I know next to nothing about them.

"In fact, I am not sure that this bird is a mockingbird. It is approximately about the size of a robin and when in flight appears to have a whitish area or spot in the wings.

"He perches on the top of an aerial, the highest point in this vicinity, and sings the whole time he is there. He will frequently stay for a half or three-quarters of an hour, fly away and return and repeat the performance.

* * * *

"He sings different calls or songs, apparently going through his whole list, and then starts over and repeats.

"What I would like to know is when he sleeps, as I have heard him at all hours of the night and most of the day. I have never seen his mate. I am taking it for granted that it is the male that sings.

"Do mockingbirds imitate birds that inhabit the section where they make their home, or do they simply have a certain number of calls or songs regardless of the other birds in the neighborhood?

"I have heard this one going strong at 11 p.m., and again at 1:30 a.m., and also as late as 3:30 a.m., and evidently he has been singing continuously all night.

* * * *

"His song is so loud and clear that several neighbors have complained that it has kept them awake, as it sounds especially loud at 2 or 3 in the morning.

"Have you any data as to where they stay in the winter, and if this bird is what we think he is do you think he and his mate have nested here, and how long do they usually remain in this climate?

"Any and all information you can give me as to habits, etc., of these birds will be greatly appreciated.

"What I am especially interested in is if and when they sleep, if they travel in pairs, and, most important, whether they imitate the calls of birds of the same section or if they are given these calls by nature; in other words, do they start out knowing all the calls they sing, or do they learn others and add to their list as they grow older, and will this bird imitate calls of birds in Washington only, and if he were in Florida would he give the calls of birds there, or would he use the same in both places?

"I realize this letter is somewhat rambling, but have tried to let you know the points about this bird in which I am most interested. I have been watching your articles for some time, ever since this bird showed up, for some information as to their habits, but evidently persons in Washington do not have them singing at their back doors all night, or if they do are not particularly interested in this bird, which, to my mind, is one of the most interesting of all birds.

"Very truly, J. DE W."

* * * *

Mockingbirds are born with a certain number of songs, but during their first few years they pick up a great many more, mainly their own interpretation of the songs of other birds.

This means that the mocker is a real musician.

Washington is fortunate in being just on the border of the South, so that a few specimens stay here with us all winter.

Perhaps no bird has been written about more than the mockingbird. This column has printed an unending succession of letters, of which the present sample is one, dealing with this bird.

* * * *

The mockingbird can only learn other songs where he is during the singing season, so that if he stays here all winter, and chooses to nest here, his repertoire consists of songs he has heard hereabouts.

If the specimen in a local garden in the summer has just flown up from the South, it may have many songs of birds peculiar to that region.

Usually the male remains here, the female not being seen until spring.

Every mockingbird's repertoire consists of all the songs it has ever heard, at least those which somehow made an impression on it.

Nobody knows just why it tries to imitate some one bird, does not try to imitate the song of another, but no doubt this depends upon its range of notes, and whether it finds the imitation easy or difficult.

* * * *

There can be little question that we often hear the mocker learning some new song, but we do not realize this, since this fellow is always making sounds, as our correspondent notes.

They like to sing on moonlight nights. Although they are the most persistent night singers in this vicinity, they are not the only ones. Sometimes deep in the night a robin will "cut loose" with a few strains. Sometimes the song sparrows chime up long before the magic hour of dawn. These singings, however, are merely in phrases; the bird immediately goes back to sleep.

Not so the mockingbird. When he is going good, he keeps it up for hours at a time, as if possessed.

He is able to get along with less sleep than most birds, evidently. There is no reason, after all, why birds need sleep from dusk to dawn, except that it is the custom.

The mockingbird, as one would expect of him, is a pioneer, trying to lead the other birds away from their stuffy old ideas of sleeping according to the ways of the centuries.

"Wake up!" he chortles. "Be modern! Don't you know that we are tearing down all the old standards and setting up new ones? Get going!"

Letters to the Editor

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although the use of a pseudonym for publication is permissible. The Star reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to condensation.

Blames American Delay For Allies' Defeats.

To the Editor of The Star:

If our Nation is forced into a war to defend our soil, the blame for it will lie squarely at the door of the isolationists and the pacifists. From the first, anyone with vision could see—and many did—that their course would get us into war, instead of keeping us out of it. The way to keep out was to help the Allies win. They were perfectly willing to do all the fighting. We had only to sell them sufficient planes and munitions for which they were ready to pay. We were not expected to shed a drop of blood. It would have been easy for us.

