



International

**The Oil Lease Investigation—The Senate Public Lands Committee in session at Washington. Right to left: Senator Cameron, E. L. Doheny, Senator Dill, Senator Pittman, Senator Walsh, Senator Lenroot, Senator Smoot**

discovered. There may be need also for revision of our judgment in the light of fuller knowledge. Can we do this?

If we can, it is even possible for Church Fundamentalists to sit down with Church Modernists in the worship of their common God and join hands in serving their common tasks; even possible for white and black, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, members of contending groups, estranged friends and embittered families, by "seeing straight," to discover new days, far more resplendent than the old ones of angle vision.

## The Teapot Dome Scandal

**N**OT since the notorious Ballinger case has any scandal arisen in the Government comparable to that of the Teapot Dome and other oil leases. Before the committee of the Senate which is investigating these leases it has been established that Mr. Fall, late Secretary of the Interior under President Harding, received from two oil men, to whose companies as an agent of the Government he had leased vast oil resources, \$100,000 and \$25,000 respectively. There is no proof, and it is unlikely, that he received this money otherwise than as friendly loans. There is no proof that he received this money in consideration of any favor he had shown the men from whom he had received it; but it is stated on the direct authority of Edward L. Doheny, head of the oil interests that

leased oil resources from the Government in California, and of J. W. Zevely, friend and attorney of Harry F. Sinclair, whose company leased the Teapot Dome resources in Wyoming, that the money was transmitted to Secretary Fall.

It is perfectly conceivable that these rich oil producers lent this money without a thought of its relation to any Government transaction. It is characteristic of men who take big risks and make big profits quickly to be generous in lending money to intimate friends. To a man who reckons his profits in millions, \$25,000 or even \$100,000 might easily be regarded as a small matter. What has astonished and shocked the people of the country is the discovery that a member of the Cabinet, responsible for the people's property, should be so oblivious of what is fit and proper in a public servant as to let himself be placed in the position in which Mr. Fall finds himself.

What has made the matter worse is the appearance of an attempt to conceal the facts in the case. It is true that this may not be an actual attempt to conceal them, but simply an unfortunate lapse of memory and misunderstanding. The difficulty, however, that the committee has had in eliciting the facts has not made the public impatience any the less.

Last week we gave an account of the testimony of Archibald Roosevelt, son of President Roosevelt, in which he told of his suspicions which led him to resign from his position with the Sinclair interests. In that testimony he said that he understood that checks for \$68,000 had

been sent by Mr. Sinclair to the manager of Mr. Fall's ranch. At that time, the secretary of Mr. Sinclair said that he thought he had said something about six or eight cows which Mr. Roosevelt seemed to understand to refer to \$68,000. Later Mr. Sinclair's secretary refreshed his memory and acknowledged that there were checks of \$68,000 referred to at the time, but these checks were sent, not to the manager of Mr. Fall's ranch, but to the trainer of Mr. Sinclair's horses. Meantime, however, Mr. Sinclair's attorney acknowledged the sending of \$25,000 to Mr. Fall.

After it became known that Mr. Doheny, whose companies had leased the California resources, had sent \$100,000 to Mr. Fall as a loan without security, the Senate investigating committee received word from Mr. Doheny that, under conditions which would reimburse his company for expenditures, he stood ready to cancel the leases and turn the property back to the Government.

Early Sunday morning, January 27, in fact very soon after midnight, President Coolidge issued a statement in which he pointed out that he was not a judge in civil cases and could not render verdicts. But he announced that he had been advised by the Department of Justice "to employ special counsel of high rank drawn from both political parties to bring such action for the enforcement of law." He concluded his statement by saying, "Counsel will be instructed to prosecute these cases in the court so that if there is any guilt it will be punished; if there

is any civil liability it will be enforced; if there is any fraud it will be revealed; and if there are any contracts which are illegal they will be canceled. Every law will be enforced and every right of the people and the Government will be protected." Prior to the issuance of that statement, but, as it is reported, before word could be received from Congress by the President, the Public Lands Committee of the Senate had agreed upon a resolution calling for the appointment of special counsel to take control over civil and criminal action in relation to these leases.

