

Our Professional Patriots

V. The New Crusade

RADICALISM as such has almost served its patriotic purpose. It is about, as such, to be shelved. I have this impression very clearly out of my last conversation with Ralph Easley. He didn't, in so many words, say: "We are done with radicalism." That would have been too drastic. He would have known that the business interests which he and his fellow patriots represent may, at any moment, require the services of radicalism in almost any one of their patriotic clashes with social liberalism or rambunctious unions, or, even, child labor reformers. But he did, in all good cynicism, show me a little tract which he contemplates publishing and in which he has a real good laugh over the anti-radical adventures of some of his fellow and brother fighters in the struggle to save America's soul. I shouldn't be surprised if at heart he too, has his doubts concerning the numbers of our resident Communists and the amounts of subversive gold sent here from Moscow. I shouldn't be surprised if he hadn't all along doubted the imaginative espionage régime of Mr. Burns's office. But, there! I shouldn't say such things.

The point is that the official demise of Mr. Burns leaves the Burns tradition to the meddlesome hands of the War Department (where it is assured a good home) and the patriots must follow the Burns tradition if they are to keep their pamphlets and correspondence up to patriotic standards of liveliness. Now the War Department, being primarily interested in preparedness, transfers the Burns tradition to pacifists. The readjustment, for the patriots, however, is rather one of nomenclature than of kind. Therefore, by a simple process of including all opponents of war in the general Bolshevik class, the good work is kept up patriotically and the efforts of the War Department are enormously augmented. Thus pacifism and Bolshevism become synonyms and *plus ça change plus c'est la même chose*.

It couldn't be more clearly put than by Mr. Easley in his masterly defense of his War Against Patriotism:

The article was not written for the sole purpose of describing the activities of the National Council for Reduction of Armaments, but to show the inter-relation of all those pacifist, Socialist, Bolshevik and other radical organizations which, in their mischievous efforts to "undermine our national virility" are practically one. True, they have different reasons for attempting to do this, but the effect is all the same. . . . The Socialists and the Bolsheviks, because they want to take over the property of the "capitalists" without opposition from the machine guns of law and order; the Quakers because they believe in that unpatriotic Tolstoian philosophy of non-resistance.

The quotation is from Mr. Easley's interminable and very bad mannered letters to Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary of the National Council for Reduction of Armaments, now the National Council for the Prevention of War. Mr. Libby is "a Quaker and therefore an hereditary pacifist, his salary being paid by the American Society of Friends." You can guess how Mr. Easley feels about Quakers. "Why," said he once to me, "if I had my way, I'd run every damned Quaker out of the country."

George Fox and Karl Marx—now you see them and now you can't tell them apart. That shows you what patriotism can do when it really buckles down to reasoning. I believe it could do as much for Queen Victoria and Cleopatra. And, as for stepping across the street from Justice (reformed) to War (unregenerate)—that's nothing.

Still, you cannot laugh off preparedness: not with war still in the offing. To my mind, however, the real question is—am I or am I not intolerant of war as the most serious of all social evils? I might be intolerant of war and still advocate preparedness and an invincible navy and compulsory universal military training. My arguments for these three programs, as the only war prophylactics, might be unsound, but they would not necessarily be the arguments of a Sophist. On the other hand, if I indulge myself in this "national virility" line of eloquence, I slip dangerously near the sophistic whirlpool, and if I go so far as to condemn as dangerous undesirables any group who are seriously investigating ways and means of eliminating war, I come off a self-convicted Junker.

As Ralph Easley wrote to Mr. Libby:

You say that no honest seeker after truth could have written the article, The War Against Patriotism. You are right! I was not *seeking*, but disseminating truth about the disruptive forces now at work in this country.

The disruptive forces in question are the World Peace Fellowship, the Women's Committee for World Disarmament, the Women's International League, the National League of Women Voters, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Council for Reduction of Armaments (now the National Council for the Prevention of War) and the Foreign Policy Association! Having listed them out of Mr. Easley's own sentences, we can safely leave him to his endorsement of the "movement promoted against all future wars by the Gold Star Mothers," and allow him to crawl out of the Junker class as best he may.

