

literary art that would make Erasmus and his Venetian friend Aldus green with envy. It puts the whole range of Greek and Latin literature at the command of any intelligent English-speaking man, and we owe it primarily to Jewish culture and generosity.

The volume of this really splendid work which I happened to pick up was the first of fourteen devoted to Plutarch's "Moralia." In it I find that Plutarch, writing on "how to tell a flatterer from a friend," concludes his essay with this pertinent passage:

It is necessary to treat frankness as a fine art, inasmuch as it is the greatest and most potent medicine in friendship, always needing, however, all care to hit the right occasion, and a tempering with moderation. Since, then, as has been said, frankness from its very nature is often painful to the man to whom it is applied, there is need to follow the example of the physicians; for they, in a surgical operation, do not leave the part that has been operated upon in its suffering and pain, but treat it with soothing lotions and fomentations; nor do per-

sons that use admonition with skill simply apply its bitterness and sting and then run away; but by further converse and gentle words they mollify and assuage, even as stone-cutters smooth and polish the portions of statues that have been previously hammered and chiseled.

I hope my Jewish friends, of whom I have many that I value, will not think that the frankness of this article has overstepped the bounds of friendship nor that I have been negligent of the excellent advice of Plutarch.

## Canada Disarmed

By DOUGLAS MACKAY

THE nations are arming again, and it would almost seem as though they were doing so in spite of their better judgment. For the ships-of-war are being launched and armaments strive in conference to come to disarm. At Geneva, when the United States, Great Britain, and Japan struggled to reach some accord on the limitation of naval armament, there was present an extraordinary analogy which the sedulous press overlooked. A disarmed nation was represented at the armament Conference.

The Dominion of Canada was represented at Geneva by the Hon. Ernest B. Mackay, Minister of Justice. He alone did not sign any agreement on behalf of the Dominion. Yet the nation which he represented was the "most disarmed" in the world. While the other great countries crouched poised on the chalk-line, ready to sprint into a new armament race, the Dominion stood by, apathetically interested.

Two destroyers and two mine-sweepers comprise the royal Canadian navy. Its diminutive equipment is all that Canada feels called upon to maintain in the use of her ocean-borne commerce—Canada is one of the great maritime powers of the world. Two great coast-guard ships on all the trade routes of the world, and four antiquated vessels for a navy. In Canada there is no demand for a big navy. The country simply is not interested. The troops maintained in the Dominion are hardly enough to suppress a civil disorder.

The permanent force consists of about 10,000 officers and men, and the units are scattered across the country as to be of little military value in a sudden emergency. Highly trained officers are without men to command. Bare skeletons of such historic regiments as the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light In-

fantry, Royal Canadian Dragoons, and Strathcona Horse are maintained. There is no military policy, as in Australia, and an exponent of universal military training or compulsory officers' training in the universities would be laughed off a public platform. All this in a proud, high-spirited country which raised 619,000 men in the late war and left 50,000 dead in Europe.

THE origins of this apathy are to be found in the people. Canadians are not frontier-sensitive. The 3,000 miles of unguarded border has become an oratorical bromide and an after-dinner anathema, but it is none the less a magnificent truth for the rest of the world to study. The other frontiers are the oceans. There is no jealous enemy at the gate. Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, perhaps the keenest military mind in Great Britain, in speaking of Europe being more heavily armed than in 1915, has said that it is not due to any imperialistic motive, but to sheer funk. Europeans are all jumpy and are keeping their side-arms on. There are no such nerves in Canada.

This unparalleled military policy—or lack of military policy—which Canada has followed can be traced to three causes:

1. Canada's geographical remoteness from racial jealousies and frontier sores of Europe and Asia.
2. The existence of the British navy.
3. The proximity of the United States.

