2-1-1936

The Techne, Vol. 19, No. 3: State Manual Training Normal

State Manual Training Normal School

THE TECHNE

LIFE WITHOUT LABOR IS A CRIME. LABOR WITHOUT ART AND THE AMENITIES OF LIFE IS BRUTALITY.—RUSKIN.

Vol. XIX January-February 1936 No. 3

FOR a' THAT

Then let us pray that come it may—
As come it will for a' that—
That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
May bear the gree, and a' that;
For a' that, and a' that,
It's coming yet for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that!

—Robert Burns

PUBLISHED BY
KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
PITTSBURG, KANSAS

THE TECHNE

Published by the Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg

W. A. Brandenburg, President

Vol. XIX January-February, 1936 No. 3

THE TECHNE publishes, for the most part, papers on educational subjects, though articles on closely related fields are also used. Part of these papers set forth the results of research; others aim at interpretation of current developments. Through some of the discussions will interest the specialist, it is hoped that in every number there will be something usful for the average teacher.

THE TECHNE is sent free to the alumni, school officials, libraries, and, on request to any person interested in the progress of education.

Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1917, at post office of Pittsburg, Kansas, under the act of August 24, 1912. Published five times a year—in October, December, February, April and June.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MENTAL HYGIENE*

C. B. Pyle

The mental hygiene movement was inspired by the initiative and experience of Clifford Beers, who enjoyed a normal boyhood in New Haven, Connecticut. Beers was graduated from high school and had just entered Yale University when his brother was stricken with epilepsy. He became obsessed that he too might be smitten by this disease which he feared more than death. He worried through college under great nervous strain but kept his fear to himself.

Three years after leaving the university he suffered a mental break-down with the delusion that he was a confirmed epileptic. Preferring death to the horrors of the disease, he contemplated suicide. He thought of many ways of carrying out his purpose. He finally leaped from an upper story window but fortunately survived. For two years he was a victim of dreadful delusions. His own relatives seemed to have become alien to him, even enemies, detectives to bring him to justice. To all this was added the inhuman treatment of hospital attendants in private and public institutions. Despite the maltreatment and suffering, and years of illness, he recovered; and devoted his life to the idea he conceived while still a patient—that of improving the conditions of the mentally afflicted. He embodied a record of his experiences in a most remarkable book, "A Mind that Found Itself." The book was published in 1908. Also he conceived the idea of a National Committee whose purpose should be, "the spreading of a common-sense gospel of right thinking in order to bring about right living." Thus the mental hygiene movement was first introduced into this country.

The National Committee for Mental Hygiene was organized in 1909 and began its work along the lines of information, education and organization. The purpose of the movement was broadened through the years and has been expressed by a former president of the National Committee, Dr. L. F. Barker, as "A continuous effort directed toward conserving and improving the minds of the people . . . a systematic attempt to secure brains so naturally endowed and so nurtured that people will *feel* better, *think* better, and *act* better than they do now."

"Mental hygiene is the science and the art of avoiding mental illness and preserving mental health." (LaRue) "Hygiene" is derived from the Greek word meaning health. For the Greeks, "Hygeia" was the goddess of health. And Hygeia, the goddess of health, was the daughter of Aescalapius, the son of Apollo and the god of medicine, mentioned in Homer as a physician. The aim of the daughter, Hygeia, (health) by preventing mental illness, is to reduce the volume of her father's business, (the god of medicine) leaving him less and less to do. Psychiatry is the science of providing medicine for the mind. It is the study

*A Radio Address.

and cure of mental disease and may be regarded as the negative side of mental hygiene.

In Macbeth, (Act 5, scene 3), Shakespeare exclaims:

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?"

Psychiatry and mental hygiene answer, "Yes."

Mental hygiene may be defined as a science of happiness. It has many facts radiating its illumination into every field of human interest—into sociology, law, ethics, eugenics, psychology, education, medicine, wherever human beings are, and wherever they are concerned. It is also an art in as much as it teaches us to do what is necssary to preserve our mental health. Plants need chemical adjustment in a physical environment. In addition humans need mental adjustment in a social environment. Mental hygiene aims to bring about this adjustment, so as to integrate the personality in the management of his impulses, feelings, desires, and emotions and to adjust himself reasonably with nature and with other people in a wholesome society.

Mental hygiene offers a novel view-point in modern education. The most striking change of view-point is the emphasis upon the development of personality rather than the mere acquirement of knowledge. In his day, 1861, Herbert Spencer asked what was supposed to be the fundamental question: What knowledge is of most worth? This question represented the view-point of the time..that knowledge is the aim of education. Knowledge when once acquired will guarantee good conduct. It marked back to the Socratic maxim: Knowledge is vitue. If one has knowledge his behavior will square itself with that knowledge.

But we are no longer misled by the thought that knowledge completely determines the conduct of a person. For the explanation of behavior in a large measure we go back to the primal urges, to impulses and drives, to deep-lying motives which knowledge only helps to shape and guide. The objective in education today is the development of a full-orbed person who can function efficiently is an integer in the complex social life.

This change of emphasis is reflected in our educational theories, in the curriculum, in class-room organization, in extra-curricular activities, in the changed attitude of teachers toward children, in the "educational literature and movements of the present time." The major objective of the education of the future will be to promote mental health and stability which means to promote happiness.

The school is not only an academic institution but also it is primarily a human welfare association in which children are increasingly

socialized. For the child is a social being and must learn to live in a social environment.

The mental hygiene program is proposed to meet the need of our modern world. It fills a greater need today because of the increasing complexity of modern life. In earlier times man could meet his comparatively few needs in a direct and simple way by the exercise of primitive skills. But with the dawn of the industrial age with its multiplied complexity of material and social relationships comes an added strain on physical and mental life. The psychic contagion of stimulating and exciting events creates a heavier burden upon the frayed nerves of the old and constantly agitates the St. Vitus dance of the young. International complications with the threat of war in the background, the economic and industrial decline with the difficulty of finding a sure place in the economic world engenders a profound feeling of fear and insecurity. All these things and many others tax heavily the art of living and make it exceedingly difficult to carry on with mental composure. According to Symonds, Pollick and Malzberg estimated that one out of every twenty-two persons enters a hospital for mental diseases in a generation and including those mentally afflicted not confined to a hospital one person in every ten is affected. Symonds adds: "All these persons go through our school systems." Many of them probably exhibit symptoms of mental aberration while passing through the schools. Here is a fertile field for mental hygiene in the recognition of symptoms for good health, the prevention of mental disorder, and the guidance of these youth into successful and happy adjustment.

The magnitude of the need of mental hygiene is further revealed to us through the work of psychiatrists among college students. Dr. Blanton reported in a study of 1000 unselected students at the University of Wisconsin that 10 per cent of the students suffered from emotional disturbances "sufficient to warp their lives and in some cases cause mental breakdown unless properly treated." Dr. Cobb of Harvard reported 16 per cent of freshmen "in danger of becoming victims of neuroses if not actual mental disease." According to Drs. Morrison and Diehl of 1300 freshmen at the University of Minnesota, 18 per cent were given to emotional disturbance "serious enough to warrant mental hygiene supervision and treatment." In a study of undergraduate adjustment Dr. R. C. Angell of Chicago and Dr. S. L. Pressey, Ohio State University report that large numbers are in very great need of the same sort of ministry. To all of these Dr. Frank Wood Williams adds his testimony: A larger number of students than is supposed develop . . . frank mental disease; others stumble out of the schools only to be picked up and tended a few years later . . . Some are very considerable warped and will recruit the world's supply of failures and mediocrities. In these widely separated centers and on all levels from the college down to the elementary school there seems to be need for a mental hygiene program.

