Church of Lehigh University on June 1–2. Though it is eighteen years since it was first established, this was only the twelfth Festival, because there was none held in 1902, and none in the years 1906 to 1911, inclusive, while Mr. J. Fred Wolle, the founder and conductor of the festivals, was absent in California. On the other hand, in 1904–05 there was a cycle of three festivals, one in Christmas week, 1904, and one in the following Lenten season, and an Easter Ascension Festival in June, 1905. At each Festival the only music performed has been that of Johann Sebastian Bach.

It is doubtful whether any community in the world, certainly none in this country, is rendering a greater service to the art of music than that which comprises Bethlehem, South Bethlehem, and their neighboring towns. The reason for the musical distinction of Bethlehem is to be found in the musical environment that was created by the Moravian settlers among the Indians and has been preserved to these days, when South Bethlehem is the seat of the greatest of steel works. It was at Bethlehem that Haydn's "Creation" was first performed in America; and it was here (as late as 1900) that the great B Minor Mass of Bach was first performed in this country—the Mass which is the most monumental of all of Bach's compositions, and which, it is said, Bach himself never heard performed. As in the case of the Bach Cycle and of every other festival, the Mass in B Minor was the culmination of the Festival this year. To this Mass were devoted the two sessions of Saturday, June 2. On Friday there were sung a number of Bach's cantatas and one motet.

As when the Festivals were held in the old Moravian Church, each session was announced by the solemn and stirring tones of the Trombone Choir, which for half an hour played in the belfry old chorales familiar among the Moravians.

During these years the Bach Choir, under Mr. Wolle's leader-ship, has not only retained its extraordinary quality of tone and sustained unity, but has increased in power. These men and women—school-teachers, workers in the steel works, business people, fathers and mothers, young people, men obviously of military age, professional men from the neighborhood—sing as they do, not because they sing as they are told, but because the music has first been in them. The result is a chorus of which we do not know the like anywhere.

There were soloists who, for the most part, did well. There was an orchestra made up of players from the Philadelphia Orchestra. But what makes the Festival are the Bach Choir, its organist, Mr. Shields, and its inspired leader, Mr. J. Fred Wolle.

In providing a home for this Festival the President and Trustees of Lehigh University are performing a service as distinctively educational as anything else the University does; and in giving it financial backing Mr. Charles M. Schwab is performing as distinctive a service as that which Major Higginson has performed in his support of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

This annual Festival is something that not even the world war ought to be allowed to interfere with. There are some things which, even for the great Allied cause, we are not yet called upon to sacrifice, and this is one of them.

THE BRITISH IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

The British Imperial Conference, after a session of some weeks, presented a farewell address to King George at Windsor Castle. Sir Robert Borden, Canadian Prime Minister, who read it, appropriately referred to the statesman who really created the Conference—the late Joseph Chamberlain. A son of Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Secretary of State for India, was one of the members of the Conference, the others being Mr. Long, Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Premiers of the dominions, and representatives from India.

While Mr. Chamberlain did much for Imperial federation, the progress of the Imperial idea was, we think, impeded rather than advanced by his insistence upon a trade policy which did not always conform to the divergent requirements of the different dominions and colonies.

of the different dominions and colonies.

The word "dominion" calls attention to the gradual transformation from the time when Mr. Chamberlain called the then Colonial Conference together. The name Colonial implies a certain dependence. It is a misnomer applied to Canada,

Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand. Hence the change of name from Colonial Conference to Imperial Conference.

The Imperial Conference has met from time to time and has adopted resolutions favoring uniformity throughout the Empire in such matters as reciprocal action regarding undesirable aliens, for instance, or in accident compensation laws, in copyright, patents, and trade-marks, in naturalization, and in treatment of shipping—matters in which there is a natural reciprocity.

Now, however, wider questions come up. Shall there be an Imperial Parliament composed of representatives from the United Kingdom, from the self-governing dominions, and from India? Shall there be a joint control by all these forces of the Empire's foreign policy? Shall there be consolidation of certain British possessions, such as Canada and Newfoundland, or Australia and New Zealand? What larger degree of self-government shall India enjoy? What shall the Imperial fiscal

policy be?

