

## IV.

Can such a treatment be effective? Apparently it is confoundingly so. Here are excerpts from a few of the many, many jubilant letters from employers which the agents of the National Foundation are taking west with them today.

Carl G. Pfeiffer, manager of Frederic's, Inc., a jewelry concern at Peekskill, writes:

We have been using National Foundation Service for a representative list of our employes, who are mostly women, during the past eight months with complete satisfaction. During a period when business is undergoing readjustment, when workers are laid off for part or all of the time, when a wage-cut is deemed necessary, we consider your educational propaganda served in their homes particularly valuable. At such time, when conditions cause dissatisfaction and unrest, your literature constitutes a natural antidote, making the workers less susceptible to the radical influences sure to be exerted upon them.

J. J. McCarthy, secretary of the Malone Dairy Company, of New York, writes enthusiastically to confirm his previous oral statement:

During the strike of the Milk Drivers, some of our men when approached by the leaders of the Union to go on strike, flouted the Man to Man Talks in their faces and stated that those were their principles and that they should read them and get some common sense. As you are probably aware none of our men went out on strike.

And along comes E. W. Booth, of The Booth Felt Hat Company, Inc., of Brooklyn, just burbling with joy. He writes:

In renewing our subscriptions for National Foundation Service we are pleased to inform you of the excellent results obtained through the mailing of your literature to the homes of our employes. We believe that the service has not only cut down our production costs, but has helped counteract radicalism among the workers of this district.

So effective have Man to Man talks proved that their circulation figures would probably be astonishing. And this is just the beginning. National trade associations are urging the service on their members, industrial leaders are offering their personal help in spreading the gospel, and already some important corporations, such as the Mergenthaler Linotype Company and the Loose-Wiles Biscuit Company, are among the Foundation's customers.

Even beyond the reaches of industry are Man to Man Talks penetrating. We are soon to have them, it would seem, in our schools. Among several eager letters from principals and educators the most interesting comes from the Massachusetts Department of Education, at the State House in Boston. It proposes to use the hokum that hypnotized Winnie Kluth in training courses for teachers!

LEONARD LANSON CLINE.

## The Bandwagon

### THEY WILL ALSO REWRITE GENESIS AND LEAVE OUT THE APPLE SCANDAL

Club women in a thriving suburb are about to give a regular performance of Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, but out of consideration for the Eighteenth Amendment they have cut out the characters of Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek.

—*The Los Angeles Times.*

### ANOTHER BUSINESS MAN GONE WRONG

I will omit all reference to the social, ethical or economic points, because I am not a Socialist, and cannot discuss these points intelligently.

—*Henry W. Moore, of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, testifying against the Child Labor Amendment before the House Judiciary Committee.*

### FRANKREICH UEBER ALLES

The destiny of us French whose mind is clear, and who will not listen to confusion, is to decide *now* whether the world shall be formed in our image, or whether our race shall be stricken from the earth. Are we worthy, indefatigable pioneers, to trace for the world the path of progress and of liberty, of peace and of reason, or shall we submit to the domination of an intelligence coarsened with animal brutality? It will be for your generation to answer, and it will be for you to deepen the furrow left by your elders.

—*Speech delivered by M. Didier, Professor of Philosophy in the Institution Sainte-Marie, Paris.*

### WHAT A DAY IN ATLANTIC CITY CAN DO

It was noticed by competent observers that the outlook on life of girls who participated [in the Atlantic City bathing beauty parades] was completely changed. Before the competition they were splendid examples of innocent and pure womanhood. Afterward their heads were filled with vicious ideas.

—*Miss Pauline B. Smith, Gen. Sec'y. of Y. W. C. A., Trenton, quoted in the N. Y. Times.*

### DIVINE DISCONTENT BY THE CUBIC FOOT

Believing that the silent teaching of good taste in furniture makes a great impression on the minds of people and that the average spectator of a film has a feeling, way down in his heart that he lacks something of culture when he sees a beautiful thing and knows that a similar object he has at home is ugly, Mr. P. A. B. Hannesey, who conducts a beautiful studio in Western Avenue, Hollywood, is adding 15,000 square feet of floor space in an attempt to better take care of his rapidly increasing business.

—*Los Angeles Times.*

### SANTA SAYS: "IT IS MORE BLESSED TO RECEIVE THAN TO GIVE"

Shortly before Christmas it was announced that good old Saint Nick would visit Tarboro the day before Christmas and would make the First National his headquarters. On Christmas Eve each of the 800 children who came to the bank to visit him received a small memento and listened to a talk on saving and banking by Santa.

—*Forbes' Magazine.*

## C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

## The Origins of the World War

**S**IR: The review of Hazen's *Europe since 1815*, published by Professor H. E. Barnes in the *New Republic* of March 19, 1924, has given rise to a warm controversy in regard to the truth about the origins of the war. Professor Raymond Turner, whose books were included in the reviewer's condemnation, has replied and suggested that the critic misrepresented the position of the so-called revisionists. In self-defence Professor Barnes, in the same issue of April 9, has called upon me specifically, among others, to come forward and disavow him by showing that he has not faithfully presented the revisionist point of view, or else to take issue with Professors Hazen and Turner.

