

But the Chinese ought to give them a chance to come out safely."

"How about business interests and property? Do you think we ought to protect them?"

"I don't see how we can protect business during a war. Of course, any property that can be reached might be guarded. But it seems a good deal like being caught in a hurricane. You have to wait till it's over and then straighten things out. It sounds to me as if the people doing business in China were just out of luck, for the time being."

It struck the Foreign Editor, thinking over the conversation, that the needed editorial explaining the situation in China had been outlined.

The Marshall-Smith Correspondence

G OVERNOR ALFRED E. SMITH'S reply to Charles C. Marshall will be a historic document. It will not prevent the American people from raising the question of ecclesiastical control over government whenever occasion inclines them to do so; but it will remain as a standard by which both public men about whom such a question may revolve and their critics will be judged. It should forever make it impossible for the form of a public man's religious faith to become a political issue in this country. It is statesmanlike in its simplicity, in its transparent genuineness, in its freedom from every vestige of personal impatience or irritability, and in the dignity and directness of its style. In every respect it is worthy to stand beside other landmarks in the history of American progress.

By raising the question whether loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church is consistent with loyalty to the United States Mr. Marshall in his "Open Letter to the Hon. Alfred E. Smith," printed originally in the "Atlantic Monthly" for April, has done a public service. He has succeeded in making that question, heretofore too much associated with bigotry, a National question of strictly political significance. By the form in which he put the question he has made it possible for a Roman Catholic to answer without seeming to heed unworthy imputations.

Mr. Marshall admits as true "that a loyal and conscientious Roman Catholic could and would discharge his oath of office with absolute fidelity to his moral standards;" but he proceeds to give his reasons for stating that "those moral standards differ essentially from the moral standards of all men not Roman Catholics." In the first place, he quotes

authorities to support his contention that the Roman Catholic Church allows toleration of other religious societies not by right but by favor; that in the twilight zone between Church and State where the question arises as to what is spiritual and what is civil, the Roman Catholic doctrine is that the Church prevails; that, in particular, the claims of the Roman Catholic Church conflict with those of the State in education and in marriage; and that the claims of the Roman Catholic Church of sovereign jurisdiction "over all men in spiritual affairs without regard to their assent" may raise grave international issues, as, for example, in the United States' relations with Mexico. Citing some of the record of the Roman Catholic Church in England, Mr. Marshall asked whether that record was consistent, in Governor Smith's opinion, with the peace and safety of the State.

Governor Smith has replied, not as a candidate for office, but as an American citizen. He declares that his experience leads him to know that there is no conflict between religious loyalty to the Catholic faith and patriotic loyalty to the United States; that there is no conflict between his official duties and his religious belief. On matters involving Church law he consulted very sagaciously with a Catholic priest known to the country as the Chaplain of the 165th Regiment in the World War—Father Francis P. Duffy, whose patriotism has been both officially and popularly recognized. And sagaciously too he has provided his own summary of his answer, which is as follows:

I summarize my creed as an American Catholic:

I believe in the worship of God according to the faith and practice of the Roman Catholic Church. I recognize no power in the institutions of my Church to interfere with the operations of the Constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land.

I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men and in equality of all churches, all sects and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor.

I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State and in the strict enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I believe that no tribunal of any church has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land other than to establish the status of its own communicants within its own church.

I believe in the support of the pub-

lic school as one of the corner-stones of American liberty. I believe in the right of every parent to choose whether his child shall be educated in the public school or in a religious school supported by those of his own faith.

I believe in the principle of non-interference by this country in the internal affairs of other nations and that we should stand steadfastly against any such interference by whomsoever it may be urged.

And I believe in the common brotherhood of man under the common fatherhood of God.

In this spirit I join with fellow-Americans of all creeds in a fervent prayer that never again in this land will any public servant be challenged because of the faith in which he has tried to walk humbly with his God.

More important, however, than any statement in this summary is his citation and approbation of statements rejecting as usurpation any attempt of priest, bishop, Pope, or even general council to rule in matters civil and political or to encroach in the least upon the Constitution.

In Mr. Marshall's letter there were in effect two questions. One of these concerns the political power and claims of the Roman Catholic Church. The other concerns the personal loyalty of the American Roman Catholic, Alfred E. Smith. Concerning the first, Governor Smith could not authoritatively answer. He cited the views on that subject of those high in the counsels of the Church, but neither he nor any other layman, nor any prelate, could answer with finality. But concerning his own position his answer was explicit, and ought to be final. The only question in that respect is whether Governor Smith has spoken in good faith. On that there can be no profitable discussion. On our part, we accept his words as the genuine, honest statement of a patriotic American.

But his answer is more than an answer concerning his own position; it also should serve as a warning and challenge to whoever may hold the views which Mr. Marshall has attributed to the Roman Catholic Church. Governor Smith could not state by his personal authority what the Church's position is; but he has stated what it ought to be. That the Roman Catholic Church has been a political power and is to-day a political power cannot be disputed. It is not unlikely that the greatest service of Governor Smith's letter will be in its influence upon all ecclesiastics, whether they are Roman Catholic or Protestant, who confuse religious faith with political power.

