

holiday at fly-the-garter; from Gray to Gay, from 'Little to Shakespeare.'"

In the last letter he sent, written when he had not two months more to live—when already he had been living, or rather, as he said, lingering through a "posthumous life" and daily asking when it would end—he rode "the little horse, and, at my worst, even in quarantine, summoned up more puns, in a sort of desperation, in one week than in any year of my life."

In the pensive gayness of Lamb there is a quieter order of things, a calmer quality, a gentler spirit

of fun and maturer perception. The presence of lifelong objective sorrow with which Keats was less deeply acquainted, as well as continual personal grief, casts a lower tone of restraint and sweet evenness over the older man's work. But the feeling for the humorous was as deep in the one as in the other, and droll, though never eccentric, the freshness of their mirth remains. This element of humor is the point of superiority over Marlowe whom Keats in many respects resembled, and is another step in his approach to Shakespeare.

FERDINAND REYHER.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Angell Replies

SIR: Your correspondent, Mr. S. N. Patten, is very positive that I have not "thought these things out, or even become conscious of the principles involved," when I suggest that in the event of America and Germany being engaged in war this country could advantageously omit as much as possible of the killing, and limit its action, as far as possible, to the organization of that economic pressure which war in any case includes. "Mr. Angell may innocently imagine," goes on Mr. Patten, "that a boycott of German goods would hurt Germany, but aid, or at least not injure America"; whereas "just a bit more thinking" on my part would show that since "less trade or less profitable trade kills off children," the kind of war I propose is "not only lower in moral tone, but also more destructive of life than the sort now being waged."

Which shows in its turn also that though Mr. Patten may know what I have and have not thought on the subject of international economics, he obviously does not know what I have said and written thereon.

Not only was I aware, but I have said with very great emphasis in articles antedating considerably Mr. Patten's criticism, that for America to sever intercourse with Germany would of course be costly, as any punitive measure of organized society is costly; our policemen and our prisons cost quite a good deal. I have gone farther and shown that the proposed measure would involve injustice and hardship to innocent parties, just as when we send the breadwinner of a family to jail we probably punish the innocent wife and children far more severely than the guilty convict. But what I have urged also is that the proposed measure would embody these disadvantages to a less degree than war in the ordinary sense, which includes them all and the killing as well; that in so far as non-intercourse lends itself more readily than war to international organization, and could, in its operation, be more easily linked to the decisions of an international court (which was part of my proposal), it would bring us nearer than does the clash of great military forces to the realization of a common policy looking to the restraint of aggression, to the organization of the common social will of Christendom, and tend to make the war with Germany more a matter of compelling a recalcitrant member of the society of nations to respect that will, and less a matter of mere struggle for power between rival empires.

Moreover, if as the result of Germany's attitude America were led to adopt such a policy as I have outlined, her

position would be by all odds morally preferable to, more open and sincere than, the one which she is actually occupying.

For of course that economic warfare which Mr. Patten regards as so immoral is now being waged by the United States against Germany. Not, however, frankly and overtly, as the declared policy of the country, as part of a plan openly adopted for using the coercive forces of society for common social ends predetermined by the nations as a whole, but by virtue of a diplomatic make-believe. The country's action is based on a "neutrality" which is obviously a diplomatic fiction.

America, by placing loans, munitions and supplies at the disposal of Germany's enemies, when—in the opinion, among others, of THE NEW REPUBLIC several times emphatically expressed—she could with equal regard to formal neutrality withhold them, is to-day exercising an economic pressure against Germany so great that it will prove perhaps the deciding factor of the war. But while American public opinion (which, had Germany's conduct been different, would have insisted upon an embargo on arms and the refusal of financial aid to her enemies) thus throws American economic forces against the Teuton, the American government, as representing the American nation, is placed in the position of maintaining a pretense of "neutrality"—is, in other words, continually justifying its action on grounds which it knows and everyone knows not to be the real grounds. It would be infinitely better from the point of view of political morals and the future of real internationalism that the American government should be able to base publicly its action upon its real motive and say to Germany: "Your enemies receive our money and munitions because you have violated a code the maintenance of which is essential to our security as to that of the nations as a whole." And for thus urging that America's justification of her action should conform with realities—for advocating, in other words, a policy that would place the American government in the position of being able to tell the simple truth to the very great advantage of the world as a whole—I am held up to your readers by Mr. Patten as adopting a moral standard so base that he cannot bring himself to describe it!