Taking the last cause first, we have a delicate subject of which Canadians rarely speak. The blunt fact is that any enemy to Canada becomes *ipso facto* an enemy of the United States. No country could menace Canada's shores without menacing the peace of the North American Continent. No Canadian statesman has ever admitted publicly

that Canada has economized in armaments for home defense because the United States was the big brother with the shotgun ready. As a proud people taking pride in British military traditions, such arguments would not be tolerated in British North America. Yet to logical minds this unspoken, unwritten Canadian-American alliance must be a major factor in Canadian national defense. Canada's small group of professional soldiers are intelligent and highly trained specialists, and it is inconceivable that this eventuality has not been considered, though orthodox military doctrine requires strategists to work out defense problems without regard for mere probable alliances. In the world to-day, nationalist-minded as it is, frank dependence upon a foreign Power for defense is not regarded as a creditable part to play. Perhaps in frank interdependence and less single-minded independence is the secret of the disarmament which the Powers are claiming is their objective.

THAT tough, shrewd old sea-dog, Lord Fisher, has been credited with putting his finger upon this crux of the Canadian defense question. In the House of Commons last year, Henri Bourassa, independent, nationalist, and French-Canadian member, told the House of an interview he had had with the Admiral shortly before he became First Sea Lord. It was mentioned incidentally in one of Mr. Bourassa's rather lengthy speeches, and consequently did not receive much notice in the press. Mr. Bourassa said:

Canada, constituted as she is, is in a better position to advance the cause of peace than perhaps any other nation on earth.

One of the reasons is that any preparation for war we would make would

be absolutely useless to us. Just a few weeks before Lord Fisher took command of the British fleet he said to me: "It is foolish on the part of Canada to spend money in naval armaments or Imperial armaments. It is foolish and useless, because you may rest assured that England will never fight for Canada against the United States, the only country which can successfully attack Canada—not because we are not willing to do so, but because we cannot. Therefore why should you spend your money in participating in a defense which is useless to your country? If you want to make Canada safe from outside attacks, do not come here to London and talk with our ship-builders, but go to Washington and make a working arrangement for the defense of your country in common with the United States." But I said, "Oh, Lord Fisher, we have such great patriots in Canada that they would never admit of such a shameful thing as having an understanding with a foreign country to defend us." He said: "Are you so foolish in Canada? Don't you realize that the world is made up of such dependency? Do you consider that we in England are humbling ourselves because we rely on the French army to fight for us on the Continent, and because France relies on the British navy to protect her northern coast, just as for years Germany relied on England to protect her, and as we relied on Germany to occupy France while we took her colonies? Do you think it is a humble thing for Belgium to count on Germany to defend her against France, or on France to defend her against Germany? No country on earth can get along without an understanding with some other country, and the most natural understandings are made between people who are neighbors and who have common interests." Therefore I say that if we are in need of defense we will not find it in Europe; we would do better to have a cordial and worthy understanding with the United States in time of peace and in view of war, and to rely on the United States for the succor which Great Britain will be unable to give us.

The only way by which we can prevent the absorption of Canada by the United States is precisely by having the best possible understanding with that country. It would be far better to maintain a spirit of Canadianism and to prevent the social, economic, mental, and moral penetration of Americans into the souls of our young people, and then have an understanding as between government and government such as all countries have.

In doing that, sir, we would simply be continuing what has been the British policy ever since the days when George Canning concluded with Presi-

dent Monroe an alliance or an understanding under which the United States made good for England on the remainder of her possessions in America, providing England took care that neither France nor Spain would endeavor to possess any portion of America again. That was not quite idealistic, but it was a very sensible and practical policy, which has held good ever since. Whenever I go to England, I meet Tories, Liberals, statesmen, diplomats, and journalists, disagreeing on all points of policy except on the Monroe Doctrine. They consider, and have considered for a century, that the Monroe Doctrine is the permanent basis of British politics in America.

Lord Fisher's opinion is the only statement of the kind which has ever come from "higher up." It is curious that this bluff old "big gun" admiral should enunciate so clearly what many patriotic—and Imperial-minded—Canadians have thought about but dared not talk of for fear of being falsely branded as renegades.

The existence of the British navy may have something to do with the disarmed condition of Canada, but not as much as a superficial observer might suspect.

