

Peace Plans From Kant to Kellogg

Harry Elmer Barnes

(Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.)
1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT TO 1914

We shall first briefly review the development of peace sentiment and of the organizations designed to advance the attack upon war as an institution. Perhaps the origin of this pacifist attitude, if we exclude the somewhat contradictory statements on the subject attributed to Jesus, may be assigned to George Fox and the early Quakers. One should mention William Penn's plan for world peace set forth in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Of eighteenth century writers on peace, leadership must be assigned to Immanuel Kant, who was a sincere believer in the great importance of world peace. In the nineteenth century a prominent position was taken by the United States in advancing the peace movement. David Low Dodge, a merchant who had lost much through the war of 1812, founded the New York Peace Society in 1815. In the same year Noah Worcester and William Ellery Channing founded the Massachusetts Peace Society. The American Peace Society was established in 1828. This was one of the leading contributions of William Ladd, a prosperous Maine farmer. Charles Sumner and James Russell Lowell took a powerful stand against war in the middle of the last century. Sumner's essays and orations being particularly powerful.

Elihu Burritt, a self-educated blacksmith, became a world figure by promoting the five great international peace congresses held in Europe between 1842 and 1851. In 1889 William R. Cremer, a member of the British House of Commons, founded the Interparliamentary Union, and in the meeting of 1895 there was submitted the plan later adopted in the form of the Court of Arbitration at the Hague. In 1896 Alfred Nobel, a Swedish inventor who had made a great fortune out of the invention and sale of dynamite and other high explosives, established an annual prize of about \$40,000 for the most notable contribution during the year to the cause of world peace. In 1895 Albert N. Smithey established the annual peace conference at Lake Mohonk in the Catskills, at which the presiding genius at the outset was Edward Everett Hale. In 1909 the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes was organized by Theodore Marburg of Baltimore. It died out in 1914, and never amounted to much. In 1910 Edwin Ginn, a wealthy text-book manufacturer, established the World Peace Foundation in Boston and gave it an endowment of a million dollars. It was early headed by Edwin D. Mead. In 1911 Andrew Carnegie established the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the richest and most pretentious peace organization in the world. In addition, Carnegie donated, the Peace Palace at the Hague, the building of the Pan-American Union at Washington, and the building of the Central American Court in Costa Rica. While capitalists were endowing peace palaces and peace foundations, the international Socialists were denouncing war and proclaiming the solidarity of labor throughout the world.

The Hague is famous in the history of the modern peace movement. Here were assembled the two Hague Peace Conferences at the suggestion of Russia in 1899 and 1907. At the first Conference provision was made for the establishment of a Permanent Court of Arbitration, which opened for business in April, 1901. Great misapprehension exists as to the real nature and achievements of the Hague Conferences and it may be well to present a realistic summary of the facts in this place. Writers with a strong anti-German bias have contended that it was Germany and Germany alone which prevented the Hague Conferences from bringing about universal European disarmament and compulsory arbitration of all international disputes a generation ago. In reality nothing of the sort was the case. Germany certainly did not conduct herself during the Hague Conferences as an outspoken supporter of either disarmament or general arbitration, but her conduct in this respect was certainly no worse than that of either France or England. The Germans at the Hague were simply more honest in expressing their opinions, and, hence, in a diplomatic sense, just that much more foolish and incompetent.

The Russian proposals for disarmament at the first Conference of 1899 were not made in good faith. As Count Witte has confessed, the Russian proposal that the peace strength of the various European armies should not be increased for five years was basic to his scheme of a continental alliance of France, Germany and Russia against England. He felt that such an alliance

would enable the continental powers to save the money expended for armies to protect themselves against each other and they would thus be able to construct a joint navy capable of contending against that of Great Britain. The first great extension of Russian naval preparations actually came in 1898. There was also a special reason for the Russian proposal in 1899, namely, the fact that Russia did not possess resources to match the proposed Austrian increase in artillery. Further, the Russian proposal for army limitation made an exception of the Russian colonial troops, thus making the proposition unacceptable to any of the other powers. Instead of Germany alone opposing the Russian plan, all the other members voted against the Russian representative. Great Britain, led by Sir John Fisher, resolutely refused to accept any proposal for naval limitations; and, while the first Hague Conference was still sitting, the British admiralty requested an additional appropriation of approximately twenty-five million pounds for the completion of new warships. At the second Hague Conference in 1907 the matter of disarmament was not seriously discussed, its introduction having been opposed strenuously by both Germany and France. The humanitarian movement in England at the time forced the English leaders to bring up the matter of disarmament, but it was tabled without a vote.

As to the relation of Germany to the proposals for arbitration at the Hague Conferences, Germany ultimately withdrew her opposition to the proposal of a permanent court of arbitration, though she did oppose making arbitration obligatory. At the second Hague Conference Germany had special reason for being opposed to compulsory arbitration as England had refused to abide by the terms of the Anglo-German arbitration treaty of 1904. As a literal matter of fact the international prize court, which was the main achievement in the matter of arbitration at the second Hague Conference, was really the product of the cooperative endeavor of England and Germany. Further, it must be remembered that the proposals for arbitration in the Hague Conferences were not such as involved the compulsory arbitration of the major causes of war. The compulsory clauses were to apply only to legal disputes, and in no sense to political and other disputes which usually constitute the causes of war. The most that can be said against the Germans at the Hague is that diplomatically speaking they were extremely stupid to go on record as opposing the irrelevant arbitration proposals. These meant nothing anyway, but by going on record against them the Germans put at the disposal of their enemies material which seemed extremely damaging to their pacific claims when maliciously distorted by Entente propagandists. No large Power actually supported obligatory arbitration at the Hague. It is interesting to note that the only large Power which has ratified Art. 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice is Germany.

Hence, it will quickly be seen that the common allegation that Germany's action at the Hague Conferences was mainly responsible for the perpetuation of the military system in Europe is pure nonsense. Germany was no more opposed to the plan for limiting land armament than was France. England remained unalterably opposed to the proposals for the protection of commerce and the immunity of private property at sea, the absence of which was believed by the United States and other powers to be the chief reason for the existence and expansion of naval armament. In the very year of the second Hague Conference England and Russia were parcelling out Persia between them and cementing the Triple Entente. In the two years before 1907 England had, during the first Morocco crisis, aligned herself with France. In the light of these circumstances it was scarcely to be expected that Germany would show any great enthusiasm for a proposal of limitation of armaments which did not carry with it adequate guarantees of safety. The charge of the foreign encirclement of Germany seemed vindicated as never before in 1907.

In short, the Russian proposals for armament limitation were not made in good faith, but were a piece of selfish and temporizing Russian strategy; the arbitration proposals in no sense covered the basic causes of war; Germany was no more opposed to limitation of land armament than France, though she had far greater need of extensive preparations; England was unalterably opposed to any naval limitation; and Germany took as prominent a part as any major European state in bringing about such achievements in

arbitration as were secured at the Hague Conferences.

The latest important development in the peace movement prior to the World War was embodied in the series of arbitration treaties negotiated by Secretary of State Bryan with leading States of the world in 1913 and thereafter. These treaties were intimately connected with the Hague Conferences, because the method envisaged was that of the commission of inquiry which had been recommended at the first Hague Conference and was formulated at the second Hague Conference. The Bryan plan provided that in the case of a dispute the states involved would not go to war until after a delay of a year during which an international commission of inquiry would investigate the case and make its report. After the report was rendered the nations were to be independent to act as they saw fit. There are some who regard these treaties as even more effective as a practical block to war than the Kellogg Pact, though they are obviously far less sweeping as a theoretical gesture against the war system.

Some twenty-one treaties of this sort were actually negotiated by the United States. Germany did not sign before 1917, a fact of much significance for the world. Had she signed and had the United States delayed its declaration of war for a year, it is possible that the World War would have ended by a negotiated peace and the present intolerable European situation might possibly have been averted.

The commission of inquiry is probably only useful for disputed questions of fact. It was most adaptable to the Tampico Incident of 1914, and though there was no treaty with Mexico, had Wilson believed in the theory he would have hesitated to bombard Vera Cruz. He wanted an excuse, however, to oust Huerta. The commission of inquiry is hardly of use for continuing wrongs or alleged wrongs committed under a claim of right. Germany, in 1917, felt she had to use the submarine, did her best to keep us out of the war, but took this chance. She wanted to keep us out; the Allies to drag us in. It may be doubted whether any commission of inquiry treaty would have restrained us.

The sentiment of the world for peace was never stronger than in the years just before the World War nor was the optimism of the pacifists ever greater than it was at this time. It was assumed that another great war was unthinkable in the light of the alignment of public opinion against war. In a truly remarkable book, *The Great Illusion*, Norman Angell had gone even further and shown that war was not only immoral but economically folly. Socialists were declaring that the international bond of working-class consciousness was far stronger than patriotism and they promised international sabotage of any war. Of late years it has become the fashion to deride the pacifists yesterday as impractical idealists living in a fool's paradise because their dream was not fulfilled, but it will be only when the aspirations of such persons are realized that we shall see the end of wars. War will disappear only when there are more persons of prominence and authority who hate war than there are who cherish it and desire to preserve it as an instrument of national policy. Especially important was the pacifist emphasis upon the necessity of considering and removing the causes of wars. In our present-day enthusiasm for legal devices, such as League decrees, outlawry, renunciation and the like, we are in danger of falling into the error of believing that war can be ended by a formal legal fiat enunciated in the face of a vast number of incitements to war. Only the true pacifist ever can end war or ever will sincerely wish to terminate it, though this does not mean that the pacifist should not be progressive and ingenious and on the lookout for all new and potentially effective methods of attacking the war system. We must guard ourselves equally against either resting content with the stereotypes of the older pacifism or placing exuberant and exclusive faith in the adequacy of formal devices and legal machinery for averting war which are not based upon any honest and complete conversion to the pacifist program.

The World War went asunder in rude fashion all the structure of peace slowly erected in the generation before the War, and soon many leading pacifists of 1913 were contributing to or participating in organizations for the promulgation of international hatred and collective murder. The one sincere pacifist gesture during the World War, the Ford Peace Ship, was contemptuously derided. The erstwhile pacifists, led by Mr. Wilson, became the architects of the Holy War Myth. The slogan of even the Carnegie

Endowment for International Peace was "Peace through Victory!"

2. THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT, 1921-22

In the period since the Hague Conference the most important international gesture in this field was the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments called by invitation of the United States on August 11, 1921, and opened in Washington on November 12, 1921. Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes set forth the view of the United States that the Conference should aim at the preservation of the status quo in naval armament and should disapprove all efforts of any one state to establish overwhelming naval preponderance. This involved a willingness to abandon existing building plans of capital ships for the future and to scrap capital ships of an older order. As a result, the United States, Great Britain and Japan agreed to provide for the scrapping of some seventy-nine ships built or building with a tonnage of 2,200,000. During the period of the operation of the limitation agreement these three states consented to the proposal to attain in 1931 a naval ratio of capital ships of "five-five-three," namely, that Great Britain and the United States would be equal in strength as to capital ships and Japan should have a navy sixty percent as strong as either. In this arrangement the United States made the greatest sacrifice, giving up fifteen ships to seven for Japan and four for Great Britain. This ratio is to be preserved from 1931 until 1937, when the time limit agreed upon expires.

Many hailed this arrangement as a great triumph for the principle of self-sacrifice and peace, but it was for the most part a hollow sham, except insofar as conferences are good international gestures and insofar as the Conference incidentally did something to straighten out tangles in Far Eastern diplomacy. The craft regarding which the agreement was to limitation or scrapping was reached were essentially obsolete in modern naval warfare. There was no agreement reached as to the limitation of light cruisers, submarines or air craft. France refused to consider submarine limitations, in spite of the earnest endeavors of Great Britain to force an agreement to put an end to the existence of such craft. Hence, Great Britain refused to consent to the limitation of light cruisers which were essential to combat submarines. There was no progress made in regard to land disarmament because France resolutely blocked any such proposal, on the absurd contention that she needed her vast army to protect herself against disarmed Germany. It is interesting to contrast the almost universal condemnation of Germany on the false charge of her having blocked disarmament at the Hague with the practically complete public ignoring of the action of France in actually blocking all discussion of military disarmament at the Washington conference. Therefore, one may say that the Washington Conference was a mockery of disarmament in which France the United States was the chief victim. The only progress growing out of it related to oriental affairs. The old Open Door policy and the Anglo-Japanese alliance were supplanted by a Four Power Pact and a Nine Power Treaty. Japan consented to abandon the Shantung Peninsula and return it to China, and an agreement was reached between Japan and the United States concerning the Island of Yap, important to the United States as a cable-crossing. This advance in good-will was, however, impaired by our unnecessary affront to Japan in 1924 in terminating the "Gentlemen's Agreement."

The problem of further naval disarmament was once again discussed at the Geneva Conference of June 20 to August 4, 1927, once more called by the United States. Here the chief impasse arose between the United States and Great Britain. The former desired to extend the five-five-three arrangement to all classes of craft, but Great Britain refused to consider such limitation of her light cruisers, deemed essential to the policing and defense of her great empire and extensive commerce. A secret naval agreement between France and Great Britain was attempted in 1928 but was discovered and published to the world by the Hearst papers, with the result that it was ostensibly abandoned. Beginning in March, 1927, a Preparatory Commission on Disarmament of the League of Nations has held sessions, in which the United States has participated unofficially, but nothing decisive has been accomplished.

