

abolition of free speech, in the suppression of soap-box spouters of sedition. The freedom of the press is as dear to us as it is to the once Honorable Tom Watson, but we cannot discern its death nor a menace of its death in the exclusion of the *Jeffersonian* and the *Masses* and other such prints from the mails. But we are quite sure that free speech and free press would quickly go a-glimmering into everlasting limbo if those curb-stone orators and gutter editors had their way and the Hohenzollern Hun were permitted to triumph and to extend his doctrine of lese majesty to the United States as in Prussia.

"Treason must be made odious." Therefore thank God for what has already been done, though late, and let us pray that the good work will go unsparingly on. Remember the definition of treason as given in our Constitution. It is anything which gives aid and comfort to our enemies. It is anything which hampers our Government in its prosecution of the war. It is anything which impairs the efficiency of our military establishment or deprives it of necessary supplies. It is also anything which is designed to embarrass our relations with our allies, or to injure them. All these are acts of treason, and upon the doers of them we invoke, swift and remorseless, the penalty of traitors. In peace, our liberal laws permit the utmost latitude of speech and action, and the man who is "agin' the government" may be as true a patriot as the head of the government himself. But when the nation, back to the wall, is fighting for life and for the life of democracy throughout the world, "he who is not with us is against us;" and he who is against us is our enemy, whether he be a Uhlan or an I. W. W., a member of the Reichstag or of the "People's Council." The only difference between them is that the former is an alien foe while the latter is a domestic traitor.

"Treason must be made odious!"

AMERICANIZING AMERICA

"THE name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity," said Washington, addressing his fellow countrymen, "must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations."

We should hesitate to imagine what would be the sur-

prise, the displeasure and the righteous patriotic indignation of the Father of His Country if he were now to revisit the United States and discover a state of affairs in which it was deemed necessary, with high official authority and at great labor and expense, to undertake an elaborate and prolonged campaign for the Americanization of the American metropolis. Yet that is precisely what would confront him in the great city in which he was installed as the first President of the United States; and he would quickly see that there was need of it there, and scarcely less need of it in many other parts of the Union, if not indeed throughout the entire Union.

The committee appointed by the Mayor of New York, which is now entering upon the work in question, reports that eighty per cent of the population of that city is foreign in birth or parentage and in speech. That fact is an indictment of our immigration laws, or of the administration of them; for it is manifestly not for the public good to permit so large a massing of aliens in a single community. How large an influx might be received into the country as a whole, under a proper system of distribution, may be uncertain. It is quite certain that it is not right to permit incoming aliens thus to settle down in a single city until they form a large majority of its population and reproduce within its boundaries the very same social and moral or immoral and unsanitary conditions which are the reproach of their former homes. Of what avail is it to flee from a ghetto in Europe and to create a new ghetto in America?

But that is not the only nor the worst reproach that falls upon us. It was bad to let so many aliens settle in that one city. It was worse to let them remain—we might almost say, encourage and all but compel them to remain—aliens. For that is what has been done not only in New York but also in many other places and largely throughout the country. There has been no organized attempt to Americanize them. They have been left to herd by themselves and to maintain here not only the language but also the manners and customs and whole social economy of the old country.

We have—Americans have—insisted that this should be done. In the Legislature, in the press, even in some of the pulpits, it has been insisted over and over again that alien immigrants should not be required to conform themselves with any American standard, but should be free to retain

their own. The number of aliens in the metropolis, their solidarity in certain sections of the city, the extent to which they retain their old customs, the number and circulation of periodicals in foreign tongues—all these have been treated not as conditions which are to be abated as quickly and as completely as possible, but rather as things of pride and boasting. They have been used as political stock in trade, to be cherished and preserved. Because we are a composite nation, we have seemed to think that we should preserve our composite character as an asset.