If this were a matter affecting ordinary public lands, the situation would be bad enough, but it affects oil resources which had been set aside as a reserve for the use of the Navy. The story of these reserves and of the influence brought upon the Government to lease them runs back to the Wilson Administration. In 1916 there was an acute struggle between those who favored the leasing of these naval reserves and those who vigorously opposed it. Among those in opposition was Gifford Pinchot. The controversy which he had with Secretary Lane, who favored the leasing of these reserves, was vigorous. That occurred before Congress had empowered the Secretary of the Interior to lease oil lands. At that time, and again later, when Congress provided for leasing the oil lands, it was argued that oil wells outside the reserved area would draw the oil out of the reserve and that the best thing the Government could do would be to lease these lands and so gain some advantage from the lease. Secretary Lane, whose integrity is beyond question, concluded that, however desirable a large reservoir underground might be, where it would be available for use at any time without loss from evaporation and from other causes, it was impracticable to attempt to keep the oil there. The Navy Department opposed Mr. Lane. Later, under the Harding Administration, Secretary Fall, Mr. Lane's successor, leased the oil lands, and in doing so received the consent of Secretary Denby of the Navy. Now there is a demand not only for the punishment of any who may be involved in the transaction corruptly but also for the dismissal from office of those who failed, if fail they did, to guard with sufficient circumspection and care the property of the Nation which might be greatly needed in war time.

All Americans, without regard to party, will welcome President Coolidge's

strongly expressed determination to root out the facts and to allow punishment for any dereliction in duty to fall where it may. An increasing number of citizens will also demand that, if any negligence or incompetence has been shown, those who have been negligent and incompetent should be dismissed from office. It is not sufficient that public

servants should be merely free from corruption. It is also necessary that they should not be foolish, credulous, dilatory in action, or inefficient. We hope that the President will make it clear to the country that he proposes not only to punish the guilty and protect the Nation's property, but also to turn out those who have not been faithful and wise trustees.

## A Unique Memorial

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of The Outlook

IT is a platitude to say that personality is as great a factor in education as erudition. But it is a platitude that deserves to be recalled to mind in these days of scientific pedagogics, when encyclopædic questionnaires are offered as tests of the educated man and school-children are ranked by index numbers—or, as the technical phrase goes, by their Intelligence Quotients.

The great names in the history of teaching are those of men and women who influenced their pupils by *being* quite as much as by *knowing*. Socrates, Erasmus, Colet, Jowett of Balliol, Thomas Arnold of Rugby, Mark Hopkins of Williams, Mary Lyon of Mount Holyoke, were not inventors of systems. They did not write treatises. They did not teach in accordance with preconceived and elaborate schemes of psychology. They had a way with them, if I may be permitted to use that lovely Irish idiom. They gave, not lectures, but themselves to their pupils. It is true that we speak of the "Socratic method," but we invented the term, not Socrates. He had principles, but he would have been astonished, I imagine, if he had been told that he was the founder of a pedagogical system. He was Socratic because he was at all times simply Socrates.

I know a group of men in New York, successful in business, politics, and the professions, who meet once a year at dinner and maintain among themselves in this way an organization of friendship which they call the Smith Club. They chose the name more than twenty-five years ago, when they were boys together in a public school on the lower East Side, gratefully to honor a remarkable teacher who was principal of their school. The history of education does not know the name of H. W. Smith; I doubt if he ever had any academic honors; it is not likely that he is recorded in any "Who's Who" of the educational world. But, although

his life ended some years ago, the influence of his personality goes on extending in an ever-widening circle. For he not only touched and shaped and mellowed and strengthened the lives of the members of the Smith Club, but something of his mind and spirit will be, although they may not know it, a living part of the minds and spirits of their children and their children's children.

To the roll of New York teachers—and it is a great roll—who have put something of themselves into the very fiber of their pupils' being there should be added the name of Clara Spence. Miss Spence died last summer, after having been for more than a quarter of a century the head of a well-known New York school for girls. It was very often spoken of by those who knew it only by name as a fashionable finishing school. I never could understand, however, why the daughters of the neglected rich should not have the same kind of sympathy and personal influence that H. W. Smith gave to his boys in Rivington Street. The fact is that the fundamental spirit of Smith, the public school teacher, and Spence, the private school teacher, although they worked in totally different environments, was exactly the same. They strove and yearned, not only to develop the individual qualities and talents of their pupils to the highest possible point, but so to train them that they would become citizens of real service in the community.

I suppose I shall be considered very mid-Victorian if I say that the greatest service which a woman can render to the community is to become the radiating center of family life. If she has the gifts to become a great artist or writer or scientist like Duse or Rosa Bonheur or George Eliot or Mary Somerville or Madame Curie, by all means let her be that. But let her not abandon, at least as an avocation, her great rôle of home-