

Mentis Trist

Never fear the phantom bird
Meditating in the Fens;
Night will come and quench your eyes,
Blind at last like other men's;
Never fear the tales you heard
In the rhetoric of lies.

Nothing here will challenge you,
Not the heron, tall and white,
Countersign upon the edge
Of the waterfall of night.
This is Avalon's canoe,
Eden murmurs in the sedge.

Here. My hand in pledge of rest.
Drift at random, all is well.
Twilight is a slow lagoon,
Dark will be a citadel.
Travellers who know the west
But report the waning moon.

In the citadel of peace
Hang the trophies of the world,
Yet no barons don their mail,
And no pennant is unfurled.
Daily robe, the Golden Fleece,
Daily cup, the Holy Grail.

ROBERT HILLYER.

Love Song

The delicate silver gates are closed, the road ahead is
paved with swords,
There's only the comfort of your breast, the arm's strength,
and gentle words
To meet the foam of the black stars a stinging wind flings
in our faces;
A bare room is the day's end, and a hard bed for our
bodies' places.

The tired limb, and the tight brow, and the strong clasp
of a hand hardened—
Only these, now the rose has gone, one with the years that
life pardoned
When your blue eyes that love deepened were more merry
and less brave,
Only these are ours, my dear, for what we give and what
we gave.

Yet only now that our eyes have seen there is no star on
the hills ahead
To guide through the ways that all have known, yet none
could mark, of men dead—
O only now, my dear, have we known the sole answer to
love's need:
The heart's dream, and the heart's strength, and the light
shed where the feet bleed.

GEORGE BRANDON SAUL.

CORRESPONDENCE

American Responsibility for French Policy

SIR: In your editorial *Militarism—An Implacable Necessity* you ascribe to Mr. Filene's remarks an interpretation which, it seems to me, by no means follows. Instead of his declaration "If I were a Frenchman, I should have supported Poincaré's foreign policy" being "a vivid illustration of the major reason for the failure up to date of agitations for peace" in that it encourages Frenchmen in the assertion of "the existence of an 'implacable necessity' on their part to subjugate Germany," rather does this statement of Mr. Filene's bring out in high relief the inevitable result of America's shortsighted policy of withdrawal from Europe.

We can all sympathize with France's life and death desire for security with a conceived potential enemy population half again larger than her own numbers. When we adopted the isolationist policy which we did, it was only human nature for France to turn to the only practical security which she, together with all the other organized peoples of the world, knew existed. And our military friends are strong in their statement that you can't change human nature. Human nature in the sense of man's original nature perhaps cannot be changed, but human nature in its control of and expressions of the instincts and desires of original nature can certainly be and is constantly being changed by the forces of the social environment. The problem therefore is to create a social environment through concerted international action which will make feasible the substitution of law for war in fact rather than in fancy.

Towards this end the World Court is but a step, as it aims to deal solely with juridical disputes as between nations. An instrument for handling non-juridical disputes, and forsooth for best effecting an economic embargo, is the existing handicapped League of Nations. The League is no longer to be confused with the Treaty of Versailles, for surely you must be aware, as Lord Robert Cecil has suggested, that we can enter the League free from any entanglements in carrying out that Treaty and practically free to correct its errors and injustices on our own terms.

Mr. Filene is not the only practical peace advocate sponsoring such views. May I call your attention to a late address by Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, a member of the Friends Service Committee, before the Institute of Politics in Williamstown, Massachusetts, last August, printed in *The Christian Register* for September 6, 1923, and since reissued in pamphlet form?

W. RUSSELL TYLOR.

Galesburg, Illinois.

[The statement of Mr. E. A. Filene's to which we objected was that if he were a Frenchman he would have supported the policy of the French government in occupying the Ruhr. The statement must mean that in his assumed rôle of Frenchman he would believe both in the probable success of the Poincaré policy in bringing security to France and, under the circumstances, in its moral justifiability. Well, it is possible to allege many plausible reasons in favor of what France is doing, but we do not see how such reasons help Mr. Filene's case. For we cannot understand how an advocate of peace can accept reasons of this kind without betraying his pacifist convictions. They are derived from the stock apology of the militarists of all ages and countries—the argument that a nation with a preponderance of military power has the right and the ability to assure its security by taking away the security of its neighbors. The result of the French adventure may for a while seem to justify this argument but if such is the event there will thereafter be obviously only one possible method of pacifying Europe—the method which the opponents of Germany attributed to her in August, 1914.

Professor Tylor, like Mr. Filene, imputes responsibility for the selfish violence of French policy to the American rather than to the French nation. We should have guaranteed the security of France and so rendered unnecessary the attack on Germany. There would have been something to say in favor of such an imputation of responsibility if the French government had ever offered to exchange a conciliatory policy towards Germany, which would have permitted that country to regain its economic strength and to pay reparations, in return for an American guar-

antee of French security. But France has never offered such a bargain. Ever since the Armistice it has wanted to have it both ways. It has pursued systematically a policy which could only result in the economic and political subjugation of Germany, and it negotiated in Paris a Treaty of Peace which could be used as the instrument of that purpose. Yet at the same time it demanded a guarantee. If under such conditions the American nation guaranteed French security, it would be pledging American resources to protect France against the consequences of her own egotistic violence.

