

nately, there have been signs of late that it may need a little rebuilding Count that day lost whose low, descending sun does not hear newsboys shouting that the Prince of Wales has just become engaged Owen D. Young

declares that it is difficult to appraise the contributions made by American members of the reparations committee. It is not difficult to see that the outstanding contribution was made by Owen D. Young.

Back Stage in Washington

WASHINGTON, D. C.

WE NEVER PLACED much stock in all this fulsome but foolish talk about the House being the more efficient and industrious of the two branches of Congress, so we are not surprised that several untoward events have proved it to be the most impoverished lot of leaders and legislators in many, many years. We share President Hoover's reputed view that the Longworth-Tilson-Snell brand of leadership is a liability instead of the asset he had counted it when the Presidency was young. If Mr. Hoover emerges from his first clashes with the men on Capitol Hill with a divided, disputatious Senate and a resentful House, it is due in no small part to the gusto with which House bosses, particularly Mr. Snell of New York, aggravated the President's own mistakes.

The House, we recall, early resolved to stand by the President right or wrong, and if several White House agents such as Franklin Fort of New Jersey and Walter Newton of Minnesota hoped thereby to cop personal glory and advancement none could hold them culpable for such a worthy ambition. The three leaders, we hear, long ago set their hearts on a Senatorial nomination, for, though they affect to despise the upper chamber, each would like to swagger in it. Mr. Snell and Mr. Tilson, we happen to know, have yearned these many years for promotion, but each suffers so from timidity that he dare not stake what he has for what he wishes. We think we understand their distrust of a State-wide election, however, since Mr. Snell's biennial return is assured by a backwoods constituency which, like himself, distrusts change of any kind. Mr. Tilson, though a thorn in the hide of the tough G. O. P. elephant of Connecticut, comes back through the grace of a wealthy and influential New Haven politician. Mr. Longworth, of course, occupies an enviable social and political position, although it would be even more eminent if he and Alice could order things and people as they please; but for all his

fiddling dilettantism, the sportive "Nick" would seek the Senate if he thought that God-fearing Ohio would condone his wetness and those droll songs of Harvard freshman days.

On their recent statesmanship, however, they will not soon climb the political ladder. Mr. Snell, whose elevation could be accomplished only by Presidential hoisting, has been in the bad graces of the White House ever since he scoffed at Mr. Hoover's presumption in establishing a patronage triumvirate for New York that did not



Kirby in the New York World

"No liquor was found in the car"

include himself. But his lack of political savvy was impressed on the White House even more vividly, we hear, in the struggle over the farm "bounty." It was the belligerent Mr. Snell who served formal notice on the Senate that the House would not tolerate its usurpation of the lower body's revenue-raising prerogatives through introduction of the debenture idea into the farm relief bill. Mr. Tilson, as always, shared the President's desire to keep this controversial issue out of the Senate-House fight, and Longworth, although he sympathized with Snell, was too diplomatic to prolong the dispute. Eventually Mr. Snell was forced to surrender, but the rural Representative succumbed so ungraciously that he enraged both Republican and Democratic Senators. Except for his indiscretions,

we understand, Mr. Hoover would have scored a clean-cut victory in the second debenture vote. What we hear of the President's reaction to two defeats in a month leads us to conclude that Mr. Snell must look elsewhere for a prop.

The President was also pained, we hear, by his leaders' handling of the tariff measure. We cannot question their loyalty to the Administration, yet we do not understand why they rail-roaded through under gag rule a measure that disregards the Presidential demand for "limited revision," affronts the farmers and threatens an unwelcome increase in the cost of living.

A month ago we would not have ventured this prediction, but now we would not be surprised if the bill suffers defeat in the Senate through a combination of Democrats and Progressives. In any event, its passage will present to Mr. Hoover the choice of vetoing and discrediting his own party's tariff measure—a heinous offense in a Republican President—or of signing a document not so dissimilar from that which propelled William Howard Taft along the path to Armageddon. Nobody here attempts to explain the motives of the House leaders, not even themselves.

We do not think it quite fair, however, to single out this hale but harassed trio for criticism. To our mind, the whole Republican membership furnished ample proof in its consideration of reapportionment that it needs nobody to lead the way in making mistakes. In three hours of childish play Northern Republicans undid the work of years and neutralized all the good that Al Smith's candidacy had done the G. O. P. below the Mason and Dixon line. We pass over the not unsightly scenes, the rude exchanges of "boos" and cat-calls that punctuated fiery speeches reminiscent of reconstruction days. The bad taste and ungentlemanly conduct of that afternoon were almost unbelievable. What impresses us is the prediction of politicians that the temporary adoption of the amendment reducing Congressional quotas for Southern States which disfranchise the negro, has closed the Democratic ranks again. Though Republican propagandizers preach Southern reformation until they are "lily white" in the face, we are told that the antics of the Longworth-Tilson-Snell boys sent shivers down the spines of many a follower of Tom Heflin, Furnifold Simmons and Bishop Cannon.

