

## These United States—X\*

# The State of Maine—"Down East"

By ROBERT HERRICK

IN my boyhood about Boston they called that part of the United States which lies between the White Mountains and the Canadian province of New Brunswick, with two hundred and more miles of fretted sea-coast from Eastport to Portsmouth—"Down East." It has been "the State of Maine" for only a hundred years, previously having been attached more or less uncertainly to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and it was not until 1850 that Massachusetts finally relinquished her undivided half interest in all the Maine State lands. With its 33,000 square miles of territory (still mostly in forest), 5,000 odd streams of sufficient size to be mapped, 1,500 large lakes, 400 sea-coast islands of over a thousand acres each, and several respectable mountains—about half of all this being still in "unorganized townships," "plantations," and "ranges" without names—the State of Maine is a considerable province, almost as extensive as the remaining five States of the New England group, with but three-quarters of a million people in it. In character Maine always was and still is a province by itself, distinctive from its neighboring States. The coastwise steamers, which still ply much as they did in my youth between its river ports and Boston, bring with the salt fish, lobsters, lumber, hay, and potatoes a special breed of rugged, ungainly, stalwart New Englander. For a half century and more "Down East" has been famous as a vacation land of romantic variety, with its roadless forests, rivers and inland lakes, Indians and moccasins, deep bays dotted with rocky, spruce-covered islands. The tail of the province running south from Portland to the Piscataqua has never been wholly characteristic, but to wake in the early morning as the Bangor boat rounded Owl's Head Light into Rockland, to see looming through the fog dim outlines of rocky coast and wooded islands, to smell the brine of cold sea water rolling clean against granite ledges was to realize that one had reached a far country, altogether different from well-tamed Massachusetts. It was much the same, if one descended from the exotic Pullman almost anywhere within the borders of the State to smell the pungent odor of fresh sawdust and cut lumber, with blueberries lying purple on the burnt pine barrens and raspberries hanging from roadside bushes. There was always, in my memory, something strong, wholesome, rugged, untamed and romantic, about the Maine of those days, and more than most parts of the modern world Maine has kept its native quality, moral and physical. Indeed, whatever may be left of that famous old New England, some time puritan and always protestant, will be found today more purely and abundantly here in Maine than elsewhere. The types of faces, the habits, and the ideas are much like those I remember in the Massachusetts of thirty years ago. It is the last stronghold of the Puritan.

Of Maine's three-quarters of a million of inhabitants

today, five-sevenths are of native-born white stock, less than one-seventh of foreign parentage (mainly French Canadians), with only a thousand Negroes and less than a thousand Indians. Where else in the United States can be found an equal homogeneity of Anglo-Saxon blood? And in spite of the annual influx of a half million of strangers, who have discovered the beauty and the freedom of Maine, in spite of the estimated thirty million dollars which they pay for their summer vacations, except for a thin fringe of parasitic "resorts," with their corruptions, mainly along the southern sea-coast, this great province has never turned itself into a summer boarding-house like New Hampshire. Within its ample borders, along its lakes and rivers and sea-coast, it can absorb such an enormous transient population without noticeable interference with its own proper activities. These are many, and all basic. Wood pulp, lumber, hay, potatoes, apples, blueberries, sweet corn, building stone, lime, fish—these are the characteristic products of this northern land—and one must not forget ships and sailors! Maine is prosperous. Out of its many farms and inexhaustible forests much wealth has been taken. There are few cities and none of sufficient size to have become a plague spot. Here and there are textile mills, mostly scattered in small towns, so that the industrial population has never become massed, nor a preponderant element in any community. In short, in spite of its many resources, not least an abundant water power, Maine is not developed industrially to the maximum—and may that day never come! Such wealth as it has has largely been taken out of the soil and the sea and is pretty widely distributed. Even after the Great War and its eruptive profiteering there are, I suspect, few millionaires in Maine, and there are few miserably poor or unemployed. Rarely even in the back country does one come across a squalid farm, and I know of no slum street in its few cities. Thus as a whole in Maine there is a stable condition of comfort, self-reliance, non-parasitic occupation common in the New England of a previous generation, which makes for sturdiness, individualism, and conservatism. Maine is not so much reactionary as stationary.

