

truth, a desire to know what the noble minds of the past have done, and a great spirit of human sympathy and a divine yearning for the future of the race. These the small college can possess, and the colleges or universities, large or small, that do possess them will give us our future leaders.

THE FIGHT OF A CLEAN SPORTSMAN

THERE is no name in the annals of professional baseball in this country which has lingered affectionately so many years in the memory of millions of fans as has the name of Christy Mathewson. Only last week an emotional wave of interest again swept over the United States when this idol of other years was reported in every important newspaper from the Atlantic to the Pacific to have hurled the first ball in a "bush" league game at Saranac Lake, straight and true across the plate for a "strike." It was the only ball he pitched, but some two thousand persons, including old friends from near and far, gathered in that secluded health center to see Mathewson do it.

He appears to be winning a grim fight of years with tuberculosis, contracted abroad, if memory serves us right, with the American Expeditionary Forces; winning it by the exercise to the utmost of the highest human quality of perfect self-control which made him so long a pre-eminent victor on the baseball diamond. He was a human thoroughbred in this field of National sport. He was applauded by millions for his character as much as for his victories, and the chief quality of his character was self-control. Nobody who has ever seen him pitch can forget it. The rest of the team might go to pieces, but Mathewson never did. Batters might find his curves furiously for the time being, but he coolly bided the turn of the tide. He was directly credited by the experts with winning one of the World's Series single-handed. Our recollection is that in this series the opposing team did not score a run against him. He never disputed an umpire's decision. He might look whimsically and regretfully in an umpire's direction, but he never said a word. He was a marked contrast to the latest popular idol, Babe Ruth, whose self-indulgent two hundred and fifty pounds seems always to be brawling with umpires, and who seems to be always wishing to thrash the grand stand whenever he strikes out and the grand stand jeers.

Mathewson was a graduate of Bucknell University, in Pennsylvania, and he

was an intelligent thoroughbred in his chosen vocation. Breeding and training will tell, whether in man or beast. Joe Patchen was the most famous race-horse of his time, because added to his other qualities was a perfect self-control. When the whole field of horses came rushing down towards the judges' stand and the bell rang for them to try again because they were not fairly in line when they passed the starting-point, all the other horses might go tearing down the field in a frenzy of excitement before they were pulled up; but as soon as he heard the bell Joe Patchen would stop suddenly as if he had a stroke of apoplexy and, turning quietly around, would walk slowly back to the original position at a great saving of energy and nerve over his adversaries. But he was usually good to win three out of four heats in any race in which he entered. He was everything that every other horse was, plus self-control.

It is Christy Mathewson's human self-control which has shown itself in a highly intelligent, unblemished character and career, which brought him unprecedented success on the baseball diamond, and which is now probably happily winning for him his fight with one of the grimmest and the most subtle of all physical foes.

Good breeding and good discipline count heavily. One of the Harvard rowing coaches at New London the other day is credited with a bit of philosophy in describing what brings victory in a grueling four-mile race. He is reported to have said to his men that the way they would perform in the first mile depended upon their training, in the second mile upon how they personally had lived, in the third mile upon how their fathers had lived, and in the fourth mile upon how their ancestors generally had lived.

Christy Mathewson has not only a good character and technical training, but he must also have a good pedigree.

Last year, when it became known that he needed funds in his fight at Saranac, a single benefit game on the Polo Grounds in New York netted him, according to our recollection, from thirty to forty thousand dollars. And there was no limit to the extent of his backing by the vast multitude of his admirers. It was not that he was a great sportsman pitcher, although he was that. There have been other great pitchers. But the thought of the kind of man Christy Mathewson had always been aroused the generosity of a great company of Americans. Mathewson is a type, whether in sport or politics or business, which the American people prize.

MUSIC AND POLITICS

IN an impromptu speech before the Republican Glee Club of Columbus, Ohio, President Harding drew a natural and apt comparison. He said, if we may paraphrase his words as they were reported in the despatches, that political parties were like glee clubs—they could only be successful if all the members sang together. He said that if the members of glee clubs acted like some party workers the sopranos would demand special consideration because they sang soprano and the altos, tenors, and basses would do likewise, to the immediate destruction of harmony and the eventual destruction of the glee club. He continued his comparison by applying it to his own situation. We quote directly. "I don't care to be a soloist," he said, "because I am President, but somebody has to do the directing. If men are not willing to sing to measure and score and the director's plan of harmony, there will not be much singing."

The President's comparison is admirable. Political parties must sing together if they are to produce the music of organized government. But the comparison can be developed further than it was by the President, if he has been completely quoted.

Political parties are like glee clubs. We have two such major glee clubs in the United States. These organizations are striving, not only for harmony within their ranks, but also to attract a National audience. They must, if they are to be successful, not only sing well, but they must also sing the music which the public wants.

In 1912 the music sung by the Republican glee club was so badly chosen that the bulk of the regular audience marched out of the Republican tent in a body, to the great advantage of the Democratic choir leader across the street. By 1916 a large body of auditors had tired of the Democratic programme, but not enough had gone back to the Republican tent to fill the house. By 1920 the tunes of the Democratic club had worn out their welcome, with the result that the Republican glee club director had to hang out a S. R. O. sign after the November elections.

The National audience will listen to the glee club which offers the most inviting programme, played with the greatest skill. The skill is important, but the programme must not be forgotten.

We think that there are increasing signs that the public is growing weary of some of the tunes in the Republican repertoire.

