



(C) Underwood

Funeral of the man who was known in Chicago as the ruler of the underworld

to the concert in much the same spirit in which it would go to a performance of vaudeville recognized the stirring beauty in that composition and expressed its approval.

Perhaps by the lowly road of jazz musical art may be coming into its own kingdom.

ERNEST HAMLIN ABBOTT.

"The Funeral Orgies"

HE always was good to the poor." This has been the tearful last tribute to many a bandit from the Italian hills, and to hundreds of the successors of Robin Hood. The latter is of course now entirely a hero of romance, his robberies forgotten in the light of his good deeds and the glamour of his adventures. In our day many a crooked politician, many a grafter who plundered the people indirectly of tens of thousands, but gave a few thousands of it back directly, has descended into the grave with the mourners sobbing, "He always was good to the poor." So also the sentimentalist murmurs of some scoundrel or other, "Yes, he murdered three or four innocent men, and led a life of black crime—but he always was good to his mother!"

In Chicago there was buried a week

ago Dion O'Banion (perfect name for a highwayman!), the so-called "thirty-two-year-old ruler of the underworld." He was said to have been "the director of at least twenty-five murders;" he was a rum-runner, gunman, and—worst of all in the hierarchy of crime—a hijacker, that is, a robber who preys upon bootleggers. Like England's great criminal Charley Peace, he followed a blameless career by day; he was a florist. When three rival gunmen called to shoot him down, he was innocently engaged in trimming chrysanthemums.

His funeral was without the blessing of the Church, although burial in consecrated ground was permitted. But—he always was good to the poor—and so his clients and his lictors, his henchmen, his competitors, and his beneficiaries turned out by thousands. There were a thousand automobiles in line, twenty-five of them carrying "floral tributes." His widow sent a seven-foot heart, made of two thousand red roses. There was a seven-foot "wall of carnations," inscribed "To our pal—from the gang." There were two broken shafts, six feet high, of white carnations and red roses. Everything was in the best possible taste. Bands and orchestras played sweet music. The body of the deceased hijacker lay in a \$10,000 silver and bronze coffin. Such lavishness would not be

right for a rich man—but, he was always good to the poor. Over the grave was spread a floral blanket (ten men worked all day and all night to fashion it) made of pink roses, lilies of the valley, and orchids; it was tied at the corners with silver ribbons. The underworld is like the Negress who put on black underclothes for her husband's death: When they mourns, they mourns!

So celebrated they the funeral rites of mighty hijacking O'Banion.

The Higher Education of Women

FOR fifty years President L. Clark Seelye, who died on October 12 last, shortly after his eighty-seventh birthday, held under his eye Smith College, the child of his creation. President Eliot, of Harvard, is the only other educator in these times whose years have outspanned those of President Seelye. But Dr. Eliot was not the creator of Harvard College. President Seelye was the creator of Smith College. Chosen President three years before its actual beginning, he prepared the way, fostered with wisdom the small sum of money left for it by Sophia Smith, planned its course of study, and, amid many discouragements, fought with unflinching faith for the fulfillment of his vision of the higher education of women.

Dr. Seelye believed that a woman's intelligence was capable of receiving and profiting by exactly the same training as that given to a man's intelligence. He believed that a woman's college could require for its entrance exactly the same preparation as that required by the highest grade of men's colleges. And he believed that this preparation could be obtained without any preparatory school attached to the college.

In his inaugural address Dr. Seelye said that "education is a broad and thorough acquaintance with the greatest minds of the ages." Those minds were best understood, he believed, through the knowledge of the classics, science, and modern languages taught in colleges for men. Girls proved by examination that they were quite as able as boys to grasp that knowledge. Therefore, he implied, let the schools preparing boys for Harvard and Yale and other men's colleges expect to get girls ready for Smith in exactly the same way and in the same classes. It was from the New England

high schools that most of the early Smith students naturally came. Of course the later effect was to create a new type of preparatory schools for girls and to raise the standard of all girls' schools.