A. F. C.

Complexities of Crime

An Editorial by Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

THE MOST important fact about the problem of crime is that it is really several problems. There is no single cause, no single cure. Indeed, crime will never be completely cured. Like disease it cannot be eradicated, only lessened. Even this will require careful study, hard work, long patience, and the sacrifice of cherished but outgrown American traditions.

The campaign of society against crime falls into four stages, of which the first and most important is the prevention of wrong doing by potential offenders. For this purpose we need to know as much as possible about the past life of actual offenders. Popular imagination visualizes all criminals as resembling some well-known, hardened crook, and is apt to regard fear of the law as the only effective deterrent. The facts indicate an immense variety in offenders—professional crooks, homicidal maniacs, feeble-minded persons unsuited to ordinary tasks, men in matrimonial tangles, bookkeepers in sudden financial straits, adventurous youth untrained for honest occupations or resentful of the humdrum of modern industry. To counteract such varying tendencies before they ripen into crime requires a wide range of methods. Doubtless fear of the law is one method, which would be more effective if punishment were made swifter and surer, but it is often bound to fail. For example, it has no operation upon the jealous husband who kills his wife and then himself, and not much upon the gangster who knows that the rival gang will get him tomorrow unless he eliminates them today. Additional forces besides fear are needed to counteract the strong emotions which lead to crime—passion, greed, long-standing habits of lawlessness. To make law breaking dangerous is worth while, but it is better still to make it unattractive and unnatural. This may necessitate alteration of both the potential criminal and his environment.

We can learn a great deal about criminals by considering ourselves. Why do we usually obey the law? Not from fear alone. If the statutes against murder and theft were all repealed, most of us would not start killing and stealing. And other statutes serve us as guides rather than threats. Our closest contact with law is the traffic policeman. It is not his power to impose penalties which makes most of us follow his signals. If all the automobilists whom he holds up chose to disregard him, he would be helpless. A hundred cars would speed by while he was arresting one or two drivers. We obey him because we know that this is the surest way to get traffic satisfactorily managed. We accept temporary inconvenience because we dislike the alternative. Belief in law is the strongest guarantee of obedience. The President has done well to arouse us to the importance of this principle.

On the other hand, think of the laws which we do violate. Mr. Hoover has not yet taken the opportunity to discuss fully the reasons which lead many otherwise respectable citizens to participate in such offenses

as restraint of trade, smuggling, bootlegging, overspeeding, and the violation of obscenity statutes. The social need served by law in this situation is less clear and less widely recognized than for the long-established crimes. In the absence of this belief in a social need, fear alone does not offset the gains from violation. Here again our own mental attitude should help us to understand the motives of the criminals whom we want to suppress. In these situations, the unconvinced minority is much larger than in robbery or embezzlement. This increases the difficulty of law enforcement but does not necessarily alter the psychology.

It is often argued that the essential respect for law cannot be secured for statutes which have excited large opposition, and that they should therefore be repealed. It is said by a group of influential lawyers attacking prohibition: "Practices which do not shock the moral sense of society cannot in a true sense be converted into crime by legislative declaration promoted by one part of society against the wishes of another. Crime, like law, cannot be made, but must be found." This argument is as much of a half-truth as the opposed reasoning that laws, however unwise, will be effective just because they are law. The rapidly changing conditions of industry and population are continually creating new social needs which require legal protection before they are popularly recognized. If the existence of a large body of dissentients were a conclusive argument against a criminal statute, then vaccination, factory legislation, bank inspection, and tenement-house laws would never have been possible. Very often the enactment of a social need into law creates in time the popular recognition of the need.

I do not mean that wide-spread opposition to a law is a factor to be ignored. It should lead us to weigh very carefully the alleged need of the community for the law. Is this need really so great as to be worth a long period of inadequate enforcement? The gain may overbalance the inevitable accompanying evils of disrespect of law, or it may not. Each case must be judged on its own merits and cannot be decided by general principles one way or the other.

The inculcation of respect for law must largely be accomplished by agencies outside the law. It is the task of schools, newspapers, churches, and parents. Another important non-legal factor also influences crime, namely, the economic situation. The criminal classes may be recruited from men thrown out of legitimate jobs by unemployment or the introduction of labor-saving machinery, and from boys who have gone into blind-alley jobs which offer neither advancement nor satisfaction so that they drift gradually

into more remunerative lawless pursuits. Vocational guidance may eliminate much of this last cause. High wages are not in themselves a cure for crime, for few lawful occupations offer at the start the income which a youth may gain from thieving or bootlegging.

(Please Turn to Page 352)

Where Is Mankind Going?

The distinguished contributors to this weekly editorial page constitute not only our list of witnesses to the progress of existence, but its interpreters as well. Professor Chafee, of the Harvard Law School, deals with the complexities of the task that confronts Mr. Hoover's law enforcement commission. Professor Henry Norris Russell, director of the Princeton Observatory, will be the next contributor