"AT WAR OVER CIVIL SERVICE"

FEW articles ever published in The Outlook have elicited such strong protests as the special correspondence by Newton Fuessle entitled "Washington at War Over Civil Service," which was published in our issue of June 14. This article was based upon statements secured from sources which both The Outlook and Mr. Fuessle had good reason to consider most authoritative as to the facts in the case. Some of the protests against this article have come from people interested in Civil Service reform; some have come from men with experience in Government positions of administrative responsibility; some from present or former Civil Service employees; and three from officers, National or local, of the Federation of Federal Employees.

Most of these protests, even when vigorous, are restrained in language and generously refrain from attributing to Mr.

Fuessle and to The Outlook any intention to misrepresent the facts.

The one letter which is heated as well as earnest in its remonstrance is from the Acting President of the National Federation of Federal Employees. It characterizes the article as ignorant and demagogic.

In general, writers of these letters of protest seem to understand that the purpose of this article was not to state The Outlook's view concerning the Civil Service, nor even Mr. Fuessle's, but to report the state of mind which is to be found in some, if not many, Washington officials.

With the exception of a letter from the United States Civil Service Commission, there is none of these letters that we can find room for in full; but in quoting from them we attempt to cover most of the important points.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Commissioners

JOHN H. BARTLETT, President HERBERT A. FILER, Chief Examiner
GEORGE R. WALES
HELEN H. GARDENER JOHN T. DOYLE, Secretary

IN the June 14 issue The Outlook printed an article entitled "Washington at War Over Civil Service," by Newton Fuessle. The substance of the article is to the effect that administrative officers of the Government are hampered in their work by the present laws which regulate the Federal Civil Service.

There are certain inaccuracies in the article and evident misunderstandings which this Commission desires to correct. The Commission does not admit that the conditions of which Mr. Fuessle complains exist in marked degree; to the extent to which they do exist they are the result of interference with and failure to enforce the laws.

A typical case is described as that of an assistant secretary of a department who one day finds that his personal secretary is not on duty after office hours, when he wishes to give her certain dictation, and who on the next day is casually informed by the same clerk, "I shan't be in to-morrow or the next day. I'm going to Baltimore to visit friends." This assertion is supposed to be made without inquiry as to whether it would suit the convenience of the clerk's chief to have her absent at that particular time.

It is definitely within the power of an administrative officer of the Government to require his subordinates to continue at work after the usual office hours if the public business makes such action necessary.

Is it not a charge against the discipline of an office, rather than against the Civil Service laws, to state that the administration of the office is so lax that a clerk is permitted to absent herself at her pleasure, without regard for the wishes of her superiors?

This is a quotation from the article: "Many of these officials, coming from private business and professional careers into Government responsibility, confess that they find themselves bewildered, baffled, and fairly hamstrung by the insolence and indifference of

Civil Service employees, who consider that their jobs are life jobs and most of whom go about their duties with lazy inefficiency."

Is that not an arraignment of departmental discipline rather than of the Civil Service system? If employees are insolent, indifferent, lazy, or inefficient, what is to prevent their discharge? It is just as much a part of an equitable merit system that inefficient and otherwise unsatisfactory employees be removed as it is that competent employees be retained, and a department head who fails to remove an inefficient employee fails in his duty.

The removal law requires that the person whose removal is sought shall be given a statement in writing of the reasons for the proposed removal, and that he shall have opportunity to make reply. Although the employee may make reply, the matter may end there if the employing department so rules. The decision rests with the employer. There is no further hearing unless the employing officer wishes it. The publicity in the matter is the safeguard against abuse of the power of removal. The employer must go on record and the employee may go on record, but the employer is the sole judge.

Mr. Fuessle missed the point here altogether. It is a fact that dismissals often are not made when they should be made. But the failure is not the fault of the law; it is due to interference with the operation of the law. Frequently when an unworthy employee is slated for dismissal he produces in his defense an array of influential supporters difficult to deny. It is this outside interference and the failure to stand against it that causes the trouble.

Comment is made in the article upon the alleged abuse of the privilege of sick leave. It is stated that "to take advantage of such sick leave one must present a doctor's certificate; but it appears that these are not very difficult to obtain."

Is that not also a reflection upon departmental administration? It does not require clairvoyant power for an administrative officer to satisfy himself that an employee is abusing the sick-

leave privilege. Actual evidence is easily obtained. If an employee is suspected of deception, it is a simple matter to have a physician or nurse connected with the welfare section of the department call at the employee's home and make investigation. It is not unusual for this course to be followed.

Abuse of the sick-leave allowance is ample ground for dismissal. A department head failing to take disciplinary action in any such case clearly is open to censure.

In this connection it may be stated that, under the law, it is entirely within the discretion of the head of a department how much, if any, vacation leave, within a thirty-day limit, he will allow, and how much, if any, sick leave, within a thirty-day limit, he will allow. Under the law, a department head may curtail either vacation leave or sick leave, or deny them altogether.

It is said that "the present Civil Service laws and rules do not insure a reasonable return of effort for money paid out." What the Civil Service laws and rules actually do is to select through competitive examinations, with much more care than is exercised by most private employers, men and women who have demonstrated their ability to perform the classes of work for which they are certified as eligible. All appointments are made for a probationary period. An employee may be dropped with little formality at any time during the six months' probation; and after that time he may be removed, through the procedure outlined, at any time, if his work or his conduct, *in the opinion of the employing officer*, is not satisfactory. The matter is one entirely within the judgment of the employer. His action is not subject to review by any one, unless there is charge with offer of proof that the removal is for political or religious reasons.

The conditions described by Mr. Fuessle, to the extent to which they exist, have nothing whatever to do with the Civil Service laws, rules, and regulations. Mr. Fuessle himself says that Commissioner Spry, of the General Land Office, is able "to cope effectively with Civil Service red tape. The Commis-