That, I suppose, is why Maine has been found so often in the Republican ranks at national elections. Its people learned their political faith in the Civil War and have found no reason to abandon it, all the more as Republican tariffs look closely after Canadian competition and its long sea coast provides ample opportunity for Federal "recognition" of one sort or another. For they still believe in high tariffs in Maine and in strictly partisan government. The State has sent to Washington such men as Blaine, Dingley, Reed, and Hale, typical perhaps of the Republican Party ideal of statesmanship not merely in Maine. But except for the fact that Maine votes in September and is therefore the subject of much earnest party solicitude, to see that her citizens continue to set a good example to other States, I do not feel that national politics play a large part in the life of Maine. (The two matters which are most negligible in the psychology of the true American are his religion and his politics.) In State and local politics Maine well illustrates the theory that

\* Reproduction forbidden. Quotation limited to 300 words. Copyright, 1922. The Nation, Inc. All rights reserved.

This is the tenth article in the series entitled These United States. The first was on the State of Kansas by William Allen White (April 19), the second on Maryland by H. L. Mencken (May 3), the third on Mississippi by Beulah Amidon Ratliff (May 17), the fourth on Vermont by Dorothy Canfield Fisher (May 31), the fifth on New Jersey by Edmund Wilson, Jr. (June 14), the sixth on Utah by Murray E. King (June 28), the seventh on South Carolina by Ludwig Lewisohn (July 12), the eighth on Nevada by Anne Martin (July 26), and the ninth on Ohio by Sherwood Anderson (August 9).

the less government the better for those governed, for the State legislature with an admirable self-restraint meets but once in two years and then only for a three months' session, chiefly concerned with game laws and road building. For the rest the famous town-meeting still flourishes in Maine, once a year at least, and the actual administration of its large, rambling townships (often fifty square miles and more in area) is left to the selectmen, who presumably give their communities as much good government as they will pay for. In a word Maine is the least-governed and therefore the best-governed American State that I know. Fortunately the prizes are not rich enough to attract heavy grafters, and there are many leisurely eyes and ears to supervise the activities of public servants.

Maine, it must not be forgotten, is an intensely individualistic community. A few of its more advanced thinkers may regret that the State disposed of all its forest lands, a precious heritage, for as little as twelve cents the acre to private exploiters, lumber companies, and pulp manufacturers, but no doubt if the question recurred today the folly would be sanctioned by popular vote, notwithstanding the fact that the income derived from these forest tracts might have made Maine a very rich State, with good bridges and roads and a modernized school system, all without cost to its citizens. But like good Americans everywhere Maine prefers to give away its natural wealth to greedy individuals and issue bonds for its public needs. The story of the looting of the pine woods is monotonously the same from the Penobscot to Michigan, to Wisconsin, and now in Washington and Oregon.

If politically and economically Maine is simple, "stalwart" American, it should not be overlooked that the State was "advanced" in the matter of prohibition. It went "dry" two generations before the nation passed the amendment. Not quite dry! There were always zones of dryness from the well-saturated border towns to the more arid interior about the State House at Augusta. For Maine administered its prohibition temperately and intermittently, like prudent New Englanders: those who wanted to remain dry could do so without much temptation, and those who wished to drink might do so with circumspection. But the act had the support of the people of the State. It is characteristic of Maine that it believed in prohibition and tried to get it long before other States in the Union strove for this ideal. Something of the puritan tradition of discipline has lingered here into these relaxed days. . . .

