

EDITORIAL

"THE BATTLE AGAINST INTOLERANCE IS ON"

WITH THE terse statement that "the battle against intolerance is on," Chester I. Long, of Kansas, president of the American Bar Association, sounded a battle cry in a dinner speech he delivered in Chicago on November 27th, before a large representation of the Illinois Bar Association.

With a zeal worthy of an American he challenged that "Liberty is imperiled" in our country today, and pleading with his audience, fellow members of the legal profession in America, he said:

The forces are gathering to preserve local self-government, liberty of opinion, liberty of the teacher to teach, liberty of parents or guardian to choose the school for the child and the liberty of the child to learn. Let us join these forces.

In reference to the recent evolution trial in Tennessee he asserted that the lawyers of America were not interested in the fundamentalist-modernist quarrel, but in "whether the liberty of the teacher to teach and the child to learn has been impaired" by the statute that brought fourth the famous trial. He asserted that "the freedom of learning is in peril" and cited several supreme court decisions, wherein intolerance statutes have been nullified. As instances he cited the rulings of the supreme courts in Ohio, Nebraska and Iowa setting aside state laws forbidding the instruction in the German language. "The child does not belong to the state" was his terse comment in referring to the Oregon law abolishing private and parochial schools, which also has been set aside by the higher courts.

What a sordid story to relate of an enlightened nation, such as America is today, that it became so swayed by passion that it lost its mental poise and equilibrium and commenced to set up laws restricting religious teachings and barring from the public schools a modern language, the language of a people with whom America had been at war.

The victor in a conflict that stands celebrated in all history, is the victor who showed himself the intellectual giant, capable of that magnanimity and extravagance of soul that cast out the spell of enmity when the treaty of peace was signed, wiped the slate clean and stood four square as a friend to his enemy of a regrettable yesterday.

The late President Harding signed a formal peace treaty with Germany in 1921, committing America to a state of friendly relations with that country. Since then much of the intolerance legislation in question has been passed. The real American soldier who followed his country's flag on the field of battle promptly saluted his erstwhile enemy, gave him the hand of fellowship and proved himself capable of backing his country as readily in its declaration of peace as he backed it in its declaration of war, but the little tinhorn soldiers, the men who never could make the grade in civil life, who love to don the uniform with one, two, or three bars, indicating rank — often won through pull — and who love the opportunity to play around as commanding officers, with men superior to them in private life standing at attention at their beck and call, these are the men

who are keeping the war spirit alive with every available means of artificial respiration.

There is a major distinction between reasonable preparedness, rendering our nation capable of defensive military action at all times, and the tinhorn soldier's little war of malice and prejudice in repudiation of his country's solemn peace pledge. If our patriotism is so shallow that it can't function unless we keep on rehearsing our recent war propaganda, we are in a bad way.

If we could silence the source of our fictitious and varicolored patriotism, from whence come the discordant notes of strife, we should at once observe a steadier mental attitude in our country. The mind that is agitated by constant discord will become calm when the disharmonious clamor has been quelled.

Act on the suggestion of Chester Long and muster in to put down the post war rebellion of the tinhorn brigade.

WHEN STUPIDITY IS CORNERED BY LOGIC

WHEN THE "know nothings" of our day are cornered on the question of justice and fair dealings with the immigrants who have come here on America's own condition of immigration, they squirm, snort and pooh-pooh, contenting themselves with giving in reply this stale, stereotyped phrase from the "know nothings" propaganda factory: "Well, if they ain't satisfied the way we do things over here, they can go back to the country they came from."

If that is an adequate American sentiment, let us look it over to see if sound American public opinion can put its stamp of approval on it.

The large number of the healthy, clean, morally sound and strong-limbed immigrants have always furnished the American nation a high percentage of its home-providing population. They have furnished America her children, and toiled, without complaint, to give them an American education.

The larger number of the aliens in America today who through intolerant legislation are being harassed and unduly restricted in their pursuit of honest livelihood are home owners tax-payers and the happy parents of good sized families of healthy American born children. The future of these children, their proper care and educational development, depends on the paternal parents' ability and opportunity to earn enough to provide them proper care and means of education. The children of these aliens are not "foreigners." Their American title is as good as any title of native birth of which the "know nothings" are so proud that they do not hesitate to refer to it in such a way as to make every foreign born feel that they consider it as denoting superiority. A solon in a neighboring state, a member of the legislative body in that commonwealth, in a recent interview, declared himself emphatically against the aliens in America, and reiterated to the editor of the United American the intelligence contained in the above quoted stereotyped phrase, as his own idea of how the aliens—who have been legislated out of their jobs and who have had the opportunities formerly enjoyed to earn the means of livelihood for their families taken away from them by arbitrary laws—might settle the matter by "going right back to the old countries from which they had come" many years ago.

We ventured the query: "But how about their