Some approach mental hygiene from the negative point of view, from the standpoint of the problem child who has already deviated from the normal in his behavior. Through remedial treament he is to be re-educated and brought back to a desirable form of conduct. Many who are interested in mental hygiene are physicians and psychiatrists. They are accustomed to diagnose ills and weaknesses and to suggest methods of treament. They would stress the cure as well as the prevention of the disease.

There are others who stress the positive side of mental hygiene more and insist that its function is to discern the symptoms of mental good health and supply the conditions for its continuance. They emphasize more the preventive measures and believe that if children are properly guided in their education in home and school they will grow up to be good citizens thus preventing the immense waste which abnormality entails. Of course where children develop mental quirks they are given mental treatment but in the interests of democracy they are not made the foremost consideration. The main burden of mental hygiene is prevention and not cure. However these two approaches—the negative and positive—are combined in present-day practice. The fact that many maladjusted children are found in the schools enjoins the responsibility of caring for them. But with a mental hygiene program premeating and affecting every phase of the organization and life of the school the number of maladjusted children would be greatly reduced and the weight of responsibility would therefore fall on the side of prevention.

PREVENTION

1. A very important principle of mental hygiene is that good mental habits as well as physical should be set up early in life. "Train a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it," is an ancient saying but it has come to assume a new significance in modern education. Under the influence of Stanley Hall we were wont to say that the most important period of life is the adolescent but Freud and others have insisted that the most critical time of life is the first five years. The most deep-lying and persistent behavior patterns are laid down in infancy. While it was once thought that tempermental and personality traits are inherited we are coming more and more to regard them as learned, or at least capable of very great environmental modification. Some claim that personality is built up entirely in the environment. It is true that intellectual capacity, impulsive and emotional urges are the common heritage of human nature. It is also true that their pecular expression is shaped by the pressure of experience and *that* experience—the earliest in the life of the child. If parents do not wish the child to get the jump on them, they should give regard to the formation of his habits the first twenty-four hours of his life and for the next five of six years thereafter.

2. One of the most fundamental principles of mental hygiene is to train the child in good personal and social habits. He should be

trained to be clean in body and mind. Cleanliness is next to godliness, it has been said. The relationship is closer than that—cleanliness *is* godliness. Courtesy and politeness are essential in our social relationships. They oil the wheels of trade providing the condition of success. They create many frienships facilitating our social adjustments. These traits are matters of training.

Also the matter of dress is important. Someone has remarked the when one is well-dressed he feels religious. We may be confused relative to naming our feelings but it is true that being appropriately dressed brings to us a sense of self-respect and mental poise. Children,—therefore, should be dressed more or less like other children. A fop in a barnyard is just as incongruous as a rag-a-muffin at the President's ball. Often adolescents suffer dreadfully by having to wear the patched-up cast-offs of their elders, or to wear clothing not on a par with the clothing worn by their friends. Even younger children develop a feeling of inferiority because they are poorly or oddly dressed and are twitted or shunned by their playmates. Often this is the cause of an emotional complex which interferes with their leadership rendering them a-social or anti-social or crowding them back into the long line of abject followers and "Yes, Yes-ers."

3. Children should be taught a forward-looking habit instead of a backward-looking habit. Customs and habitual behavior must be set aside for more intelligent standards when once realized. Prof. James held that the view-point of a person is fixed by twenty-five years. Doubtless, the tendency to become fixed early is a strong one. But for that very reason the mind should be kept flexible and open as long as possible. The later investigation of Thorndike and others have shown that learning is effective to rather advanced age. And surely our view-point of life will be influenced by our learning. Having jealous care to preserve an open-minded attitude from youth will go far toward guarding open-mindedness down to old age. Nothing contributes more to mental soundness and health than a disposition of open-mindedness and tolerance.

4. Good environment is needed to preserve sound mental health for the child. The child copies the attitudes of his elders. The young lad swings the golf club three times because daddy does. He will use tools as father uses them. He will saw off the limb of the plum tree because daddy is trimming the(little) trees, but the child always manages to saw off the wrong limb. Daughter will play school or keep house and spank the doll baby as she observed mamma doing it. What we do as parents and teachers is far more impressive and contagious than what we say. Children pick up slang, obscenity, rudeness and other bad forms of behavior, as we would like to think, from our *neighbor's* bad children. Also it may be *our* children teach others. Some writers on personality development have concluded that of the 132 bad traits found by teachers and parents in children most of them were picked up from their parents. It is certain that

these undesirable traits do not fall into the lives of children miraculously like the manna in the wilderness.

5. Good physical health is important. One of the first conditions we look for in children with behavior problems is the state of health. Adequate adjustments are difficult to make when the child is fatigued, undernourished or is suffering from lack of exercise or eye defect. While attention to the physical factors may not work a complete cure, abounding health is an essential condition of a well integrated life.

6. Mental weaning should take place before and during adolescence. Children should be weaned mentally as well as physically only the psychological weaning comes later than the physical. Children come into life helpless at the mercy of their parents. They are fed, foundled and controlled by them. All decisions are made for them. But as the child grows older he threatens to take things into his own hands and often does. The child demands more flexibility in parental rule as the parents themselves grow older and become more inflexible. There is a tightening tension all around. By the time of adolescence the children struggle harder for release. But the more the children fight for independence the more the parents hold on. At this point parental authority often breaks down instead of passing over into wise guidance. As parents and teachers we could do more to help children to accept responsibility and to make more rational decisions concerning the things of routine life earlier.

7. A child should learn to try things alone without fear. Parents will often restrain their children from doing things for themselves, especially new ventures, and will solve their problems for them. But the child gets a thrill by attempting things himself. He may make mistakes and should be guided in his enterprises but he should never have his problems solved for him.

8. A child should learn to meet situations without undue excitement or fear. He should meet them with enthusiasm and confidence. This attitude is essential to mental poise and stability. If we can keep from the child our fears, tensions and worries and throw round him an atmosphere of calm and assurance we can do much to supply the conditions of good mental health.

9. A child should learn to face reality or the facts as he finds them. Nothing conduces more to mental health than meeting situations squarely as we find them. This habit of facing reality may also become contagious and pass from parents or teacher to children. Our wishes often blind us to our faults and exaggerate our virtues. We are constantly erecting defense mechanisms to escape reality. Rationalization, projection, day-dreaming and other introspective tendencies are attempts to avoid facing the real situations of life. A child should be trained to show a fighting spirit where needed; to face his problems squarely; and to bring into his failures a sense of humor. In this way

he is able to make an adjustment without arousing an emotional conflict.

In this brief space I could not show adequately how the principles of mental hygiene can function in the realms of law, medicine, sociology, and ethics. But I have sought to show how some of its basic principles can be employed by parents and teachers to prevent in children slight departures from the normal which are apt to become serious aberrations in adulthood. The Mental Hygiene Movement is not a fad but a movement which has taken firm hold of our thinking and practice in modern educational procedure and is rolling up its tones in ever mounting crescendo.