3. LOCARNO: FACT AND FICTION

Down to the time of the Ruhr invasion by Poincare the Entente pursued the same vindictive policies which had dominated the Paris Peace Conference. The Conferences at Spa, London and Lausanne were devoted chiefly to considerations of how to enforce the Treaty. At Spa in July, 1920, and at London in the spring of 1921, reparations were the

chief subject discussed. At Lausanne in 1922-23, the problem was that of Bulgaria and a new treaty with Turkey. The Ruhr invasion was a part of the whole French policy from 1912 onward and it really involved a last desperate effort of the French to execute the aspirations embodied in the Secret Treaty with Russia concerning the French boundaries in the East and the creation of an independent Rhineland state. Poincare made the mistake of not letting Britain share in the prospective spoils, hence even Curzon and Bonar Law found the Ruhr invasion quite immoral. Liberal and conservative opinion alike in Britain roundly condemned Poincare's policy and radical opinion in France viewed it with apprehension. In the general elections of May, 1924, Poincare was repudiated and the French radicals won an overwhelming victory. A radical ministry was formed under the presidency of M. Edouard Herriot. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 was the last effort to attain the ambitions embodied in the French Security Pact of 1919-1920. It was evident that any future effort to give France security would have to be founded on some general European policy in which other states might share the benefits of protection and mutual guarantees. Since 1922 the Germans have been advocating some such plan from which all western Europe might benefit. On February 9, 1925, the German Cabinet sent a note to the Entente Governments suggesting that Germany, Great Britain, France and Italy should enter into an engagement to renounce war against each other.

As a result of this suggestion and succeeding negotiations a conference was called at Locarno on the shore of Lake Maggiore in Switzerland in the autumn of 1925, with representatives from Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia in attendance. Some five treaties were the outcome of this conference. The most significant of the lot was the treaty of mutual guaranty signed by Germany, Belgium, Great Britain, France and Italy. This treaty guaranteed the existing boundaries between France and Germany and between Germany and Belgium. It also guaranteed the inviolability of the demilitarized zone extending fifty kilometers east of the Rhine. Germany and France and Germany and Belgium mutually agreed not to attack, invade or make war against each other, except in cases of defense, in carrying out acts of the League of Nations against an aggressor, and in cases in which the Council of the League of Nations failed to come to a unanimous decision in regard to the dispute at issue. Germany signed compulsory arbitration treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia, and France signed treaties with both of these latter states agreeing to come to their aid in case of an attack. To handle possible disputes between Germany, France, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia there was created a Permanent Conciliation Commission of eight members, five from the states immediately concerned and three from neutral states. If this Commission cannot reach an agreement then the dispute is to be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to the Council of the League of Nations. It was generally understood that if Germany ratified the Locarno agreements she would be admitted into the League of Nations. Germany ratified these treaties on November 27, 1925, and was admitted into the League of Nations on September 8, 1926. During the meeting of the Assembly of the League in the autumn of 1926 Herr Stresemann, the German Foreign Minister, met with M. Briand, the French Foreign Minister, at a restaurant in the small village of Thoiry where they carried on a long conversation in regard to reparations and the evacuation of the Rhineland.

After Locarno, the admission of Germany to the League, and the Thoiry conversations there was a vast outburst of ecstatic rhetoric on the part of the optimists throughout Europe and America. It was alleged that a new era had dawned in European diplomacy and international relations and that the old age of secret diplomacy, great armaments, mutual fear and hostility and the like had passed forever. There was no doubt that the Locarno conference was very significant in one respect. It initiated the practice of bringing together for conference the representatives of states with conflicting interests and inducing them to talk about their difficulties instead of fighting about them. This was the only sense in which Locarno could be said to have launched a new era, and this was not strictly a novel procedure. On the other hand, the hard-headed realists recognized that little or nothing had been done to deal with the basic causes of contention between the states involved in the Locarno conference. The matter of war guilt, reparations, the occupation of the Rhineland, the

Polish Corridor, Upper Silesia, the German minorities in Czechoslovakia, and the union between Germany and Austria were subjects left untouched or unsettled, but these are the problems upon which a settlement must be reached if permanent European peace is to be hoped for. The final adjustment of the Alsace-Lorraine question was the only vital issue raised and dealt with frankly and honestly and this primarily because Germany was to be the loser by the arrangement. Still further, the Locarno spirit has subsequently all but evaporated. M. Poincare has been returned to power in France and has resumed his harsh anti-German policy. The Rhineland has not been evacuated. In the summer of 1928 the French and the British troops of occupation held joint maneuvers in the occupied area in a manner and under circumstances most offensive to Germany. In the autumn of 1929 M. Briand made speeches in which he implied that France could never safely evacuate the Rhineland as Germany was a more powerful, vigorous and industrious state than France. He may have been talking for political purposes in anticipation of the impending bargaining over reparations, but his words were not of a sort calculated to inspire confidence on the part of those interested in the progress of a conciliatory spirit in Europe.

4. THE KELLOGG FACT: A CHALLENGE TO THE FUTURE

The Locarno plan to renounce war between a definite group of states was a sort of first step towards a general treaty for the renunciation of war signed by the majority of the more important states of the world in August, 1928. The Kellogg Pact of 1928 was a combined product of the Locarno gesture of renunciation and the campaign to secure the outlawry of war. The conception of attacking war head-on through outlawry was launched as a practical movement during the World War (first in the *New Republic* in March, 1918) by Salmon Oliver Levinson, a distinguished Chicago corporation lawyer. Mr. Levinson perceived an analogy between war and duelling. He held that the causes of duelling had persisted and yet we have been able to outlaw it through adverse public opinion. He believed that this might also be achieved in regard to war. His first distinguished convert was Philander C. Knox. He later converted a number of eminent statesmen, clergymen, scholars, jurists and publicists, such as William E. Borah, Arthur Capper, John Dewey, Charles Clayton Morrison, Raymond Robbins, James Thomson Shotwell, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Allen, Joseph P. Chamberlain and Harrison Brown. The latter, an energetic young British engineer, has been engaged by Mr. Levinson as his European representative to advance the cause abroad. There is an obvious distinction between the outlawry of war, which presupposes a common force to execute the sanctions of outlawry, and the mere renunciation of war, yet the Kellogg Pact to renounce war owed much to the exponents of the outlawry project.

On April 8, 1927, the tenth anniversary of the entry of the United States into the World War, M. Briand in a speech to American reporters in Paris, recommended the outlawry or renunciation of war (he identified these) between the United States and France. It was not a sudden stroke. American newspaper men had suggested such action to Briand months before, and Professor Shotwell had intimated to Briand that the time was ripe for such a gesture. It may be, as Charles Austin Beard has suggested, that Briand's real motive was to maneuver the United States into a position where we could not effectively block French action in maintaining her domination over Europe, but, in any event, the best interpretation was put upon his suggestion. Mr. Levinson was in Paris at the time and immediately began to stir up support for the proposal. He was joined later in the summer by the Rev. Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, author of the standard treatise on the outlawry of war. In this country the most effective approval of the Briand proposal was embodied in a letter of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, to the *New York Times* on April 25, 1927.

In May 1927, Professor Shotwell and Professor J. P. Chamberlain of Columbia University prepared a draft treaty embodying the implications of the Briand proposal. Though the Kellogg Pact bears little resemblance to this Draft Treaty, the latter was important in an educational sense. On June 20, 1927, M. Briand sent to Washington the draft of a proposed treaty renouncing war. The United States made no official answer, but on November 21, 1927, Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas proposed a set of resolutions, later introduced in Congress, expressing approval of the renunciation move. The more ambitious support of out-

lawry was embodied in the resolution of Senator William E. Borah, introduced into Congress on December 12, 1927. Senator Borah really directed the policy of Secretary Kellogg in regard to this discussion. On December 28, 1927, the United States made its formal reply to the Briand proposals by announcing a much broader plan. Instead of a Franco-American agreement, Secretary Frank B. Kellogg proposed a multilateral treaty with the other great powers, all agreeing to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. France answered affirmatively on January 7, 1928, but confirmed the renunciation to aggressive war only, which was said by Mr. Kellogg to be unacceptable to the United States. During the next few months there was a campaign of education supported by intelligent opinion in the United States and western Europe. On August 27, 1928, a pact renouncing war was signed at Paris by the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Japan, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The text is brief and we may quote it in full:

The President of the German Reich, the President of the United States of America, His Majesty the King of the Belgians, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominion Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, the President of the Republic of Poland, the President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind:

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process, and that any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this Treaty;

Hopeful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavor and by adhering to the present Treaty as soon as it comes into force bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy;

Have decided to conclude a Treaty and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries

ARTICLE I
The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II
The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

ARTICLE III
The present Treaty shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties named in the Preamble in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements, and shall take effect as between them as soon as all their several instruments of ratification shall have been deposited at Washington.

This Treaty shall, when it has come into effect as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the other Powers of the world. Every instrument evidencing the adherence by all the other Powers of the world shall be deposited at Washington, and the Treaty shall immediately upon such deposit become effective as between the Power thus adhering and the other Powers parties hereto.

It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States to furnish each Government named in the Preamble and every Government subsequently adhering to this Treaty with a certified copy of the Treaty and of every instrument of ratification or adherence. It shall also be the duty of the Government of the United States telegraphically to notify such Governments immediately upon the deposit with it of each instrument of ratification or adherence.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty in the French and English languages both texts having equal force, and hereunto affix their seals.

Done at Paris the twenty-seventh day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

One cannot assess the nature and significance of the Kellogg Treaty

The New York World and the Catholic Church

Theodore Dreiser

On October 14, 1929, I was invited by *The New York World*, to write my views on the subject of divorce. The letter of invitation follows:

Mr. Theodore Dreiser, New York, N. Y. My Dear Mr. Dreiser:

I am arranging a symposium of articles by well-known writers on the subject of divorce, each article to be based either pro or con on the resolution recently offered at the International Congress for Social Reform assembled in London. The resolution is as follows:

"The present laws and customs with regard to marriage are in most of the countries of the world inhuman and unworthy of civilized people. The present oppressive and vindictive spirit of the laws should be replaced by a more creative attitude so that parents and children may achieve greater freedom and individual happiness. There should be full individual freedom of contract to dissolve marriage so that no unwilling partner can be forced to remain in unhappy relationship."

H. G. Wells, Sinclair Lewis, Fannie Hurst, H. L. Mencken and Bertrand Russell have already agreed to write articles and I expect several other distinguished contributors. Would you care to write an article for *The World* to be included in this list? I can pay \$200 for one thousand words upon receipt of the manuscript.

Please make some comment on the New York State law which allows divorce on only one ground—adultery. Hoping that you will find it convenient to write this article, I am, Very truly yours,

PAUL PALMER, Sunday Editor.

I wrote such an article and submitted it through my secretary to Mr. Paul Palmer, the Sunday Editor, who read it and expressed himself as highly pleased with it and in sympathy with the opinions expounded, but interposed an objection to a paragraph containing the sentence: "Not only that, but that world's largest real estate organization, the Catholic Church, condemns them to hell besides. As though one hell weren't enough."

From this he wished to delete the proposal and concluded with the Soviet Government corresponding pact; other States passed silently this proposal and evaded reply, but a third of the States declined the proposal with this strange explanation, that unconditional prohibition of attack was incompatible with their obligations toward the League of Nations. This, however, did not prevent the same powers from signing the Pact of Paris with a full silence in the very text of the said obligations.

(4) The above-mentioned facts are irrefutable proof of the fact that the very idea of suspension of wars and armed conflicts is a matter of international policy, a basic idea of Soviet foreign policy. Nevertheless the initiators of the Pact of Paris did not deem it necessary to invite the Soviet Government to participate in the negotiations for the Pact of Paris and the elaboration of the very text of the compact. In the same way were not invited also powers which were indeed interested in guaranteeing peace because either they have been the objects of attacks (Turkey and Afghanistan) or are so now (the republic of the great Chinese people). The invitation to join in the compact as transmitted by the French Government also does not contain conditions which could allow the Soviet Government to influence the very text of the document signed in Paris. However, the Soviet Government puts as axiomatic premises that under no conditions can it be deprived of that right which Governments already signatory to the pact realized or could realize, and in exercise of this right it must first make several remarks concerning its attitude toward the compact itself.

(5) First of all the Soviet Government cannot fail to express its deepest regret as to the absence in the Pact of Paris of any obligations whatsoever in the domain of disarmament. The Soviet delegation to the Preparatory Commission for Disarmament already has had the chance to declare that only the culmination of a compact forbidding war with the full realization of universal disarmament can give real effect in guaranteeing universal peace, and that on the contrary an international treaty "forbidding war," and unaccompanied by even such elementary guarantee as limitation of incessantly growing armaments, will remain a dead letter without real meaning. Recent public declarations of some participants of the Pact of Paris concerning the inevitableness of further armaments even after the conclusion of the agreement confirm this. New international groupings which have appeared at the same time, especially in connection with the question of renewal of armaments, have still more underlined this situation. Therefore the conditions created by the compact reveal at the present time more than ever the necessity of taking resolute measures in the domain of disarmament.

(6) Considering the text of the compact itself the Soviet Government thinks it necessary to point out the insufficient definiteness and clearness in the first clause concerning the formula for the prohibition of wars itself, this having the effect of permitting various and arbitrary interpretations. It believes on its part that international war must be forbidden not only as so-called "an instrument of national policy" but also a method serving other purposes (for instance oppression, liberative national movements, etc.).