It is not, after all, so surprising that the War Department should exhibit a Junker spirit. But I have

also called the War Department "meddlesome," and I have previously made certain allegations concerning a somewhat too close association between the War Department and these prodigious patriots. Now that same Mrs. Lucia R. Maxwell who prepared the Spider Web Chart is very willing to give away a catalogue of her other patriotic activities as librarian of the Chemical Warfare Service. They may seem digressive in this article, but they apply to the general subject matter and are much too varied to be omitted.

The first of her labors, in order as she lists them, accounts for the suppression of a motion picture which the War Department seems to have considered "propaganda against the army and navy camouflaged as educational." The picture was endorsed by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and

The showing of this disloyal film was only stopped after a long-drawn-out correspondence with Will Hayes. This correspondence was turned over to the Woman Patriot for publication and was also given to the American Defense Society for patriotic use.

Patriotic labor number one. The second labor convicts Mr. Libby's organization of Communism.

The oft-expressed program of the Communist is to "disarm the bourgeoisie and to arm the proletariat."

The third labor is the Spider Web Chart of which sufficient has already been said. The fourth is a history of the National Council for the Prevention of War.

Key women of these organizations direct other women's organizations . . . "We shall never establish Communism, if we do not take up energetically the question of educating women to class struggle."

The connection between the quotation and the Council is not quite clear to me and I pass on to the fifth labor which is A History of the Women's Committee for World Disarmament.

Copies of the histories of both organizations have been distributed for patriotic use.

The sixth labor is described as "Bringing to the Notice of the Army the 'Slacker Oath'" (it is well to read that title twice) which:

. . . was introduced at the Convention of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom as a test of membership by Mary Winsor of Pennsylvania, cousin of a pre-war Austrian attaché, but was not made a test for reason of keeping out certain people who might otherwise join, but the oath was supposed to be taken in the heart.

We shall meet the "Slacker Oath" in due time,

and the seventh labor deals obscurely with the "plan to abolish war by Constitutional amendment." Neither can I quite make out the gist of the eighth, but the ninth is clearly "Who's Who in the National Student Forum, Showing the Socialist-Pacifist Tendencies and Activities of its Personnel."

The National Student Forum has been characterized by an official of the State Department as one of the most insidious and pernicious of all the numerous organizations working for Socialism.

We shall meet the National Student Forum, too, in good time. The tenth labor is entitled "Who's Who of the Joint Amnesty Committee."

Compiled copies were distributed to the American Defense Society, Department of Justice and the late President Harding.

The eleventh and twelfth describe resolutions supplied by Mrs. Maxwell to the Daughters of the American Revolution and to the Daughters of the Confederacy. The catalogue has its bearing both upon my use of the word "meddlesome," and upon the War Department's indignant disavowal of the Spider Web Chart.

One marvels and marvels at the ramifications of this division of our national government, the ostensible business of which is to provide soldiers and arms for our national defense. Pershing himself joins the lecture forces of the American Defense Society to tell the country, among other things, that:

At home our situation is seriously complicated by the teachings of numerous pacifist organizations . . .

Others with baser designs, or with crass ignorance, strenuously advocate internationalism . . .

Some people, whose idealism overwhelms their common sense, express the fear that we may develop militarism.

Fries and Bowley have made great names for themselves and great positions, not so much by advancing our national defense as by attacking organizations and individuals which venture to lift their voices in criticism of the government's military policy or in advocacy of peace as preferable to war.

"The insidious pacifist," said General Fries, "who is more to be feared than the man with the torch, gun or sword."

"The National Council for the Prevention of War," said General Bowley, "which has, as its impelling motive, the overthrow by violence of our form of government."

What rot! What unutterable no less than untruthful rot! It is very well for General Fries to "investigate the activities of various disarmament and pacifist societies and to find that they have carried on their activities under a constant change of name." But this splenetic disregard for fact, this

unmannerly and personal tone of personal attack puts the government itself in a singularly ignoble light. And that, by the General's leave, is something which the citizenry of the country has a right to resent.