WHAT EDUCATION IS OF MOST WORTH?*

Josephine A. Marshall, Head of Department of Home Economics

About a century ago Herbert Spencer, an eminent English writer, raised the question, "What education is of most worth?"[1] With the great advances in knowledge and materials since his day, the question is even more perplexing to school men of our time. From the vast accumulation of resources, what to choose for mastering in one short school lifetime is an ever present problem.

For guidance in their perplexity, educational philosophers have searched for principles by which to determine the right of materials to a place in the educational scheme. Spencer broke away from the classical tradition and for guidance, looked to the life about him in which young people must be prepared to bear a part. He saw their need for physical vigor and for earning a living, he saw them rearing children, participating in civic and political life, and engaging in various leisure time pursuits. These, according to his philosophy, should be the major interests in education.

That education should concern itself with certain broad areas, our present day educational philosophers are substantially in agreement. To prepare the young to take their places worthily and effectively in the groups in which they find themselves, to leave those groups the better for their participation and, while so doing, to achieve a large measure of satisfaction and contentment for themselves would probably be accepted today as the ultimate objectives of education.

But not even philosophers agree upon the relative worth of competing materials for reaching these objectives. Certain aspects of life activities as given by Spencer are accepted as legitimate fields for educational effort. Others, however, have not been so whole heartedly adopted. Health, vocation, and citizenship are pretty firmly established as educational objectives. Preparation for the use of leisure is rapidly assuming a position of importance as work hours shorten and men are faced with an increasing amount of free time to be construc-

*A Radio Address

[1]Spencer, H. Education. D. Appleton & Co. 1890.

tively occupied. But that there is need for preparation for homemaking and the rearing of a family has only very limited acceptance as yet.

Spencer in his day called attention to this serious lack in education in the following words:

> "If by some strange chance not a vestige of us descended to the remote future save a pile of our school books or some college examination papers, we may imagine how puzzled an antiquary of the period would be on finding in them no indication that the learners were ever likely to be parents. "This must be the curriculum for their celibates," we may fancy him concluding. "Perceive here an elaborate preparation for many things: especially for reading the books of extinct nations and of co-existing nations, ...but I find no reference whatever to the bringing up of children. They could not have been so absurd as to omit all training for this gravest of responsibilities. Evidently then, this was the school course of one of their monastic orders."
>
> "Seriously," he continues, "is it not an astonishing fact that though on the treatment of offspring depend their lives or deaths, and their moral welfare and ruin, yet not one word of instruction on the treatment of offspring is ever given to those who will hereafter be parents? Is it not monstrous that the fate of a new generation should be left to the chances of unreasoning custom, impulse, fancy,-joined with the suggestions of ignorant nurses and the prejudiced council of grandmothers? If a merchant commenced business without any knowledge of arithmetic and bookkeeping, we should exclaim at his folly, and look for disasterous consequences. Or if, before studying anatomy, a man set up as a surgical operator, we should wonder at his audacity and pity his patients. But that parents should begin the difficult task of rearing offpring without ever having given a thought to the principles —physical, moral, or intellectual—which ought to guide them, excites neither surprise at the actors nor pity for their victims."[2]

Preparation for homemaking and parenthood as fields for education have found their way into the schools since Spencer's day but are far from being universally accepted or understood. Their practical aspects have been considered by many educators as placing them on a lower level of intellectual attainment than that of the academic type of subject. In consequence they have been too frequently reserved for those whose intellectual ability will not permit them to attain high scholastic success in any field. Furthermore they have not been highly regarded by women themselves as fields for study. This attitude of women is easily understood when the history of their struggle to win the right to an education equal to that of their brothers is recalled. Women had first to prove that they had intellectual ability equal to that of men. The early leaders in the struggle for women first applied themselves to and conquered the same curricula that the men were studying.

At a time when it was considered that women's only place was in the home it was necessary for women to scorn the home as a field for their activities and prove to a skeptical world that they could do everything else. Today, though the abilities of women are recognized and they are admitted into almost every field of the world's work, the old

---

[2]Op. cit. pp. 44—45

belittling attitude toward the home persists. When asked their occupation it is no uncommon thing to hear married women say apologetically, "Oh, I have no occupaton, I am just a homemaker."

In attempting to estimate the value of homemaking as a field for education, one fact is frequently lost sight of: that is that homemaking is an all but universal occupation for women during some period of their lives. According to the 1930 Census there are 43,000,000 women fifteen years of age or over in the United States and of these 75 per cent are married. There are then approximately 30,000,000 families in this country in each of which there is a woman engaged in homemaking. The fact that in some of these homes trained housekeepers are employed does not materially alter the picture. Managerial duties and the still more importat responsibilities of child rearing and family adjustments still remain. This group, however, is relatively small. At the other end of the scale is the large number of those who must combine wage earning with homemaking and who therefore need all the more the knowledge and skills necessary for conducting their homes effectively with the least expenditure of time and energy. If we agree that education should bear at least some relation to one's future life work, it would seem that some preparation for homemaking should be a part of every woman's education.

Nor should it be lost sight of that in the large majority of these 30,000,000 homes there is a man who shares in the responsibilities. Homemaking is not an occupation of one sex alone but is a cooperative enterprise demanding the interest and energy devotion of all toward a common cause if it is to be successful. There are certain areas within the home-making field that are just as legitimate fields for the efforts of men as for women. These will be considered later.

The scope of the homemaking field is not well understood. It is too often interpreted by its practical activities of cooking and sewing. To fully understand its breadth and depth it is necessary to survey the round of activities and responsibilities of the home as a whole and of the community outside as it affects the home. These may be considered roughly as falling into five divisions.

There is first that group of duties which have to do with the physical maintenance of the members of the family and the house. It is by these activities that homemaking education is usually interpreted and it is these which call down the scorn of the academically minded upon it as a subject of study in the schools. But these activities are recognized as important parts of the conduct of a home. Bodies must be nourished, clothed and protected from disease, and spirits must be renewed and refreshed by comfortable and artistic surroundings. In schools, however, these activities are not taught as ends in themselves. Food preparation becomes an avenue for teaching the selection of proper food elements for the nourishment of the body. Cooking becomes a study of the preparation of food so as to preserve its nutritive elements and to render it more digestible and usable by the human

cells. Both the study of food preparation and nutrition are based on a knowledge of the chemistry of food and of the body just as a physician's study of therapeutics is based on a knowledge of the chemistry of the human organism and its reaction to the elements and compounds in his remedies.

In the same way garment making becomes a study of fabrics and of art as well as of construction. To be able to distinguish rayon from silk, to know when silk is relatively free from harmful weighting, to determine if wool is virgin wool or shoddy, or is heavily mixed with cotton is a basic part of clothing study. It too calls the sciences of chemistry and physics to its aid. Likewise to consider the selection of styles or garments from the point of view of becomingness involves the study of principles common to all art.

As in these two phases of homemaking so in others science and art are involved. A sanitary home is based on a knowledge of bacteriology just as is a sanitary water or milk supply watched over by our boards of health. A harmonious and beautiful home and its surroundings are based on the same principles of architecture as are public buildings and cities beautiful planned by city art commissions.

