

nothing, than to act through unofficial observers and accomplish a great deal. Otherwise Mr. Davis would have explicitly denounced the Dawes Plan.

Mr. Davis's speech is most disappointing in that portion which affirms his policies. For the most part he states them in vague and general terms. He is most explicit in his views on taxation. He attacks the Mellon Bill as the result of an effort to "favor the few possessors of swollen incomes beyond the many of moderate means," and he evidently accepts as sound the views of taxation which have been advocated by William Jennings Bryan, for he apparently assumes that all taxes are ultimately paid by those upon whom they are directly levied. As to the tariff, while thoroughly denouncing the present schedules, he proposes in their place nothing more definite than "a statute designed primarily to raise revenue for the support of the Government and framed on a truly competitive basis." On the questions raised in the controversy over the Ku Klux Klan Mr. Davis, without mentioning the Klan by name, makes the following statement, translating his views into terms of action:

Into my hands will fall, when I am elected, the power to appoint thousands of persons to office under the Federal Government. When that time arrives I shall set up no standard of religious faith or racial origin as a qualification for any office. My only query concerning any appointee will be whether he is honest, whether he is competent, whether he is faithful to the Constitution. No selection to be made by me will be dictated, inspired or influenced by the race or creed of the appointee.

For specific and clear statements on most of the chief debatable questions before the country the reader of this speech will search in vain. Mr. Davis advocates the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment, but he says nothing about the present prohibitory statute. Is he in favor of relaxing it? He does not say. What plans has he for the reorganization of the railways or for the modification of railway regulation? His answer does not appear. He says nothing definite about Conservation. Does he approve, for example, of the specific plans approved by Senator Walsh, of Montana? Or does he hold to the policies which were laid down by Theodore Roosevelt? Nothing in his speech tells. He has nothing to say about immigration. He mentions both disarmament and the

maintenance "of the means of adequate National defense," but he says nothing which would either allay the fears of those who dread all preparation for war as provocative of war, or reassure those who believe that the Government's first duty is to provide for the safety and security of the people. Even as to the League of Nations, of which he is known to be a strong advocate, he is willing to say: "Neither have I at any time believed, nor do I now believe, that the entrance of America into the League can occur, will occur, or should occur until the common judgment of the American people is ready for the step." Whether he thinks the American people are ready for the step now, or should be urged to take the step, he does not say.

Before The Outlook of this date will have reached all its readers President Coolidge will have delivered his speech of acceptance. When that appears the issue will have been joined. The campaign does not seem to us quite so issueless as Mr. Frost, in his correspondence on another page, makes it appear. Until, however, we have before us the President's speech, we shall defer further comment.

Mr. Mason's Articles

THOSE who think of art in any of its forms as merely a means of enjoyment miss its true value. It is not merely a decoration, it is a revelation.

Those who measure the greatness of a picture, or a cathedral, or a statue, or a symphony, by the thrill that

it gives them do not understand it. Painting, architecture, sculpture, and music are not intellectual substitutes for a roller-coaster. They are means by which man sees the universe in which he lives as it really is.

The artist, therefore, has a function not unlike that of the philosopher and the prophet. Instead, however, of thinking out the truth in abstract form, as the philosopher does, or summoning mankind to faith in the truth, as the prophet does, the true artist seeks to put the truth into visible or audible form.

Of all the arts there is none that performs this function quite so directly as music. Speaking a universal language and unconstrained by the need for serving any other purpose, music in the hands of a great artist is as near perfection in an imperfect world as man can attain.

To understand music it is not necessary to understand the technique of the artist, but it is necessary to understand his aims and something of his means. In the articles which begin in this issue of The Outlook Daniel Gregory Mason makes these aims and these means clear. Taking the folk-song as one of the simple and basic forms of music, these articles will consider in turn the Art Song, the Opera, Piano Music, and Chamber Music. They are designed not merely for the musically uninformed, though we believe readers who know little or nothing of even the elementary terms used in music can understand and enjoy them, but also for those who, however versed in music, are glad to re-examine at intervals the foundations of the art.