In the opinion of the Soviet Government there must be forbidden not only wars in the form of the juridical meaning of this word but also such military actions as, for instance, intervention, blockade, military occupation of foreign territory, foreign ports, etc. History in recent years has known several military actions of this kind which have brought enormous calamities to various nations. The Soviet Republics themselves have been the objects of such attacks and now 400,000,000 Chinese suffer from similar attacks. More than that, similar military actions often grow into big wars which it is already absolutely impossible to stay.

Meanwhile these most important questions from the viewpoint of the preservation of peace are silently passed over. Furthermore, the same first clause of the compact mentions the necessity of solving all international disputes and conflicts exclusively by peaceful means. In this connection the Soviet Government considers that among the unpeaceful means forbidden by the compact must also be included such as the refusal to reestablish peaceful and normal relations, or the rupture of these relations between people, because such actions mean the suspension of peaceful methods in solution of disputes and by their very existence contribute to the creation of an atmosphere favorable to the breaking out of wars.

(7) Among the reservations made in the diplomatic correspondence between the original participants of the compact, especial attention of the Soviet Government is drawn by the reservation of the British Government in Paragraph 10 of its note of May 19, 1928. By virtue of this reservation the British Government reserves a freedom of action toward a series of regions which it does not even enumerate. If it means provinces already belonging to the British Empire or its Dominions, they are already included in the compact in which are foreseen cases of their being attacked, so that the reservation of the British Government regarding them must seem at least superfluous.

However, if other regions are meant, the participants of the compact are entitled to know exactly where the freedom of action of the British Government begins and where it ends. But the British Government reserves freedom of action not only in case of military attack on these regions but even at any "unfriendly act" of so-called "interference," while it obviously reserves the right to an arbitrary definition of what is considered an "unfriendly act" of "interference," justifying commencement

of military action on the part of the British Government. Recognition of such a right of the British Government would mean justification of war and could be a contagious example also for the other participants to the compact who, in virtue of their equality, might take the same right regarding other regions, and in result perhaps there would be no such place on the terrestrial globe regarding which the compact could be applied. Indeed, the reservation of the British Government contains an invitation addressed to every other participant to act as exempt from the exaction here and in other regions.

This reservation the Soviet Government cannot but consider as an attempt to use the compact itself as an instrument of imperialistic policy. However, inasmuch as the note of the British Government has not been communicated to the Soviet Government as an integral part of the compact or its supplements, it therefore cannot be considered obligatory for the Soviet Government. Similarly, other reservations contained in the diplomatic correspondence concerning the compact between the original participants may be passed over.

The Soviet Government also cannot agree with any other reservations which can serve as justification for war, particularly with reservations which are made in said correspondence in order to keep effective the compact and resolutions entailed by affiliation with the League of Nations and the Locarno agreements.

(8) Summarizing what has been said above, one must state the absence of the compact of obligations concerning disarmament, which is the only essential element of peace guarantee, the insufficiency and indefiniteness of the formula itself for prohibition of war and the existence of several reservations having as their object even appearance of obligations toward the cause of peace.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Pact of Paris objectively imposes certain obligations on the powers before public opinion and gives the Soviet Government a new chance to put before all the participants of the compact a question most important for peace, that is the question of disarmament, the solution of which is the only guarantee of prevention of war—the Soviet Government expresses willingness to sign the Pact of Paris. In consequence of this assent I shall have the honor to hand over to you, M. Ambassador, the corresponding act of my Government in its joining in this compact as soon as the formalities connected with this are ended.

Further, there are obvious proofs of bad faith on the part of the signatory powers. In spite of the Locarno treaties of mutual guaranty, the disarmament of Germany, and the demilitarization of the Rhine, France is carrying on a more extensive fortification of her eastern frontier than was embodied in the pre-war defenses in 1914. In the New York Times for September 9, 1928, which carried ecstatic and exuberant comments on the signing of the Kellogg Pact, we find the following description of the new plans for French fortifications:

Paris, September 8—Paul Painleve, Minister of War, accompanied by a number of the foremost Generals of France and members to the Senate and Chamber Army Commissions, will hold a conference at Metz next week during which final decisions will be taken with regard to the plan for re-fortifying the eastern frontier of France, which has been already elaborated by the Army Commission under General Guillaumat and which was drafted by Marshal Petain.

M. Painleve's visit is rather in the nature of a tour of inspection of the country which must be reorganized for defense, consequent on the alteration of the French frontier necessitated by the return of Alsace and Lorraine.

The system which is being adopted will mean a considerable extension of the fortifications as they existed in 1914. It will extend from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, the whole frontier line being divided into separately organized districts of varying depths so as to include the old fortification system which will be modernized. In addition to forts, redoubts and battery emplacements of the old kind, an enormous amount of work is contemplated in making new roads, light railways, concrete trench work, underground communications and shelters.

The expense is to be spread over a period of at least seven years, and the first appropriation of 200,000,000 francs was made in this year's budget. This sum will be devoted to the first work of strengthening the frontier in the Metz-Thionville sector and in Lower Alsace.

Equally significant is the British fortification of Singapore, well described in an editorial in the *Living Age* for December, 1928:

The British decision to proceed with the construction of the Singapore naval base, following as it does almost immediately upon the signature of the Kellogg treaty, seems a little cynical. But governments, after all, deal with the realities of the international situation; and Great Britain shall at all times be able to exert her full naval strength in the Pacific. At present she cannot do so because there are no British dockyards in Pacific waters capable of receiving such giants of her fleet as the battleships of the *Nelson*,

price of article with phrase.....\$200
Price of article without phrase..... 500

Total contribution of *The World* to the welfare of the Catholic Church\$300

The Editor asked for time to consider the relative merits of paying this additional \$300 and finally replied as per his enclosed letter of October 24. My final answer is also attached.

Mr. Theodore Dreiser, New York, N. Y. My Dear Mr. Dreiser:

I will be unable to print your divorce article with the phrase "that world's largest real estate organization" included. The phrase seems to me to be a gratuitous reflection on the Catholic Church and without logical connection to the rest of your argument which I find to be excellent. I am perfectly willing to let the rest of the sentence stand, i. e., "the Catholic Church condemns them to hell besides. As though one hell weren't enough"—which is uncontestedly true.

This being the case please let me have your permission to print the article with this one deletion or return the payment to me and I will send back the manuscript.

PAUL PALMER, Sunday Editor.

Mr. Paul Palmer, Sunday Editor, The New York World, New York City. My Dear Sir:

It is gratifying to find the *New York World* so careful of the feelings of the Catholic Church. I trust that in connection with all other organizations and individuals—large or small—it will be as tender.

I am returning the check. Please return the article.

THEODORE DREISER.

ment of military action on the part of the British Government.

Recognition of such a right of the British Government would mean justification of war and could be a contagious example also for the other participants to the compact who, in virtue of their equality, might take the same right regarding other regions, and in result perhaps there would be no such place on the terrestrial globe regarding which the compact could be applied. Indeed, the reservation of the British Government contains an invitation addressed to every other participant to act as exempt from the exaction here and in other regions.

This reservation the Soviet Government cannot but consider as an attempt to use the compact itself as an instrument of imperialistic policy. However, inasmuch as the note of the British Government has not been communicated to the Soviet Government as an integral part of the compact or its supplements, it therefore cannot be considered obligatory for the Soviet Government. Similarly, other reservations contained in the diplomatic correspondence concerning the compact between the original participants may be passed over.

The Soviet Government also cannot agree with any other reservations which can serve as justification for war, particularly with reservations which are made in said correspondence in order to keep effective the compact and resolutions entailed by affiliation with the League of Nations and the Locarno agreements.

(8) Summarizing what has been said above, one must state the absence of the compact of obligations concerning disarmament, which is the only essential element of peace guarantee, the insufficiency and indefiniteness of the formula itself for prohibition of war and the existence of several reservations having as their object even appearance of obligations toward the cause of peace.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Pact of Paris objectively imposes certain obligations on the powers before public opinion and gives the Soviet Government a new chance to put before all the participants of the compact a question most important for peace, that is the question of disarmament, the solution of which is the only guarantee of prevention of war—the Soviet Government expresses willingness to sign the Pact of Paris.

In consequence of this assent I shall have the honor to hand over to you, M. Ambassador, the corresponding act of my Government in its joining in this compact as soon as the formalities connected with this are ended.

Further, there are obvious proofs of bad faith on the part of the signatory powers. In spite of the Locarno treaties of mutual guaranty, the disarmament of Germany, and the demilitarization of the Rhine, France is carrying on a more extensive fortification of her eastern frontier than was embodied in the pre-war defenses in 1914. In the New York Times for September 9, 1928, which carried ecstatic and exuberant comments on the signing of the Kellogg Pact, we find the following description of the new plans for French fortifications:

Paris, September 8—Paul Painleve, Minister of War, accompanied by a number of the foremost Generals of France and members to the Senate and Chamber Army Commissions, will hold a conference at Metz next week during which final decisions will be taken with regard to the plan for re-fortifying the eastern frontier of France, which has been already elaborated by the Army Commission under General Guillaumat and which was drafted by Marshal Petain.

M. Painleve's visit is rather in the nature of a tour of inspection of the country which must be reorganized for defense, consequent on the alteration of the French frontier necessitated by the return of Alsace and Lorraine.

The system which is being adopted will mean a considerable extension of the fortifications as they existed in 1914. It will extend from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, the whole frontier line being divided into separately organized districts of varying depths so as to include the old fortification system which will be modernized. In addition to forts, redoubts and battery emplacements of the old kind, an enormous amount of work is contemplated in making new roads, light railways, concrete trench work, underground communications and shelters.

The expense is to be spread over a period of at least seven years, and the first appropriation of 200,000,000 francs was made in this year's budget. This sum will be devoted to the first work of strengthening the frontier in the Metz-Thionville sector and in Lower Alsace.

Equally significant is the British fortification of Singapore, well described in an editorial in the *Living Age* for December, 1928:

The British decision to proceed with the construction of the Singapore naval base, following as it does almost immediately upon the signature of the Kellogg treaty, seems a little cynical. But governments, after all, deal with the realities of the international situation; and Great Britain shall at all times be able to exert her full naval strength in the Pacific. At present she cannot do so because there are no British dockyards in Pacific waters capable of receiving such giants of her fleet as the battleships of the *Nelson*,

price of article with phrase.....\$200
Price of article without phrase..... 500

Total contribution of *The World* to the welfare of the Catholic Church\$300

The Editor asked for time to consider the relative merits of paying this additional \$300 and finally replied as per his enclosed letter of October 24. My final answer is also attached.

Mr. Theodore Dreiser, New York, N. Y. My Dear Mr. Dreiser:

I will be unable to print your divorce article with the phrase "that world's largest real estate organization" included. The phrase seems to me to be a gratuitous reflection on the Catholic Church and without logical connection to the rest of your argument which I find to be excellent. I am perfectly willing to let the rest of the sentence stand, i. e., "the Catholic Church condemns them to hell besides. As though one hell weren't enough"—which is uncontestedly true.

This being the case please let me have your permission to print the article with this one deletion or return the payment to me and I will send back the manuscript.

PAUL PALMER, Sunday Editor.

Mr. Paul Palmer, Sunday Editor, The New York World, New York City. My Dear Sir:

It is gratifying to find the *New York World* so careful of the feelings of the Catholic Church. I trust that in connection with all other organizations and individuals—large or small—it will be as tender.

I am returning the check. Please return the article.

THEODORE DREISER.

Royal Sovereign, or Queen Elizabeth class, cruisers of the *Renown* and *Hood* type, or aircraft carriers like the *Eagle*. The new drydock now being installed at a cost of million pounds sterling will be large enough to accommodate anything afloat.

But in time of war such a drydock would merely become a convenience to any enemy strong enough to hold it after capture; and the Singapore base will therefore require adequate land defenses. These will include three eighteen-inch guns, recently shipped from England. Each is some sixty feet long, weighs about 150 tons, and fires a shell weighing nearly a ton and a half. As no existing battleship mounts a gun of more than sixteen-inch caliber, these are supposed to be able to sink any attacking fleet before it is near enough to the fortifications to use its own guns—probably, indeed, before it has even appeared over the horizon. The fire will be concentrated in force at the base after the new 600-acre flying field has been completed. But as the strongest land fortifications are helpless if taken in the rear or on the flank, the British naval authorities will have to provide a garrison adequate to prevent some future enemy from landing in force just out of range of their guns and marching calmly in from behind. To a large degree, no doubt, Singapore will be defended by the fleet based upon it, since no hostile transports will be able to land troops anywhere in the vicinity while that fleet is able to sally forth and sink them.

It would be tactless to speculate on the probable identity of the enemy against whom all these elaborate precautions are directed.

In addition we have the secret Anglo-French naval pact, fortunately discovered and published to the world by Mr. Hearst's papers, and the British and American talk about bigger navies. Finally, fundamental hypocrisy might well be charged against the Entente Powers in any contemporary proposal to renounce war. Any state is strong for peace after it has obtained what it has desired through war. Bismarck was the great European pacifist after 1871. Further, the behavior of the United States in Nicaragua during the period of the negotiation of the Kellogg Pact was not of a nature to disarm and reassure skeptics. The European charge of levity and hypocrisy on the part of certain American Senators in their light-hearted discussion of the Treaty and in passing the Big Navy Bill on the heels of the ratification of the Treaty may be accurate enough, but Europe is, however, in no position to cast the first stone. The complete failure of Europe to face the realities in regard to war guilt, the post-war settlement and the disarmament situation certainly represents far more cynicism and hypocrisy than can be accurately alleged against the United States in the question at issue.