However, these phases of homemaking, important as they are, represent by no means its most vital aspects. These can be most easily turned over to others. A more important group of activities has to do with the use of the family income. These have greater significance not only because of their importance to the well-being of the family but also because of their far reaching effects into the lives and happiness of hunderds of workers who produce what the home consumes. Homemakers collectively form the greatest single body of buyers in the nation. Recent figures from the federal department of agriculture show that some three-fourths of our American families live on $2500 a year or less, the majority having considerably less than that figure.

When the income is small the getting of value received for every penny expended becomes of vital importance. No business man, no matter how small his business, undertakes to conduct it without establishing a budgeting and cost accounting system. Yet the majority of young people enter upon their homemaking adventure with only the vaguest idea of the costs involved. They know practically nothing of the relative amounts that may be safely allowed for the several divisions of the home running expenses. Is it to be wondered at that so many homemaking enterprises are shipwrecked on the rocks of financial incompetence?

Nor is the best use of the family income the only responsibility of the homemaker consumer. By her demands production is controlled and the lives of those who produce the articles she buys made comfortable or intolerable. To cite one instance that shows the power of the consumer over production and producers we may consider the rise and fall of the Eugenie hat. For those readers who do not recall that

coquettish piece of millinery it will be sufficient to say that it was generally of felt decorated with an ostrich feather and that it took the feminine world by storm a few years ago. The shape of the hat was so different from any worn years previously that to appear in last year's head covering was to be hoplessly dated. Hence came tremendous activity in the felt hat and ostrich feather industries. Factories that had been idle or running far under capacity were suddenly swamped with orders. Additional workers were called in and towns around the mills were taxed to their utmost to find places for workers to live. Ostrich feathers had not been in vogue for years, flocks of birds had been allowed to die off and the supply of plumes was not sufficient to meet the demand. Feather making is a skilled occupation but workers had been dispersed into other fields. They were assembled to work over into new styles the old stock hastily collected from warehouses and attics. Factories worked night and day to fill their orders.

And what happened? In less than four months there was not a Eugenie hat to be seen anywhere! The "smart set" who had adopted the style first, quickly found it becoming too common and abandoned it, and the vast majority of women finding its gay couquettishness quite unsuited to their styles of beauty or their requirements, sadly laid it away among their other mistakes and returned to their discarded last year's headgear. But what of the industry so hastily created? It collapsed of course. Factories closed and employees, many of whom had given up good jobs for this one, were thrown out of work. Business losses and human suffering were the result.

Some will say that consumers are helpless, that they can buy only what the producer puts on the market. This is true to an extent, but listen to another instance. A few years ago when women were wearing extremely short skirts, manufacturers were pleading for even a few added inches in order to increase the demand for yardage and make it possible for them to keep their factories open and their employees at work. The designers cooperated and brought out a new style of ankle length, voluminous garments. Mannequins modeled them and retailers bought them out in their stores. And there they remained. Women continued to wear their favorite styles and after a month or two merchants withdrew from sale the useless stock, pocketed their losses, and went about producing the thing which women demanded. Yet about a year later skirts suddenly descended to ankle length and the reign of the extremely short garment was ended. Manufacturers would gladly pay handsomely anyone who could work out a scheme for predicting demand a season ahead so that they could be prepared with the goods needed and be protected from the loss of producing goods which no one will buy.

Recently the sales resistance against better class merchandise has brought onto the market garments of lower price. The reduced income from sales must be met in some way, by reduced yardage, by cheaper fabrics or by reduced manufacturing costs. When the latter way is

chosen it is usually at the expense of the worker. It is said that to put on the market the kind of dress which today is selling around five dollars, workers must turn out at least twenty a day to make even a bare subsistance wage. That means hours of high tension work and exhaustion. It means the exploitation of one group of citizens for the gratification of another group.

That consumers bring such conditions about through their demands or buying practices does not mean that they are heartlessly and willingly exploiting another for their own gain but that they are ignorant of the effect of their demands. They have never considered the working of the laws of supply and demand. They have never considered how their practices affect the lives of the workers. They need education in economics and sociology to give them understanding and a social consciousness. They need if possible contact with industry so that they will know at first hand what it means to produce the goods they so thoughtlessly consume. One experimental college in the east is attempting to supply this experience. It is requiring a period of work in industry on the part of its students as a part of its training. To have mingled directly with the workers, to have experienced in one's own muscles the aching fatigue of long hours of exacting toil at machines will give a very different perspective to this group of citizens and should profoundly alter their buying habits. Such education might well be extended.

The gravest responsibilities of the homemaker, however, center around the rearing of children and the relationships among the members of the family. These are closely allied and may be discussed together. Until very recently it was considered that the taking care of a child's physical well-being until the time he entered school was all that was necessary to assure him a good start in life. His learning was supposed to begin when he entered school. His teachers were expected to direct that part of his development. His emotional and social development were largely matters of chance.

The studies of psychologists and psychiatrists have shown the fallacy of this conception. The child is not a vegetative animal until school age but a growing and learning individual from the day he is born. And his parents are his first, and for that reason, his most important teachers. By the time he enters school many of his habits and personality traits are so firmly fixed as to be changed only with difficulty and distress, if at all.

As guides and teachers, parents should receive education for their vocation. No school board will hire a teacher who has not prepared herself in child psychology. Why should parents be allowed to enter upon the rearing of children without at least a minimum of preparation for child guidance? As one writer discussing, "Standards in Parenthood,"[3] puts it:

> "Parenthood in its simplest forms is as old as history, or older, but it remains unorganized, unstanderdized, and too often unrecognized

[3]Watson, Amey E. *Survey*, 42:622-623. July 26, 1919.

as a field of constructive effort of vital significance. Socially important as is sound parent-craft, the state allows almost anyone to undertake the work without question; no standards of training are required of those who plan to enter upon the field, and the standards of practice have not been clearly formulated. A contrast, indeed, to the attitude toward standardization of the older recognized professions. Parenthood deals with the formation of character in all those who are to be future citizens; yet parents often approach their tasks as amateurs, nor is it made easily possible for them to obtain direction or training in their chosen work."

That young people themselves are becoming aware of the shortages in their education is evidenced by the results of a conference at Rollins College in Florida in which the students were asked to make recommendations for changes in the curriculum. Their recommendations were reported as follows:

"As to the individual's relationship to his family, very few college graduates would go so far as to say that present day education even scratches the surface of this phase of life, although it is admittedly the one which is most likely to influence his character and bring his real happiness . . . . .

"We are taught dates, formulas, scientific principles; we are taught that certain novels are more highly regarded than others; but we are not shown how to make a living, how to keep accounts, how to get on with our husbands and wives, how to rear our children or how to vote. Yet these are the questions that lie nearest to our everyday interests in life . . . . .College education in this respect, has advanced little since Spencer's time. Our colleges continue year after year to graduate men and women who are to be trusted with the upbringing of the next generation; yet these men and women are quite ignorant of the scientific principles of marriage relations and child rearing."[4]

Investigators place the ineffectual home above all others as the cause of juvenile delinquency. They charge inept or quarrelsome or separated parents with the responsibility for wrecked childhood. Two research workers in reviewing the cases of 4000 delinquents reached the conclusion that only 7.6 per cent of the total number of these children could be said to belong to "good" families, "good" as used here meaning merely those in which constructive disciplinary forces operate.

Two other investigators have shown home standards, ideals and practices to be by far the most potent factors in the shaping of the ideals and standards of children. The influence of teachers is shown to be far below that of parents, and that of Sunday School teachers is revealed as almost negligible.

