

the other exactly in the middle of the forehead, and it was by the latter hook that the fish was played. So Pinchot was literally driving the steed by a single rein, which makes the catch remarkable. No wonder it literally defied the efforts of two men. It was practically free but for the long, thread-like driving line leading back from its dome-shaped forehead.

As to the ferocity of these fishes there is no question. They have the strength to penetrate ships, and the inclination at times, and have often accomplished it, according to authentic records taken by the Government. And that the angler takes more risk in playing them in the open sea than any other game fish may be fairly conceded.

CAN THE SALOON BE REFORMED?

For many years those engaged in the liquor traffic met every attack with a counter-attack upon some phase or other of the temperance movement. In later years, however, a number of liquor dealers and manufacturers have undertaken to meet the anti-saloon movement by an attempt to reform the liquor business from within. As a consequence there has been organized what is known as the National Model License League. As it has been officially characterized, it is "an organization of liquor interests and allied trades advocating a form of law designed to take the liquor question out of politics and to put the lawbreakers out of the liquor business." Its policy was stated in a letter from its President, Mr. T. M. Gilmore, which was published in *The Outlook* for February 13 of last year. In brief, this policy is that of giving to licenses the value of property of which the holder could not be deprived without due process of law; of limiting the number of licenses to a certain proportion of the population; of keeping the license rate low enough to avoid tempting the holder to reimburse himself by selling inferior beverages; and of exacting rigorous and mandatory penalties. The *Outlook* has expressed its strong dissent from this policy. To give a license or a franchise a property value is to create a new vested right. The problems that the Government has now to deal with arising out of existing vested rights ought to be enough to deter it from creating new ones. Nevertheless, The *Outlook* has expressed its gratification at the evidence afforded by this Model License League that liquor dealers and manufacturers are regardful of public opinion and are seriously concerned at the evils connected with their business. Even if, however, there were no question as to the nature of the liquor license, there would yet remain the more fundamental question as to whether the American saloon as it now exists is capable of reform, or whether it is essentially evil. It is this question that is discussed in the following correspondence between the President of the National Model License League and the Editor-in-Chief of *The Outlook*. It is because this correspondence states clearly a fundamental issue which is often beclouded in discussions of the liquor question, and incidentally because it elicits the interesting fact that the President of the League, who is connected with "Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular," is in favor of the principle of local option, that we publish it in full herewith.—THE EDITORS.

January 5, 1910.

*Dr. Lyman Abbott, Editor The Outlook,
New York City:*

Dear Doctor—The Third Annual Convention of the National Model License League will take place at the Planters' Hotel, in St. Louis, on February 3 and 4, and I feel that this work is now well enough known for men like Dr. Lyman Abbott to look into it thoroughly, and, if possible, to indorse it as a common-sense solution of what is known as the liquor problem.

I therefore write to ask if you would agree to come out and address this Convention, and let us syndicate your address to the press of the country. To come to a convention and speak to a lot of brewers, distillers, wholesalers, and the like requires some moral courage on the part of a man holding the position that you do in society, but then you have the moral courage, and certainly there is no one in this country who would say that you were in the pay of the liquor men, and if you did some plain talking to the liquor

men, I am sure that they would appreciate it.

We would like to have you come to the Convention as our guest, and you would most certainly have the earnest attention of every member.

If you are willing to come, I would appreciate it if you would wire me on receipt of this, so that we could arrange the programme accordingly.

Very truly yours,

T. M. GILMORE,

President National Model License League.
Louisville, Kentucky.

January 18, 1910.

Mr. T. M. Gilmore, President:

Dear Sir—Your letter of January 5 came in my absence from the office, hence my delay in replying. I already am engaged on the date which you have named, and this engagement would make it impossible for me to accept your invitation.