But the isolationists would not have it so. Congress wrangled and dawdled about help for the Allies (as for Finland) till too late.

So the Allies had to fight, half armed, an enemy armed to the teeth.

Today, gallant France is beaten to her knees. And Britain is facing destruction. Possibly, now that she has a man for a Premier, instead of a mouse, she may survive. But the odds are terrific.

We could have prevented this and protected ourselves at the same time.

The Allies victorious, we could have kept on our easy going, vulnerable way, with nobody to attack us. But the Allies defeated! Even the isolationists now are beginning to see—too late—that when Hitler gets through mopping up Europe, he will come over after us. Hence this frenzied defense program, which bids fair to bankrupt us, but which, due to the blindness of the pacifists, has become urgently necessary.

I am for peace. Every woman is. But not at any price. There are some things worse even than the horrors of modern war.

I am not one of those who fear the utter collapse of all civilization in Hitler's wake. That will never be. Such a man, with absolutely no inhibitions, and no honor to lose, can go far, for a time.

But an empire, founded on lies, treachery, greed and hatred, cannot endure.

The Allies would have fought the battle, if we had given them the weapons they so desperately needed. But we did not.

And so I fear now that finally our Nation, as the last of the democracies, may have to be the one to overthrow that evil.

NELLA FOUNTAINE BRINCKLEY.
June 18.

Discusses Means Of Resisting Hitler.

To the Editor of The Star:

Do we believe that Hitler intends to dominate the world? I submit that we cannot afford to believe otherwise. It is the only safe presumption. If it proves correct, and we arm to prevent it, then we shall live on as a free Nation. Armed to defy it, though it proves false, we will have gained the power to subdue other gangsterlike nations whom we, and most of the world have ample cause to challenge.

So let us make this safe presumption, and let us assume that it is desirable, even from a selfish viewpoint, to prevent such domination. Then, it seems to me, there are two general courses of action available to us. Neither of these may attain success, but if one, upon analysis, appears better than the other, it behooves us to adopt it immediately.

One of the two courses is to go "all out," conscript wealth and men, recess all unnecessary activities, bend every effort toward building an American juggernaught, and, in the meanwhile, render all possible aid to Britain (the best we could do would probably be to convoy food, supplies and arms across the Atlantic). This plan involves the risk of retaliation by Hitler, but its far-reaching benefits appear to discount this risk. At the head of the list of benefits is the sheer psychological effect upon the people who are already defending freedom as we know it—France would fight on, Turkey would keep her pledge and other smaller nations would join as they did in the first World War. A second benefit would be the opposite psychological effect upon the aggressors—the active opposition of a nation with immense resources. A third would be the delay to the conquerors, thus giving us more time to prepare before engaging in major warfare—this is an axiom of tactics. A fourth benefit is the invaluable training afforded our forces in the convoying operations; the knowledge gained by Hitler's forces in Poland and Norway was a major factor of their smashing success in the Low Countries and France—no amount of peacetime training is equal to the smallest amount of actual combat. To me, the last two benefits standing alone outweigh whatever risk is involved. Unaided, far-flung vulnerable Britain may be conquered within a few months. Should this happen we will stand alone, the small nations will be afraid to support us even as Turkey now hesitates to support Britain, and we will not even approach the preparedness of the aggressor.

The other course is that now being pursued, aid for Britain (steps short of armed aid) and preparation for national defense, superimposed upon our regular peacetime activities. The single advantage of this plan is the lesser risk of retaliation by Hitler. Its disadvantages are many, the worst of which is that years instead of months will be required to reach any substantial degree of preparedness. In failing to insure a flow of war materials into Britain by the use of armed convoys, we simply advance the date when we will have to face the full fury of Hitler. Capitulation by Britain involving the possible acquisition of her fleet by Hitler would practically render us impotent and defenseless.

JOHN ALLEN MATTHEWS.
June 21.

Quotes Ancient Dramatist In Behalf of Peace.

To the Editor of The Star:

The following lines, written by the Greek poet, Aristophanes, seem especially applicable to the present barbaric period in which bloody belligerency has all but supplanted rest and peace:

"From the outcry and subtlety of hatreds
Give us rest * * *
Fuse again the kindreds of nations,
With nobler purposes touch our souls."

EDMUND K. GOLDSBOROUGH.
June 23.

Answers To Questions

By Frederic J. Haskin.

A reader can get the answer to any question of fact by writing The Evening Star Information Bureau, Frederic J. Haskin, director, Washington, D. C. Please inclose stamp for reply.