In writing on, "Home Economics and the Modern Girl,"[5] one author says: "In directing a home intelligently it is not woman's most difficult task to see that the family is healthy, well-fed, tastefully dressed and housed. . . . A far more important aspect of her vocation is to understand and reconcile the different ages and personalities that make up the family, and to shape the place of the family in the larger community. Within the home she must not only understand the develop-

[4]Report of the Curriculum Conference. Rollins College Bulletin, 26:24-25. February 1931. Winter Park, Florida.

[5]Thayer V. T. *Journal of Home Economics*, 23:7 July 1931.

ment of each member and adjust each personality, but decide in considerable measure what cultural influences shall play upon the family."

It is in these areas of child rearing and family adjustments particularly that men should be educated as well as women. The child does have two parents. Two parents working together with a common basis of understanding and purpose are much more likely to give a child the feeling of security and well-being which are so necessary to his proper development than will be the case if there are conflicting standards and practices. Likewise in the adjustments of their own lives young married people who have a common understanding of their own impulses and an ability to look at themselves and their problems objectively will be more likely to establish a stable home. If they can bring to the working out of their perplexities a willingness to cooperate on a basis of mutual adjustment and respect for the personalities of each, they will be more likely to establish a lasting and affectionate life partnership. That young men are beginning to demand such training is indicated by the quotation from the Rollins College conference already given.

Homemaking does not stop at the door of the home. It extends out into the community and brings to the homemaker her last large group of responsibilities, those which concern the community as a whole. The community is but an aggregate of homes and as the majority of homes in a given community do and think so will the community do and think. What the majority of thoughtful parents wish for their own children they will wish for all children within their reach.

Homemakers are intimately concerned with public utilities and services. Pure milk and water, sanitary markets and restaurants, properly supervised playgrounds and public amusements, law enforcement concerning quarantines against the spread of communicable diseases, all these and others are of vital interest to the homemaker. It is a part of her responsibilities to see that proper regulations are set up and maintained and to see also that she and her family carefully observe the regulations adopted for the good of all.

When homemaking is looked at from this broad perspective it is seen in true proportion as a profession needing no apology, as one offering great opportunities and rich reward. It demands many skills and abilities which come only through knowledge and training, or through the long, painful and often costly school of "trial and error" experience. It demands the knowledge of the scientist, the acumen of the business executive, the discipline of the psychologist, the appreciation of the artist and the patience of Job. Its chief product is the personalities of the persons to whom it ministers. As such it demands and deserves the highest possible training for its performance. For women at least it goes far toward answering Spencer's query. "What education is of most worth?

THE COST OF NEUTRALITY IN TIME OF WAR*

ERNEST MAHAN

The roads of the land surface of the earth may be divided into two general kinds. Highways are public ways open to the use of the general public; but private roads such as railroads and private drives are, of course, not highways and can be restricted in their use by the owner.

Likewise, the oceans of the world are divided into two areas. Along the shores of these oceans runs a rim of water three miles in width, known as the three mile limit. Out from the shore for a distance of three miles the water belongs to the state which borders upon it. Beyond this three mile limit lies what we commonly call the high seas which, like highways on land, are open to the use of all peoples and states of the world. Even in time of war the high seas are generally considered to be open to the use of ships sailing under the flag of a neutral country. A ship sailing the high seas under a neutral flag cannot be hindered by a nation at war except under one condition. If the neutral vessel carries contraband of war it is subject to seizure and its goods can be confiscated. This statement leads us immediately to a consideration of the question of contraband of war.

Back in the early part of the seventeenth century lived a Dutchman by the name of Grotius. The fatherland of Grotius was an important commercial country engaged in a lucrative carrying trade on the seas. England and Spain were at war. Grotius, like Americans of our day, did not want Holland to become involved in the war, but at the same time, like Americans of our day, he wanted Holland to be permitted to ship goods over the high seas to the belligerents. From time out of mind the right of a nation at war to seize neutral ships carrying contraband goods has been recognized, but the difficulty lay in the fact that no complete definition of contraband goods had been established.

Spain was the weaker power on the sea. She could not expect to restrict neutral trade with England. Moreover, Spain needed the goods carried by Holland, as great a volume and as great a variety of goods as possible. Therefore she had no quarrel with Holland concerning contraband of war. But England, on the other hand, was a stronger sea power than Spain and of course, was eager to prevent goods from reaching the enemy. Consequently, England was interested in adding to the contraband list as many kinds of goods as possible, and so England and Holland entered into a dispute about what was and what was not contraband of war.

Grotius, as I have said, wanted Holland to keep out of war, but he did not want England to place so many kinds of goods

*A Radio Address, October, 1935.

on the contraband list that Holland's profitable trade with Spain would be seriously damaged. Apparently, he decided that he could do the most good for his country and for his fellow citizens by writing a book on the rules of war and peace. This book on international law was published in 1625. In it Grotius divided goods shipped on the high seas into three classes. The first class included goods used exclusively for war purposes, such as guns and ammunition. Such goods carried by a neutral ship could be seized by a belligerent. Nobody denied it. This class of goods he called **absolute contraband.** In the second class were articles of commerce which might or might not be used for warlike purposes. If such goods as these were carried on a neutral ship on the high seas, and were destined for the use of the civilian population of a nation at war, they were not subject to seizure by a belligerent. On the other hand, if these same goods were destined for the use of the fighting forces of that nation then they were subject to seizure. This class of goods Grotius called **conditional contraband.** The third class of goods was intended by Grotius to include a long list of commodities which could not be used for purposes of war and which, therefore, could under no circumstances be seized by a belligerent. Grotius called this class of goods **non-contraband.**

So Grotius classified the goods of commerce into three groups, (1) **absolute contraband,** (2) **conditional contraband,** and (3) **non-contraband.** Thus did he seek to keep Holland out of war and yet enable her to reap the rich profits of war time. How strikingly recent this situation seems; how like our own position in World War days! Grotius had his own ideas about the question of **conditional contraband,** for example, but unfortunately England had a different idea. A prize court was to determine the use to which the goods were to be put, whether for war or for peace. Obviously, it was impossible in most cases to determine the ultimate destination, but the prize court had the last word. So the controversy went on and it has continued from that day to this. Unto this day no satisfactory and generally accepted definition of contraband has been established.

This question of contraband of war underlies the whole problem of the rights of neutrals on the high seas in time of war. Many have been the times when nations have gathered at peace conferences and otherwise and have attempted to define and establish the rights of neutrals; the Armed Neutrality of northern Europe in 1780, the Armed Neutrality of 1800, the Paris Peace Congress of 1856, the Second Hague Conference in 1907, the occasion of the Declaration of London in 1909 and many more, but no satisfactory solution for the problem has been found. Many have been the times when

nations have poured out blood and treasure to uphold these so-called neutral rights. Twice in history the United States has been drawn into a major European war and has sacrificed thousands of lives and millions of dollars in the effort to enforce our rights as a neutral.

As a matter of fact, the World War demonstrated conclusively that the classification of goods of commerce by Grotius has now become obsolete. Really there is no such thing any longer as **conditional contraband** and **non-contraband** goods. Practically every conceivable commodity can logically be placed on the contraband list by nations at war. For one reason, the whole population of a country at war is mobilized to win the war and not alone the soldiers at the front. For another reason, modern methods and implements of warfare make use of practically every kind of raw material as well as arms and munitions.