While calling attention to certain realistic matters which must be considered in connection with the Kellogg Treaty, there is no valid reason for opposing the principle of the Treaty and many powerful arguments for supporting it. Merely as a gesture it is a most portentous departure, though we must remember the truth of Professor Shotwell's

suggestion in his address before Yale University on March 13, 1928, namely, that gestures in which a strain of apparent hypocrisy can be detected may do more harm than good. At any rate, it is the point of departure from which other and better arrangements may be obtained. The most serious defect is that no cognizance is taken of the injustices perpetuated by the application of the post-war treaties. Professor Shotwell, one of the foremost supporters of the Kellogg Pact, admits this frankly and says that if the Kellogg Treaty assumes a perpetual continuance of these conditions "war will remain with us and the renunciation of war will be a hollow farce." In a brilliant and realistic article in *Harper's Magazine* for January, 1929, on "Bigger and Better Armaments" Dr. Charles Austin Beard draws a powerful and challenging contrast between the rhetoric of the Kellogg Pact and the realities of secret diplomacy, alliances, national interests, and great armaments in the world today. He makes it clear that we must be on our guard against both the cynic who depreciates and mocks at any attempt to preserve peace and the naive enthusiast who believes that merely by putting ink to parchment we can remake the world. The Kellogg Treaty is, quite obviously, a challenge to the future and not an assured achievement. The limitations and defects of the Pact in its present form have been clearly pointed out by realistic and practical-minded commentators like Professor Edwin M. Borchard and others.

A BOOK ON FRANK HARRIS

Dear Sir: I shall appreciate your giving space to this communication. For many months I have been engaged in gathering material for the first full length study of Frank Harris. For that work I have received the aid of many distinguished people, such as Ernest Newman, Upton Sinclair, Augustus John, Dunsany and dozens of others; and various American periodicals have given space to my request for material bearing on my subject. I shall be obliged for transcripts of letters from Harris, reports of meetings and conversations with him, impressions of his personality, etc. Of course, I shall keep all communications private and confidential unless otherwise instructed. —ELMER GERTZ, 1421 S. St. Louis Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Write to Haldeman-Julius Co., Girard, Kans., for free catalog.

merely by reading the text of the Treaty. The terms, taken literally, are profoundly modified by the reservations and interpretations embodied in the exchanges of notes between the chief signatory powers prior to the signing of the Treaty. The so-called "Kellogg Treaty" does not outlaw war; it renounces war as an instrument of national policy. It does not renounce all wars, but only wars waged to advance national interests and policies. In other words, it actually renounces only aggressive wars, and the cynic would retort that there have been none of these in history. Certain types of wars are exempted in the interpretations exchanged by the signatory powers before the Treaty was signed. Among these are collective wars to enforce the sanctions of the League of Nations and of the Locarno covenants; wars of national defense; and wars in defense of special areas or interests with which Great Britain is vitally concerned. Clever diplomats would be able to interpret the majority of wars as falling under one of these exempted headings. Certainly the "special interest" exemption would have made it impossible to prevent the World War, as the Straits were as vital to Russia as India or Egypt is to Britain or the Monroe Doctrine to the United States. Moreover, as Professor Borchard points out, the exempting of certain types of wars from the operation of the Pact sanctions and approves by implication all the wars of the exempted types. For the first time in modern history it puts the sanction of international morality behind a large group of wars. There is no provision for enforcing the pact, which is its weakest point in a positive sense. If one of the signatory powers resorts to war the other signatory powers are no longer bound by the Treaty and simply recover their former freedom of action. It is evident, therefore, that the chief sanction of the Kellogg Pact is a moral sanction and the main hope lies in popular support of the spirit of the Treaty. Yet, it must be remembered that the people are easily deceived, and clever leaders would be likely to be successful in inducing their fellow-citizens to believe that any bellicose action of their own state was in harmony with the Treaty or was an answer to the violation of the Treaty by another power.

It has been frequently contended that the second article of the Treaty, to the effect that "The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall not be sought except by pacific means," is a conclusive guarantee against war. This might be accepted as a correct interpretation but for the above mentioned reservations which were made in the preliminary correspondence and do not appear in the text of the Pact. Britain would not be bound in the case of disputes relative to her interests in India nor the United States in regard to her Caribbean policy and interests. Further, it must be pointed out that the "High Contracting Parties" do not agree actually to settle their disputes by pacific means. All that the second article does is to bind them to seek a pacific settlement. It will not be difficult for any nation to contend that it did not seek a warlike settlement. It is generally maintained by their spokesmen that none of the nations sought war in 1914.

Further, most wars arise without evidence of any particular controversy or dispute, but out of an unexpressed conflict of interest, treaties of alliance, etc. What dispute did Germany have with any Power in 1914? How could the issue have been identified so as to be settled? The chief weaknesses of the Treaty are then: (1) the obvious loopholes for crafty diplomats; (2) the lack of provision for rectification of the injustices contained in the post-war treaties; (3) the absence of any provision for disarmament; (4) the failure to renounce any of the real causes of wars; and (5) the ignoring of the realities of the European situation. The most effective criticism of the Treaty is that contained in the note of the Soviet Government sent on August 31, 1928, in reply to the invitation to sign the pact; it is so relevant and important as to merit reproduction in full:

(1) Having taken from the very beginning of its existence as a basis of its foreign policy the preservation and security of universal peace, the Soviet Government has always and everywhere acted as a constant adherent to peace and has gone halfway to meet every other nation in this direction. At the same time the Soviet Government has considered and considers now that the carrying out of a plan for universal and full disarmament is the only actual means of preventing armed conflicts, because in an atmosphere of general feverish armament every competition of the powers inevitably leads to war, which is the more destructive the more perfect is the system of armaments.

The project for full disarmament has been worked out in detail and proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union in the Preparatory Conference of the League of Nations, but unfortunately it did not gain the support of the commission, the majority of which included representatives of those powers which are original participants of the pact just signed at Paris. The project was declined, notwithstanding that its acceptance and realization would have meant a real guarantee of peace.

(2) Not desiring to omit any chance to contribute to the reduction of the burden of armaments, painful for the peoples and masses of the world, the Soviet Government, after having had its proposal for complete disarmament rejected, not only did not refuse to discuss partial disarmament, but through its delegation to the Preparatory Commission came itself with a project for partial but very essential disarmament, worked out in detail. However, the Soviet Government must state regretfully that this project also did not meet with the sympathy of the Preparatory Commission, thus demonstrating once more, in full the weakness of the League of Nations in the cause of disarmament, which is the strongest guarantee of peace and the most powerful method of abolition of war. There was obvious resistance to the Soviet proposals from part and almost all of the States which first gave their signatures to the pact for prohibition of wars.

(3) Together with the systematic defense of the cause of disarmament long before the idea of the newly signed Pact of Paris arose, the Soviet Government also addressed to the other powers a proposal anent the prohibition by the conclusion of bilateral compacts not only of wars foreseen by the Pact of Paris but wars of all attacks one upon the other, and all armed conflicts whatsoever. Some States, such as Germany, Turkey, Afghanistan, Persia and Lithuania, accepted the same pro-

posal and concluded with the Soviet Government corresponding pacts; other States passed silently this proposal and evaded reply, but a third of the States declined the proposal with this strange explanation, that unconditional prohibition of attack was incompatible with their obligations toward the League of Nations. This, however, did not prevent the same powers from signing the Pact of Paris with a full silence in the very text of the said obligations.

(4) The above-mentioned facts are irrefutable proof of the fact that the very idea of suspension of wars and armed conflicts is a matter of international policy, a basic idea of Soviet foreign policy. Nevertheless the initiators of the Pact of Paris did not deem it necessary to invite the Soviet Government to participate in the negotiations for the Pact of Paris and the elaboration of the very text of the compact. In the same way were not invited also powers which were indeed interested in guaranteeing peace because either they have been the objects of attacks (Turkey and Afghanistan) or are so now (the republic of the great Chinese people). The invitation to join in the compact as transmitted by the French Government also does not contain conditions which could allow the Soviet Government to influence the very text of the document signed in Paris. However, the Soviet Government puts as axiomatic premises that under no conditions can it be deprived of that right which Governments already signatory to the pact realized or could realize, and in exercise of this right it must first make several remarks concerning its attitude toward the compact itself.

(5) First of all the Soviet Government cannot fail to express its deepest regret as to the absence in the Pact of Paris of any obligations whatsoever in the domain of disarmament. The Soviet delegation to the Preparatory Commission for Disarmament already has had the chance to declare that only the culmination of a compact forbidding war with the full realization of universal disarmament can give real effect in guaranteeing universal peace, and that on the contrary an international treaty "forbidding war," and unaccompanied by even such elementary guarantee as limitation of incessantly growing armaments, will remain a dead letter without real meaning. Recent public declarations of some participants of the Pact of Paris concerning the inevitableness of further armaments even after the conclusion of the agreement confirm this. New international groupings which have appeared at the same time, especially in connection with the question of renewal of armaments, have still more underlined this situation. Therefore the conditions created by the compact reveal at the present time more than ever the necessity of taking resolute measures in the domain of disarmament.

(6) Considering the text of the compact itself the Soviet Government thinks it necessary to point out the insufficient definiteness and clearness in the first clause concerning the formula for the prohibition of wars itself, this having the effect of permitting various and arbitrary interpretations. It believes on its part that international war must be forbidden not only as so-called "an instrument of national policy" but also a method serving other purposes (for instance oppression, liberative national movements, etc.).

In the opinion of the Soviet Government there must be forbidden not only wars in the form of the juridical meaning of this word but also such military actions as, for instance, intervention, blockade, military occupation of foreign territory, foreign ports, etc. History in recent years has known several military actions of this kind which have brought enormous calamities to various nations. The Soviet Republics themselves have been the objects of such attacks and now 400,000,000 Chinese suffer from similar attacks. More than that, similar military actions often grow into big wars which it is already absolutely impossible to stay.

Meanwhile these most important questions from the viewpoint of the preservation of peace are silently passed over. Furthermore, the same first clause of the compact mentions the necessity of solving all international disputes and conflicts exclusively by peaceful means. In this connection the Soviet Government considers that among the unpeaceful means forbidden by the compact must also be included such as the refusal to reestablish peaceful and normal relations, or the rupture of these relations between people, because such actions mean the suspension of peaceful methods in solution of disputes and by their very existence contribute to the creation of an atmosphere favorable to the breaking out of wars.

(7) Among the reservations made in the diplomatic correspondence between the original participants of the compact, especial attention of the Soviet Government is drawn by the reservation of the British Government in Paragraph 10 of its note of May 19, 1928. By virtue of this reservation the British Government reserves a freedom of action toward a series of regions which it does not even enumerate. If it means provinces already belonging to the British Empire or its Dominions, they are already included in the compact in which are foreseen cases of their being attacked, so that the reservation of the British Government regarding them must seem at least superfluous.

However, if other regions are meant, the participants of the compact are entitled to know exactly where the freedom of action of the British Government begins and where it ends. But the British Government reserves freedom of action not only in case of military attack on these regions but even at any "unfriendly act" of so-called "interference," while it obviously reserves the right to an arbitrary definition of what is considered an "unfriendly act" of "interference," justifying commencement

of military action on the part of the British Government.

Recognition of such a right of the British Government would mean justification of war and could be a contagious example also for the other participants to the compact who, in virtue of their equality, might take the same right regarding other regions, and in result perhaps there would be no such place on the terrestrial globe regarding which the compact could be applied. Indeed, the reservation of the British Government contains an invitation addressed to every other participant to act as exempt from the exaction here and in other regions.

This reservation the Soviet Government cannot but consider as an attempt to use the compact itself as an instrument of imperialistic policy. However, inasmuch as the note of the British Government has not been communicated to the Soviet Government as an integral part of the compact or its supplements, it therefore cannot be considered obligatory for the Soviet Government. Similarly, other reservations contained in the diplomatic correspondence concerning the compact between the original participants may be passed over.

The Soviet Government also cannot agree with any other reservations which can serve as justification for war, particularly with reservations which are made in said correspondence in order to keep effective the compact and resolutions entailed by affiliation with the League of Nations and the Locarno agreements.

(8) Summarizing what has been said above, one must state the absence of the compact of obligations concerning disarmament, which is the only essential element of peace guarantee, the insufficiency and indefiniteness of the formula itself for prohibition of war and the existence of several reservations having as their object even appearance of obligations toward the cause of peace.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Pact of Paris objectively imposes certain obligations on the powers before public opinion and gives the Soviet Government a new chance to put before all the participants of the compact a question most important for peace, that is the question of disarmament, the solution of which is the only guarantee of prevention of war—the Soviet Government expresses willingness to sign the Pact of Paris.

In consequence of this assent I shall have the honor to hand over to you, M. Ambassador, the corresponding act of my Government in its joining in this compact as soon as the formalities connected with this are ended.

Further, there are obvious proofs of bad faith on the part of the signatory powers. In spite of the Locarno treaties of mutual guaranty, the disarmament of Germany, and the demilitarization of the Rhine, France is carrying on a more extensive fortification of her eastern frontier than was embodied in the pre-war defenses in 1914. In the New York Times for September 9, 1928, which carried ecstatic and exuberant comments on the signing of the Kellogg Pact, we find the following description of the new plans for French fortifications:

Paris, September 8—Paul Painleve, Minister of War, accompanied by a number of the foremost Generals of France and members to the Senate and Chamber Army Commissions, will hold a conference at Metz next week during which final decisions will be taken with regard to the plan for re-fortifying the eastern frontier of France, which has been already elaborated by the Army Commission under General Guillaumat and which was drafted by Marshal Petain.