I did not reply to Mr. Patten's first criticism because it seemed to me so clearly the outcome of an incomplete knowledge of what the proposal was that he was criticizing. But his last letter would seem to suggest that he makes a point of not reading those whom he criticizes. Notwith-

standing that Mrs. Whicher had pointed out very simply and clearly that the proposal under discussion does not include anything that warfare in the ordinary sense does not include, Mr. Patten still loftily reproves her (and me) for superficiality of thought in failing to realize that since "less trade, or less profitable trade, reduces population and kills off children," the new kind of warfare would be not only "lower in moral tone, but more destructive of life than the sort now being waged." Does the sort now being waged permit, then, of trade with the enemy? Is not England using her navy for the express purpose of ensuring commercial non-intercourse with Germany? And if we went to war "as now waged," should we not include with the shutting off of trade with the enemy, and add to the killing of the children by our non-intercourse, the killing of their fathers by our bullets?

If Mr. Patten's phrase means anything it means that the "kind of war now waged" by (say) England allows of trade with the enemy for the benefit of his civil population. Are we to understand that Mr. Patten believes that that is the way the war is now being waged?

When Mr. Patten writes of my "innocently imagining" that non-intercourse would "aid, or at least not injure America," and proceeds to deliver a little lecture upon the mutuality of trade losses, he suggests to your readers that I am not fitted by even the most elementary economic knowledge to discuss this matter at all. May I submit that a suggestion of that kind should not be made—especially by one who takes his stand upon the very highest moral grounds—unless the critic has the most unquestionable proof that he is correctly interpreting the work of the author he criticizes. Yet even a cursory glance at the books in which I happen to have dealt with the economics of international relations must have convinced Mr. Patten that I have emphasized, to a degree that has led my critics to accuse me of giving a quite disproportionate place to it, the element of interdependence in international affairs. Anyone knowing even the general tenor of what I have written could not possibly suppose me likely to imagine, "innocently" or otherwise, that America could escape her share of loss which non-intercourse with Germany would involve.

I am not blaming Mr. Patten for not reading my very dull books; that is an offense he shares, I am sorry to say for the sake of my royalty account, with all but a very select and of course discerning few in Europe and this country. But while he is at liberty not to read an author, he is not at liberty to leave him unread and then, from the vantage point of quite overpowering moral altitudes, assure the public of the immorality of this unread author's doctrine, and to ascribe to him beliefs that he does not happen to possess.

NORMAN ANGELL.

New York City.

Musical Differences

SIR: The unquestionably well-intentioned letter of Alice Damrosch Pennington in your issue of September 25th, attempting to make corrections in Mr. H. K. Moderwell's splendid article "On Acquiring New Ears," prompts me to say a few words on the subject.

First let me say that Mr. Moderwell, analyzing keenly in this article the relation of futurist music to music of an earlier day, has pointed out, as has no one writing on the subject, the essential difference between Beethoven and Schoenberg, if you will have it so. Sanely and far-sightedly he shows how we must listen to the new music. Ped-

ants interest themselves in how this new music is written; Mr. Moderwell has suggested, and wisely, that the analysis of this music—if it proves in time to be really worth while—will come later; that at present we must learn how to listen to it.

In answering Mrs. Pennington Mr. Moderwell rightly states that neither Roussell's "Le Festin l'Araignée" nor Ducasse's "Le Joli Jeu de Furet" can be called "futuristic." He suggests that the excerpt from Ravel's "Daphnis and Chloe," which Mr. Damrosch performed last season, may be considered futuristic. I beg to differ in regard to this work with Mr. Moderwell, and I am certain that many musicians will agree with me that this Ravel music is simply good modern French music.