In the World War Britain was a greater sea power than Germany. Britain was interested in keeping as much goods as possible from going to Germany by way of neutral ships in order that the enemy might be starved into submission. One way to accomplish this purpose was to increase the contraband list, for Britain could stop all neutral ships carrying contraband, even on the high seas, and condemn the goods. Consequently Britain placed on the contraband list many kinds of commodities that had not hitherto been considered contraband. Let me give you a few samples from a list of articles declared to be contraband of war which was submitted to the British parliament. The list includes such articles as the following: camphor, asbestos, bones, cork, celluloid, maps, iodine, paper money, soap, starch, sulphur, pepper, cotton, gold, wool and turpentine. An Englishman, writing at that time, guessed that human hair was about the only thing which could not in some way be used for military purposes. "Yet," says R. G. Adams in his **History of the Foreign Policy of the United States**, "at that very time 'hair' was already in the Manual of the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army as an article which might be properly requisitioned, along with "school-books, corkscrews, cuspidors, pencil-sharpeners, rat traps, whistles, clothespins, etc." Manicuring sets might appear harmless to people of a neutral country, but as Adams points out, lip-sticks can be converted into glycerine which can be used to make explosives and nail files were used in the World War to fill shrapnel-cases. Americans might insist upon their neutral right to ship cans of condensed milk to feed German children but the fats in the milk could be used in the manufacture of ex-

plosives and the cans could be converted into the German "potato-masher" hand grenades.

Enough has been said to indicate the difficulties which would be encountered by the United States in an effort to maintain so-called neutral rights upon the high seas in a time of major war, especially if a great sea power like Britain was a belligerent. We are a great commercial nation. We could continue to ship goods and run the risk of having them seized as contraband of war; in other words let the owner pursue this business at his own risk. We could forbid the shipment of goods which could be used for purposes of war but, as we have seen, that would mean virtually the cessation of all foreign trade as there is really no such thing as **non-contraband** any longer. The adoption of either of these policies would probably mean ruin to certain groups of our citizens. It would be a heavy price to pay, but no doubt it would go far to keep us out of war. On the other hand, we could refuse to adopt either of these policies. We could define our neutral rights and attempt to enforce them, as we have done more than once before but in doing so our ability to keep out of a prolonged major war would be very problematical.

Let us now turn to a brief consideration of the neutrality legislation enacted by the last session of congress. Sensing a strong public sentiment for peace, congress apparently made a sincere and determined effort to keep the United States out of the next European war by passing the Neutrality Act. This act gives the President the power to forbid the shipment of arms and munitions of war to foreign countries that may be at war. It provides for the creation of a government Munitions Control Board and requires all munitions manufacturers to register with that board. Remembering, probably, the Lusitania episode in the World War, when this British ship carrying American passengers was sunk by a German submarine, thereby widening the breach between the United States and Germany, congress also gave the President power to declare that citizens of the United States should travel on ships of nations at war at their own risk.

Pursuant to the provisions of this Neutrality Act the President has appointed the Munitions Control Board and it has begun to function by requiring all munitions manufacturers to register, and all importers and exporters of munitions to take out a license by the last day of November. This board has also made a recommendation to the President and he has issued a preliminary definition of implements of war which may not be exported to a nation at war. Moreover, the President has taken a further step, under the provisions of this Act,

by proclaiming Italy and Ethiopia to be at war and declaring that citizens of the United States travel on the ships of these countries at their own risk.

While the sincerity of purpose behind this Neutrality Act should not be questioned, it is clear that the Act falls short of solving the problem of neutrality. In the first place, this legislation is to remain in force only until February 29, 1936. However, the aim of congress seems to have been to follow this Act with legislation of a more permanent character. In the second place, the President is to determine the definition of implements of war. In the preliminary list which has been issued no attempt is made to include raw materials which might be used for war purposes. Apparently, a study of the raw materials question is now being made by the Munitions Control Board with a view to broadening the definition of implements of war, but even the broadest interpretation of the Neutrality Act could probably not make it cover the bulk of our foreign trade. So long as such commodities as copper, cotton, wheat and petroleum are shipped by us to a nation at war our problem of neutrality will remain unsolved.

These economic sacrifices, however, great as they may be, do not compose the whole cost of neutrality in time of war. Other factors have, in the past, functioned powerfully to get us into war and can well do so again. I refer in particular to the altogether human tendency to form opinions for or against a nation at war and to give expression to sympathies and prejudices oftentimes in a very impassioned manner. At the beginning of the World War President Wilson realized the danger in such unneutral attitudes and warned against it in one of his appeals to the people. Let me give you an excerpt from a proclamation made by President Wilson in August, 1914. Said he:

> I venture, therefore, my fellow countrymen, to speak a solemn word of warning to you against the deepest, most subtle, most essential breach of neutrality which may spring out of partisanship, of passionately taking sides. The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another.

The citizen body of the United States is a heterogeneous group bound by ties of blood and sentiment to many nations of Europe and other parts of the world. Foreign wars, therefore, have a tendency to arouse passions among these racial groups. A good example of such a thing is the recent trouble between Negroes and Italians in New York because of the Italo-Ethiopian struggle. Another recent example is the violence done to the German flag in New York harbor, an act

which produced an international incident, an act committed by a group which presume to be pacizic in its character.

It is probably impossible for individuals to remain neutral in thought, even in case of a dog fight. But we can exercise judgment and restraint in giving expression to our unneutral feelings. I dare say that, notwithstanding all the sentiment we have for peace in the United States, and in spite of all the desire we may have to keep out of war, there are many Americans strongly prejudiced against Italy and in deep sympathy with Ethiopia in this present international crisis. In most cases such feelings for or against a nation at war do not rest upon any profound understanding of the issues involved or the claims of the belligerents.

In conclusion we can say, I think, that it is not impossible for the United States to remain neutral in case of a major war. Holland and the Scandinavian countries remained neutral in the World War in spite of the fact that they are next door neighbors to Germany and the fact that commerce is an important part of their economic life. We, as a government and a people, can probably remain neutral if we are willing to bear the cost of neutrality in time of war. But we shall probably need to abandon our traditional attempt to enforce our so-called neutral rights upon the high seas, and we shall need to maintain neutral attitudes and actions toward foreign nations and issues, for to permit our sentiments and passions to become aroused against a foreign nation is to embark upon a road which, if traveled far enough, as Walter Millis so well points out in his recent book, leads inevitably to war.

A GLIMPSE OF RUSSIA*

A RADIO ADDRESS

EDGAR MENDENHALL, *Professor of Education and Director of Research, Kansas State Teachers College*

This evening, I shall ask my listeners to go with me on a trip made to Russia last summer. Our time will be too brief to see as much as we should like of this vast country with its 165,000,000 people. Nevertheless, we may be able to get a picture a bit clearer than that we already have, of one of the most momentous social and economic experiments in human history.

With our party of approximately 100 Americans gathered from various walks of life, we shall start our trip tonight at the Finnish border. A night ride on a Finnish train from Helsingfors has brought us to the small Finnish station or village near the boundary We write the name of the village in our note-books, R-A-J-A-J-O-K-I, and leave its pronunciation to someone else. Our pocket calendar confirms the date, July 16. Our watches register 10:40 a. m. We make the mental note that it is aproximately three o'clock in the morning back home in the Middle West of the United States.