These and other questions were considered by the latest Imperial Conference. Its members from abroad enjoyed access to all the information at the Government's disposal, and occupied a status of absolute equality with members of the British Cabinet. "The decisions arrived at," said Premier Lloyd George in Parliament, "will enable us to prosecute the war with increased vigor and will be of the greatest value when we come to negotiate peace." The Prime Minister added that future meetings will be held annually and that the Imperial body will be composed of the Premier of the Imperial Parliament, such of his colleagues as deal especially with Imperial affairs, the Premier of each of the dominions, and some specially accredited representative of India with equal authority.

AN IMPERIAL COMMONWEALTH

The resolutions of a confidential nature adopted by the British Imperial Conference may not be made public until the end of the war. The others—

Recommended that full representation of India be permitted

at all future Imperial Conferences;

Requested the Admiralty to work out, immediately after the conclusion of the war, the most effective scheme of naval defense for the Empire, and called attention to the importance of developing an adequate capacity of production of naval and military material, munitions and supplies, in all parts of the Empire where such facilities do not exist;

Declared that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the Empire's component parts, while too important to be dealt with during the war, must be based upon full recognition of the dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial commonwealth and of India as an important portion of the same, and must recognize the right of the dominions and India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations;

Recommended that encouragement should be given to make the Empire independent of other countries in respect of food supplies, raw materials, and essential industries, with due regard

to the interests of Great Britain's allies;

Recorded its appreciation of the French Government's action in allotting in perpetuity the land in France where British soldiers are buried, and urged that arrangements be made with all governments—Ally, enemy, or neutral—for similar concessions;

Recognized the importance of securing uniformity of policy and action throughout the Empire with regard to naturalization;

And, finally, called the attention of the authorities to the temptations to which soldiers on leave are subjected, asserting that such authorities be empowered by legislation "to protect our men by having the streets, the neighborhood of camps, and other places of public resort kept clear, as far as practicable, of women of the prostitute class."

The resolution concerning foreign policy constitutes, we believe, a landmark in the Empire's constitutional history.

WAR AND BRITISH LABOR

So much has been said about the diplomatic side of the British Commission in this country that the labor side has hardly received proportionate notice. It may be remembered that, at the request of Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the

American Federation of Labor, Premier Lloyd George appointed certain eminent representatives of labor to be added to the already appointed British Commission to this country. Prominent among the labor representatives were the Rt. Hon. C. W. Bowerman, Privy Councilor, Member of the House of Commons, and Secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, and James H. Thomas, another Member of the House of Commons, and General Secretary of the National Union of Railway Men of Great Britain and Ireland, who last week was included as Privy Councilor in the King's birthday honor list.

Though pressing business at Washington kept Mr. Balfour and his diplomatic colleagues in Washington, the labor representatives have been able to make a tour of the Middle West, and have done much to enlighten us concerning the co-operation in England between labor and capital necessary to the conduct of the war. At Cleveland, for instance, Mr. Thomas declared that before the war labor and capital in England "were as far apart as the poles" and that revolution was never nearer; consequently, Germany "staked her all on our internal disruption." But, he proceeded, "when a common enemy appeared at our gate, we stood united to defeat her. A united trades-unionism said, 'While this danger lasts there shall be an industrial truce; we'll forget our temporary grievances; we'll fight them out later." Mr. Thomas then described the particular successes of labor in getting the Government to increase soldiers' allowances and the allowances to soldiers' wives and children, to their widows and orphans, and to the crippled veterans. He asserted that the Government was "not running a charity bureau," but, through the post-office, was paying great sums to the people, not only in war allowances, but also in special school fees for children, and even special house payments and insurance policies for those rendered incapable of keeping them up because of the services in the war of the head of the family.

Mr. Thomas also showed how Premier Lloyd George corrected the house congestion ills through his introduction of a bill in Parliament by which a landlord is prevented from raising

the rent paid by the wife of a soldier.
"Munition volunteers," Mr. Bowerman added, "forced to leave their families to work in our big new factories, receive a subsistence allowance."

"Through it all labor has not been cheapened," he concluded, "and I warn you of America to be on your guard. Do not let National emergency be exploited so as to introduce cheap labor."

The testimony of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Bowerman as to conditions in England and as to how they have been met should be of aid to us in this country in resisting attempts to break down legal safeguards for labor under the plea of war exigency.

