

the basic position. We are as nature made us. Professor Parshley is too good an observer, both in the laboratory and in the human scene, to be misled into supposing that what is natural wholly determines what is desirable. We all live the artificial life. Whatever may be the point of divergence set by nature between what when developed we call "good" and "bad" behavior, it is a fact that the distinction is a sociological one. It is introduced by ends and purposes, ideals and goals which appeal to organized society as conducive to its ends, its welfare, sociologically expressed. The concept of value in behavior appears early and changes its character constantly in the course of the ages. It is because of the profound, almost violent, change in values that recent illumination has precipitated, that many of the older generation regard the current moral code as a menace to the human future. The important attempt of Professor Givler to supply a naturalistic basis for ethics (his "Ethics of Hercules" deserves a far wider hearing than it has received) serves to confirm Professor Parshley's position.

The practical emphasis falls on freedom, responsibility, knowledge; for such is the trinity of progressive ethics. This in turn proceeds upon the conviction that there is a scientific method of studying behavior and its naturalistic foundation. To suppose that this leads either to a radical or to a limitedly rational view of behavior is to make the false assumption that there is no place in the naturalistic code for feeling. Decidedly there is. Happiness is love tempered by knowledge. It is precisely the emphasis upon the emotional nature that represents one of the achievements of modern psychology. Those who are so inclined will detect it in the contributions of Freud and his illumination of abnormal behavior; it is equally dominant in the altered view of child nature and the stress on control of emotional response in the guidance of childhood. If not already, then soon, will it be the common property of every teacher to recognize that emotional guidance is even more essential than mental guidance in the progressive enfoldment which we call education.

As a defender of naturalistic ethics, the author does well to include concrete examples of the positions to which it leads; in so doing he enters the field of controversy but battles considerably and effectively. He tackles the case of alcohol and has little difficulty (if only we seek unprejudiced evidence) in making plain that this craving is one of the methods of making life bearable; that if indulged in with a sense of freedom tempered by responsibility and knowledge, it has its due place in human behavior. For the moment, disregarding the ignoble mess of prohibition, which politically is called a "noble experiment," it is refreshing to find the way out as available in this as in any similar issue.

The second instance is the case of religion, a far more difficult, more encumbered arena. Much that is advocated in the name of religion is naturalistically unsound and detrimental. The agreement remains that man cannot and does not care to live by bread alone. That science holds a warrant for the good life is urged with the same loyal enthusiasm that itself is a support for noble causes. The fight with the fundamentalists is fairly simple in principle, however entangled in social obstruction; but the replacing of age-old, revered tenets and their setting with a set of principles detached from historic movement and esthetic appeal, is a far more intricate undertaking. Yet the trend is set in that direction, and science is patient. The association of atheism with moral perversity is at all events obsolete. There can be no evasion of the issue that science claims the dominant share in the regulation of behavior. The long era of compromise between ideals may ease the uncertain adjustment of tradition, emotionally reinforced, and a rationalism too barely challenging, too meagerly rewarding.

Without presenting Professor Parshley's admirable volume as a complete solution of how to adjust modern behavior to modern ideas, one may express the large aid which thousands of readers will derive from this clear and attractive statement. It is in itself an aid both to the appreciation of science and of good behavior.

ERRATUM

By a regrettable error the review of "Thomas Lovell Beddoes, Eccentric and Poet," by Royal H. Snow, which appeared in the issue of the SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE for January 26, was accredited to the wrong publisher. It is issued by Covici, Friede.

The BOWLING GREEN The Folder

DURING a few weeks' leave of absence from The Green there were three books that came particularly to my attention. One of these, the bed-book par excellence, the perfect Drowsy Syrup, I have taken regularly at midnight, a few pages at a time before my eyelids dropped their shade. I've consumed two or three hundred pages in small doses, and still happily have nearly a thousand to go. The only embarrassment of this champion volume is that it is heavy, and when it falls out of the bed it does so with a crash that wakes you up. This grand work, surely the greatest anthology of detective stories ever compiled, a real Bible for all crime lovers, is called "Great Short Stories of Detection, Mystery and Horror." It is edited by Dorothy L. Sayers (who writes good shockers herself), contains 1230 pages, and is published in London by the admirable Victor Gollancz. I've been waiting to see some publisher announce an American edition, but so far no one has spoken. It's a grand book, no bedside is complete without it.