But, while he felt that women could profit by and should have every opportunity for the same college education as men, he went a step farther. He thought that they should have even more opportunity than men for acquaintance with the æsthetic side of the intelligence. As he said in his inaugural, "Too many of the grandest creations of human intellect are embodied in the fine arts to remain unnoticed by an institution which seeks the highest mental culture." He held that the highest products of thought and the highest products of emotion supplemented each other. "No artistic gift should be impoverished from lacking the nutriment of that broad and generous thinking on which alone it can grow to its greatest strength and beauty." The American college man might be hopelessly Philistine as regards æsthetic culture. President Seelye did not propose to have the college woman in the same predicament. Therefore time spent on music and art was counted as credit toward the degree of the regular Smith College student, and until this day is so counted. While special schools of music and art were temporarily established in connection with the College, every student in these special schools had to take some courses of a purely academic nature.

Finally, what did he conceive the fundamental purpose of the college to be? "It is not a school to make musicians, painters, or sculptors any more than it is to make poets, novelists, or astronomers, but a college to obtain that broad and thorough education in mind which is itself the best preparation for any calling." He lived to see a "vocational" course or two in the college—in education, in household chemistry, in landscape gardening. But, on the whole, Smith, like the main body of the other colleges for women and the colleges for men, has remained as he founded it, "a college of liberal arts." And his faith that a girl was better fitted to run a house or an office because she had had a college training of the mind has justified itself. Continuing to live in Northampton after his resignation, he was present like a benediction on all important occasions at the college.

The great financial ability of President Seelye, his practical sagacity and attention to detail, even his religious tenderness, are traits that have sometimes obscured his chief claim to immortality. It is only recently that the educational world, and even the alumnae whom he called "his joy and his crown," have begun to perceive that in his conception of the potentiality of the average woman's mind and the training of that mind to the enrichment of the average woman's life lay the substance of his genius.

Conferences and Conferences

AMONG current beliefs there are few held more firmly than the presumption in favor of conferences. In particular, it seems to underlie discussions about international affairs. The very word conference seems to connote the solving of all problems. Is there a question of getting Germany to pay reparations? Call a conference. Do some nations consider other nations over-armed? Call a conference. Does the world in general seem to be in need of improvement? Call a conference. For every ill that mankind is heir to it seems often to be assumed that a conference is the only medicine.

This faith in conferences has survived a most discouraging experience. In the first place, the Peace Conference at Paris did not leave the nations exhilarated. Then the succession of conferences with a climax ascending to Genoa resulted in growing friction. Of course the Conference at Lausanne can hardly be cited as an example of the efficacy of conferences in general. The conferences at Geneva—for such, in fact, have been the meetings of the Assembly of the League of Nations—have been variously estimated. The two conferences since the war which are more widely acknowledged as successful in solving serious questions were the Washington Conference of 1921-2 and the London Conference of last summer. Yet even these two conferences have not escaped reproachful criticism as ineffective. Why, after such a record, should any one believe in the effectiveness of a conference as a method of settling international differences?

And yet faith in the conference as an instrument of international justice and good will seems almost as lively as ever. The more difficult the question, the more

complicated and perplexing the circumstances surrounding it, the more persistent seems to be the demand for a conference to solve it. No question has vexed statesmen more continually than that of placing limits upon the forces and weapons of land—and air—warfare. It somehow seems to be assumed that the way to settle it is to call a conference of the nations to throw all their claims and demands together, and then to find some means of transforming all these demands and claims into concessions and sacrifices.

To doubt whether this is the best method of reaching international agreements seems to be regarded by many good people as very nearly treason to humanity.

This seems to be the chief foundation for the very widely accepted belief that if one does not have much confidence in the political value of the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations one must of course be committed to the theory that every nation should be a hermit nation. If one questions the usefulness of a general conference on the reduction of armaments one is likely to be called upon to explain how opposition to an armament conference can be reconciled with faith in the brotherhood of man or even with a desire for peace on earth.

All this exaltation of the international conference as a panacea is assumption. It is without basis in fact. It borders on the superstitious.

For certain purposes and under certain circumstances international conferences are valuable. For certain other purposes and under other circumstances they may be worse than useless—they may create rather than allay irritation. The more definite and limited the scope of an international conference and the more circumscribed its membership, the more likely it is, if we can judge by experience, to succeed in its purpose. The two outstanding examples of successful international conference—that at Washington and that at London—were both of them limited alike in object and in membership.

Even when both the object and the membership are limited, success may be doubtful. At present there is in session at Geneva the Opium Conference, which is very definitely limited in its subject-matter. There is practically one outstanding question with which that conference has to deal, and which will per-