THE TEMPERANCE SITUATION IN NEW YORK CITY

The temperance forces of New York State, captained by the Anti-Saloon League and with the active support of Governor Whitman, have gained an important victory. They have not yet succeeded in passing the Optional Prohibition Remonstrance Bill, which has been described and supported by The Outlook on more than one occasion, but they have succeeded in extending over a tremendous area the opportunities and advantages of local option.

The cities of the State have in the past been denied an opportunity to vote on the question of wet or dry. Now, with the exception of New York City, they have all, by an Act of the Legislature, become local-option territory. For New York City there is the privilege of voting whether or not it shall become local-option territory at a special election to be called by a

petition of its citizens.

IN DEFENSE OF THE CLASSICS

Aroused by the movement to make education more utilitarian, and especially by the educational proposals of the General Education Board, under the leadership of Mr. Abraham Flexner, discrediting the study of Latin and Greek, Dean Andrew F. West, of the Graduate College of Princeton University, with the approval of his colleagues, arranged for a Conference on Classical Studies in Liberal Education, which was held at Princeton on June 2.

Among the several hundred men and women who attended there were, of course, a large proportion of classical teachers, members of various associations and clubs devoted to the classics, and trustees and members of the faculties of various colleges.

What was most significant about this Conference, however, was the testimony of men whose calling was far from academic. Among those who either by address or by letter or telegram thus testified to the value of the so-called classical studies were the President and the two ex-Presidents of the United States. Mr. Taft spoke of the classics "as an essential element in the best liberal education." Mr. Roosevelt declared that "every liberally educated man should be familiar with Greek or Latin, and, if possible, with both, as well as at least one of the great modern culture languages, and a wide sweep of general history and pre-history." President Wilson wrote urging that since we should not "throw away the wisdom we have inherited and seek our fortunes with the slender stock we ourselves have accumulated" we should hold every man we can "to the intimate study of the ancient classics." Such American statesmen as Elihu Root and Senator Lodge also testified as to their belief in the value of studying Latin and Greek.

Even more impressive was the list of scientists and business men who were witnesses for the usefulness of the classics. Such were H. H. Donaldson, Professor of Neurology at the Wistar Institute; Charles H. Herty, formerly President of the American Chemical Society; Lewis Buckley Stillwell, formerly President of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers; Thomas Hastings, an eminent architect; Professor Henry W. Farnam, of Yale, formerly President of the American Economic Association; President Fairfax Harrison, of the Southern Railway; Alba B. Johnson, President of the Baldwin Locomotive Works; and two eminent editors, Mr. Charles R. Miller, of the New York "Times," and Mr. Edward P. Mitchell, of the New York "Sun."

The values of such testimony lay, not so much in the nature of the arguments presented, which were not unfamiliar, but in the character of the witnesses themselves, who spoke from their knowledge of the effect which classics had had upon their varied activities.

Such testimony as this cannot be ignored. In making changes necessary to fit education to our modern needs educational reformers should bear in mind the truth that Viscount Bryce stated in a cabled message to the Conference: "The modern world needs ancient writings as much as ever, not only because they furnish perpetual delights as models of style, but also because by their very unlikeness to modern conditions they touch imagination, stimulate thought, and enlarge our view of man and nature.

THE DRAMA OF MEMORIAL DAY

EMORIAL DAY for many years has come to us like the epilogue of a great drama. It has meant to us the memory of a fulfilled ideal.

Year after year the hosts of those who marched up Pennsylvania Avenue in victory and of those who turned back to their broken homes after the tragedy of Appomattox Court-House have been melting away like mountain snows in a spring thaw.

But Memorial Day, 1917, brought to the Nation no vain regret for these melting hosts, no easy satisfaction in a completed task, but rather the challenge of a great crusade whose purpose we know better perhaps than the men of '61 knew the portent of Sumter's guns, but whose end it has not yet been given to any man to see.

The broken ranks of the veterans of the Civil War seemed doubly close to the heart of the Nation as they marched on Memorial Day beside the regiments whose call to service in the

cause of democracy is so near at hand.

More than a half-century has passed since the veterans of the greatest civil war in history laid down their muskets. To other days other arms; but the living presence of these veterans in the streets of our cities and of our villages brought home to the youth of 1917, as nothing else could have done, an understanding of the truth that democracy was not born to die.