We grab our several pieces of baggage and helter-skelter pile off on the platform. Here we wait some minutes until a Russian train backs across the border. This we board and are taken into Russian territory across a small stream that seems to be the dividing line between the two countries. Here we again stop at a small station and prepare to go through the customs. Our passports are examined. An energetic, attractive young woman wearing a cap and a blue uniform enters our car. At her direction we open all our hand luggage. She goes down the train aisle and delves deep into each open bag making sure that we bring nothing into Russia that is dutiable or perhaps objectionable from the Russian point of view.

We declare the amount of money we are taking into the country and are given an official statement. This statement we are cautioned carefully to preserve and present at the border before leaving Russia. It is expected that we take out less money than we take in. If we took out more it might indicate that we had been speculating or profiteering and this would not be tolerated. The number of each camera is registered. We learn that all films must be developed, inspected and officially approved with a seal before they can be taken from the country. The magazines we brought from America were not put back into our bags. Some of our party

*Summer of 1934.

say this is because there is a need of reading matter in the country. Others suggest it may be fear of ideas out of harmony with Russian political thought. Anyway, we gladly donate our magazines to "the cause," whatever it may be. Like several other countries of Europe, Russia is careful to prevent objectionable propaganda reaching her people. As we travel throughout the country, we coming from America, feel the dearth of uncensored world news.

Some of us now have our baggage examined and officially marked. The customs inspection goes along leisurely and we realize that it will be some time before our train will be ready to start for Leningrad. We who are through customs walk about and get our first impression of Russia. We note a large building under construction near the railroad. We are told that it is to be used as a new customs building later. We see women, usually barefoot, doing work ordinarily done by men. Some sift sand; some mix mortar; others carry the mortar upon a four-handled carrier, one woman behind, another in front, to workmen constructing the walls. We wonder about the emancipation of women under the Soviet system. We later find them digging the subway in Moscow and removing the debris. But they are also found in factories, trade unions, government posts, scientific institutions, political organizations, etc. (Women constitute 41 per cent of the total number of students who enrolled in medical courses. Of the total number of students preparing for teaching careers, 51 per cent were women.) It is the contention of the Soviets that in no other country are women given the privileges and rights enjoyed by the women of Russia.

Not until three o'clock in the afternoon is our customs inspection completed. We then board our train and are off for Leningrad, where we arrive late in the afternoon.

We are taken in a bus to the large ornate Hotel Europa with its wide marble stairways. We are assigned a room garish with brass hardware, an immense pendant crystal chandelier and, what delighted us most, a private bath. After a brief clean-up we step out on the street to watch the folk go by. We are impressed by the absence of well-dressed people, nor were there many very poorly dressed. In general, there were no extremes in the way people dressed such as one sees in our own cities or the cities of other European countries. We could but note the shoes. We see all sorts of foot-wear, "sneakers," rubber overshoes, and not very well-made pumps and half-shoes. In fact, wherever we go in Russia there is an obvious need for better foot-wear. The shoes that most of my hearers now have on would attract envious attention in Russia. I now vividly recall having my shoes polished in front of a hotel at Odessa and the gaping crowd, some on tip-toe, eagerly watching the performance

and admiring my American shoes. The Russians say that in time when their lighter industries are well under way, all the people will be well-dressed and well-shod.

As we stand in front of the hotel, a Red solider in khaki dress comes along and one of our party who speaks Russian engages him in conversation. Among other things, he is asked about Russia's preparations for war. The soldier deplores the fact that Russians felt it necessary to put so much energy in war equipment but claims that it is now necessary to prevent aggression.

Later it was our privilege to visit an immense aeroplane factory in Moscow and follow from the beginning the construction of air-ships. We saw the big bombers as they were turned out ready for flight. We observed how much of the work is done by women and reflected upon the terrific fight that Russia could make, since the women could be kept at work manufacturing war material and release man power for the battle line. But, we believe the Red soldier was right. Russia wants no war. She wants to organize her internal affairs. The Russian Commissar of Foreign Affairs, M. Litvinoff, has always expressed himself as opposed to war.

I had hoped to be able to give a message to my hearers on the attitude of Russia toward foreign countries from Litvinoff himself. I wrote him last October for such expression and received the following cryptic letter dated at Moscow, October 22. This letter is characteristic of the secret diplomacy which, notwithstanding Litvinoff's general attitude, I regard as unfortunate for better international relations:

Commissaire of the People for Foreign Affairs — Moscow, Oct. 22, 1934

Dear Sir,

In acknowledging your letter of October 5, and thanking you for your suggestion, I am sorry to have to inform you of my inability to accept same.

Yours truly,
M. Litvinoff

But, here we are still in Leningrad. We have plenty of time to look about the city, for the summer day lasts long in these northern regions. With ten or twelve other members of our American group we take an Intourist Bus. Jane is our guide. She wants to be called Jane, so Jane it is and to say it is easier than a Russian unpronounceable. Jane is a keen, energetic, blonde young Russian woman. She is steeped in the history of the Revolution and she speaks English faultlessly. As we drive about the city over both smooth-

paved and rough cobblestone streets, Jane proudly calls attention to the stretches of newly paved thoroughfares constructed since the Revolution by the Soviets and tells us that soon all the bumpy cobblestones will be torn up and be replaced by smooth modern paving. We believe her, for we constantly see evidences of busy construction.

We stop before the famous Winter Palace formerly belonging to the imperial family, now the House of the Scientists. Before it is the wide open space formerly called the Field of Mars, since it was the parade ground for the Imperial Guards. It is now called the Square of the Victims of the Revolution. We sit enrapt as Jane feelingly tells how the peasants and workers gathered here to petition the Czar for redress of their grievances; how their petitions were denied and the suppliants fired upon by the Imperial soldiery. With suppressed emotion she points to the trees fringing the square and tells of the children climbing into them that they might better see, and how they were shot out of these vantage places in the melee.

We pass a Mohammedan Mosque. We ask Jane whether it is still used as a place of worship. She answers, "Yes," and adds, "We permit freedom of religious worship, although organized religion is discouraged throughout Russia." In confirmation of Jane's statement, we later saw in Moscow religious services in Russian churches. There were only slight evidences of anti-religious activity, although anti-religious museums are still maintained and the Marxian statement, "Religion is the opiate of the people," is still to be seen lettered in Russian on a building on one of the main thoroughfares of Moscow.

The next day we start out to see the State Hermitage Museum, one of the richest and most famous museums of the world. Here have been gathered under the Czars thousands of paintings of Western European artists, beginning with the Renaissance and ending with the twentieth century. We realize as we stroll through the spacious halls that words cannot describe this marvelous collection of French and Dutch landscape paintings and the unsurpassed collection of Rembrandts. We can only tell our friends how we stood before them in quiet awe. We find that we foreigners are not alone in the appreciation of this great collection. We see group after group of Russian workers shown about by guides. These groups gather before these masterpieces and listen attentively to the disclosure of hidden beauty which their untrained, unaided eyes could never see. These workers and peasants were now having an experience beyond their fondest dreams, for in the old days these galleries were open only to the privileged classes. We are attracted by the quaint, zealous

peasant women who act as guards. How quietly they sidle up to us if we edge too close to a precious painting, lest we touch it with thoughtless hands!