May I be permitted to make a correction about Stravinsky's "Fireworks"? Mrs. Pennington states that "Mr. Walter Damrosch, in his regular series of New York Symphony Society concerts, has produced many works of Stravinsky and Ravel." Mr. Moderwell names the Stravinsky piece as being that composer's "Fireworks." It has not been given by Mr. Damrosch. "Fireworks" was produced two years ago by Josef Stransky at one of the concerts of the New York Philharmonic Society. Previous to that it had a very unsatisfactory presentation by the Russian Symphony Orchestra. I wish to applaud Mr. Moderwell for stating that "Fireworks" is not real Stravinsky; it is no more representative of this interesting Polish composer than is "Rienzi" of Wagner, or "Monna Vanna" of Maeterlinck.

A. WALTER KRAMER.

New York City.

Calls New Republic Pro-German

SIR: I have read your paper since it started, with great profit and on the whole with great delight. But I have felt a cumulating irritation at much of your attitude toward the war, an irritation which was much rasped by Mr. Bourne's article in your issue of September 4th, "American Use for German Ideals," an article which out-Germaned the Germans in its claims for universal German supremacy. Then came the very hard and cynical editorial in your issue of September 11th, "If Germany Wins." You have declared in the past that "German victory would be dangerous to the security of the United States and would temporarily bring national ambitions into conflict with democratic ideals." But this editorial seems to indicate that you are getting amazingly well reconciled to the possibility of German success.

The writer of the editorial does not say that he prefers German success. But I cannot see how anyone who reads the editorial can escape the conclusion that German success is his actual preference. Only one who preferred German success could think that such a settlement as that he outlines was possible. He does not consider the inevitable results of such a settlement. He admits that the German kingdoms would take a large part of the Balkans, a shocking result surely. He does not dwell on the tragedy of that result. He does not even mention many other tragic results which would follow so terrible a settlement. He says that probably Germany would give up Belgium. But she would not give it up in trade. In short, she would profit by her crime. The editorial assumes that England and France would not be crushed, and says that for a generation Germany would be too busy to disturb Great Britain or the Monroe Doctrine. What a pleasant generation that would be. We should have almost civil war with the German-Americans here, who would want us to follow

the conqueror's chariot. We should be in daily fear of Germany. Your editorial belittles the English fears of vassalage to Germany. But there is a vassalage of the spirit as well as of the flesh. England and the United States might not be subject to the German "*verboten*," but we should be subject to the fear of Germany. We might not be subject to a tangible German bureaucrat, but we should be subject to his methods. Vassalage to the damnable German theories of government is as stifling as vassalage to German bayonets. We should have to despotize and militarize our institutions in order to get ready to fight her. Democracy would have to step aside for that generation.

But who knows that Germany would give us a generation in which to get ready for that inevitable conflict? Nations drunk with victory do not feel the exhaustion of war. They are like victorious athletes intoxicated by success. Germany would have a new purpose, new strength for new aggression. The megalomania of her past would be nothing compared to the megalomania of her future.

The result to Germany would be as terrible as that to us. Autocracy would be triumphant, reaction firmly entrenched. No Social Democratic party, craven as it has proved to be, could ever budge it. If Germany wins, to continue your editorial, Zaborin wins, the Hohenzollern wins, the German system wins.

No American journal ought to admit that Germany may win unless in the same breath it urges that the United States take its place where it long since has belonged, at the side of the Allies. Our country dreams on and you do not try to help rouse it. If we enter the war free government is sure to win. Personally I still believe that it will win without us. But it will take longer and will cost infinitely more in lives to defeat Germany without us than with us. But it will still be done. I can understand the world on no other basis. I not only believe that Germany will lose, but I believe that her system, which is a materialistic despotism, will also lose. I prefer to believe that the inevitable victor of the war is a different system, democracy.

EDWARD R. LEWIS.