I accept the invitation with pleasure, particularly since I consider myself at least indirectly responsible for Professor Barnes's review. I am one of those to whom he submitted the manuscript before publication, and I gave it my whole-hearted approval.

By way of explanation I might say that I supported the war enthusiastically, and considered it a privilege to serve at the front. Nothing could have been more natural in view of our general ignorance of the real situation. Since that time, however, a prolonged study of the books and documents which have been deluged upon us, supplemented by extensive travel abroad and discussion with some of the leading European historians, has led me entirely to revise my opinions. Not that I have become pro-German. I doubt whether anyone could honestly accuse me of partiality in that direction. But I fail to understand how anyone at all acquainted with the new source material can still regard article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles as anything but the most stupendous hoax in history.

Professor Turner seems to include himself among the "revisionists," but I question whether any of these gentlemen would welcome him as one of their own. It is truly remarkable how slight the divergence in view between impartial scholars, even between those on the Allied and those on the German side, really is. To the best of my knowledge Professor Barnes has given a clear exposition of the moderate revisionist point of view, and if he has laid himself open to persecution on that account I am only too ready to take my stand by him and suffer the consequences.

Professor Turner makes the statement that, "generally speaking," historians maintain that while the war arose from large general causes, and though all the participants were in some sense to blame, yet Germany was the principal immediate factor that made the war not to be avoided. If he means by this that the majority of Allied and American so-called "historians" (most of whom have only a very casual acquaintance with the source material) uphold this viewpoint, he is unquestionably correct. He is just as certainly wrong if he believes that the leading authorities maintain this position. He is equally mistaken if he thinks that "any new statement in favor of the Germans and discreditable to the Allies . . . is at once accepted with indiscriminating enthusiasm and pleasure, and given the impression that it refutes all held before." Some of the most violent indictments of German and Austrian policy came to my ears in those countries, and, I think, it is generally believed by our former opponents that their statesmen were preëminent by their incapability more than by anything else. So far as acceptance of material from "Russian revolutionary sources or German spies" is concerned the obvious answer is that the Allied governments can easily change the situation by throwing open their own archives. The historian's suspicions are quite justifiable when, in contrast to the voluminous and frank publications of the German and Austrian governments and the unadorned confessions of many of the statesmen of the Central powers, the Allied countries produce such pathetic contributions as the French Yellow Books and the memoirs of Poincaré or Asquith. It must be confessed that what has been revealed of the doings of the Allied statesmen incriminates rather than

exonerates them. So far as I know there has been no serious attempt made to answer the conclusions of either Fay or Gooch on the basis of the material they used. The warm welcome given both those works should have shown Professor Turner that they had the approval of a great many impartial minds in this country as well as abroad.

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

Worcester, Massachusetts.

## Mr. Keynes Denies

**S**IR: In your issue of April 2, Mr. Auld, the author of an article signed "Alpha" dealing with the French claim for reparations, invites me categorically to deny or affirm "one simple question of fact: that the French claim was a 1914 valuation made directly on pre-war records." Of course I categorically deny it. The French first worked out what the claim would have been on pre-war prices; but—quite naturally—they introduced a multiplier to bring their claim into accordance with post-war prices before actually presenting it. In his original criticism of my figures Mr. Auld just forgot the multiplier. But the mistake having been pointed out, he has no excuse to go on repeating it.

J. M. KEYNES.

London.

## Partly Free Speech at Harvard

**S**IR: In its issue of April 16 the *New Republic*, referring to the speakers' controversy at the Harvard Union, states that "a censorship committee has been set up consisting of faculty members and hand-picked students." Although I am one of those undergraduates who has been most strongly opposed to the policy of the Union Governing Board, I consider it only fair to say that the Governing Board appointed a special speakers' committee, in order that a more balanced program of speakers might be arranged. It is decidedly not a "censorship" committee. It could not be a "censorship" committee even if it wanted to, for the Governing Board maintains the right of veto over all the committee's recommendations. Moreover, the two student members are two of the men who have been leading the fight to invite Mr. Debs, Dr. Nearing, and Mr. Foster. Hence it is plain that the Governing Board, in appointing the undergraduates' representatives, has not shown favoritism for its own side of the case.

In spite of the Governing Board's veto power over the Speakers' Committee, the undergraduates feel that the appointment of such a committee is a step in the right direction. But there is a long, long way to go. The real principle at stake is: Shall or shall not the active members of the Harvard Union be permitted to hear in the halls of their club the speakers they desire? The undergraduates have submitted the following proposition: "That hereafter when 200 members of the Harvard Union show by petition that they wish to hear a certain speaker and when the Undergraduates Committee\* approves the choice, that speaker should be invited to the Union, provided only that he is permitted to lecture in public by the Government of the United States." This right will probably be refused at first. But the undergraduates, supported enthusiastically by many of the most prominent and respected members of the Harvard Faculty, will eventually win out.

CORLIS LAMONT,  
Vice-President Harvard Union.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

\*The Undergraduates Committee is composed of six undergraduates elected yearly by the student members of the Union to represent their opinions as to how the Union should be run.