There is in the Empire a type of Imperialist who regards the Dominion as a contemptible parasite for not contributing more to the defense of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and there are those in Canada who actually advocate cash payments to Great Britain to be devoted to the royal navy. But Canada's naval policy—such as it is, with its four small vessels—was settled in 1911. The Government of that day decided to create a royal Canadian navy rather than contribute capital ships or cash to the British navy. Those were in the days of the European armament races, when the dreadnaughts were the monsters of the sea. Canada was expected to do something, so the skeleton was created. During the war the skeleton actually had some meat on its bones, though not much; but to-day it is the same old rattling structure, and Canadians are satisfied. At least the people do not demand more, and certainly no government is going to build war-vessels if there is no popular demand for them. Moreover, governments of Canada do not endeavor to create any demand for a greater navy.

An observer might say that it was under the wing of the British navy that Canada cowered defenseless. The teaching in the schools of the greatness of the Empire and the power of the British navy appears to have had the effect of setting minds at rest on naval matters.

The brilliant performance of the navy during the war thrilled the whole population of the Empire and gave undoubtedly a sense of ownership, although a penny of Canadian money goes to royal navy. As to actual defense, British navy is only remotely interested in Canada. There are no Imperial naval bases in the Dominion and his Majesty's ships pay only casual calls to Canadian ports.

Australia, a Pacific Power, is keen on naval development, and maintains a brisk, efficient force of six light cruisers, two submarines, and many light craft. New Zealand contributes to the royal navy, and both countries are strong advocates of a great British naval base at Singapore. Canada too is a Pacific Power. But why does the Dominion only pay 29 cents per capita for naval defense? It would seem that Lord Fisher had sensed the whole situation and stated it for the benefit of inert late Canadians. So the British naval prestige can be held responsible for a part of Canada's extraordinary position.

SINCE the war the various "situations" which have arisen in Europe have meant little to Canada. The oil of Persia, the race hatreds of native India, even the protection of British concessions in China have failed to reach Canadians. When the trouble in the Orient was acute during the past winter a few military-minded offered themselves for any expeditionary force, but the country as a whole was not stirred, and within a week it was all forgotten.

While the periodicals of Great Britain keep nervously reviewing the various possibilities of war, the subject is practically never heard in Canada except on an annual day in Parliament, when certain Farm Progressive members demand the reduction of the few thousand dollars voted annually for cadet training. Periodicals from the United States (which load the news-stands of Canada) have in recent years played up war cries and the predictions of retired generals, as well as much comment by servers on the subject of arms and man. Yet in the midst of all this Canada has produced little or no war fiction and very few war memoirs have been published, despite the fact that there has been something of a literary revival in the country since the war. It is notable that these people who put their lives on the line into the war and were ready to put their last dollar are now so conspicuously indifferent to the whole business.

Canada's complacency is reflected in dollars and cents when the expenditure for army and navy in the various pa-



August 3, 1927

of the British Empire are tabulated. The following is the per capita expenditure in Great Britain and the Dominions:

Canada .....	\$1.46
New Zealand .....	2.33
South Africa .....	2.92
Australia .....	3.20
Great Britain .....	15.32

And it should be remembered that Canada is the oldest and most populous of the Dominions. Occasionally a statesman from a sister Dominion visits Canada and points to these figures with significant gestures. Canadians become at once indignant and editorial writers announce that, while distinguished visitors are always welcome, Canadians do

Springfield, Missouri

not have to be told of their duty to their country and the Empire. Undoubtedly the distinguished visitor decides that Canadians are a shameless lot.

The truth is that Canadians are a patriotic people, strong for the Imperial connections, yet in matters of armament indifferent almost to the point of active pacifism.

# Why Pick on Prohibition?

By a Confirmed Criminal

**LEARN** by reading Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler that the Eighteenth Amendment has made us a nation of lawbreakers. I'm very grateful for the explanation. I've been a persistent, consistent lawbreaker for more than ten years, and I've never before known why. You can understand my reason for writing anonymously. I can't be sent up for being under the Baumes Law because I've only been caught three times and I don't live in New York State, but there's no use advertising myself to the home-town police.