The Fading Masculinist

SIR: All roads used to lead to Rome; nowadays all discussion leads to feminism. Somebody wrote a few quaint, innocent words about "The Chances of Being Married"; THE NEW REPUBLIC printed them; Mr. DeWitt C. Wing muttered something like: "Let the women talk less and mind their family obligations"; and the writer has forgotten all about his own and everyone else's matrimonial chances at the numerous and exhilarating possibilities offered by Mr. Wing's letter.

To begin with, deny it roundly as he may, Mr. Wing has contributed a slogan to the so-called feminist movement. A little long, perhaps, for a first-rate slogan; still, a very good effort. Here it is: "The overwhelming majority of men—the steady, unpoetic, breadwinning workers . . . are incapable of appreciating independent, highly accomplished women." It will be observed that the descriptive clause, "who are best qualified physiologically to mate," is omitted. That is unfortunate but quite necessary. Were it to be retained, and were some careless suffragist to replace "steady, unpoetic, breadwinning workers" by "stolid, lugubrious, money-grubbing workers" an extra issue might be provoked.

Did it perhaps occur to Mr. Wing that the fact that a majority of men are incapable of appreciating independent, accomplished women, is precisely what rankles with some people?

But no, Mr. Wing is a masculinist. He thrills when men "get together, apart from their wives, and recover the joy and content of being frankly what they are." He undoubtedly reacts a little when a big man with a close-cropped mustache plants his fist in the center of the table, or when a group of successful hardware dealers bandy great political truths in low, slow, portentous tones. Personally, I have not so felt the stout impact of masculinity since drinking large steins of beer, frowning heavily, and reciting—with my fellow sophomores—Gelett Burgess's:

"Leave the lady, Willy, let the racket rip!"

It is because of their "secret, personal attitude toward women," says Mr. Wing, that men "merely smile and look on while the female social ferment 'works.'" And because of his own secret personal attitude Mr. Wing is doubtless smiling and looking on at me. Maybe it is as well that way as another; Mr. Wing—representing a class—and the Cheshire cat will continue merely smiling, and looking on, and fading, until merciful oblivion shall encompass them both.

JOHN LOWREY SIMPSON.

San Francisco, Cal.

Chance for Another Constitution

SIR: In your issue of October 2nd you expressed the opinion that the proposed constitution for this state should be adopted by the people at the election next month. You concede that there are a number of things in the proposed paper with which you do not agree, but you say that the good points in the instrument counterbalance those which you do not favor.

Why should not the constitution in its present shape be voted down by the people? The provisions which are admirable can be passed by the legislature at its next session and again at the session in 1917, so that they will come before the people at the election in November, 1917, and if then adopted they will be in force from January 1st, 1918, only two years later than if adopted next month.

In my judgment there are a number of provisions in the paper which should not be ratified by the people. In fact, the convention seemed to have lost sight of the most important matter that should have been considered, namely, the improvement of the organization of the legislature. It was certainly a great mistake on the part of the convention not to submit to the electors a series of questions, so that the voters could exercise their own discretion on the various points presented by the amendments. For instance, there could have been a provision for the appointment of all the judges in the state by the governor, which was favored by the State Bar Association. There could also have been submitted the question as to whether the members of the Senate should not be elected for a term of four years and the members of the Assembly for a term of two years. The proposal as to home rule in cities and counties should form the subject of another question.

I understand that in twenty-eight of the states of the Union constitutional conventions are required to present the amendments separately and not as has been done by our convention.

M. A. KURSHEEDT.

New York City.