M. Painleve's visit is rather in the nature of a tour of inspection of the country which must be reorganized for defense, consequent on the alteration of the French frontier necessitated by the return of Alsace and Lorraine.

The system which is being adopted will mean a considerable extension of the fortifications as they existed in 1914. It will extend from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, the whole frontier line being divided into separately organized districts of varying depths so as to include the old fortification system which will be modernized. In addition to forts, redoubts and battery emplacements of the old kind, an enormous amount of work is contemplated in making new roads, light railways, concrete trench work, underground communications and shelters.

The expense is to be spread over a period of at least seven years, and the first appropriation of 200,000,000 francs was made in this year's budget. This sum will be devoted to the first work of strengthening the frontier in the Metz-Thionville sector and in Lower Alsace.

Equally significant is the British fortification of Singapore, well described in an editorial in the *Living Age* for December, 1928:

The British decision to proceed with the construction of the Singapore naval base, following as it does almost immediately upon the signature of the Kellogg treaty, seems a little cynical. But governments, after all, deal with the realities of the international situation; and Great Britain shall at all times be able to exert her full naval strength in the Pacific. At present she cannot do so because there are no British dockyards in Pacific waters capable of receiving such giants of her fleet as the battleships of the *Nelson*,

price of article with phrase.....\$200
Price of article without phrase..... 500

Total contribution of *The World* to the welfare of the Catholic Church\$300

“Every Man In His Own Humor”

E. Haldeman-Julius

Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co. This title of an old play by Ben Jonson whose “learned sock” is mentioned by Milton might be taken to heart by critics as an illuminating text. For the good critic takes every writer in his own humor, realizing that in style, in material, in thematic handling of material, and in particular mood or slant of sensitive reaction to life no two writers (or, let us say, no two writers of distinctive importance) are quite alike nor really should they be.

It is a truism—yet surprisingly often neglected—that a good critic or, to put the same thing more simply, a good interesting talker about books is one who is principally concerned with books as reflections and studies of life. He discusses ideas and the human element in literature, its meaning and movement, rather than technical and rare questions. Above all, a first-rate critic is one who has a variety of fitting and intelligent appreciations. He must have, not necessarily a great mind, but a versatile and ranging mind, rather than a mind which views all things from a fixed point and insists upon squeezing all things within a narrow compass of predetermined judgment. He (the good critic) is cordial to different kinds of talent, at least fair to them, not condemning Oscar Wilde for writing in a vein unlike Macaulay's nor holding it as a serious charge against Macaulay that he failed to do something which he never tried nor intended.

A good deal of criticism is merely an expression of personal liking or disliking; this may be a very entertaining method, may even be brilliant and perhaps informative to some extent, but its danger is that it tends toward irrelevance; a critic may very impressively review his distaste for Oscar Wilde yet the real talent of Wilde remains untouched. It is really only a question of whether one has the type of mind that can appreciate the rather brittle staccato of wit and impudence which is Wilde. It is true enough that the author of “The Importance of Being Earnest” (Earnest in the play being a name and not a state of mind) was not an original philosopher uttering tremendous new truths for the edification of mankind. He was not, strictly speaking, a thinker although he was bright, sensible, and appropriate (although delighting in paradox) in his handling of ideas: subtle rather than profound ideas. It was his special joy to take a common idea or sentiment and give it a quick, sly, unexpected twist; and also, as his sometime friend, Lord Alfred Douglas, poetically phrased it, to show “beneath the common thing the hidden grace.”

But then Wilde did not pose—poser though he was—a great thinker. Nor did he intend to be a social reformer: a Communist critic who some time ago reminded

us a bit fiercely that Wilde did not sound the social revolutionary note was indeed correct insofar as he was merely describing Wilde as a writer. That critic was pathetically misled by fanaticism, however, in that he ventured to dismiss Wilde from the proper company of important or legitimate writers because Wilde did not, as it were, discuss the relations between capital and labor. Beyond the fact that he was not vividly interested in this undoubtedly vital subject, Wilde may well have been excused for thinking that Karl Marx had done this job better than he (Wilde) could manage. Marx was a thinker and student but not an artist; Wilde was an artist and not a thinker; so it must be every man in his own humor, every writer following the natural lead of his talent.

It belongs, of course, to the critic's function that he should remark analytically and definitely upon the nature—upon the special quality and direction as well as the limitations—of an artist's work. And such analysis may show relatively that an artist has a narrow and not lofty place; yet this is by no means a severe or absolute disparagement and indeed, rightly viewed, it is not in an artistic sense a disparagement at all. Obviously there is room in literature for every shade, every level, of talent; if a writer has talent of a certain kind, if he does a particular thing cleverly and effectively, that is a distinction which cannot properly be challenged by the pointing out of any number of deficiencies in other respects.

Quite often a criticism of some writer may be summed up in the absurd refrain: “So and So does not write like Somebody Else.” De Maupassant was not the devoted, careful, unwearied artist that Flaubert was. Such a perfectly written and profoundly human story—psychologically at once bold and subtle—as “Madame Bovary” was quite evidently beyond the limited, though within its limits striking, talent of De Maupassant. This artist who is most notably thought of in connection with the short story had a gift for ingenious and surprising narrative. He could tell a story in a style of conversational, direct and uninterrupted, lucidity. One will search in vain through his pages for the flashing presence of word-magic. Equally absent are the force of intellect and the range of great comprehension. De Maupassant was a vivacious commentator on a very few aspects of life, but he was not a thinker about life. Like Wilde—only with a far less keen and glittering mind—he took his ideas mostly at second hand.

Plot—or not even plot in the large sense but the peculiarly sharp situation—was De Maupassant's forte. He could tell a story which, as a critic has recently remarked, is “as unforgettable as any of the best traditional tales like that of the Ephesian matron or that which Boccaccio recounts of the falcon and the lady.” Very well, it is no trifling praise to say of a writer that he was a first-rate story-teller. A good story-teller De Maupassant was and meant to be—and nothing else. He was not a philosopher; but then Epicurus was not a teller of tales; Newton was not a dramatist; Voltaire was not a composer of operas—in a word, we must fairly

study each man of outstanding or considerable importance in his own field; and if this man seems not to be as important as that man—a question, which, after all, must remain judiciously relative—he may be worth studying, he may be amusing or stimulating, even so.

A glance reveals a world of difference between Shakespeare and Ibsen; yet each is significant in his own way; Ibsen did not have the golden melody of language nor the full rushing tide of inspiration as Shakespeare had; while Shakespeare did not set forth the revolutionary social criticism which, together with dramatic skill, is notable in Ibsen. Critics may point out, as does Bernard Shaw, that Shakespeare was an insular English patriot and that he was devoid of a social philosophy worthy of the modern name; James Branch Cabell may labor the point (in his “Beyond Life”) that Shakespeare's wisdom consisted in artfully phrased platitudes—yet many of them are “platitudes” only to those who see life as clearly as Shakespeare saw it, while even the ideas set forth in Cabell's own books may easily be reduced to what seems a platitudinous essence. Notwithstanding such criticisms, however close to the mark they may be, there is no denying Shakespeare's superb eminence as a master poet, as a profound realist of character, and as a dramatist who, if not technically without fault, possessed wonderful ingenuity and, more than that, sheer irresistible force.

So with Ibsen—it may be objected that in certain respects his plays suffer by the lapse of time, because of their contemporary significance as social propaganda in his own day; his point of view having seemed more original, bold, and challenging than that seems now. But nothing can rob the dramas of Ibsen of their somber power. It is not necessary that we should appreciate Ibsen's plays in the same way that his contemporaries did—or rather be struck by them forcibly in the same way; but thoroughly grasping the dramatist's point of view at the outset, we are better able to appreciate the timeless human aspects of the plays and their individual characterization. When they first appeared, Ibsen's plays aroused more social discussion than dramatic appreciation (and, we should add, more denunciation than discussion); now we can, while perceiving their social significance, enjoy them more readily as true drama.

Shaw, who has acknowledged his indebtedness to Ibsen, is more attractively fashioned with wit; and it is his unflinching wit (added to the last word of technical expertise in dramatic construction) that carries lightly and gracefully forward the most pretentious themes, the most fundamentally serious social preachments, which in other hands might press upon the spectators as heavily intellectual. Intellectual discussion is a danger to the really moving quality of drama; but Shaw can handle ideas easily, and there, indeed, is all the difference. Propaganda, at any rate propaganda that is direct and obvious, that is too forced in its preacher-like tone, is more than any form of art can agreeably sustain. To be sure, the artist should have a point of view, an intelligent theme, a sense of related values and of true and convincing as distinguished from spurious objectives. In selecting his material, the artist primarily judges what is interesting to him, the best way of dealing with his images and characters, and what logically will be the outcome of a certain chain of events or grouping of characters and ideas. Yet if the artistic motive be strongest within him he will contrive skillfully to let his art, and not preaching directly, tell its own story and convey its own lucid and powerful meaning, all the more impressive for not being over-labored.

It is not disputable that art suffers from an overloading of propaganda. The writer in America who has argued most earnestly for the close relationship of art and propaganda—Upton Sinclair—is the man who has most conspicuously (among writers of real importance) burdened his novels with clumsy and excessive preachments, so that “The Jungle” to name a sad instance, deteriorates from pages of gripping description and swift, intense narrative to pages of windy stumpporatory. Intelligently from the viewpoint of a Socialist propagandist, Upton Sinclair could have written a much greater Socialist novel had he been less wrought up about, less unreservedly and over-emphatically interested in, Socialism. He is a man of unusual artistic talents who has used these talents for the (artistic) lesser purpose of pamphleteering; possibly from his own point of view he is well justified—but all that we are saying here is that his point of view is not that of the genuine artist; he may argue that pamphleteering for the social revolution is more important than art, but he cannot argue very plausibly that pamphleteering and art are identical. True, Sinclair is far more important and is infinitely more readable than many novelists who tell simply a story—but what a simple-minded and unimportant and, first and last, unconvincing story! Injudiciously mixed as they are, both his art and his propaganda deserve attention, even though that attention is specially charged with criticism.

There is propaganda and propa-

ganda; to cite an extreme illustration, both Tolstoy and Harold Bell Wright (is the latter still remembered?) are obviously propagandists in their fiction; but there is a world of difference, and chiefly two differences—Tolstoy at his worst is a more able (which does not mean necessarily a more subtle) propagandist, and again he has artistic talents that suffer from his propaganda proclivities, while the briefly famous American Messiah of the littered-literate has no talent save the ability to write, on the whole, grammatically. Anyone who has a deep appreciation of art must regret that Tolstoy so often preferred to preach a sermon rather than tell a story. His quasi-Christian sentimentality and asceticism distorted his whole view of human character, led him to forcibly cast a story into an unnatural mold of moral purpose, and held him back from the full exercise of his undoubted gift of narration and characterization. In the most inartistic and heavily, awkwardly purposeful of his novels—in “Resurrection,” for example—there are pages that really move in the novelistic sense and there are vivid, clearly etched bits of description, glimpses of true characterization and the quality of familiarized life—but, alas, how the tale drags and how conscious we are of the stiffness and unnaturalness inseparable from such a preaching, preaching, endlessly and earnestly preaching document.

It is certainly not a sign of the artist, nor for that matter is it a sign of the good propagandist, that he afflicts us with a feeling of boredom. And Tolstoy is very often a bore. It is fatal to the artist when he is persuaded that he is a savior of mankind. It is the task of the artist, a rare and thrilling task, to feel and perceive life profoundly or at least (within his range and depth) vividly, to create life in artistic shape and motion, and to transmit the unmistakable sense of life to the spectator who never so truly lives as when he experiences life as it is intensified by art.

Yet the critic who really wishes to appreciate and not only to find fault will not wave aside as unworthy of consideration any work of art that is plainly, too plainly and insistently, involved with propaganda. We do not say that because Tolstoy was a propagandist and too often used his art as a vehicle for the expression of Messianic (and miserably warped) ideas, he is therefore of no account. He wrought both well and ill, and if we perceive and point out his defects we also recognize the excellence that was just as genuinely a product of his mind. Criticism does not vacate its office but rather fills that office conscientiously and discriminatingly, when it analyzes in a clearly appreciative way the work of important thinkers and artists. It is a betrayal of the true function of criticism when one either damns or praises intolerantly, seeing only black and white, and ignoring all other distinctive shades that are important in their own style.

Admirers are equally at fault with detractors in this matter. There are idolaters of Shakespeare who are severely offended at the slightest intimation that there were any loose or inconsistent aspects in the art or thought of their idol. When Shaw, some years ago, first took the view into his confidence as to the superiority of himself, a modern, over Shakespeare with his ancient philosophy of pessimism and social indifference, there was a scandalized fluttering among the many who were accustomed to regard Shakespeare less as a man than as a literary demigod and not only a superb artist but an inspired thinker, teaching timeless truth. Yet Shaw's criticism of Shakespeare—his statement that Shakespeare's attitude was largely an impotent outcry against an unalterable and incomprehensible Fate instead of the modern attitude of social understanding and progressiveness—was a well-reasoned and cogent criticism.