The second of the three I have only had opportunity to glance at, on the shelves of the SATURDAY REVIEW office, but was seriously tempted to theft. It would be easy, I said to myself, to make off with it while Dr. Canby and Miss Loveman were not looking. I refer of course to Caroline Spurgeon's "Keats's Shakespeare," published by the Oxford University Press. In the private library of Mr. George Armour at Princeton, Miss Spurgeon discovered the little seven-volume edition of Shakespeare which once belonged to Keats and on which the best loved of all young poets fed his imagination. By the kindness of Mr. Armour Miss Spurgeon was able to write an exhaustive description of these volumes, reproducing Keats's own markings and memoranda. It is a fascinating study in the process and cross-fertilization of a poet's mind, and no lover of Keats can even see the facsimile of those marked pages without a strong shudder of excitement.

The third book is one I have not even seen: Robert and Helen Lynd's "Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture." This is reported as an honest attempt to put a representative mid-Western small city under the microscope, studying its morals, manners, and ways of getting, spending, and thinking. I gather that it is a book written purely as observation, with no attempt to be caustic or humorous. That is the kind of anthropology that appeals to me, and this book, though it has not come under my eye, emits vibrations of great interest.

I think it proper to round up here some odds and ends of inquiry or comment that have gathered in The Folder. First, as an anthropological item, I can't resist reprinting a charmingly discreet card from a merchant of unconstitutional wares:—

Any future business in the line that I was formerly connected with will be taken care of by —

Ruth L., St. Louis, writes:—

You state that Antony and Cleopatra contains the wittiest line of indecorum in Shakespeare. Such a statement would arouse anyone's curiosity, so I promptly reached for Antony and Cleopatra and began the hunt.

An hour later I decided that I had found the line. I thought it occurs when the messenger arrives to tell Cleopatra of Antony's marriage with Octavia. But when I showed the line I had chosen to a friend, she remarked that she could see nothing very witty in it. I appealed to a second friend. "It is unusual," thought I to myself, "for me to miss a witty or indecorous line, but I could hardly miss a combination of the two." The second friend also failed to confirm my suspicion. Next I asked an English teacher with whom I'm taking a course in Shakespeare. She also disagreed.

Now, in desperation, I write to you. If you will make such a tantalizing statement, I hope you will be willing to illustrate it.

I think it is good for clients to be tantalized occasionally so I shan't identify the line further than to say that it occurs in the 5th scene of the First Act.

J. S., Philadelphia's tireless leatherstocking in the forests of literary relics, reports:—

I was in Richmond, Va., for the day with my boy; we "did" all the places of Poe interest—Lord, same thing ob-

tains there as here, 'n prob'ly anywhere else—we went to the Home of Poe's Helen (the first one—the first Helen, I mean); it's a fashionable club now where none but a member or one bearing member's card is permitted; not open to visitors, but a dollar greased the colored gentleman, who showed us thru. He was a fairly intelligent fellow, but it was plain as day that he neither knew nor ever heard that the fashionable old clubhouse was once the old Stanard home—nor, for that matter (painful to think of it) could he find any of the members who knew anything at all about it!! We went out to Shockoe Cemetery, to see Helen's grave, and were pleased beyond measure to "discover" for ourselves that the Allan graves are on the other side of the pathway, but few steps from Helen's resting place. We were in the lovely old church on the spot where the Richmond Theatre stood (destroyed by fire during Xmas holidays 1819); church was erected as a memorial of the fire. Poe's mother and father played there.

But most charming of all recent correspondence is this letter from our subscriber in Buffalo, Wyoming; who is dissatisfied with the portrait of Harry Johnson's bartender's mustache which we printed some time ago.