VERSE

Reaping

You want to know what's the matter with me, do yer?
 My! ain't men blinder'n moles?
 It ain't nothin' new, be sure o' that.
 Why, ef you'd had eyes you'd ha' seen
 Me changin' under your very nose,
 Each day a little diff'rent.
 But you never see nothin', you don't.
 Don't touch me, Jake,
 Don't you dars't to touch me,
 I ain't in no humor.
 That's what's come over me;
 Jest a change clear through.
 You lay still, an' I'll tell yer,
 I've had it on my mind to tell yer
 Fer some time.
 It's a strain livin' a lie from mornin' till night,
 And I'm goin' to put an end to it right now.
 And don't make any mistake about one thing,
 When I married yer I loved yer,
 Why, your voice would make
 Me go hot and cold all over,
 And your kisses 'most stopped my heart from beatin'.
 Lord! I was a silly fool.
 But that's the way it was.
 Well, I married yer
 And thought heav'n was comin'
 To set on the doorstep.
 Heav'n didn't do no settin',
 Though the first year warn't so bad.
 The baby's fever threw you off some, I guess,
 And then I took her death real hard,
 And a mokey wife kind o' disgusts a man.
 I ain't blamin' yer exactly.
 But that's how it was.
 Do lay quiet,
 I know I'm slow, but it's harder to say'n I thought.
 There come a time when I got to be
 More wife agin than mother.
 The mother part was sort of a waste
 When we didn't have no other child.
 But you'd got used ter lots o' things,
 And yer was all took up with the farm.
 Many's the time I've laid awake
 Watchin' the moon go clear through the elm-tree,
 Out o' sight.
 I'd foller yer around like a dog,
 And set in the chair you'd be'n settin' in,
 Jest to feel its arms around me,
 So long's I didn't have yours.
 It preyed on me, I guess,
 Longin' and longin'
 While you was busy all day, and snorin' all night.
 Yes, I know you're wide awake now,
 But now ain't then,
 And I guess you'll think diff'rent
 When I'm done.
 Do you mind the day you went to Hadrock?
 I didn't want to stay home for reasons,

But you said some one'd have to be here
 'Cause Elmer was comin' to see't th' telephone.
 And you never see why I was so set on goin' with yer.
 Our married life hadn't be'n any great shakes,
 Still marriage is marriage, and I was raised Godfearin'.
 But, Lord, you didn't notice nothin',
 And Elmer hangin' around all Winter!
 It was a lovely mornin'.
 The apple-trees was jest elegant
 With their blossoms all flared out,
 And there warn't a cloud in the sky.
 You went, you wouldn't pay no attention to what I said,
 And I heard the Ford chuggin' for most a mile,
 The air was so still.
 Then Elmer come.
 It's no use your frettin', Jake,
 I'll tell you all about it.
 I know what I'm doin'
 And what's worse, I know what I did.
 Elmer fixed the telephone in about two minutes,
 And he didn't seem in no hurry to go,
 And I don't know as I wanted him to go either,
 I was awful mad at your not takin' me with yer,
 And I was tired o' wishin' and wishin'
 And gittin' no comfort.
 I guess it ain't necessary to tell you all the things.
 He stayed to dinner,
 And he helped me do the dishes,
 And he said a home was a fine thing,
 And I said dishes warn't a home,
 Nor yet the room they're in.
 He said a lot o' things,
 And I fended him off at first,
 But he got talkin' all around me,
 Clost up to the things I'd be'n thinkin'.
 What's the use o' me goin' on, Jake,
 You know.
 He got all he wanted,
 And I gave it to him,
 And what's more, I'm glad!
 I ain't dead, anyway.
 And somebody thinks I'm somethin'.
 Keep away, Jake,
 You can kill me to-morrow if you want to,
 But I'm going to have my say.
 Funny thing! Guess I ain't made to hold a man.
 Elmer ain't be'n here for mor'n two months.
 I don't want to pretend nothin';
 Maybe if he'd be'n lately
 I shouldn't ha' told yer.
 I'll go away in the mornin', o' course.
 What you want the light for?
 I don't look no diff'rent.
 Ain't the moon bright enough
 To look at a woman that's deceived yer by?
 Don't, Jake, don't, yer can't love me now!
 It ain't a question of forgiveness.
 Why! I'd be thinkin' o' Elmer ev'ry minute.
 It ain't decent.
 Oh, my God! It ain't decent any more either way!

AMY LOWELL.