So we have failed not only to assimilate but even to digest the great mass of aliens that has been received; with the result that today it lies a foreign body within the state. It should be obvious to all that such a condition is undesirable and potentially pernicious. We must regret, though perhaps it is quite characteristic of us, that it has required the prodigious and tragic cataclysm of the world war to arouse us to a recognition of the evil and to a realization of the necessity of abating it. But at least we should not now let the awakening, which has come to us at so great cost, be neglected or in vain. If we do nothing else for our domestic life in all this war, we should at least make sure that every American citizen is indeed an American.

There are some things to be done officially. One is, to abolish utterly and forever the system of dual allegiance which Germany for years had the effrontery to foist upon us. It would not be inappropriate to refuse naturalization of aliens from any country which undertook to maintain such a system. Another thing is, to require of immigrants prompt and unequivocal entry into American citizenship, through admission of aliens into this country in numbers determined by the proportion of them who became naturalized. If immigrants from a certain country become naturalized, let them come in; if they refuse to become naturalized, shut them out. We might, for example, decree that there should be received from any country in one year only as many immigrants as had been naturalized from that country in the preceding year, plus a certain percentage to permit of an increase in immigration.

It is probable, too, that there has been too much teaching of foreign languages in our public schools and too little teaching of the English language to foreigners. It is notorious, for example, that German has been taught in

many schools not because it was useful for American children to learn that foreign tongue, but because the large German element in the community demanded such propagation of their mother tongue among their children, as a matter of pride. They wanted their children, American born, to be able to speak German at home, and thus to retain that tongue in the family circle, just as in the old country. Nor would it be improper to impose some handicap, in postage rates or otherwise, upon the circulation of papers and periodicals printed in alien tongues. We would not suppress such prints, unless for cause, but we certainly would discourage rather than encourage them. Aliens coming hither should learn the English language and read English papers, and not seek to perpetuate the use of an alien tongue.

As for the unofficial, social and other methods of Americanizing aliens, they are many and effective if properly employed. We imagine that the use of the hyphen has now been made almost sufficiently odious, in political and other public relations. But even the implication of it in social and private life should be discouraged. Instead of Americans taking pleasure in seeing alien manners and customs and sympathies preserved and cherished among them, they should convert their immigrant neighbors to taking pleasure in adopting American manners and customs and in cultivating American sympathies. America is no longer an experiment. It is an achievement. The laws of compensation and conformity should prevail. When the alien comes hither to gain the great advantages which America offers to him over the old country, he should give something in return for them; namely, he should abandon and renounce the systems and customs and sympathies of the old country. He should conform himself with American manners and customs and principles, and become in heart and soul American. To adapt the words of Washington:

"The name of American, which belongs to them in their naturalized capacity, should always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from former habitation or allegiance."

THE TWO VIEWS

BY ARTHUR POLLEN

THAT the main object in war is to bring about the utter breakdown of the enemy, so that his armed forces, the people and the government seem to disintegrate in a common impulse to surrender, has long passed into a commonplace. If the enemy's armed forces on land are beaten, and his fleets scattered and sunk, then it is generally not long before the civil organization, being helpless, yields. But, even without an utter *debâcle* in the field, there may yet be a kind of spontaneous breakdown of the State. Armies may entrench to avoid defeat; fleets can lie protected in harbor. The State that avoids decisive battle invites siege. Siege and the hardship that it brings, financial stringency, the pressure of economic ruin, the threat that such ruin must grow more intense if the now hopeless struggle is prolonged, will make a civil population despair of victory, distrust its leaders, and surrender before perhaps all is lost. Either of the two main operations of war then, battle or siege, may have the desired effect. But more commonly it is victorious battle followed by stringent siege that brings about surrender. Surrender does not come until the nation as a whole is conscious that it can do no more. That State can endure the greatest stringency whose confidence in its government remains unshaken.

All this, as I have said, is a commonplace. But, a corollary follows whose truth is not so generally apprehended. If defeat is the cessation of a whole nation's effort, victory can only follow a whole nation's effort. It takes a nation, that is to say, to beat a nation. And in the struggle it is not legend strength, not statistics, not book entries that count,—but blows given in the field, and siege rigorously enforced. War is fighting and fighting is killing. It is not the nation with the most men, with the greatest riches, with the best organized industries or the largest tonnage