It is idle to deny the truth of Shaw's criticism in the main; although it is extremely foolish to conclude that because Shakespeare was not modern in his social philosophy, because he expressed a fatalistic sense of life's tragic aspects rather than a spirit of optimistic progressiveness, he was not a great, significant, unique artist; indeed, one can fairly appreciate both the point of view expressed by Shakespeare and the point of view expressed by Shaw, in each of which there is something that corresponds to the attitude—both to the reason and the feeling—of a modern man. In this modern age, with the sound inspiration of a scientific attitude and scientific knowledge and power, we have the constructive idea of widening man's mastery over life, of solving problems, of mitigating what used to be called Fate and even “cheating” nature, of building a far greater civilization than could have been dimly imagined in Shakespeare's time. Shaw does not believe, for example, in simply giving artistic expression to the tragedies and futilities of life; he believes in our taking life intelligently in our hands and making the best of it, a best which must be much better than anything yet done. But even so, there remains a sense of an inexorable nature which limits man—there is a tragic side to life, and an ironical side—there is a spirit of

rebellion and disillusionment in man; and it is to this attitude, which inspires a response in any sensitive man, that Shakespeare gave mastery, poignant expression. The sensuous beauty, the grand gestures, the tragic accidents and defeats of life, the sensation of man's brief role ending in death—to these things Shakespeare gave the infinitely spirited and heart-wringing magic of art.

It is obviously a demand of impossible narrowness that every thinker and artist shall represent in terms of art only the ideas and emotions which seem valid or important to a particular critic. Naturally one expects the artist to deal with types of character and with emotions which he does not absolutely approve—and which, as an artist, he does not absolutely condemn but rather tries sympathetically, that is to say vividly and accurately, to interpret. Balzac, for instance, portrayed a number of diverse characters with an artist's insight, his object being to make them live in an intelligible and forceful shape of art; and certainly he was not representing himself in every character, nor was he distributing praise and blame with the unctuous certitude and the stern, self-conscious purposefulness of a moralist. Even the good Dickens, in some respects a model of Victorian respectability in his novels (especially in his avoidance of the sex side of life), portrayed with considerable and affectionate attention a good many low, shiftless characters—was drawn by peculiar though not admirable individuals with an interest that was artistic rather than moral.

Dickens, by the way, is another example of the need for critical appraisal which is shrewd without being intolerant. Dickens was a poor moralist, a poor thinker, and there were depths of character that were beyond him. As a psychologist and, in a broad and profound sense, a creator in art one could not compare him with such a genius as Balzac, nor in a hearty, convincing realism could one compare him with Fielding; while in what may be called the intellectual basis of a novel he was far inferior to some of our modern workers in fiction. Nevertheless, Dickens had a vivid imagination—he had the true artist's gift of endowing with an illusion of real, personal life even inanimate things, landscapes, buildings, streets, and the like—and he had an odd gift of characterization, which is not so much lessened as more clearly defined when it is called caricature. The mind of a truly modern reader will not be much impressed by nor attracted by the general outlook upon life which Dickens had, partly in himself and partly in his age; but unless he has a closed mind or obstructed, narrowed sensibilities, he cannot be untouched by the simple, infectious humanity of the man and by his marvellously memorable, even though not always strictly accurate, portrayals of the flossam and jetsam stranded in odd places by the social tide.

It is the pleasure of the critic—and by critic is meant any intelligent reader who is equipped with a capacity for shrewd and feeling judgment of what he reads—to extend widely, while at the same time identifying and comparing, his appreciations in the far-spreading fields of literature (which run with the fields of thought and life); narrowness is the worst fault, the most crippling and unhappy fault, that the mind can have; and to condemn men for not being or not doing this, that or the other, by the condemnation shutting oneself away from appreciation of what men interestingly are and have done, is narrowness in an unreasonable extreme. The reader who lets himself be swayed by an intense dislike of certain literary artists because he thinks they are morbid or improper or wrong-headed or something-or-other—who has, in other words, a disposition to quarrel with an artist's special interest or individual viewpoint about life—is, after all, only denying himself a great deal of excellent entertainment and edification.

The true critic (who is, again, any intelligent spectator) understands quite well the difference between appreciation and agreement. He does not adopt the sense of values of every artist whom he finds interesting. His list of appreciations reveals wonderful variety: Balzac and Dickens, Felding and Scott, Macaulay and Charles Lamb, Shakespeare and Ibsen, Hawthorne and Mark Twain, Goethe and Hugo, Flaubert and De Maupassant, Shelley and Ernest Dowson, Hardy and Kipling—it is a company of life's reporters and interpreters who combine, for the catholic critic, a stimulating diversity of viewpoints and styles of high, impressive entertainment. If, as the well-known but not (in terms of true toleration) so well-applied maxim, has it, all kinds of people are required to make a world, then evidently all kinds of writers are required to represent a world in the salient shapes of art. “Every man in his own humor,” to be appraised with many-sided discrimination, but with sympathetic insight and good humor: this is the good, free rule, which one ignores to one's own loss.

WORKS OF BOOTH TARKINGTON in four handsome blue-leather volumes. Alice Adams Gentle Julia, in the Arena, etc. Was \$8. Now all four for only \$2.79 per set, postpaid. Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas.

A Window on Europe

A Weekly Letter from an Englishman About Europe John Langdon-Davies

Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.

CLIMATE AND CHARACTER Twenty-five days of drought and then torrential rains! I imagine that my American reader will not be disposed to think much of that statement of fact. Yet to me it has had some very astonishing features. The English weather has been abnormal throughout the year; long rainless periods culminating in this five weeks' period of absolutely dry weather in London, something never before recorded in the history of meteorological observation.

It has shown me how quickly climate affects character and civilization; for during these weeks the London crowds both as crowds and as individuals have quite perceptibly changed into something new and unforeseen. Their attitude on life, morals, happiness has altered. Consider the Londoner as his climate has made him; a man expecting and prepared for change; never certain that a fair morning is not the prelude to an afternoon storm; never to be tempted by sunshine into forgetting his raincoat; distrustful of the open air and disillusioned about its possibilities of pleasure. Naturally this attitude is reflected in his habits, his ideals, his whole attitude to life. Then suddenly he finds that for five long weeks he can stroll about the streets all day and all night warm and dry; his morals and his desires are at once thrown into a different mold.

It has been announced that if the coming winter is as severe as the last two or three, ten percent of all the plants in the English florists' catalogues will disappear forever from the lists. In other words, the comparatively small deviation from the normal has been enough to make life impossible for one in ten of the cultivated plants in the British Isles. What is true of plants and animals is also true of men. Hidden away from sight are several types of human beings distinguished by their climatic preferences; this summer has brought out and stimulated the type which thrives on fine weather and this type has given it the prevailing tone to the crowds and to the general aspect of everyday life.

Put most simply, I think we can say that London has been looking more like Paris or some other southern town; gay and more irresponsible perhaps than the usual London; less busy about business and more busy about pleasure. Londoners have learned the art of sitting about and doing nothing without being bored. Curiously enough, the present Labor Government has lent its hand. Many Americans know our great central desert, Trafalgar Square; a level plain of huge flagstones with a high central column at the top of which on a fine day with a telescope you can make out the figure of Lord Nelson. Well, Mr. George Lansbury, the great revolutionary and terror of all who read the Morning Post, has actually had seats put in Trafalgar Square so that for the first time in history you can sit down there and look at the fountains. By the way, the fountains have not been playing during the drought, not as the authorities have been careful to explain, because they are unaware that fountains go on using the same water again and again; but because it was feared that people might resent restrictions on car-washing and lawn irrigating if they saw the waters plashing in Trafalgar Square.

Beside the general gayness brought about by the dry weather there has been a definite effect upon trade: such industries as charabanc excursions and seaside resorts have boomed and the roads out of London on a Saturday afternoon have come almost to resemble those out of New York City. Indeed the fine weather has done much to help forward the Americanization of English life in general. One of the chief features of Americanization as we know it is the regarding of a motor car as a necessity rather than as a luxury. Only a few years ago nobody kept a car unless they were distinctly well to do, now less comfortably situated folk are having to economize by keeping a car. You can see the results at week-ends, or if you are a railway company shareholder you can see the results whenever dividends arrive or fail to arrive.

Our amusements are becoming more and more trans-Atlantic: chewing-gum, I am sorry to say, can now be found sticking to the street pavements, turning them by their magic from “pavements” to “sidewalks”! My children come home with all-day suckers and any day now I expect to find an all-week sucker, such as I once saw in Hoboken. The movies of course long ago introduced us to the intimate family life of cousins across the sea, and now the Talkies are with us—But let us turn to less disagreeable subjects; having recently heard Mary Pickford and old Southern Justice and honor in Coquette, I am not fit to talk about Talkies.

I always remember that when first I went to America a millionaire radical said to me, “you will find

three things exhilarating in America; the variety of races, the spirit of democracy and the climate.” The first stood me in good stead by making my lectures on race prejudice popular; the second—well in another Window I will show you why I think Europe more democratic than America. The third, the climate, I did find exhilarating especially in New York in January. If I could have settled down to be an icicle or a kettle of boiling water for a considerable consecutive period all would have been well, but I could not get used to being one in the streets and the other in the buildings. It made me a patriot, and I am now all for the English climate, campfires, droughts and everything, else that makes for our alternative to your climate in winter time.

I have often noticed that all Russians seem to spend the day drinking hot tea and sleeping on the top of a stove; that was what caused the revolution in all probability. If I had thought of that before I should not have opposed Scott Nearing in the debate “That communism is applicable to America.” Steam heat will blow up the social fabric of America, just as it did in Russia. As an anti-Communist Socialist I am all for the English climate; I hate extremes.

TWO WAR BOOKS

In many ways the most remarkable thing which has happened in Europe during 1929 is the appearance and overwhelming success of two war stories. All Quiet on the Western Front and Journey's End have taken the minds of the world by storm in a way far outstripping that of any previous war literary product. I think it is well worth considering why this has been so.

Most of my readers will have seen Journey's End acted, and will have read All Quiet; why they will have done so is not very interesting, as likely as not it is because of that modern wizard Advertising, who is able to shove anything good or bad down our throats. What is really interesting is why the book and play were written. Though both of them have made fortunes for their authors, neither was written for money; nobody foretold their financial success. I was present when Maurice Brown, who was largely responsible for the first appearance of Journey's End, read the play to a dozen people after lunch. Two of the twelve decided that they would take it for the good it might do as anti-war propaganda; they were willing to lose a little on it; now they are thinking out wise plans for spending their share of the profits.

Remarque is the most interesting perhaps of the two authors; and we can see in him not only the explanation of the writing of such books as these, but also of the attitude toward life of his generation. He is one of the million of those who, though never killed, came dead out of the war: they have been walking about dead ever since.

When Remarque was discharged from the shattered German army he found that he did not know what to do; it was not just that he did not know how to make a living, he did not know how to live; he had left an important part of himself somewhere amid the mud and muddle, the waste and breakage of the Western Front. He became a pedlar, and sold shawls and dress lengths to peasant women, moving on at the sight of a policeman since he had no license to trade. Then he played the organ in a lunatic asylum. Then he taught children in an elementary school.

Next he began to write rhymed advertisements and to do sporting journalism; but all the time there was something overhanging him. It was like walking always beneath an overhanging cliff which must sooner or later, break off and overwhelm him. Then at last he resolved to put an end to the constant menacing gloom; he would take a pick-axe and cut away the rocks which threatened to smother him; he wrote “All Quiet.”

“All Quiet” was written to exorcise the war. Remarque did not wish to remind himself of his experiences; he wished to forget them. By imprisoning them within the covers of a printed volume, he could expel them from his brain; instead of walking about with them perpetually inside him, he could leave them on a shelf.

Paradoxically enough his very success has almost defeated his own end for the public is refusing to allow him to forget the war. They want him to lecture, they interview him, they argue with him and all he can do is to escape into his own shell and say: “I do not wish to be associated with the War; I wrote my book to forget it; let me forget it for God's sake.”

Now I think that Remarque can be taken as the symbol or type of his generation; it is true that he has been vocal, and heard of; his feeling of an overhanging rock ready to crush him has become familiar to all of us and we have all seen how he has hewn away the danger and the nightmare. But silently, and unknown, millions of men are passing their life in Europe today under the shadow which fell across them in their early youth and manhood. “I only wanted to relate,” says Remarque, “how the ideals of myself and my companion were de-

[Please turn to page four

“DUST” IS A STORY HUNDREDS OF MARRIED MEN AND WOMEN WILL RECOGNIZE. AND YET NO ONE EVER TOLD IT BEFORE. NO OTHER AMERICAN WRITER EVER HAD THE COURAGE. IT IS TOO STARK—TOO RUTHLESS—TOO MERCILESSLY SHORN OF SENTIMENTALITY. NO ONE PERSON COULD HAVE TOLD IT! ONLY A MAN AND A WOMAN TOGETHER COULD HAVE PROBED SO DEEP INTO LIFE AND SEEN IT SO COMPLETELY. MR. AND MRS. HALDEMAN JULIUS HAVE THE GIFT OF RARE UNDERSTANDING. THROUGH THIS IS THEIR FIRST NOVEL. IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THEIR REPUTATIONS ESTABLISHED AS WRITERS IN OTHER FIELDS. “DUST” IS UNLIKE THE USUAL EPHEMERAL WORK—IT IS STILL READ: AS CARL SANDBURG REMARKED, “IT LINGERS ON” AND STAYS WITH ONE. IT HAS BEEN DESCRIBED AS “A WORTHY VOLUME IN THE MID-WESTERN EPIC THAT OUR YOUNGER AUTHORS HAVE BEGUN TO WRITE.” THE THEME OF “DUST” OPENS AND CLOSES THE STORY AND RUNS ALL THROUGH IT. FROM FIRST PAGE TO LAST.