A New Hot Weather Sport

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of The Outlook

ONE would hardly call the study of the dictionary a midsummer sport, and yet during the recent "spell" of hot weather the heat drove me to the dictionary, in which I found a good deal of entertainment. The sport consisted in attempting to tag elusive definitions which refused to be caught, or, when caught, to give intelligible information. The game was started by my attempt, with the few reference books at my command, to find out the meteorological difference between "mean temperature" and "average temperature." I came out of the game much

more confused and heated than when I went in. I learned only one thing accurately, namely, that one way to keep cool is to abstain from consulting thermometric tables.

The New York "Tribune" in its daily calendar of the weather recently stated that the highest temperature of August 7 was 92 and that the lowest temperature was 74, and from this deduced the information that the average temperature for the day was 83. Now I had a dim recollection, surviving from such smattering scientific knowledge as I acquired forty years ago in a small New

England college, that the mean temperature of a given day is the average of the highest and lowest temperatures of that day, and that the average temperature is the average of many readings of the thermometer taken at stated intervals during the twenty-four hours. None of my acquaintances whom I consulted during the day, many of them highly educated and highly intelligent, although none of them professionally scientific, could give me any coherent explanation of the problem. So in the evening I turned to the Standard Dictionary. In that mighty two-volume work I found the adjective "mean" defined as "intermediate as to position occupied; between extremes; equidistant from given limits; average." The substantive "mean" is defined to be "the middle point or state between two extremes; a quantity having an intermediate value between two extremes, or between several quantities, especially the average or arithmetical mean." Next I turned to "average" and found that it is "the quotient of any sum divided by the number of its terms." Here I was at sea because it is quite apparent that the average of the two extremes of a series of numbers is not always the same as the average of the entire series.

Expert mathematicians will of course laugh at all this. There is undoubtedly some simple explanation of the words "mean" and "average" as applied to temperature. I am, however, simply trying to show how little the lexicographers help an honest layman who is sincerely seeking for information.

Having failed to get any help from the dictionary, I bethought myself of turning to the word temperature. I found nothing there about "mean" or "average" temperature, but read with great care and bewilderment the following enlightening paragraph:

The temperature of one body is said to be higher or lower than that of another according as it imparts heat or receives it from the other when the two are brought into contiguity. Besides this relative criterion of temperature scientists recognize an absolute one, regarding temperature as a measure of molecular motion and measuring it from absolute zero (see ABSOLUTE), whose position is calculated from thermodynamic data and laws. The air—or gas—thermometer conforms almost exactly, and the mercurial thermometer quite nearly, to this thermodynamic definition of temperature. Compare THERMOMETER.

The molecular motion of my game of tag was by this time getting extremely thermodynamic. Nevertheless I took a long breath, turned and pursued THERMOMETER. Capturing it, this is what I found: "An instrument for measuring temperature. See TEMPERATURE."

By this time, utterly exhausted, I gave up the chase, knowing no more about the subject than when I began except that the average temperature for August 7 was a very mean one. While resting from my labors in the foregoing pursuit of knowledge, and ruminating on the peculiarities of lexicographers, I recalled that one July day about twenty-five years ago a small nephew asked me if house-flies die at the end of the summer, after laying their eggs, like butterflies, or live for several seasons, like birds. I endeavored to get the information out of the dictionary and encyclopædia. These useful books referred me from house-fly to *Musca domestica*, thence to *Lepidoptera*, thence to *Diptera* where I paused long enough to learn that the house-fly belongs to "an order of euglossate insects having a single anterior pair of membranous wings with radiating nervures and a posterior pair of poisers or halteres, and a suctorial proboscis: includes the flies, gnats, mosquitoes, etc." Thus driven back to house-fly, I was again turned in the direction of *Musca domestica*, and should have been going the rounds yet, like a horse in a treadmill, if my nephew had not happily forgotten to push his question to an ultimate solution.