Dear Sir: Please excuse me writing in pencil but the rheumatism is so bad I can't use a pen. I just got back from three weeks at Thermopolis and when I got home my wife only had two Sat Reviews. I always read your part and she reads the literary part. If it were a Saturday Evening Post lost I could go to any of the neighbors and get theirs, but ours is the only Sat Review West of the Missouri, though I have an idea there is one at Albuquerque, N. M., and that's a long way to go. What I am writing to you about is the Bartenders and their moustaches. I am an old man but have had quite an experience in such matters and so I hope you will forgive me for correcting you. The moustache you illustrate is not a bartender's, it belongs to the professional gambler who runs the game, it's exactly Cain's. No not Hall Cain, he was a Manxman and wrote books and they were all right in those days but they would not sell nowadays, not enough pep. I mean Harrison Cain, you have got his moustache to a hair. The bartender moustache was not so Italian, more Dutch. Red Angus here in Buffalo had it perfect, flatter and more droop but well turned up at ends. Red was the perfect bartender. That man of yours, Rose Benét, rides 'em pretty, he's the best of your outfit and don't let him quit, raise his wages if you have to, he steps on to them pretty, his confidence in himself is colossal but he does not handle 'em rough. I visualize him as looking like Kipling but bigger. I am trying to string together a lot of my anecdotes which are typed, they are all about people I have met in the West, Bryan (good old soul), James Gordon Bennett, Lily Langtry, Miss Fortescue, Calamity Jane, Cattle Kate, Booth, Jim Bridger, Moreton Frewen, father of Sheridan, Indian fights, buffalo, army officers, dance girls, pony express, Roosevelt and lots more. I like paper.

EDWARD BURNETT.

Clifton Blake, of Austin, Texas, learns from a London bookseller's catalogue that in Sir Kenelm Digby's copy of Percival's *Dictionnaire in Spanish and English* he wrote "Vindica te tibi! Kenelme Digby," which was not only very characteristic of him but an excellent motto for a bookplate.

Some melancholy reflections on the relativity of human taste and morality are induced by study of the scandals of former generations. I have been reading the script of *The Black Crook*, an old play by Charles M. Barras (does anyone know anything about him, by the way?) which was a sensation sixty years ago. All of us, from our earliest years, have heard *The Black Crook* spoken of in a bated breath as a work of wicked audacity which gave our grandparents delicious thrills of vicarious sin, and rent the air of little old New York with discussion pro and con. It now appears that the horror was caused by the fact that members of the chorus appeared in tights, which was regarded as a pulverization of the Stone Tables. For certainly there is nothing in the script of the play that can be construed as vicious. It is a rather charming and florid work, more than a mere baroque spectacle for it involves a quaintly Faustian plot and some good buffoon comedy. But as for being wicked, it is as moral as John Bunyan. It was probably inspired by the Drury Lane pantomimes, and was certainly the progenitor of the modern revue—a sort of shotgun wedding of George Sand and Sliding Billy Watson. But to find out why it was considered Wicked it will be necessary to revive it and play it again. To do so will be a fascinating laboratory experiment in comparative anthropology. It is disheartening to think that the sociologist of sixty years hence will undoubtedly make merry over the embattled moralizings of 1929 and regard some of our Scarlet Sins as mere peccadilloes.

The Black Crook (who wasn't a crook in our present sense of the word, but a hunch-backed "alchymist") was published in Buffalo in 1866, by a printing house called Rockwell, Baker, and Hill, 196 Washington Street. Have any Buffalo booksellers ever run across copies of the first edition?

CHRISTOPHER MORLEY.

England and America. II,

Economic Aspects: Economic Empire-Building: Industrial Democracy

AN earlier article expressed the view that the real basis of Anglo-American relations was a certain unity in moral outlook which in the past had caused the development of political liberty and democracy, and that this same moral sense was now driving the British Commonwealth and the United States to coöperate to end the war system through the substitution of reason and justice for force as the final arbiters of international problems. When we turn to economics, however, the place of morals is not so clear. It is true that the amazing energy and efficiency of modern invention and business enterprise sprang largely from that moral independence of character which resulted from the Renaissance and the Reformation, and which had exceptional opportunities for growth in Great Britain and the United States because they were insulated from the constant military storms of Europe by the sea. It is by no means an accident that the Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain and has reached its most striking manifestation of power in modern times in the United States. But in the development of its economic civilization neither country has given much place to moral ideas.