“DUST”

By E. and M. Haldeman-Julius REVIEWS:

Boston Transcript—

“From beginning to end, DUST is a work of art, a searching probe into human souls brought together by an indifferent fate and parted by a caprice of nature.”

New York Evening Post—

“DUST is a highly worthy addition to the best in our contemporary letters.”

Chicago Tribune—

“DUST is a true work of art. It is a joy to find a first novel so brimming with promise.”

New Jersey Leader—

“This gripping story is bound to take its place as one of the important first novels of the year—indeed one of the high water marks in a season that is rich in the production of notable literature.”

Philadelphia Public Ledger—

“The authors have produced a most remarkable novel of the Middle West, a masterly piece of work which touches every emotional chord, as well as making a strong intellectual appeal.”

New York World—

“In truth a work of literary note—a tragedy set forth with such dignity and power that it should compel reading.”

PRICES:

Paperbound edition, cover in attractive colors, substantial, handy size, thoroughly readable. The complete novel—not a word omitted—exactly the same as the cloth-bound edition. Now sent postpaid anywhere for 39c per copy.

Clothbound edition, 251 pages, with protecting jacket. Large, clear type. A neat piece of book-manufacturing craftsmanship. Published at \$1.90; now sent postpaid to any address for \$1.35 per copy.

\$1.35

In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other Literary Ruminations
Isaac Goldberg

Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.

PAPER BOOKS

Undismayed by the indifferent success with which paperbound books have heretofore met in the United States, Charles Boni, founder of the Modern Library, has inaugurated a highly interesting variation on the theme of the monthly Book Club.

We Americans, unless we have had to purchase foreign books in connection with our studies, are unaccustomed to the book in paper binding. To be sure, Haldeman-Julius, with the famous Little Blue Book series, converted millions of readers with an irresistible combination of good matter and low price. Other publishers have ventured, now and then, to issue a play in stiff paper, or boards. Up to now, however, the public, despite the obvious saving thus effected, has remained cold to the idea.

Yet why should this be so? There is always the binder ready to do an individual job on any book that you admire sufficiently to put between special covers. In this way, your library acquires, in part, a personal appearance. Every library, if one can afford it, should contain such favorite volumes. I have seen some collections of Blue Books excellently bound and specially stamped. A paperbound book, afterward bound in cloth to the taste of the owner, turns out cheaper in the long run than the average book in its conventional hard covers.

At any rate, here is Mr. Boni with his monthly paperbound volume, offered at \$5 the year. Each book, then, comes to something like 42 cents. The editorial board of the Paper Books is composed of five writers, an artist, and a typographer. The writers are Horace Kallen, Lincoln Colcord, Padraic Colum, Everett Dean Martin and Louis Untermeyer. The artist is Rockwell Kent, to whom is entrusted the decoration. The typographer is Elmer Adler, the man who designed the page and format of *The American Mercury*.

The first book to be distributed by Paper Books is a Chinese fantasy entitled "The Golden Wind," written by Takashi Ohta and Margaret Sperry. The adventures recounted are those that happened, more or less, to Mr. Ohta, now an Americanized Japanese, with an American wife; Miss Sperry has entered into the spirit of the narrative with a most delicate adjustment to the mood and the manner. One feels not the slightest sense of divided effort. The story itself is a series of stylized adventures in war and love; if movies were made in the fashion of Japanese prints, this tale would provide an excellently imaginative scenario. The hero, escaping from prison in his native Japan, becomes involved in the Chinese revolution, and in the quest of a man whose wife he loves. He meets many charmers—and these Oriental ladies can be charming—but they all seem, as Mr. Colum has pointed out in his introduction, the same woman. Love, like the end of the rainbow, forever eludes him

as it seems to be just within his grasp.

Yet the story, exciting and enjoyable as it is, yields in pleasure to the verbal style. It is delicate, perceptive, agreeably sententious, and all delightfully impossible.

Paper Books, as I understand, has no definite policy as to the kind of volumes it will issue. Anything that is good in its special field will find a ready welcome at the hands of its most catholic editorial board. At \$5 per year it strikes me as one of the best bargains in the book market.

"CRUSH THE INFAMOUS INSTITUTION!"

Voltaire: The Incomparable Infidel. By Joseph Lewis. New York. The Free Thought Press Association.

Mr. Lewis, you will remember, is the author of "The Tyranny of God," "The Bible Unmasked," and monographs upon those freethinkers, Burbank, Jefferson, Franklin and Lincoln. This little book upon Voltaire centers its attention upon the great Frenchman as a tribune of the people and an enemy of the Church. The cases of Calas and of the Sirvens should never be forgotten; always they return in one guise or another to give proof that the abuses of power still blight our lives. We had need of a Voltaire when Sacco and Vanzetti were being sacrificed to mob passion and the might of the privileged class. We have need, in these days of recrudescent censorship, of a Voltaire and a Cervantes in one.

Lewis' book is not ambitious; it is not a biography. Sometimes it is carelessly written, as if, in his eagerness to transmit his message, the author had considered it unimportant to pay much attention to his expression. This is a mistake; good writing is in itself an admirable preservative of what it says. But Lewis does not succeed, within his chosen compass, in filling one with abhorrence for the theological monsters of the day, and in winning for the brave, shrewd Voltaire a commensurate meed of admiration. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. There is need today, too, of that watchfulness, that courage, that high dedication which filled the long life of this amazing Frenchman.

ARAB AND JEW

What Happened in Palestine. By Maurice Samuel. Boston. The Stratford Company. \$2.

Mr. Samuel, author of "I, The Jew," "You Gentiles," "The Outsider," and translator for Keyserling, went recently to Palestine to live. He is a confirmed, but not a fanatic, Zionist. He is not specially concerned with the form that Zionism will assume in Palestine—whether it will be under British supervision, or establish a homeland for Jews in the approved Messianic style. He regards the so-called Holy Land as a focus of Jewish creative endeavor. He had gone to Palestine in the expectation of taking up peaceful residence. Little did he dream that the book which he was commissioned to write would turn out to be, instead, a record of bloody unrest.

This is the first book by an eyewitness of the Arabian attacks upon the Jewish colonists. It might have been penned in indignation, in righteous wrath; instead, it is a dignified, scarcely ruffled, calm exposition of the facts.

Samuels makes the following points:

- 1. The Jew and the Arab are

normally friends.

2. The Arab is not by nature politically or economically conscious; he is creed-conscious, and may be stirred only when his religion seems to be in jeopardy.

3. Knowing this, the mob-leaders of the Arabs systematically deceived them into anti-Jewish activity by a series of preposterous lies. Thus, the Jews were supposed to have blown up the Mosque of Omar; they were supposed to have massacred a frightful number of Arabs; they were, as crowning atrocity, accused of having bought Palestine outright from the British government, at a fabulous price.

4. The Arabs were led to believe that the British officials were on their side. This was proclaimed even at their church services. And what is more, the obvious indifference of the British officials to the Jewish plight lent color to this belief. When the actual massacres broke out, after long planning of which the administration was fully aware, the official acts of that administration were suspiciously such as to deprive the Jews even of self-defense, let alone timely aid, and to help the Arab mob in their work of looting and slaying.

Yet, despite the malice of the mob-leaders, where were Arabs who, at the risk of their lives, concealed their Jewish friends from the blind rage of the assailants. It is the conviction of Samuels that the combined attacks were a failure from within—that the heart of the Arabs as a whole was not in the deed—that there is no reason why, given the opportunity to work together, the Jew and the Arab should not build peace in Palestine.

The account is straightforward, plentifully documented, coolly reasoned. It is distinctly not anti-Arab; for the Arabs as a people it entertains, as do the Jews of Palestine themselves, a wholesome respect, and an offer of sincere cooperation.

FRANK-HARRISIAN

I am glad to see that Elmer Gertz, who used to provide us with so much news about Frank Harris and his times, is at work upon a biographical study of the man. Certainly there is plenty of fascinating material to be had; and just as certainly there are a number of tough nuts for the prospective biographer to crack. There has always been a tendency on the part of many readers to question, for example, the veracity of the aging Harris. And now comes a book that devotes itself to making out a substantial case against that selfsame veracity.

The author is Kate Stephens; the book, entitled "The Lies and Libels of Frank Harris," is edited by Gerri and Mary Caldwell Smith. Harris' letters to Kate Stephens, written between 1915 and 1919, are to be included. "The Lies and Libels of Frank Harris" will deal chiefly with Harris' university days in America. It purports to lay "incontrovertible facts against Harris' fictions." The chief scenes are laid in Kansas, dear to the home of truth and the Haldeman-Julius Blue Books. "Lies and Libels of Frank Harris" will appear shortly from the Antigone Press, 236 West Fifteenth Street, New York City. We shall look forward to it with interest and with an open mind.

FREDERICK THE NOT-SO-GREAT

Frederick the Great. By Margaret Goldsmith New York. Charles Boni. Paper Books. Price, outside of the \$5 per year series, 75 cents.

This is the second of the Paper Books that Charles Boni is offering at \$5 per year in a series of twelve. In England, we understand, the book sells at \$3; to subscribers to the Paper Book series it comes to something like 42 cents. The format of the second book is somewhat larger than the first; the page and the cover designs are the same in dimensions; wider margins make the book more attractive.

Miss Goldsmith has done a good, unostentatious job. Of course, the material already at hand about the paradoxical monarch is plentiful, but it required skill to condense it, and to organize it in a manner that brought out the significant details without excessive emphasis.

Frederick the Great—he, that is, whom History would some day know as the Great—was the double victim of paternal authority. His father was worshipful of strength, young Frederick was a weakling. Upon the heir to the throne, the elder Frederick lavished a discipline that was one day to turn his son violently against him. The poor child had not a moment to himself. His every motion was scheduled. He was a little royal automaton. If, in his

early years, Frederick had not been Frederick the Little, we should never have had a Frederick the Great. For the young Frederick conceived a death-wish against his father; not a Freudian, symbolical wish, but an actual wish, often expressed, that his father would physically die. And what happened when Frederick William went the way of all flesh? The reaction of young Frederick was complete. His father had spoken German; young Frederick hated the tongue, and grew into a passion for French. You will remember that one of Voltaire's functions, at Sans Souci, was the correction of the monarch's pedestrian French verses. The elder Frederick was a religious fanatic; the new potentate at once established religious freedom. Frederick soon-to-be-the-Great was, in fact, the complete anti-father. But as he grew older, the inferiority complex that had been forced upon him rose to the surface after years of submersion. It is sad to contemplate how, with our advancing years, the voices of our parents and grandparents—we often call them by the name Conscience—return to haunt us with all the force of their early inhibitory commands. In the end, the older Frederick won out. His son became precisely the military martinet that he had longed for. The younger Frederick picked quarrels that he might show Europe what a great commander he was. He won victories, but never over himself.

I CHALLENGE

you that I will teach you, by mail in one lesson, the simplest, shortest, method. Not telepathy. You can read one's mind to a dot by only looking in the eyes of partner, chum, sweetheart, etc. Praised by New York, Boston, Montreal Police Chiefs, colleges, Thurston, Blackstone, etc. If fake, let them arrest me. Send in all \$1.00. A. Honigman Sta. E. P. O. B 85, Sec. Haldfre-2, Montreal, Can.

ADDRESS ENVELOPES

at home. Spare time. \$15-\$25 weekly. Experience unnecessary. Dignified Work. Send 2c stamp for particulars. Brown Co., Dept. B-8, Paducah, Ky.

Frederick the Little, we should never have had a Frederick the Great.

For the young Frederick conceived a death-wish against his father; not a Freudian, symbolical wish, but an actual wish, often expressed, that his father would physically die. And what happened when Frederick William went the way of all flesh? The reaction of young Frederick was complete. His father had spoken German; young Frederick hated the tongue, and grew into a passion for French. You will remember that one of Voltaire's functions, at Sans Souci, was the correction of the monarch's pedestrian French verses. The elder Frederick was a religious fanatic; the new potentate at once established religious freedom. Frederick soon-to-be-the-Great was, in fact, the complete anti-father.

But as he grew older, the inferiority complex that had been forced upon him rose to the surface after years of submersion. It is sad to contemplate how, with our advancing years, the voices of our parents and grandparents—we often call them by the name Conscience—return to haunt us with all the force of their early inhibitory commands. In the end, the older Frederick won out. His son became precisely the military martinet that he had longed for. The younger Frederick picked quarrels that he might show Europe what a great commander he was. He won victories, but never over himself.

I should like to see a special study devoted to Frederick's sexuality. The man hated women, and—another way of saying the same thing—feared them. If he never cohabited with his wife, that may well have been because she was forced upon him by diplomacy. But his retreat at Sans Souci was for all the world a secular monastery, and I am afraid that the practices of the eminent gentlemen who inhabited it were too much like the Greek cult of masculine beauty. In other words, there is a distinct atmosphere of homosexuality here.

Frederick the Great. . . . But Great for what?