Dr. Johnson, in his famous Dictionary, defines a lexicographer as "a writer of dictionaries, a harmless drudge." With the word drudge I have no quarrel, but I take issue with Dr. Johnson in his employment of the adjective harmless. It is certainly harmful to get into a passion, and I know of no book that can be more exasperating than the dictionary or the encyclopædia can be at times. Boswell relates that a lady once asked Dr. Johnson "how he came to define *Pastern* the knee of a horse: instead of making an elaborate defense, as she expected, he at once answered, 'Ignorance, Madam, pure ignorance!'" I should be inclined to say that the trouble with the modern lexicographer is not ignorance but too much knowledge. Dr. Johnson was not a scholar in the modern sense of the word, and, while his conversation was direct, incisive, and witty, he often wrote ponderously. But his pon-

derosity was not mere dull, dead weight; it had, as Burke said, the strength of an oak. In its heaviest moments it had wit. Johnson was one of the executors of the estate of his friend Thrale. "When the sale of Thrale's brewery was going forward," says Boswell, "Johnson appeared bustling about, with an inkhorn and pen in his button-hole, like an exciseman; and on being asked what he really considered to be the value of the property to be disposed of, answered, 'We are not here to sell a parcel of boilers and vats, but the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice.'" When traveling with Boswell in Scotland, a country which Johnson affected to despise, Boswell called the great Doctor's attention to a mountain as being "immense;" Johnson somewhat contemptuously replied, "No; it is no more than a considerable protuberance!"

It would be too much, I suppose, to ask modern dictionary makers to get this kind of picturesque language into their definitions. On the day of high mean temperature which was the occasion of this article my wife remarked, "What a hot sound that locust makes." "Yes," I replied, "but what a cool song that house-wren sings!" This brief interchange of ideas sent me again to the dictionary in quest of information. I found that the American locust is a cicada, and that the cicada is "one of other hemipters and orthopters, as the locust or cricket, that makes a stridulating sound." The word stridulating has its root in the Latin verb *strido*, which means to creak. Now creaking comes from friction, and friction implies heat. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that the sound of the locust or the cricket should emphasize the hot weather in which they apparently rejoice. In this case the dictionary was enlightening, but it gave no explanation as to why the cheerful song of the little house-wren, that lives in a tiny, swaying, cylindrical box which is suspended by a wire from the limb of the maple tree just outside my library window, should be so cool and refreshing. The dictionary simply says that the wren is "a troglodytine bird, especially of *Troglodytes* or a related genus, having short rounded wings and a short tail carried erect. *Troglodytes troglodytes* is the common Old World wren. The house-wren (*Troglodytes aedon*), the winter wren (*Troglodytes hiemalis*), Bewick's wren (*Thryothorus bewicki*), and the Carolina wren

(*Troglodytes ludovicianus*) are familiar North American examples."

How such a little bird with such a gigantic nomenclature can sing such an angelic song is hard to conceive. But the song is cooling, I surmise, because it

is a spray of rippling, sparkling, limpid melody. It suggests the tinkling, dripping, splashing of a fountain of clear, cold water in the sunlight. For the *Troglodytes aedon*, unlike most other song birds, sings all day long—even in

the heat of a midsummer noon. It is a serene and refreshing friend to have about the house on a day of irritating thermometric readings—or, perhaps I should say, of thermodynamic dictionary readings.

Our Four-Handed Political Chess Game

Special Correspondence by STANLEY FROST

A VISITOR from Mars might well wonder what the Presidential campaign was all about. This is almost the most complicated, confusing, and unsatisfactory campaign on record. The intricacies of the last three-party campaign, when Wilson, Roosevelt, and Taft were running, will be more than doubled.