Yes, I'm a (or an) habitual criminal—and now it seems that I can lay it all on prohibition. I do not drink. I do not deal in alcoholic liquors, either as sender or vendee. I do not serve drinks to my friends. I began my criminal career some time before the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment and before Mr. Volstead became famous. It would never have occurred to me to lay my sins at prohibition's door had not Dr. Butler convinced me that the Eighteenth Amendment is the root of all lawbreaking among respectable folk; that it alone has broken down respect for authority and made us a nation of scofflaws.

If my case were exceptional, I might think Dr. Butler's reasoning covered the rest of humanity and left me to a private accounting with my conscience, but my case is not exceptional. My wife breaks the law almost as diligently as I. Our friends break it. The mayor of our town, the pastor of our church, the teachers in our schools, the members of our city council—all of them are lawbreakers day by day. The only law-abiders of my acquaintance are those who lack the necessary machinery for criminality—and some of them jaywalk. I don't know one solitary owner of an automobile who never exceeds the legal speed limit.

Do you? Can you call to mind any driver of a vehicle faster than an electric

who does not disregard the law with some degree of frequency? If you meet one who makes such a claim, say to him, "What, never?" and if he is honest he will answer, "Well, hardly ever," and be none too honest at that.

**I** DOUBT whether it is reasonably possible for a person to do much driving and keep wholly within the law. Many small towns in our neighborhood have twelve-mile speed limits, and some have an eight-mile limit at street crossings. Did you ever try to drive through a town at twelve miles an hour and to slow down to eight at every crossing? Try it some time. An engine has to be running very smoothly to slow down to eight miles an hour without either shifting gears or stalling.

Our State has a thirty-five-mile limit on open roads. Most of us make it a point not to drive more than twice the limit. Those of us who have long distances to cover—two hundred, three hundred, even five hundred or more miles in a day—know that such distances are not made at thirty-five miles an hour. And, judging by the number of cars that pass us on the road, ours is not the only business that requires a man to get where he is going. One day last fall Mrs. Criminal and I drove from Kingman, Kansas, to Colorado Springs between 6:15 in the morning and 6:15 in the evening—four hundred and eighty-one miles in twelve hours (we lunched in the hour's change from Central to Mountain time). We would try to claim the long-distance sustained lawbreaking record, but we know that a thousand drivers from coast to coast would rise up to put us to shame. And, after all, automobile lawbreaking is too commonplace to confer much glory.

You will notice that we, the universal lawbreakers, have no shame about our criminality. Every-day lawbreaking is taken for granted, but our out-of-the-

ordinary lawbreaking exploits are topics for conversation around the dinner table, and the rare and unlucky wight who has received a ticket for turning against a traffic signal or for parking overtime receives sympathy and razzing in the same chorus at the club. There is no sense of shame, no apology for guilt. We are brazen as well as habitual criminals—we, the twenty million people in the United States who drive motor cars.

And to think that all this lawlessness, this unconcerned contempt for authority, this conscious disregard for the statutes in such case made and provided, can all be blamed on prohibition!

**I** HAD rather thought the converse was true. It had seemed to me that long before the Eighteenth Amendment our people were being schooled in disregard of law by the failure of motor laws to keep step with motor progress. It had seemed to me that laws passed in the days of two-cylinder vehicles and applied in the days of four-wheel brakes were engendering a spirit of deliberate lawlessness certain to extend to more serious matters and likely to undermine such respect as we may previously have had for constituted authority. It had even seemed to me that much of the flouting of the Eighteenth Amendment might be traced to the state of mind occasioned by habitual flouting of traffic ordinances. Apparently I am wrong, for Butler says it's prohibition, and Butler is an honorable man.

**B**EING a lawbreaker, however, and therefore without due respect for the law, the Constitution, and the voice of authority as represented by Dr. Butler and the Association Against Prohibition, I think I shall continue to oppose the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment until I can be assured that all drivers of automobiles have come to universal respect for the traffic laws.