But, in truth, my views are such that I do not believe I could be of any service to your Convention were I able to accept the invitation. I am heartily glad that those who are engaged in the liquor traffic are taking this matter up, and are endeavoring to make much-needed reforms in the way in which that traffic is too often carried on. I heartily appreciate the difficulty of their work, and should be glad to render them any service in my power, but the reform which seems to me necessary is so radical that I do not think any presentation of it to the Convention by me would be of value. Whatever use alcoholic liquor may properly have as a beverage, I am clear in my own mind, first, that distilled liquors should never be used except under the advice of a physician; and, second, that beers and light wines, if taken as a beverage at all, should be taken only in connection with meals. All physiologists, I think, are agreed that taking alcohol upon an empty stomach is injurious, except in the rare cases in which the resultant disturbance is necessary for medical reasons. This principle, if it be sound, is fatal to the saloon as ordinarily conducted in America, because the saloon as ordinarily conducted in America promotes the drinking of alcoholic liquors not really as a beverage but as a stimulant, not as an accompaniment to meals but apart from them. To furnish a little food

with the liquid is quite a different thing from furnishing a moderate amount of liquid with the ordinary regular food. A bar with a free lunch is neither a hotel nor a restaurant. The only real and radical remedy of the liquor traffic, in my judgment, would be to abolish the American saloon and use alcohol only either as a medicine, under the advice of a physician, or, in its lighter forms, as a beverage in connection with meals.

I shall venture to assume, if I do not hear from you to the contrary, that you have no objection to my printing your invitation to me and this letter in response, if I should deem it best to do so, and I have no objection to publication of the letter provided that it is published in its entirety.

Thanking you for the invitation, and the opportunity it has furnished me to give this frank expression of my views to you, and through you, if you choose, to your associates, believe me

Very sincerely yours,

LYMAN ABBOTT.

January 25, 1910.

Dr. Lyman Abbott:

Dear Sir—On my return from the South I find your letter of the 18th, in which you say that it will be impossible for you to accept our invitation to speak at our Convention in St. Louis next month, but you say you doubt whether you could be of any service to our Convention, even were you able to accept the invitation.

You say that you are glad that the men engaged in the liquor traffic are trying to bring about reform, and that you appreciate the difficulty of their work, and you would be glad to render them any service in your power, but that your ideas are so radical that you fear they would be of no value to us.

You say that you do not think that distilled liquors should be used except under the advice of a physician, and that where beer and light wines are used as a beverage it should be only in connection with meals.

You say that you believe that alcohol is very injurious if taken on an empty stomach, and you conclude, therefore, that these views would be fatal to the saloon as ordinarily conducted in America. There-

fore you hold that the only real and radical remedy for the liquor traffic would be to abolish the American saloon, use alcohol only as a medicine, and use wines and beers in connection with meals.

This is very good as far as it goes, and I will not say that your conclusions are incorrect. I will say, however, that there are millions and millions of people in this country who do not seem to agree with you.

The people in this country consume 114,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits every year for beverage purposes. If we figure seventy drinks to a gallon, this amounts to 7,980,000,000 drinks of distilled spirits used by the people of the United States, and this does not include imported brandies, Scotch whiskies, etc., and it does not include the alcohol used in the arts and sciences.

What are you going to do with a people who consume this enormous amount of alcohol in a way you believe to be injurious, but which they seem to think is of advantage to them?

Would you prohibit them?

Would you say, "I am going to have a glass of wine, or a bottle of wine, with my dinner, but you men shall not have a drink of whisky at the time that you think it is of greatest advantage to you"?

The people of this country consume per capita one and thirty-hundredths gallons of distilled liquors and twenty-two gallons of fermented liquors a year. They seem to me to be about as prosperous, and about as healthy, and about as enterprising, and about as religious, and about as philanthropic as any people on earth.

Perhaps it would be better if they did not use any alcohol at all. But can we compel ninety million people, who drink the enormous amount of whisky, wine, and beer above referred to, to give up the habit by an edict of law?

Must we not depend upon example and instruction and evolution?

I have no objection to your printing my invitation and your response, provided you will also print the above response to your letter; and I am sure you will not hesitate to print the above response if you decide to print your letter to me, because I know that Dr. Lyman Abbott

is not only in earnest in matters of reform, but I know that he is absolutely unafraid.

Very truly yours,

T. M. GILMORE,

President National Model License League.

Louisville, Kentucky.

February 8, 1910.

