

that some compromise may be found between the two? Those who are really desirous of the United States taking full participation in the World Court of Justice should lay aside their prejudices and put their mind and strength to the forwarding of either plan as occasion may serve to show that one plan or the other is the more feasible.

When Schoolboys Choose Their Books

NOT many years ago it was the almost universal custom to destroy a pupil's potential liking for good reading by the use of the "Coroner's Inquest Method." The best in literature was painstakingly dissected, limb from limb, under the pleasing delusion that this highly improper performance would develop an appreciation on the part of the children and aid them in developing a good writing style. What most children chiefly gained was an abiding horror of good literature in general and of the classics in particular.

On top of this destructive system was the custom of planning all school reading on an adult's opinion as to what a child should like, rather than on a knowledge of what children can and will appreciate. Now of course adult experience is very valuable in such matters, but such experience should be based on a thorough knowledge of juvenile taste and capacity. School libraries, in fact, are multiplying these days, but too often yet their selection of books is made without sufficient study of the natural tastes of children. And it is only by planning to capture this taste that effective reading can be encouraged and developed. One school seems to have solved this problem. Perhaps an outline of the process may particularly be interesting to those who have read articles which have appeared in former issues of *The Outlook* concerning children's reading.

This school library was desired and then organized by a group of older boys, and a modest sum was raised by subscription and by a school musicale. The sixteen-year-old "Library Committee" then asked every boy in the school, ranging from sixth grade through high school, to hand in a list of the ten books that interested him most during the past year.

In this manner titles were obtained of books that were actually interesting to boys of different ages. From this large list the Committee selected what they

felt to be the best books mentioned, remembering that the tastes of all ages had to be considered. In all, somewhat more than 200 books were purchased to begin the library. In this list every book purchased had been declared interesting by one or more boys covering a range of age from ten to seventeen.

The selection is not a bad one at all, even from an adult standpoint. Let us touch upon one or two characteristic purchases. There were, for instance, a few biographies, including "The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page." There were but three books of poetry—Kip-



(C) Underwood

The Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, a minister with a radio voice

ling's, Poe's, and the *Odyssey*. There were many adventurous sea stories, as was quite proper, ranging from *Oliver Optic* (an old friend!) to "*Moby Dick*" and Sabatini's most gory tales. There were several scientific books, including three on "radio" and a number on chemistry—stiff ones, too. Nature study was represented by Fabre's "*Life of the Spider*" and "*Insect Adventures*." There was Toby Tyler, whom some of us have not seen for many a year, a string of Kirk Munroe's "Mate" series ("*Raftmates*," "*Dorymates*," and so on), *Openheim*, of course, and Rohmer, Howard Pyle, and Cooper—good books all, and not to be sniffed at by supercilious adults. There were some of Seton's, and, for contrast, the Polish war novels of Sienkiewicz. Dickens and Scott had their admirers, as did Doyle and Verne. Wonder of wonders, there were "*Barches-*

ter Towers" and that great novel "*The Cloister and the Hearth*." We cannot give the entire list, of course.

Here, then, were books known to appeal to boys, and the boys of the school patronize that library steadily. As reading one book leads to another, it has proved easier for the boys to read the required books. In fact, as college examinations now allow greater leeway than formerly, the English department of that school will accept almost any of these "library" books in lieu of the usual type of required reading.

The Church's New Voice

WILL the radio make for religious tolerance? It will depend on the character of the religion which is taught and preached over the radio.

Hitherto the vast majority of churchgoers of every denomination have kept pretty closely within the confines of their own Church. Presbyterians have flocked with Presbyterians, Baptists with Baptists, Episcopalians with Episcopalians, and Catholics with Catholics. Now with the broadcasting of religious services it is quite possible for an ardent Protestant, even a Ku-Kluxing Protestant, to listen to the pastoral of some Catholic priest. It is equally possible for an ardent Catholic to imbibe the advice of an eminent Protestant divine without trespassing upon the property of a Protestant church. It is possible that in such cases both Catholics and Protestants may discover an amazing number of things common to their faiths—particularly in the field of conduct.

The great power which the radio gives to the Church brings with it an equal danger. If it gives power to mitigate intolerance, it also gives power to create intolerance. An intolerant sermon sounds doubly intolerant over the radio, for the mysterious voice in the air cannot bring with it the face and the gesture of the speaker. Listening to a man with whose views you disagree and observing that he is made of flesh and blood, you might come to the opinion that he would make a good neighbor, after all. But there is a remoteness about the average radio voice, as there is perhaps about the average editorial, which leads the listener or reader to forget that the speech or the editorial must be the work of a human being.

Radio reaches not only church mem-

bers, but also those who have dropped out of churches or have never belonged to any church. That is another reason why every care should be taken to eliminate intolerant sermons from the air. Furthermore, there is a great body of non-church-goers who are not only offended by the intolerance of some preachers but who also find the manner of many ministers objectionable. To be frank, we doubt whether ministers realize how much the average non-church-going citizen objects to the professional tone of voice which many preachers have uncon-

sciously and unfortunately acquired. A minister may be thoroughly sincere in his belief and thoroughly sound in his opinion, but if his radio voice carries with it an air of pietism his message will lose a great deal of its effectiveness.

If churches of all denominations are to realize the tremendous benefits which can be derived from the use of the radio, they will see to it that they are represented in the air by men of tolerant minds and men who can speak the language of the lay world.

One of the most popular features on the radio programmes during the past year have been the Sunday afternoon talks by the Rev. S. Parkes Cadman at the Bedford Branch of the Y. M. C. A. in Brooklyn. They have been popular because Dr. Cadman has a powerful radio personality, because he has been tolerant, and because his voice carries with it a conviction of his humanity.

The judgment shown in the selection of Dr. Cadman is one which can well be followed by churches of every denomination.

What Japanese Exclusion Will Exclude

By K. K. KAWAKAMI

NOW that both the Senate and the House have, against the will of the President and of the Secretary of State, written a Japanese exclusion clause into the Immigration Bill, it is time we should clearly define what that clause purposes to accomplish. Such a definition seems necessary, because the scope and intent of that much-debated provision are in the public mind far from plain. The President may veto the bill, but the treaty, which may be concluded with Japan in the event of a veto, will closely follow the Oriental exclusion provisions of this bill.

First. No Japanese resident, no matter how long he may have been domiciled in America and no matter what business he may be engaged in, will be permitted to bring here his parents, wife, or children. The only exception is provided for ministers of religion and professors of academy, college, university, or seminary, who may bring to America their parents, wives, and children. This exception is made evidently for the purpose of protecting American missionaries in Japan in the event of Japan's possible adoption of a reciprocal measure.

Second. Japanese who "seek to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination," or to become "professors of college, academy, seminary, or university," will be admitted. This provision was inserted, not because its author would welcome Japanese of this class, but for fear that Japan might adopt a retaliatory law forbidding the entry of American missionaries and mission-school teachers. Certain of the members of the House Immigration Committee urged the exclusion of Buddhist ministers, but this view was not adopted, obviously for the reason above

indicated. The Committee felt secure in admitting Japanese ministers and professors, because the number of Japanese of this class seeking admission to America would be less than negligible.

Japanese ministers or professors will be permitted to enter and reside here only upon the sufferance of the American Government. They may remain in America only so long as they are actually engaged in the profession of a minister or a professor. Suppose a Japanese professor at Harvard or Yale had become so deeply attached to the scholarly surroundings of that great institution as to desire to remain in those surroundings after he had severed his official connection with the university. Would he be allowed to fulfill the desire? No; he would be told to pack up and get out of the country, for that is clearly the intention of this bill. True, this provision apparently applies to all nationals, but professors or ministers of European or American origin can become American citizens, and thus remain here indefinitely even after they have changed or retired from their profession.

Third. In the original Senate and House bills an Oriental student, to be admissible to America, must be "over eighteen years of age" and must "seek to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited college, academy, seminary, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary of Labor." This provision, if adopted, would have been a shock to the Japanese admirers of the educational system in America, for it would have barred out Oriental pupils from grammar and high schools, and from private educational institutions of lower grades than academy. In recent years well-to-do, influential Japanese

have been sending their children to America in their early teens in the hope that they might acquire a thorough American education.

Fortunately, the conferees of the Senate and House Immigration Committees have amended the above provision, lowering the age limit to "over fifteen years" and adding "school" to the above-enumerated educational institutions.

Students of Oriental origin may remain in America only so long as they are actually in schools designated by them and approved by the Secretary of Labor. The moment they graduate from their respective schools they must be "shipped" back to the Orient. Suppose an Oriental student proved so proficient that upon his graduation he found it possible for him to enter a professional career in America. Would he be permitted to remain here? Not either in the letter or the spirit of the law. Furthermore, if an Oriental student marries while in school that fact alone terminates his or her qualification to stay in America as student. In other words, Oriental students are regarded as a sort of "tolerable nuisance." Under such circumstances, the Japanese Government should discourage students to come to America.

True, provisions relative to students, except that relative to marriage, are apparently applicable to all nationals. As a matter of fact, however, non-Oriental students may enter America, regardless of age limit, within the quota restrictions, which will leave a fair margin for such students. Nor will they be required to leave America upon their graduation, for they may declare their intention to become American citizens, and thus remain here permanently. There is no restriction about their marriage. Therefore the restrictions put upon the admis-