Q. Which is the coldest of the Great Lakes?—M. B. R.

A. Lake Superior is the most northern and the coldest of the lakes. Even summer rarely brings its temperature much above 40 degrees F. and until late in May its ports are icebound.

Q. Who trains Midnight, the black leopard that appeared in the Tarzan movies?—J. C.

A. Olga Celeste of Los Angeles is the animal's trainer.

Q. What is the inscription on the Alice Freeman Palmer bells at the University of Chicago?—B. L. M.

A. The dedicatory inscription on the chimes of bells in Mitchell Tower, University of Chicago, in memory of Alice Freeman Palmer reads: "Joyfully to Recall Alice Freeman Palmer, Dean of Women in the University, 1892-1895, These Bells Make Music."

Q. Is Mayor La Guardia a Mason?—J. R.

A. He is a life member of Garibaldi Lodge No. 542.

Q. Please give the origin of the sabbatical year.—L. C. B.

A. In ancient Hebrew law, the sabbatical year was every seventh year during which fields were to lie fallow. The term is now applied to a year's vacation awarded to teachers after a certain number of years.

Q. What are some of the chief chair designs that were executed by Hepplewhite?—J. D. S.

A. Among his most famous chair designs are the shield, the oval and the heart-back, carved with the Prince of Wales feather, wheat ear and honeysuckle motifs. Mahogany was his favorite wood and he exemplified its superb qualities by his excellent carvings and designs.

Q. Who wrote the song, "Can't You Hear Me Callin', Caroline?"—C. C. P.

A. The words are by William Gardener and the music by Caro Roma.

Q. What is the largest tuna fish ever caught by rod and reel?—D. B.

A. The record catch of 792 pounds was made by Thomas Howell, Chicago financier, at Liverpool, Nova Scotia. This fish is reported to have weighed 12 pounds more than the one caught by Zane Grey.

Q. What is the source of the quotation "Beware when the Great God lets loose a thinker on this planet?"—F. W. K.

A. It is from the Essays of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Q. Why is it believed that rain on St. Swithin's Day means rain for 40 days thereafter?—M. C. H.

A. When the body of St. Swithin was about to be removed to Winchester Cathedral, in 971, after his canonization, violent rains fell, delaying the removal for 40 days. Hence the legend that if it rains on his feast day, July 15, it will rain thereafter for 40 days.

Q. What is the name of the prominent man who returned a decoration which had been given him by Hitler?—R. V. C.

A. Thomas J. Watson, president of the International Business Machines Corp., returned the Merit Cross of the German Eagle which had been bestowed on him in 1939 for his promotion of world peace and trade.

Q. Who played the parts of Lennie and George in the original stage production of "Of Mice and Men?"—R. S.

A. Wallace Ford played the part of George and Broderick Crawford enacted the role of Lennie.

Q. What is the shortest major league baseball game ever played?—H. J. S.

A. The shortest baseball game was played by New York of the National League against Philadelphia on September 28, 1919, in 51 minutes.

Q. How strong are the tendrils of a Virginia creeper?—H. T. P.

A. The flat disks at the end of the tendrils secrete a cement-like substance so strong that a single tendril with five branches will support a weight of 10 pounds.

Q. Please give the derivation of the word carat.—C. S. L.

A. It is derived from the Arabic word qirat, meaning a bean or seed. In ancient times the seeds of the coral and carob trees were used as weights for precious stones, which were described as being of so many "beans weight" or "qirats."

Q. From what poem is the line "Breathes there a man with soul so dead?"—J. F. B.

A. It is from "Lay of the Last Minstrel," by Sir Walter Scott.

Q. What was the first advertising agency in the United States?—S. L. A.

A. The first advertising agency was established in Philadelphia by Volney B. Palmer in 1840. Later offices were established in Boston and New York.

Q. How is the first syllable of Mussolini's name pronounced?—C. E.

A. It is pronounced as if spelled moos.

This Month of Roses

No other June can ever mean so much
To us, for while fulfillment claims its own
With every opening rose, we hear the moan
Of tortured souls, see age fleeing on crutch
From lovely, old-world gardens where beauty such
As Keats once joined to truth when he, alone,
Pointed the way of life, holds all they've known
From other Junes and dies with Hitler's touch.

This month of roses in a distant land
Yields only thorns for their fulfillment time—
But roots of gallantry no war lords quell.
We have the faith that they will yet withstand
The turmoil of a people's final climb
To vales of peace where children safely dwell.

EVELYN NORCROSS SHERRILL.