Mr. T. M. Gilmore, President:

Dear Sir—I regret that a pressure of special duties has prevented me from earlier answering your letter of January 25. The figures which you give indicate that the evil is far greater than I had supposed, and the necessity for reform more urgent. I think that all physicians are agreed that the use of alcohol, except in connection with meals or as a special medicine, is always injurious. Most physicians are agreed that distilled liquors should be used only medicinally, and as medicine, with great caution. All physicians are agreed that the excessive use of alcohol is a most prolific cause of disease, all sociologists that it is a prolific cause of poverty, and all penologists that it is a prolific cause of crime. If distilled liquors are used to the extent that your figures indicate, and I must assume their accuracy, that use would go far to account for the disease, the poverty, and the crime which are three of the great burdens which the Nation is carrying. You ask me what I would do, in view of this state of facts. I would use all my influence to persuade my fellow-citizens not to patronize or support the saloons; second, to educate both the children and the adults to a rational understanding of the perils involved in an excessive use of alcohol; third, I would leave to each locality the question what measures it would take for the regulation of the saloon, and I would give to every locality the power to prohibit it altogether. In my judgment, the moral and educational reform is more important because more fundamental than legislative reform; and no particular legislative reform can be prescribed alike for all localities, but each locality must be left free to adopt such methods as public opinion will support and enforce.

Yours respectfully,

LYMAN ABBOTT.

February 11, 1910.

Dr. Lyman Abbott:

Dear Mr. Abbott—Your very interesting letter of the 8th just received, and I

have read same very carefully. Practically, I agree with all that you say in this letter.

I agree with physicians that the excessive use of alcohol is a prolific cause of disease; with sociologists, that it is a prolific cause of poverty; with penologists, that it is a prolific cause of crime; and I agree with you that mankind should be educated either to avoid the use of alcohol altogether or to use it in moderation.

I agree with you that "the moral and educational reform is more important because more fundamental than legislative reform;" and I agree with you that "each locality should be left free to adopt such method of reform as public opinion will support and enforce."

Very respectfully yours,

T. M. GILMORE,

President National Model License League.
Louisville, Kentucky.

TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE SCHOOLS

BY J. H. GARDINER

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MR. W. D. Lewis's lively article on "College Domination of High Schools" will help to keep alive a discussion which, if based on knowledge of the facts, can do only good to both parties to it.¹ No college can hope to live in these days unless it draws the largest percentage of its students from the public high schools of the country; and a high school which does not send a reasonable, even though a small, number of its pupils on to college is failing to create the ambition for large intellectual experience. There should always be a healthy and stimulating difference of opinion as to the exact adjustment of the balance between the special interests of the school and of the college; but here, as elsewhere in human affairs, bitterness and prejudice will disappear when the two parties come to the discussion in the belief that there is no difference between them in fair-mindedness and the anxiety for the public good. Above all, no good can come of the discussion without an exact knowledge of the facts; and it is because I think that Mr. Lewis has been misinformed on one important part of the discussion, and therefore has unwittingly misled the readers of *The Outlook*, that I wish here to explain the requirements in English which are the

basis for college entrance examinations through most of the country, to show how they are made, and what they are intended to accomplish.

The assertion that I particularly wish to challenge is that "nowhere else has the stiff formality of an examinable requirement been so fatal as in that most important of college subjects, the mother tongue. College teachers have written the courses, trained the teachers, set the examinations, and execrated the results." It is the fact for the most part that college teachers have trained the teachers, for college training is now generally required of teachers in high schools. It is the fact for the most part that college teachers set the examinations, but with the important exception that on each of the committees which make the papers for the College Entrance Examination Board there is always one school-teacher. It is often the fact that college teachers have execrated the results of much of the school teaching of English composition, but here they are at one with business men and the public generally. It is not the fact that college teachers have written the courses, except in so far as they have done so in co-operation with teachers from the schools. As to "the stiff formality of an examinable requirement," the phrase seems to me to have no relevance to any requirements in English that I know of, unless it

¹A letter from Mr. Lewis, whose article in *The Outlook* for December 11 last has called out Professor Gardiner's reply, will be found in "Letters to *The Outlook*."—THE EDITORS.