The primary effect of the substitution of power and machinery for human and animal labor has been to raise the standard of living of all industrial peoples. During the nineteenth century the average standard of living of the inhabitants of Great Britain rose fourfold, and to-day the standard of living in the United States is more than fifty per cent higher than that of Great Britain.

The secondary effect has been to introduce a new public issue comparable in its importance to those which centered around political liberty and political democracy in earlier days. The industrial revolution has resulted in the ownership and control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, by which the community lives, becoming concentrated in the hands of a highly prosperous minority while the majority of the people have become wage-earners. The worst consequences were seen in Great Britain where the transition took place before the people had conquered political power from the landlords and the early capitalists, and where the workers were herded from the land into industrial slums with no statutory protection against exploitation and maltreatment until the middle of the nineteenth century. In the United States the industrial revolution produced no equal evils, partly because the Homestead and other Acts enabled a very large proportion of the people to become individual owners of landed property, and partly because where popular government flourished in a land of vast untapped natural resources it paid capital better to make profits by looting the national estate by political corruption than by depressing the standard of living of the people.

Recently, in both countries, factory acts have placed ever increasing responsibilities on the employer, and the policy of social reform has taxed the superfluity of the rich in order to relieve the necessities of the poor, or to provide social services and amenities for the many. The increase in the proportion of the wage earning classes has also been accompanied by growth in the practice of shareholding among people who a decade or so ago only patronized the savings banks. But shareholding has little to do with industrial democracy. In neither country has any real step been yet taken to bring the vast economic machine which increasingly governs the lives of the community under the control of the people themselves. While the ideal that all government should be of the people, by the people, for the people, is now triumphantly conquering the world so far as politics are concerned, it has made practically no progress in the economic sphere.

The international effects of the industrial revolution have been not less far reaching than the domestic. It began by increasing the volume of ordinary trading exchange. But it soon produced another and more far reaching result. In the nineteenth century Great Britain exported vast quantities of capital all over the world in the shape of railroad equipment, machinery, and cash with which

to pay local labor. This did not merely mean that new democratic nations, such as modern Canada, Australia, or the Argentine came into being through migration from Europe, and that the use of power and machinery was introduced into the ancient civilizations of the Orient. It meant that Great Britain began to own vast and profitable assets all over the world and to supplement her political empire by an economic empire. In lesser degree France and Germany followed the same course in Africa and Asia. In this world process the United States took but a small part. Her energies were concentrated on her own "manifest destiny," to annex, people, and develop most of the North American continent. Her economic empire building was confined to Central America and the North Pacific.

The days of political empire building are now over. Nationalism—the child of liberty and democracy—is too strong. Even Great Britain is now everywhere in full retreat from political imperialism under the impulse of the doctrine of self-determination. But economic empire-building is only in its infancy.

There are 1,800,000,000 people living on the earth. Of these not more than 500,000,000 had learnt to use power and machinery to any effective degree before the war. To-day power and machinery and economic organizations are transforming all the world, even the jungles of Central Africa, partly because surplus Western capital is ransacking the globe for trade opportunities and profitable investment, and partly because the people themselves are beginning to clamor for economic development because they see that it is the only way in which they can escape from their age-old calamity—poverty. Whatever may be said against economic imperialism on theoretic grounds, it is the only way in which the standard of living of the masses of Africa and Asia can be raised at present, just as political imperialism by a liberal power was the only way in which politically backward peoples could survive the impact of Western civilization and be taught the rudiments of free government in the century that has passed. Indeed, the real criticism which can be made of British Imperial policy in the past is that it failed to improve the standard of living of the people in anything like the same degree as it improved the political government under which they lived. It established individual liberty everywhere, but it did not abolish poverty.

In this economic empire building the United States, so far from taking a secondary position, is bound to take the leading place. She has more surplus capital, more engineers, accountants, and business men in training than any other nation, and as the proportion of her people in mining and agriculture falls and in industry rises, she must become ever more interested in the raw materials, the food supplies, and the markets of the whole world.