Titian Comes to Town

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of The Outlook

A MILLION dollars is a cabalistic phrase in New York. Let it be said that a house, or a jewel, or a tapestry, or a picture, has cost somebody a million dollars, and a thousand people will rush to see it and gaze on it with awe.

This is what happened lately at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. That splendid institution recently acquired a hitherto comparatively unknown portrait by Titian; the Trustees announced that funds for its purchase would come from the Frank A. Munsey bequest; and the newspapers capped the climax by intimating that the portrait was worth a million dollars, or, at any rate, that the nabob Rothschild once offered that sum for another of the canvases painted by the great Venetian. Here was an "open sesame," and scores visited the Museum who had perhaps never been inside its portals before.

Some observers find this depressing and affect to believe that it is a prostitution of Art to Plutocracy. But is this true? Did not some of the curiosity seekers who, dazzled by the glare of a million dollars, went to worship the tainted dollar remain to receive their first real impression of painted beauty?

As a matter of fact, the portrait of the Duke of Ferrara did not cost the Museum anything like a million dollars, but it may easily be worth that sum if it can teach New Yorkers what money, wisely expended, can do for art and beauty. When it was painted, Venice, of which Titian was an adopted citizen and where he learned his trade, was the New York of the Italian Renaissance. It was a city of merchant princes, bankers, and politicians. They loved money, but they also loved beauty, and they spent the money made by their shrewdly conducted trading ventures in making Ven-

ice, what it still is to-day, one of the most picturesque cities in the world.

"The whole purpose of Venice," says the chief English biographer of Titian, "lay in the transmission of merchandise from the East to the West and *vice versa* by the inland seas." Its wealthy merchants knew gems, silks, satins, velvets, furs, and brocades at first hand.

It is no wonder that the painters they employed to make their public and private portraits learned how to paint the sheen of satin and the texture and color of velvet better than any other painters the world has known. "Only Titian," says Bryson Burroughs, of the Metropolitan Museum, speaking of the newly acquired portrait of the Duke of Ferrara, "could have painted the deep crimson velvet of the doublet, the soft fur of the collar, the liquid blue of the sapphire, and the glint of the pendant pearl on his chest. Surely our picture is one of his great achievements."

Titian was a country boy, born in 1477, or thereabouts (for dates were not very exact in those days), in the little Alpine village of Cadore in the Venetian republic. Even to-day this mountain hamlet is twenty miles from the nearest railway station. His full name was Tiziano Vicelli, but the Italians of his period were accustomed to use the baptismal rather than the family cognomen in speaking of their famous countrymen. Thus Alighieri is known as Dante and Buonarrotti as Michelangelo.

Titian was sent to Venice as a mere boy to learn "the trade" of an artist. In those days a long and arduous apprenticeship was considered as necessary in art as in industry. Unlike the modern "cubists," the artists of the Renaissance believed a knowledge of anatomy and draughtsmanship to be the very basis of good painting.

Titian began his art life as a worker in mosaics, but soon turned his attention to painting. He introduced novelties into the technique of his art, such as mixing varnish with his colors and laying on his paint in broad smears with his thumb instead of a brush when he wished to produce a certain effect. He apparently believed in the sound doctrine that no amount of inspiration or intuitive genius is a substitute for painstaking labor. A contemporary says of him:

He laid in his pictures with a mass of colors which served him as a groundwork for what he wanted to express. I myself have seen such powerful strokes swept in by him with solid pigment, sometimes with pure "terra rossa" [red ocher]—and this served him for the half-tones—sometimes with a brush full of white lead; and with the same brush dipped in red, black, or yellow he picked out the lights. In four strokes he had sketched in a remarkably beautiful figure. Then he laid the picture against the wall, and left it there, often for several months, without looking at it again, and when he wanted to work at it he examined it very critically, as if it were his mortal enemy, in order to discover any possible faults. . . . Then he took away a prominence here, set an arm straight there, and got a foot into the right position. So by degrees he brought his figures to the most perfect symmetry, and then he proceeded to do the same with the next picture.

In many respects Titian's career is without a parallel in the history of art. The span of his productive life is unprecedented. He lived to be ninety-nine years of age, and painted steadily and laboriously for nearly three-quarters of a century. Vasari says that he visited Titian in 1566, when the artist was in his ninetieth year, and "found him, notwithstanding his great age, brushes in hand, painting"—a notable example of the capacity of the human body and the human brain.

The College Entrance Problem—and a Solution

ONLY a short time ago a conference between secondary schools and colleges on college entrance would not have got very far. There would have been anything but a spirit of co-operation. Until very recently these two groups of institutions could see their problem only from opposing angles, with little practical attempt on the part of one to understand the conditions facing the other. Many schools, rightly, no

doubt, were beginning to feel that the College Entrance Board examinations, invaluable as they have been, have in their present form outlived their usefulness and are gradually causing the schools to become little more than machines for getting pupils through examinations. On the other hand, rightly enough too, the colleges insisted on the need for examinations, not only to hold weak schools up to the mark, but to aid

in weeding out the unfit from the increasing army of college candidates.

Last spring, on behalf of an anonymous corporation interested in such things, the writer visited a number of schools scattered from Brookline to Dayton, and south to Philadelphia, selecting schools that seemed to represent different principles and policies, in order to find if there were any common opinion regarding this serious question of