It is on the 18th of July we take a train for Moscow. Before us is our first night on a Russian train and we look forward to the experience with keen interest, for we are to ride third class or hard. We have learned that one can ride in Russia, provided he has the requisite "valuta" or foreign money, either first or second. Both of these accomodations, especially first, are very comfortable and compare favorably with American Pullmans. But we take third class or hard. Our American party is large enough to be assigned a separate coach and for this we are duly glad. It is time to board. We grab our baggage as do all our party and mass about the train steps, trying to be among the first to climb into the coach. We have picked up in our journey the acquaintance of two congenial Americans, Mr. Donald Zeigler, a principal of a New York School and his gentle wife. Don is a husky six-footer, so he bulks through the pressing crowd, reaches the middle of the coach and takes possesion of a compartment holding it for the six who compose our small group. After we are well on our way, the Russian brakeman comes along to make up our beds. At least we take him for the brakeman. He is far from being a pullman porter. He hasn't the color nor the dressy style. Our bedding consists of a thin pad, sheets, a spread and a small pillow. It is hinted that these are luxuries not usually bestowed upon third-class passengars.

There is room for six people in our compartment. Three may sleep on each side, one above another crosswise with the coach. The opening to the compartment has no doors. We note along the passage way running lengthwise of our car two other benches which may be used as beds. I take the lower one rather than run the risk of rolling off the top bunk in the compartment. We sleep in our clothes. Our American modesty asserts its dominance. During the night our vigilant Russian brakeman makes frequent trips through our car with his oil lantern to make sure our baggage is safe. He peers here and there looking for possible pilferers.

Time will not permit going into greater details concerning this journey. We must see a bit of Moscow and meet some of its people. Without more adieu, we are now settled in the New Moscow Hotel overlooking the Moscow River with the famous Kremlin only a little ways beyond. From our hotel we start on a walk to the Red Square, which joins the Kremlin on the east. We cross the bridge spanning the Moscow River. Street cars packed with people go by us at frequent intervals. The old saw, "packed in as tight as a can of sardines" becomes vividly meaningful. It may be another passenger might wedge

into these cars, but we seriously doubt it. We note that the "motorman" as well as the "conductor" are usually women.

We pass St. Basil's Cathedral with its multi-colored, onion-like domes. It is no longer used for religious services. We recall that this cathedral was built at the direction of Ivan the Terrible, 1564-68; that the architect was blinded to prevent him from duplicating the building.

We are now on the famous Red Square mentioned so frequently in our papers and always a place of high interest to the tourist because it is here that are held the great demonstrations of the Moscow workers and the Red Army. It was here we saw the latter part of July the spectacular physical culture parade when 130,000 physical culture enthusiasts, sportsmen and gymnasts, husky young men and women, march past us for hours. As this great throng moved past with sprightly step singing their martial songs we sensed the might of this great northern country.

Near the Kremlin on the west side of the square stands the Mausoleum of Lenin, a massive truncated pyramid built of great blocks of red granite. The granite glistens in the sunlight, for it is cleaned and polished daily. Soldiers stand guard constantly at the entrance of the tomb. We see a long line of Russian folks waiting their turn to pass into the vault.

We are among the foreign curious. We too, would see Lenin. We have learned that we need not wait in line if we go up to the guard at the entrance and simply say, "Intourist".

This we do and are permitted to enter the mausoleum at once. We go down a stairway and view the wax-like body of the moving spirit of the Russian Revolution. We marvel at the embalmers skill for Lenin has been dead ten years.

It is the 29th of July when we visit a court with a guide and a party of Americans. We enter a rather small court room. Behind a desk sits a young man near his forties dressed in clothes resembling khaki. He is the chief judge of a group of three who administer justice in this particular district. In Russian he tells of the merits of their judicial system. Our guide translates what he says in good English. We are told that the main task of Russian justice is not to punish but to correct those who break the law. A lawbreaker is one who is primarily looked upon as a creature of his environment rather than as a potential criminal. Society rather than the criminal is more frequently at fault. Many examples are cited of those who have broken the law and because of proper treatment have become splendid citizens. Prisoners are not outcasts after they have served sentences. We remember Bolshevo, the village prison, not far from Moscow where we found no high fences or bars. Here prisoners may go and come as often as they wish. They are per-

mitted to live as normal lives as possible, sometimes having with them their wives and children. It is pointed out to us that precedents have little weight in the administration of Russian justice; the merits of each case are considered in themselves without citing cases from musty past decisions. Court procedure is very informal. Great freedom is given the accused to present evidence and discuss his case. Even the spectators in the courtroom may sometimes freely express what they know on the points at issue.

There was so much commendation of the legal system I ventured to tell our guide to inquire whether the court system had any faults. In response to the inquiry the judge readily listed five which I jotted down in my notes. Here they are:

1. Report of the actions of the court is made to the workers every four months. This is too long a time. The report should be made more frequently.
2. The courts are not closely enough connected with the factories.
3. They do not have time enough to serve the people.
4. Often the cases are decided too quickly.
5. Sentences are not quickly carried out.

We have a conversation with a Slavakian, a worker who has been in America. He tells us he is not satisfied and would like to get out of the country if he could. He shakes his head and says, "It's a pretty tough life." In front of our hotel Stybor Wladyslaw, also a worker who has spent many years in our country, comes up to us and enters into conversation. He gives us an entirely different story. He likes Russia immensely and is warm in his praise of the opportunities for the working classes. We meet Sophia. She has been in America a number of years. Her mother lived in a village among the peasants. She tells us that it is not unusual for the peasants to complain. In fact their complaints are a good sign. If the peasants were satisfied, they would not want to help better the conditions and this would be bad indeed. "All of us know," she says, "that we as yet do not have the things we need in Russia, but they will come in time." She tells us that the peasants live on a higher plane than they did under the old regime. Then it was not uncommon for ten or a dozen to share one room in a dirty hut. Even a pig was welcome to add warmth. Now, according to Sophia, sanitary conditions are far better.

In working out their social plan, the Russians have unquestionably made many mistakes and we find many Russians readily admitting errors. Nevertheless we are led to feel that the majority of the people have faith in the ultimate success

of their program. They still look forward to building a classless society and finally achieving, "from each according to his ability—to each according to his needs."

But we are glad to get back to our America. We come home feeling much as Mr. G. Glaze, an elderly Englishman who had been in Russia many times. We met Mr. Glaze at Moscow and later again in Kharkov. He said to me, "Russia is paying a heavy price for her program to equalize opportunity among her people. All of us realize the existence of grave inequality and social and economic injustice in England and in America, but in righting these wrongs I believe that England and America will do the job better."

O beautiful for spacious skies
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!
O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
Whose stern impassioned stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness!
O beautiful for heroes proved
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved
And mercy more than life.
O beautiful for patriot's dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears!
America, America,
God shed his grace on thee,
And crown they good with brotherhood,
From sea to shining sea.

JOSEPHINE MARSHALL, *Head of Department, Home Economics*

SOME NEEDS OF EDUCATION AS I SEE THEM

If I had Aladdin's lamp and could with my wish supply one of education's greatest present needs as I see them, this would be my wish: that all those engaged in the work of education should see each student not as a potential receptacle for the world's accumulated wisdom but as an individual entity to be assisted to the attainment of a poised, well-balanced, courageous personality.