According to the terms of the Triple Alliance to which M. Clemenceau persuaded Messrs. Wilson and Lloyd George to consent, the English-speaking nations were to protect France against an unprovoked attack from Germany. But the policy of the French government towards Germany since the Armistice has assumed a character which according to the principles approved by Mr. Filene, which underlie the Poincaré policy, would have been considered not merely a provocation to attack but a complete justification of it. For France has behaved as if Germany and herself were engaged in an irreconcilable struggle from which only one could survive as a united and independent commonwealth. Every reason which would justify Mr. Filene in saying that if he were a Frenchman he would support M. Poincaré would justify him equally in saying that if he were a German he would become a captain in Ludendorff's imaginary army. Should such reasoning be justified there is nothing for sensible Frenchmen and Germans to do but to cut one another's throats.

The problem is, as Professor Tylor says, to create a social environment through concerted international action which will be favorable to the substitution of law for war, but the guarantee by the United States of French security would not contribute to the creation of such an environment. That is, it would not do so unless France were willing in exchange for the guarantee to abandon those articles in the Treaty which give her a strangle hold on Germany. But she has never offered any such bargain, and those Americans, like Mr. Filene, who would favor the guarantee have never stipulated that she must. The guarantee, as it has been proposed, merely provides an American and English shelter behind which France can safely pursue her designs against the unity and liberty of the German nation.

No society of nations is possible in Europe until France abandons her present policy of which the Ruhr occupation is the culminating act; and she can justify the policy on the score of implacable necessity only on the pretext that French security is more important in the eyes of a final arbiter than that of Germany or any other country. She is for the moment the dominant military power in Europe and her behavior is the decisive fact in the moral and political condition of that continent. She appealed for aid during the war on the ground that she was fighting for the general international welfare as well as her own safety. Yet after a victory obtained by the help of peoples who accepted this assurance she relentlessly pursues a policy which is disastrous to the general international welfare. If Germany were victorious, it would have been difficult for her to treat France more barbarously and with less regard for the interests of "civilization" than France is treating Germany. Unless other peoples recognize this truth and unless in one way or another they induce France to recognize it and abandon her policy, any plans for international appeasement or the substitution of law for war are fantastic impossibilities.—THE EDITORS.]

"Self-Education for Scientists"

SIR: The admixture of misstatement, platitude and flippancy composing the editorial article, characteristically named Self-Education for Scientists, in your issue of January 16, is unbecoming to a journal such as the New Republic. The two-column article continues in the style in which it begins, namely:

The American scientist appears to be least scientific in those annually recurrent periods when he is conscious of being a member of a scientific society. He exhorts everyone to adopt the scientific attitude throughout the year and then for the space of a short week between December 26 and January 1 he sloughs off his scientific predilections and reverts to Rotarian habits. Nothing could be less scientific than an annual meeting in a scientific society.

Such an article is reminiscent of the kind of thing the local

daily press used to print thirty years ago. In recent years there has been great improvement. The Cincinnati meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and its affiliated societies, which gave occasion for your trivial comments, was admirably reported throughout the country. Leading papers of New York City sent special correspondents and devoted many columns to telegraphic reports. This is as it should be. Our civilization is based on science. You tell your readers: "Science is a tentative (*sic*) hypothesis." Science has quadrupled the productivity of labor; it has doubled the length of life; it has made possible democracy, universal education and equality of opportunity; it has given us the truest faith and the finest art. Do you not know that? J. McKEEN CATTELL.

New York City.

[Our article to which Professor Cattell takes exception was not intended to belittle the place of science in modern life; nor do we believe it is fairly susceptible of that interpretation. Its sole purpose was to point out the inefficient and therefore unscientific manner in which the meetings of scientific organizations are, in general, conducted.—THE EDITORS.]

KDKA Speaking

SIR: We well may view with awe the wonders of radio, which last night brought to my study from Pittsburgh, Pa., over KDKA (studio of the Pittsburgh Press) a message which should not vanish in the thin air which carried it over mountain, stream, city and lake to me. It was the peroration of a man whose name I didn't catch but who was announced as a former commissioner of agriculture (I think) of Ohio.

"One country; one flag; one religion; one wife; and TWO political parties."

OLIVER S. MORRIS.

St. Paul.

Housekeeping Plus Teaching

SIR: Your article, Extending the Teacher's Tenure, interested me, because I am a teacher, and have found it practicable and profitable to carry out an *extension of tenure*, along the lines you suggest.

Two years after an A.B. from a well known woman's college, I married. Within four years, two fine boys had appeared. When the younger was a year old, I found it possible, since we lived near a college, to secure a master's degree with a year of non-resident work. All the studying was accomplished at home, and attendance at seminars required but nine hours a week. The earning capacity of my husband enabled me to hire efficient help in the house, and this fact is obviously to be taken into account.

The result of the year's work was a \$1,200 fellowship from a Foundation, for a year's study abroad. With the two sons and a nurse, a nine months' stay in a foreign capital was found to abound in interest and adventure. As my husband was travelling on business in America during a large part of this period, the difficult separation, it was believed by both of us, took place at an opportune time.

Upon my return, I obtained a good position as a teacher in a private school for girls, at an excellent salary, which, added to my husband's earnings, enables the family to travel in Europe or invest! Free at three o'clock, I can devote the afternoon to my children, who are in school themselves until that hour. On the wages of last year, the two boys and I spent three months together in Europe.

It does not seem to us that the children have suffered or are now suffering from this sort of maternal régime. They are happy, healthy, normal—a year under the average age in their grades, and they head their classes. Nor has my husband felt abused or deprived of conjugal society. My working hours make no conflict with his free time. In this respect a teaching job is an ideal one for a married woman, who wants to be active.

In brief, I find myself fulfilling my capacities, serving the community in two fundamental ways, and producing welcome dollars. With such a rounded program, a woman exists as an individual and as a factor in the social group. I advise others to try it, who find domesticity alone not satisfying. It's superfluous to add that criticism and gossip have been abundant.

Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

ROSALIE.