BEST BETS

Peter the Great, by Stephen Graham, issued by Simon & Schuster at \$5. . . . The Story of Crime, by Judge Louis Harris, published by The Stratford Company, Boston, at \$2.50. . . . Marie Antoinette, The Player Queen, by John Palache; Longmans, \$5. . . . Humanity Unrooted, by Maurice Hindus, Cape and Smith, \$3. . . . Creative Theater, by Roy Mitchell; John Day, \$4. . . . Francois Rabelais, Man of the Renaissance, by Samuel Putnam; Cape and Smith, \$3.50. . . . To some of these I'll return.

My own new book, to be published shortly by The Stratford Company, has finally been christened "The Fine Art of Living: An Approach to Life and the Arts." It will sell at \$2.50, and is intended as an introduction, for intelligent novices. I am especially indebted to Haldeman-Julius for permission to use material from numerous blue books of mine. The book is dedicated to Havelock Ellis, and I am modestly proud of his acceptance. But more of this, also. As to my "Yiddish Literature," it will not appear until the autumn of 1930.

A Window on Europe

Continued from page three

stroyed by a reality for which we were by no means equipped." The key to much in Europe today lies in that sentence. The war broke the pre-war ideals.

And yet there are ministers of religion today who seem surprised that we should turn away with a half-cynical, half-pitying smile when they advocate a set of doctrines in which it was once almost possible to believe. Anyone who has seen a clergyman recruiting for Flanders mud in the name of Jesus of Nazareth is unlikely to find his highest ideals echoed from church benches in 1929. And the poor parsons, seeing youth slip away from them, try to regain their hold by telling stories to prove what he-men they and the nightmare. But silently, were as army chaplains twelve years ago! But this, though perhaps the most obvious, is the least of the ways in which the overhanging rock has cast shadows over our minds, our ideas, our ideals.

If I may say so, I have often felt that one of the main differences between Europe and America is that this shadow does not come over men's minds so much among you as among us. I have actually heard a quite healthy and honest American say that it was a pity the Armistice came when it did, for it prevented us giving German soil something of what France had suffered. In other words it was a pity that we could not have tortured men like Remarque, men that is, like ourselves, a month or so's further torture; and a pity that a few pretty little villages in Germany were not turned into craters and twisted wreckage; we might even have got a cathedral or two to go the way of Rheims. Now it is quite impossible to imagine anyone in Europe sincerely feeling that any time during these last few years. The shadow has kept it out of our souls.

NOW READY

Completely Informative ENCYCLOPEDIA of LOVE & SEX

By Joseph McCabe

Joseph McCabe pledged his scholarship to write a *Key to Love and Sex* that would answer heretofore unanswered questions; that would include heretofore omitted facts; that would be more comprehensive and that would be more captivatingly interesting than any other work purporting to cover anywhere near the same field. HE HAS DONE IT! In *The Key to Love and Sex* Joseph McCabe gives you a complete encyclopedia of human sexual life—past, present, and hints of the future! Savage, primitive, civilized; child, youth, adult, old age—every aspect is discussed, in every historical and every physical age of mankind.

THE KEY TO LOVE & SEX

Vol. 1. WHAT SEX REALLY IS. What distinguishes the male from the female sex, physically, emotionally, intellectually, etc. Complete Contents of the 8 Volumes

Contents No. 1: The Fundamental Distinctions of the Sexes: Differences of organ and function. Secondary sexual characters. Meaning of hermaphroditism; The Evolution of Love: Animal development. Love as a distinct emotion. Platonic love: The Dawn of Sex in the Individual: Does sex begin at birth? The child and its sex feelings. Revolution of puberty. Decay of sex-life; The Essential Relations of the Sexes: Normal sexual intercourse. Refinement of the relations of the sexes. Intercourse and procreation; The Normal Psychology of Woman: Basis in the nervous system. Periodic disturbances. Conservatism bias of woman. Coyness and coldness: Variation from the Sex-Types: Masculine women. Effeminate men. Effects of castration and ovariectomy; Maternity and Birth Control: Normal child-bearing. Need of birth control.

of Jesus and Paul; The Triumph of the Church for a thousand years. Eventual control of marriage; The Struggle for Divorce and Sanity; Perplexities of Luther; Marriage after the Reformation. Beginning of secularization; Rise of Modern Puritanism; Skeptical ascetics of the 19th century. Moral argument for religion. Consequences of the new virtue. The latest feminist Puritanism; The True Ethic of Sex; Moral science and Christianity. The genuine limits of free love. Problems of the home and the state.

Vol. 6. WHAT IS THE "MYSTERY" OF WOMAN? How fables about "mysterious woman" began: the facts about feminine intuition. Contents No. 6: Legendary Gifts of the Chaste Woman: Raw material of the chastity ideal. Virgin oracles and virgin goddesses. Early Christian celibacy; Erotic Element in Religion: Sex and religion. Oracles in paganism and the early Church. Fresco of the Egyptian desert. Medieval mystics. Orgies in modern sects; Modern Views About Chastity and Mysticism: Matron and bachelor virg. Charm of the chaste woman. Compensating vices: The Truth About Woman and Religion: Evidence of statistics. Woman's reasons for church-going. Women founders of sects and mysticisms: Physical Basis of Woman's Mystery: Her nervous instability. Psychology in periods of disturbance. Literary tradition.

Vol. 2. THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE SEXES. The historical facts behind inequality and the goal of freedom and equal rights. Contents No. 2: The Primitive Equality: Woman amongst the lowest peoples. Beginnings of inequality. Causes of inequality; Sex-Life of Primitive Peoples: Normal sex-life. Curiosities of savage sex-life. Orgies and the spring fever; Religion and the Love-Urge: The cult of fertility. Rise of ascetic ideas; Moral Influence of the Ethical Religions: Sex in the ancient civilizations. Spread of the ascetic religions. Influence of Christianity on woman; Medieval Degradation of Woman: Return to savagery without freedom. The rule of the monks: The Age of Chivalry; Romantic lies. Free love and the troubadours. Cruel position of the majority; The Next Phase—and Its Survivals: Woman in the depths. The Cave Man and the Climbing Vine. The self-sacrificing woman; Modern Emancipation: Beginning of the struggle for rights. Character of the leaders. Economic complication.

Vol. 4. THE ABNORMAL ASPECTS OF SEX. Perversities and aberrations of the human sexual instinct and its expression. Contents No. 4: Abnormal Sex-Life Amongst Savages: Why it is comparatively common. Abnormal Sex-Life in Ancient Civilizations: In ancient times. Other abnormalities; Scientific Study of Abnormalities: Prescientific literature about sex. Medical study in the 19th century; Modern psychology of sex; Practice of Masturbation: Extent of the practice. Modern views of the effect; Erotic Symbolism and Other Phenomena: Sexual fetishism. Exhibitionism; Sadism and Masochism; Modern study of Sadism. Flagellation. Masochism; The Homosexual impulse: Homosexual temperament. Modern views. Homosexuals and the law; Sex and Insanity.

Vol. 7. WHAT SHOULD BE TAUGHT ABOUT SEX? What are the real effects of modern freedom in sex discussion and education? Contents No. 7: Evolution of Clothing and Modesty: The immodest savage. Why he begins to wear clothes. Development and nature of modesty. Recent changes in the idea of modesty; Erotic Aspects of the Bath and the Dance: Evolution of cleanliness. Bath and sexual freedom. Development of the dance; Effects of Concealment and Isolation: Puritan modes and morals. Homosexual institutions. Demands of public decency; Sex-Instruction of the Young: Evolution of sex-education. Historical causes. Rise of science. Study of venereal diseases; Revolutionary Discovery of Birth Control: From abortion to contraception. Bearing on morality.

Vol. 3. WOMAN AND MARRIAGE. Problems of morals, divorce, sexual revolt, free love, children, etc. Contents No. 3: Sources of the Chastity Ideal: Woman's normal "uncleanness." Mystery of childbirth. Woman's diseases; Woman As Economic Property: Male instinct of monopoly. Value of chastity in the evolution of society; Historical and female chastity: The sacrifice of Love: Priestess-prostitutes. The theory of sacrifice. Eunuch-priests; The Greco-Roman Reaction: Persian ideas of the flesh and the spirit. Asceticism in Egypt and India. Influence of the Greek philosophers. The unoriginal

Vol. 5. WOMAN AND THE CREATIVE URGE. Sex and love and their place in art down through the ages. Contents No. 5: Woman As an Inspiration of Art: Dawn of art. Growing sense of beauty. Artistic urge of love and mysticism; Sexual Selection and Feminine Beauty: Evolution of the feeling for the beautiful. Evolution of beauty in woman. Different national types of beauty; Psychology of the Artist: Sense-perception and sex. Cult of the nude. Rapture of the kiss. Absurd Puritan reactivity; Relations of Sense and Intellect: Harmony of human nature. Sensuality and thought. Sensuality and genius; Woman in the Golden Ages: Sex the predominant inspiration. Why few women won distinction; Woman in the World's Literature: Lack of historical perspective. Element of vindictiveness. Conventions of literature. Lure of the sex story; Women Writers on Men and Women: Curious inaccuracy of women writers on women. New type of woman writer. Idols of the woman novelist.

Vol. 8. THE QUEST FOR SEXUAL HAPPINESS. Modern trends toward adjustment and harmony in sexual relationships. Contents No. 8: Introduction: The philosophy of history: Marriage As It Is: The taint in Christian marriage. Poisoned lives and perverted instincts. The surplus of women; Revolt of Woman: Recoil from subjection. Demand of economic independence. Real Needs of the State: Population question. Problem of the child. Question of modesty; Future Evolution of Marriage: Value of permanent unions. Function of divorce. Social groupings of the future. Free love: Problem of Prostitution: History of prostitution. Extent and control today. Future development; Development of Sex-Types: Attempts at equality and sexlessness. The approach of the sexes. The philosophy of pleasure.

Price Complete \$2.65

The Key to Love and Sex is a complete story, continuous from Vol. 1 through Vol. 8; it is complete in itself—it is part of no other group of books. The material in this set has never appeared anywhere before; every word was written exclusively for this series. The price for all 8 volumes, complete, has been fixed at \$2.65, prepaid to any address. Orders for less than a full set cannot be accepted: SINGLE COPY ORDERS WILL BE REFUSED. Books are shipped in plain wrappers..

USE THIS BLANK FOR KEY TO LOVE & SEX
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
I enclose \$2.65 for one complete set of Joseph McCabe's KEY TO LOVE AND SEX, in eight volumes, to be shipped to me fully prepaid, in plain wrappers.
Name _____ Address _____
City _____ State _____

Little Blue BOOKS

Joseph McCabe

Joseph McCabe's Little Blue Books make up a complete "Outline of Religious Controversy." The whole question of religion is candidly surveyed; every fact is considered. Each book is complete in itself, or all together they make a stimulating story. Read these compelling titles:

ORDER BY NUMBER

- 109 Facts You Should Know about the Classics
- 297 Do We Need Religion?
- 354 Absurdities of Christian Science
- 365 Myths of Religious Statistics
- 386 Religion's Failure to Combat Crime
- 439 My Twelve Years in a Monastery
- 445 Fraud of Spiritualism
- 446 Psychology of Religion
- 477 Nonsense Called Theosophy
- 841 Future of Religion
- 1008 Origin of Religion
- 1007 Revolt Against Religion
- 1030 World's Great Religions
- 1059 Myth of Immortality
- 1060 Futility of Belief in God
- 1061 Human Origin of Morals
- 1066 Fogery of the Old Testament
- 1076 Morals in Ancient Babylon
- 1077 Religion and Morals in Old Egypt
- 1078 Life and Morals in Greece and Rome
- 1079 Phallic (Sex) Elements in Religion
- 1084 Did Jesus Ever Live?
- 1095 Real Sources of Christian Morality

- 1102 Pagan Christs Before Jesus
- 1104 Myth of Christ's Resurrection
- 1107 Legends of Saints and Martyrs
- 1110 How Christianity "Triumphed"
- 1121 Evolution of Christian Doctrine
- 1122 Degradation of Woman
- 1127 Christianity and Slavery
- 1128 Church and the Schools
- 1130 Life in the Dark Ages
- 1132 New Light on Witchcraft
- 1134 Horrors of the Inquisition
- 1136 Medieval Art and the Churches
- 1137 Moorish Civilization in Spain
- 1140 Renaissance: A European Awakening
- 1141 Reformation and Protestant Reformation
- 1142 Truth About Galileo and Medieval Science
- 1144 The Jesuits: Religious Rogues
- 1145 Religion in the French Revolution
- 1150 Churches and Modern Progress
- 1203 Seven Infidel U. S. Presidents
- 1205 Thomas Paine's Revolt Against the Bible
- 1211 Conflict Between Science and Religion
- 1215 Life of Robert G. Ingersoll: Benevolent Agnostic
- 1218 Christianity and Philanthropy
- 1224 Religion in the Great Poets
- 1229 Triumph of Materialism
- 1237 Real Beliefs of Scientists
- 1243 Failure of Christian Missions
- 1248 Lies of Religious Literature
- 1262 Is Evolution True? Debate vs. Prof. Geo. McCready Price
- 1450 Do We Live Forever? A Reply to Clarence True Wilson
- 1455 The End of the World
- 1486 Are Atheists Dogmatic?
- 1487 A Manual of Debunking
- 1490 Is Einstein's Theory Atheistic?

Your pick of these books 5c each, postpaid to any address, as long as you order at least 20 books at one time (\$1 worth). Order by numbers instead of titles. Remit by cash, check, or money order. If you want all 59 titles listed here, remit \$2.95 and ask for the 59 Little Blue Books by Joseph McCabe.

YOUR CHOICE 5c EACH

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas