

king. We must secure the best protection possible in the midst of a civil war for American business and property. And—most of all—we must keep our traditional liberty of action.

To identify our interests and policy in China with those of concession-holding Powers would be to involve the United States in a false position which we might have to regret for all the future. It is our business to take the lead for the sort of policy in China now which will best advance the historic American principles of preserving the integrity of China and keeping the "open door" of opportunity on equal terms for all foreigners there. Fortunately, Secretary Kellogg shows that he realizes this when he announces that Americans are being urged to withdraw to safety zones, that all aid asked by Admiral Williams at Shanghai is being given, and that the Government is exercising its right of independent action while co-operating with other Powers on problems of joint concern.

Imagine, for a moment, a similar situation in the United States: the southwestern half of the country at war with the northeastern half, rioting and banditry rife, a fierce resentment of all aliens aflame, and foreign lives and property attacked. Then imagine the spreading of news that the British had sent fleets to Boston and New York and landed troops, that the French had occupied Baltimore and Philadelphia and Washington, that the Italians had seized New Orleans, that the Canadians had entered Chicago in force, and that Japanese squadrons had arrived at Seattle and San Francisco. Would not Americans forget their differences, temporarily, and join to expel the foreigners? Could any other people, according to the means at their disposal, be expected to act differently? That is one feeling which is the same in any country, whether it is America or Russia or China. It is the situation we have to face in the Far East.

We need calm and far-sighted judgment. But intervention together with other Powers means to embark impetuously on a cruise with several captains and no fixed course of destination—and Heaven help the crew!

A Reassurance

A COMMENDABLE effort at consolidation, in the United States Department of Agriculture, of various units engaged in chemical research is meeting with a measure of opposition, not serious perhaps, but difficult of comprehension from a superficial view.

The Bureau of Chemistry is to absorb the Bureau of Soils (an organization that has had to do with soil chemistry and fertilizers), the Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory (which has had to do with methods of extracting nitrogen from the air), and two offices from the Bureau of Plant Industry (which have had to do with soil fertility and soil bacteriology). Thus all of the chemical research work of the Department is to be consolidated under a single administrative head.

It is conceivable that objection might come from persons directly interested in the bureaus and offices to be absorbed, but it does not. It comes, in the main, from a former chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, the eminent chemist Dr. Harvey W. Wiley. Dr. Wiley may be regarded, practically, as the founder of the Bureau of Chemistry. He should have, it would seem, no sentimental objection to its becoming a larger bureau.

But if the Bureau of Chemistry is to gain a great deal, it is also to lose a little. The work of enforcing the Food and Drugs Act is to be taken out of the Bureau of Chemistry and placed in an administrative unit under the Director of Regulatory Work. That, apparently, is the thing to which Dr. Wiley makes strenuous objection. He is quoted as saying that enforcement of the act is to be taken out of the hands of chemists and placed in the hands of a "lawyer." But Dr. Wiley objects also to some things that have been done by the chemists in the enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act.

This objection goes back to Dr. Wiley's warfare of almost a generation ago on benzoate of soda and sulphur dioxide in foods. He held that these two substances are injurious. The Remsen Referee Board, appointed by President Roosevelt, failed to find that they were injurious. Their use in foods has been permitted ever since, under the regulation, however, that the presence of either in a preserved food must be stated on the label. Dr. Wiley has never been reconciled to this practice.

Two of the three chiefs of the Bureau of Chemistry under whom the continuance of this practice has been permitted developed under Dr. Wiley's guidance. W. G. Campbell, though educated as a lawyer, was Dr. Wiley's chief examiner. Dr. C. A. Browne, who succeeded Mr. Campbell as Chief of the Bureau, was one of Dr. Wiley's laboratory chiefs.

It happens that the "lawyer" who is to wrest enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act from the hands of the chemists is this same Mr. Campbell, now Director of Regulatory Work of the

Department of Agriculture and charged with the enforcement of nearly half a hundred laws. He has been engaged in food inspection work for twenty-one years. Enforcement of the Federal Food and Drugs Act has actually been in his hands ever since Dr. Wiley appointed him chief inspector in 1907. In very large measure, he developed the machinery of enforcement. It was because of his efficiency in enforcing that particular act that the Department of Agriculture placed him in charge of all the regulatory work with which Congress has charged it. He will still have at his command, just as he has always had, the services of chemists in finding the facts upon which he will proceed. The only essential change is that the Bureau of Chemistry is no longer to be distracted from research work by the exigencies of enforcement.

In deciding upon the consolidation and, at the same time, the separation of functions, Secretary of Agriculture Jardine did not proceed upon his own judgment alone. A group of leading chemists outside of the Department studied the situation for months and recommended the changes.

When the Food and Drugs Act was passed, its administration was properly placed in the Bureau of Chemistry. Dr. Wiley was then chief of that Bureau. He was practically its founder. He was the father of the Food and Drugs Act. In both the Bureau and the act he was building to himself enduring monuments. He had at his command, as no one else did, the means for enforcing the act.

But 1906 was one year, and 1927 is another. Twenty years have intervened. Changes have come. Enforcement machinery can now function better outside than inside the Bureau of Chemistry.

The essential point in the situation is that the changes being made are not, in any sense, radical. Industry may be assured that it will not be upset. The public may be assured that its food supply will be safeguarded, as it has been since 1907.

Roman Catholicism and the Presidency

BETWEEN Roman Catholicism as a religious faith or system of doctrine and Roman Catholicism as a political power Americans of whatever creed should have no great difficulty in distinguishing.

Whether a man holds to the Roman Catholic faith or not, whether he accepts the creed of the Roman Catholic Church as an explanation of this life and as a hope for the life to come, has no bearing

whatever upon his eligibility for public office; but whether his loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church as a political power is compatible with thorough loyalty to the constitution and principles of the nation of which he is a citizen has a very distinct bearing upon his eligibility.

That the Roman Catholic Church is a political power, not only in this country but in the world of nations, cannot very well be denied. To-day in many countries of Europe there are distinctive Catholic parties, and in some of them Catholic parties are determining factors in deciding national policies. In European chancelleries are representatives of the Vatican. Our next-door neighbor, Mexico, has been rent by a struggle between the Mexican Government and the Roman Catholic hierarchy as a political power.

Now the question of the relation between the Roman Catholic Church as a political power and the Government of the United States has been raised in the candidacy of Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, for the Presidency. In the "Atlantic Monthly" for April a New York attorney, Charles C. Marshall, has addressed an open letter to Governor Smith, presenting to him certain questions in the light of the political history of the Church to which he belongs and of its political doctrines. To such questions it is right that answers should be made. It is not sufficient to say that in the government of a free people there should be no distinction or consideration of religious beliefs. The questions that rise in the minds of Americans when a loyal Roman Catholic is considered for the Presidency are not religious questions, but political.

Even as political questions they are not of first importance or of National concern in the case of candidates for local offices, or even in the case of the appointment of an Associate Justice or Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Questions as to conflicting loyalties might arise without danger in such instances. But the Presidency of the United States is an office unique in the world. The fathers of the Constitution recognized it in making the office of the Presidency the only one to which a foreign-born American is ineligible. He, together with his understudy, the Vice-President, is the only representative of the electorate of the entire Nation. He has power to make war without declaring it. He institutes policies. He is not only the head of the state, but in a peculiar sense its guide and controller.

What is the nature of the Roman Catholic Church as a political power?

What are the principles which it avows concerning the relation between itself and any state? What have been its practices, its claims upon its adherents, its record in making its claims effective?

Such questions have nothing to do

with religious faith. They would be equally valid concerning the candidacy of any adherent of a political organization, whether it were Protestant or Catholic, Jewish or Christian, or the Ku Klux Klan.

Educated Sportsmen

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of The Outlook

THE Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has just published an interesting bulletin which is a careful and complete survey of the place and influence of sports in British schools and universities. The author is Major Howard J. Savage, of the staff of the Foundation. Major Savage is a graduate of Tufts and Harvard, and has been a teacher of English in Harvard, Radcliffe, and Bryn Mawr. Among Major Savage's conclusions are the following:

1. Games and sports form an important phase of the educational process as it is carried on at British schools and universities.

2. However much participation in games may be insisted upon at public and day schools, at all universities sport is essentially casual. It is the result, not of compulsion or pressure in any form, but of individual volition and choice. College and university sport is therefore free from exaggerated self-consciousness.

3. The major emphasis of British university student opinions sustains academic work and the group of activities connected with it rather than games. Sport is made ancillary to study. The reason is to be traced in the strong persistence of the tradition that a university shall be conducted as primarily an intellectual agency.

4. The course of British sport has always been strongly influenced by the graduates of the universities and the public schools.

5. Since games are regarded in Great Britain as essentially play rather than work, the line between the amateur, the man who plays at his games, and the professional, the man who works at sport for financial profit, is strictly drawn in most branches of athletics.

6. It is to the tonic quality of moral education implied in these ideals that games and sports in British schools and universities significantly contribute.

If these six judgments were summarized epigrammatically, would they not read thus: In Great Britain the universities control athletics, while in America athletics control the universities?

Major Savage might have pointed out—although, doubtless it was outside his purview—that the influence of university men on sport in Great Britain is distinctly indicated in English literary annals. The two foremost contemporary writers on golf in England, for example, are public school and university men. Bernard Darwin is an Etonian and a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge; Horace Hutchinson was educated at Charter House School and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he took classical honors. I do not know of any instances in this country of sports writers with such a literary background. The result is that the writings on sport by both Darwin and Hutchinson have a literary flavor that is hard to find in the sporting columns of American newspapers.

Moreover, the first-class men of letters in England have not thought it unworthy of their art to write on sports of various kind. The Rt. Hon. Augustine Birrell, a statesman and barrister by vocation, but an essayist by choice, has a delightful paper on George Borrow, who wrote the best apostrophe to prize-fighters that has probably ever been penned in English. This tribute may be found in the famous twenty-fifth chapter of "Lavengro," and is, says Mr. Birrell, "as good as Homer."

But perhaps the best example of that appreciation of the fine side of sport, which is not uncommon among Englishmen of letters, is found in an essay of Hazlitt's. If there ever was an Englishman who lived, and moved, and breathed in an atmosphere of literature, it was William Hazlitt. It may almost be said that he out-Lambded Charles Lamb in this respect. In one of his essays, written more than one hundred years ago, he paid the following tribute to a famous handball or fives player:

When a person dies, who does any one thing better than any one else in the world, which so many others are trying to do well, it leaves a gap in society. It is not likely that any one will now see the game of fives played in its perfection for many years to