The backwoods, the wilderness and the frontier, also a stern ocean, have never been far from man's consciousness in this easterly province. It is not surprising, then, that the lighter, the more suave growths of civilization are not much in evidence. Architecturally, except for a few handsome examples of old colonial to be found in coast towns like Wiscasset, Gardiner, and Portland, Maine is bleaker than its more southerly neighbors, where there has been greater wealth, ease, and ready intercourse. The usual Maine farmhouse is a strong plain affair, too steep in the roof (to stand heavy snowfalls), too heavy and angular, perched on big granite blocks, connected by a long shed with an even larger barn, equally homely. Even in the older inland towns size and substantiality count for much more than grace of line and proportion. Timber is cheap, winters long and rude, and the Maine man is not given to adornment, to prettiness. Yet perched on the hills—and I think that Maine farmhouses are more frequently placed on high ground than in other New

England States as if to survey the approach of possibly hostile strangers—with a broad fall of plowed land and pasture and backed by heavy "dark growth," these rude white buildings have a solidity and abidingness about them which make them part of the rugged landscape. One realizes that each fertile farm is the result of a long struggle with an unyielding nature, to which generations of tenacious, strong men have given themselves. The fishermen's houses along the coast and on the many islands are smaller than the inland farmhouses, equally white and graceless, and dotted with a pleasant irregularity about the waterfront, their faces turned often to the open sea, quite negligent of the road, because from the sea comes the struggle and the livelihood. All these outer aspects of old Maine are, of course, undergoing change, being gradually overlaid with new and cheaper growths, as automobiles increase and the number of miles of passable roads. But Maine yields more slowly to new ways than other parts of the country, and it will be many a year before the "ranges" and "plantations" of the north have become tamed to the bungalow and garden hose. Meanwhile there are many "unspoiled" towns and villages, where except for the new garage the outer aspect of things is much what it was fifty years ago.

What the inner aspect is of the life in these towns and villages it would be more difficult to pronounce. Culturally Maine is proud of its old New England college, Bowdoin, of its State musical festival, of its newer schools, but culturally these days America seems too much of a muckness to be discriminating about. The trains run daily from the great cities of Boston and New York, and the *Saturday Evening Post*, the Hearst newspapers, the cinema reels, and the Hart Schaffner and Marx clothes penetrate, one and all, to the northernmost and easternmost corners of the province. What Maine has "done in literature" may be read of elsewhere. Maine is not primarily concerned with aesthetics. I think it never will be. That comes like the summer visitor superficially into men's and women's minds. I doubt if many inhabitants of the State are aware today that our most considerable American poet was born and has lived many years among them.

Maine is a great example of the prodigal beauty and richness of our America. From one of its innumerable hilltops you may look across whole counties of pine and fir and hemlock, dotted with farms and lakes, across to other ranges of blue hills, and to still other far-away misty mountain tops, or to the ledgy reefs and dark salt water of its broken coast. There is a sense of space and variety and wildness in Maine not to be felt elsewhere in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. The old province is not yet tamed and crowded. One can realize how those early adventurers felt when they sailed up to its coast out of the Atlantic—the Sieur de Monts, the Jesuit colonists, Captain John Smith, and all the others. The same fir-covered islands stand sentinel before the deep bays, the same fog hangs over the cold deep waters, the same vista of hills and wide upland rises from the coast, still wild, still pungent with many mingled scents of sea and land. There is still the sense of wide, free space. There is still the wilderness for background. So life remains "Down East" a little more like what it was in the days of the forefathers, when men came to this unknown Western world to be free, to win their right to survive by struggle with nature rather than with their fellow-men.

[The next article, to appear September 6, will be Delaware: The Ward of a Feudal Family, by Arthur Warner.]



# What Women Won in Wisconsin

By ZONA GALE

## TEXT OF WISCONSIN EQUAL RIGHTS LAW

SECTION 1. Women shall have the same rights and privileges under the law as men in the exercise of suffrage, freedom of contract, choice of residence for voting purposes, jury service, holding office, holding and conveying property, care and custody of children, and in all other respects. The various courts, executive and administrative officers shall construe the statutes where the masculine gender is used to include the feminine gender unless such construction will deny to females the special protection and privileges which they now enjoy for the general welfare. The courts, executive and administrative officers shall make all necessary rules and provisions to carry out the intent and purposes of this statute.

SECTION 2. Any woman drawn to serve as a juror, upon her request to the presiding judge or magistrate, before the commencement of the trial or hearing, shall be excused from the panel or venire.