The fact that in 1926 her people invested no less than \$1,500,000,000 abroad (though the net figure was only a third) is a symptom of the tide of American investment which is going to flow round the world in future. Before many decades have passed the United States will possess the most tremendous economic empire the world has ever seen, owning and managing land and buildings and factories, mines and businesses in all countries and having a large proportion of the human race in its employ. It cannot be otherwise because the whole world wishes to escape from poverty, poverty can only be destroyed through the use of power and machines, and power and machines can only be installed in return for giving the purveyors of capital the ownership and management of the assets into which their lendings are turned.

It is sometimes said that an irrepressible conflict must arise between Great Britain and the United States and other leading economic powers, each struggling for the raw material supplies or for the lion's share of the markets of the world. There will be competition and friction, no doubt, but there need be no irrepressible conflict if wisdom governs their policies. The world is on the verge of an expansion of production and exchange hitherto undreamed of—an expansion which will keep all the industrial nations fully employed on a rising standard of living for an indefinite period, if the leading

nations can prevent war among themselves. The equipment with power and machines of the 1,200,000,000 of the human race now mainly dependent on human and animal energy will give them a producing and therefore a consuming capacity which will not only immensely heighten their own standard of living, but create a world market immeasurably greater than any yet conceived. If the industrial nations, following the intelligent capitalism of the modern era, recognize that the key to their own problems is not internecine competition for a limited market, but the intelligent expansion of the world market through judicious investment and good wages, and the rationalizing of competition within it, no irrepressible conflicts need arise.

The problems will be difficult. They seem likely to fall into two groups. The first will come from the prevailing nationalist desire to manufacture as well as produce primary products. Just as the United States, Canada, Australia, and so on, erected tariffs against British machine-made goods once their primary production was organized, and maintain these tariffs to exclude the products of cheap labor, so Asia and Africa seem likely to raise tariffs against American and other mass production goods. Similarly international problems will arise from the attempts now being made by almost all nations to help their own traders or to build up national merchant marines each capable of carrying their own trade, by subsidies or discriminations of various kinds, a system which can only have the result of so reducing the price of world commodities or so over-developing merchant shipping as to make international trade non-paying, or to transfer ocean transportation costs to the taxpayers' backs.

International relations in economic affairs for the next few years seem likely to be dominated by the controversy between those who believe in the nationalist or protectionist and subsidizing policy and those who see far greater prosperity for everybody in international coöperation for the all round reduction of tariffs, subsidies, and other restrictions to normal commercial intercourse all over the globe.

The second group of economic problems goes deeper. The equipment of the whole world with machinery will bring into being international, financial, and business organizations more powerful than many pre-War governments, and these international organizations will be entirely beyond the control of any government or people. The greater proportion of this colossal wealth will remain in relatively few hands, for, though poverty is disappearing, the proportion of wealth in the hands of the rich and the relatively poor seems to remain fairly constant. Moreover, these gigantic trusts and combinations are not only beyond the control of governments but also of the shareholders who draw dividends from them. The power over finance and industry to-day is almost as absolute and as autocratic as was the power over political government in the days when feudal barons and hereditary kings were preparing the ground for the modern Parliamentary states.

There is another immensely important aspect of this problem. Not only will there be the difference between the majority inside each state who live mainly on their earnings and the minority who live mainly by owning the means of production, distribution, and exchange, but the Western nations, and especially the United States, will be largely *rentier* nations living, as Great Britain does to-day, to a great extent on the tribute in rent, dividends, and profits drawn from their foreign investments in mainly wage-earning countries not so far advanced in the economic scale. Not only is it becoming increasingly difficult for protectionist nations to draw interest in real values, but an increasingly violent national protest is arising in backward countries against their land and industries being largely owned and controlled by absentee landlords—a protest only kept in bounds by the still obvious need of these countries to continue borrowing capital abroad.

It is this second group of questions which is manifestly becoming the supreme economic issue of the twentieth century. Already, though capitalist expansion is rushing round the world at an ever-rising speed, the arena for the next great struggle for human progress is set. Lenin, Gandhi, and Mr.