This is because this year we have not only three parties, but the Ku Klux Klan. La Follette will cut across the campaigns of both the big parties, and then the Klan will cut into all three. There are still other minor parties. Thus there are many different elements involved, each of them of a strength as yet unknown, any of them likely to coalesce presently into combinations as yet unguessable but sure to be weird. It is these elements which make the victory of the Republicans uncertain, in spite of the immense advantages with which they start the campaign. It is a four-handed game of chess—each player moving at will against all the other three, and with onlookers permitted to take part, too!

All the minorities are in some degree against the G. O. P., but that is about the only similarity between them, and that is not always the controlling motive with any of them. Each one, and particularly the La Follette and Klan groups, has ambitions and troubles of its own; each threatens both the big parties in some ways; each is likely to be able to throw sand in the bearings of either of the big machines.

We are quite likely, therefore, to discover in November that the election has been decided by some obscure factor which so far has not even been considered.

At the risk of repeating fundamentals of politics already understood by many readers, I should like first to review the tactical situation which gives comparatively small minorities so overwhelming a power in the present campaign. It is not probable that all these minorities together will control fifteen per cent of the total vote, so it is important to get firmly

in mind the circumstances which endow that small vote with such a leverage. These circumstances depend on the balance of power both inside many States and between all the States in the Nation at large.

Where the Minorities Get Their Power

IF there were some big issue or some big enthusiasm in the present campaign, this minority power would disappear. It is only the issueless, characterless nature of the present campaign, when most voters neither want nor hope for anything in particular, and when they may be induced to act on prejudice, minor resentments, or personal, class, and sectional interests, that gives the guerrilla forces a chance.

As it is, their first opportunity will come inside the States. In most States this year it is not likely that either party will have any very large majority—100,000 may be considered a fair average. Now if one of the minority forces can go into such a State and draw that number of votes away from the stronger of the big parties, it will defeat that big party, even though it gets nothing for itself. As an example: New York State is normally Republican, but this year the Democrats are hoping to carry it by a narrow margin, perhaps inside 50,000. Suppose, as is possible, that La Follette runs in that State, draws a labor vote of two or three hundred thousand, most of which would come from the Democratic strength. It is plain that his campaign would return the State to the Republicans.

Again, it is quite possible that the Klan will be able to throw a large part of its vote to either party as its leaders see fit. It has done this in many primaries. There are above twenty States in which its membership is over the 100,000 mark. In any such State, therefore, it is quite likely to be able to upset the "normal" situation and give the State to either party, regardless of the major campaigns and campaign issues.

The situation is similar when we come to the Electoral College. To elect a President some party must have a majority—266—of the electors' 531 votes. If La Follette can carry enough States so that the total of his electoral votes and of those of either major party is above that number—266—he will prevent any election. This would leave the choice of a President to the present House of Representatives, where, through the Farm Bloc, La Follette believes, he could dictate the results. But the Klan also has members in the House, and will put others under obligations during the coming campaign, so that it, too, will have a finger in that pie. Incidentally, since La Follette's war record was hardly one hundred per cent American, the Klan, to be consistent, must fight him all down the line.

La Follette's original plan was to campaign in the Northwest and the wheat belt, getting all his strength by cutting into the Republican vote. Since the nomination of so conservative a Democrat as Davis, however, and the rallying to La Follette of the semi-radical labor leaders, it is likely that this campaign will cut into the Democratic strength almost as much as into the Republican. The support promised him by Senator Wheeler and other "Progressive Democrats" is only the beginning of the damage that may be caused the Davis ticket. Far worse is the minority cutting that may be caused in States which would otherwise go to Davis. Since there is little chance that La Follette himself could get most of them, this means that they would be thrown to Coolidge. If that happens with even a few, La Follette would beat his own scheme, for to succeed he must make sure that he and Davis between them have an Electoral College majority.

In general, it may be said that in the farming States La Follette, by rolling up a fairly large vote, would cut under Coolidge and throw the States he failed to win to Davis. But in the East, where the La Follette strength is with labor and the hyphenates, he would cut far