THE extension of suffrage to include women left women with legal discriminations against them incompatible with citizenship. By what means would women best call the attention of lawmakers to these disabilities?

By amendment of individual statutes, one would say. But there had been introduced in the 1921 session of our Wisconsin Legislature a bill removing the most obvious discrimination—that of the right to jury duty. This bill, which was only an optional jury-service bill, passed the Senate but was defeated in the Assembly. Wisconsin women admitted to the State bar, admitted to the law school of the State University, and of course sharing in the franchise, still merely because they were women might not sit on a jury as the peers of an accused citizen. And, following the defeat of this jury bill, the judiciary committee of the Assembly introduced a bill expressly barring women from jury service.

This experience led in Wisconsin to the vision of the necessity for a proclamation of a general Bill of Rights for women, to build on. There is the point—to build on. This general grant of power lays down principles similar to the principles laid down in the constitutional Bill of Rights. We know that it must be followed by specific legislation in those instances—and many may arise—in which the issues are not clear. But we hold that a foundation is necessary on which to build, for the guidance of future legislators; and that this foundation is the proclamation of rights embodied in the Wisconsin Equal Rights Law.

Women are going to be vigilant to work for the amendment of individual statutes as these issues arise; and in approaching the legislature Wisconsin women will now have the moral backing of their Bill of Rights. Freudians tell us that an inferiority complex endangers any undertaking, and perhaps this law will operate to sweep away the inferiority complex—not in the minds of women, who have been getting rid of it for some time, but in the opinions which legislators sometimes hold in regard to the rights of women.

The following instances of the actual working of the law in the twelve months since its passage may be cited: The Civil Service Commission of Milwaukee ruled that married women were not eligible to take civil-service examinations. Various women protested, and with the backing of Mayor

Hoan and Assistant City Attorney Babcock, both of whom said that this ruling was in direct violation of the Equal Rights Law, after several meetings and much argument gained their point.

Another instance was in regard to two new policewomen. Women had worked hard for the establishment of these posts. Imagine their dismay when it was announced in the newspapers that married women would be barred. The women again protested. The city officials replied that the newspapers had misstated the case, and that the Equal Rights Law would not permit them to discriminate against married women.

A Wisconsin woman moved with her husband to Montana where he was engaged in the mining business. When their son was of college age this woman returned to Wisconsin to live so that he could enter the State University. The husband remained with his business in Montana. The university ruled that since the husband's home was in Montana the wife also lived in Montana, that the boy was therefore non-resident and must pay tuition. It was not until after our Wisconsin Equal Rights Law was brought forward that the university ruled that the wife lived where she lived.

A Richland Center woman had been deprived of her vote because, although she and her husband live in town with their children, the husband keeps his voting residence in the country district where their farm lies. She could not leave her young children to go to the country to vote and had not voted since the passage of the national suffrage amendment. Under the Equal Rights Law she can now vote in the town where she lives.

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin rendered a decision on last July 7 ordering a Milwaukee teacher reinstated and awarding her back pay for the time she had been deprived of her position. The court held that her dismissal violated the Equal Rights Law. The teacher had been dismissed under a ruling made by the Milwaukee board that a married woman cannot "be transferred, promoted, or permanently appointed to regular teaching positions." The teacher who was dismissed was married March 5, 1921, but continued to use her maiden name and did not inform the school board of her marriage until the following August 30. On September 15, 1921, she was discharged by the school board under the ruling quoted above. Among other specific charges brought against her and on which she was discharged was the failure to report her name promptly and the fact that after her marriage she had signed her maiden name to the school records.

These cases are good examples of the superior merit of a general bill. If we had passed a specific bill in Wisconsin instead of one establishing the general Equal Rights principle it would not have touched points such as these.

Harry Slattery of the District of Columbia Bar makes the following statement on the Equal Rights campaign:

The adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment . . . enfranchised the women of the United States . . . but it did not provide as thousands of good folk think it did that women should have the same rights and privileges under the Constitution and laws of the United States as men. It did not remove civil or legal disabilities, inequalities, or other discriminations of law against women by reason of sex or marriage. . . . In fact the suffrage