Mr. Libby has to call General Bowley to account for ridiculous and outrageous accusations—that he was educated in Russia for the promotion of Communism, that he taught Communism in Pennsylvania, that he is a Communist and the “reddest of the Reds,” that his secretary and himself take turns in visiting Russia for instructions, that his organization is the tool of the Soviet government. A year ago it was General Fries who “was being used just as you are being used for making false attacks upon the Council.” What a thing to say about a general! But what a position for the General to take at the very grave expense of his government's dignity!

And the General actually backs his statements up by reference to the works of Mr. R. M. Whitney of the American Defense Society. Whitney as an authority for the United States army! Clearly, the War Department is the perfect home for the Burns tradition and clearly there is less here than meets the eye.

So much less! Mr. Libby, “described in an official dossier as ‘either a dangerous fanatic or in the pay of some foreign government,’” has not even been in Russia. He is a Quaker and the moving spirit of a society of liberally minded American citizens who have got together to look toward:

Ultimate world organization, by whatever name, which includes the plan of a permanent court, through which all questions of international difference can be dealt with on the basis of reason and understanding and, ultimately, international law; progressive reduction of armaments by international agreement to a police status; education of world peace by sane and practical discussion.

All this to be arrived at through “orderly processes of government” and “the development of the intelligent public opinion that will find a better way than war to settle international differences.” Not a penny of Soviet gold. No members except American citizens and no affiliations with Communist organizations. No opposition, even, to reasonable preparedness pending a more orderly arrangement for the world's affairs. Such are the sins of Mr. Libby and his associate intelligent and legitimate pacifists who are labelled Bolsheviks and traitors in honor of their dislike for the Junker spirit which so labels them.

The motives of the War Department are clear—a war is a fine thing for professional soldiers: lacking a war, preparedness is a fine thing. Wherefor Mr. Libby must not be allowed to lecture and it is quite all right to tell the Woman Patriot and the American Defense Society any variety of whopper about him. The motives of the prodigious patriots are only a little less clear.

SIDNEY HOWARD.

... (This is the fifth in a series of articles, of which the sixth will appear in an early issue.)

Old First Night

CHAUTAUQUA DAY-LEE! Program for today and tomorrow!”

The Hotel Athenæum is full, even to the annex. The boarding cottages are full, and the private cottages, and the new dormitory up on the hill. The program is full. Through maple-shaded streets the people move busily, criss-cross, streaming to and from the amphitheatre, the summer schools, the Hall of Philosophy. There is so much to do. There is always much to do at Chautauqua, something for everyone, the whole day through. But this year is more than busy. It is significant, portentous. Time, by the magic of numbers, has invested it with a special solemn meaning. It is the fiftieth anniversary year, Chautauqua's Golden Jubilee.

Think what it means! The Chautauquans, hurrying to hear Edward Howard Griggs on Lights and Shadows of the Present Age, or to the Home Missions study hour, or to a ball game, pause a moment by the old stump in Miller Park to think what it means. Fifty years! Think of that first little Assembly in 1874, when a few splintery

benches and some leaky tents and Model Palestine were all there was of Chautauqua. Think of the intensity of those early years, of the common exaltation and the common discomforts in which the Chautauqua spirit grew. Remember the Bishop in the old dining hall, holding an umbrella over his plate in one hand while he carved tough steak with the other? And Knowers' Ark, frail shelter of celebrities, and Frank Beard drawing Moses in the Bullrushes? And best of all, the vesper service by the calm lake under the stars? The Chautauqua memory is corporate. People who were not born in 1874 recall these things and dwell on them affectionately. Review and appraisal is in the air. The Chautauquans, after fifty years, are thinking what it has meant, what it means. Old Chautauquans have come back because of what it means. Speakers are here to tell them what it means. The program is full.

“Chautauqua Day-lee. Old First Night program!” Think what it means! . . .

“I'll bite, what does it?” The youth from Yale, who is obliging his mother for three days, is ap-