

rituals a new and broader significance. Indeed, it is in these very inheritances from non-Christian sources that Christendom has found material for its distinctive forms of art. To abolish, therefore, these Indian customs in the interest of Christianity, as perhaps some zealous Christians would do, is as contrary to the historic spirit of Christianity as it is to the spirit of American freedom. We hope Mrs. Burlin is mistaken when she says:

That type of Americanization which is largely a matter of mail-order-house clothes and crockery, of chewing-gum and "movies," will soon wipe its erasing hand across the Southwest like a well-meaning but ignorant servant who, zealously "setting to rights" an artist's studio, dusts off his pastels.

In view of that, we are glad to receive assurance from the Indian Office that, though Indian dances have been properly subjected to criticism for certain abuses, "the feast and ceremonial occasions of the Indians in the Southwest are less open to this criticism."

That there are abuses in connection with such ceremonials may well be believed without condemnation of the ceremonials in themselves. Indeed, a year ago in a circular letter to the superintendents under him the Commissioner of Indian Affairs noted that the Indian dances were growing less frequent, were of shorter duration, were interfering less with the Indians' farming and domestic affairs, and had fewer barbaric features, and at that time the Commissioner said that it was "not the policy of the Indian Office to denounce all forms of Indian dancing," but recog-

nized that it was a "manifestation of something inherent in human nature, . . . a medium through which elevated minds may happily unite art, refinement, and heathful exercise." What the Indian Office has objected to have been such abuses as "self-torture, immoral relations between the sexes, the sacrificial destruction of clothing or other useful articles, the reckless giving away of property, the use of injurious drugs or intoxicants, and frequent or prolonged periods of celebration . . . in fact, any disorderly or plainly excessive performance that promoted superstitious cruelty, licentiousness, idleness, danger to health, and shiftless indifference to family welfare." The Commissioner does not go so far as to approve the recommendations of missionaries assembled last October in the Sioux country who would have the Commissioner exercise his authority to prevent, for instance, any Indians from taking part in the dances or being present who are under fifty years of age. Apparently, what the Commissioner prefers to depend upon is the prohibition of what is obviously vice or crime, and then the education of the public feeling of the Indians themselves in the direction of healthful, orderly, and temperate practices. The Commissioner would "give tact, persuasion, and appeal to the Indian's good sense a chance to win ahead of peremptory orders." In his message to the Indians he has emphasized at the start his protest against the Indians allowing these ceremonial dances to be degraded as a spectacle for public gatherings of whites. With this in particular all friends of the Indians must agree.

Whatever value there is in these ceremonials is vitiated by turning them into shows for the amusement of others.

With the attitude of the Commissioner Indians who value their own customs can agree as well as whites. For example, an Indian sixty-six years old, a nephew of Chief Joseph, and once a warrior wounded in battle, Peo-peo-tah-lik, writes to the Commissioner:

I long ago quit the war-path and settled down to a peaceful life. I quit attending the long tent dances, which are a bad thing for my people. I still enjoy short celebrations lasting only a few days and at times when they do not interfere with the work of the farm, but I am opposed to frequent celebrations and dances and I advise my people not to indulge in them.

There seems to be nothing in any of the suggestions which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has made concerning Indian dances that any intelligently sympathetic friend of the Indians can object to. All may not agree with the application which any superintendent might make of some of these recommendations or which the Commissioner himself might make under certain circumstances; but all ought to support his purpose of providing for the preservation of these ceremonial dances at the same time with the progressive elimination of their abuses. And missionaries engaged in work among the Indians will be wise if they learn from the history of Christianity and, instead of attempting to do away with these ceremonial dances, will help the Indians to invest them with a meaning of a larger, truer faith.

## POLICING PANAMA

STAFF CORRESPONDENCE BY WILLIAM C. GREGG

**T**HE people of the United States find their Panama Canal doing a good business. A good deal of loose talk is going around about it being necessary to build another; it may be fifty years from now, but just at present we should give attention to protecting the one we have.

The big addition to the Panama Canal business is domestic; *i. e.*, between ourselves—we East dealing with us West.

Hoping no foreigner is listening, we would like to say that we did a fine piece of work when we dug that Canal—at a cost of around \$400,000,000. We couldn't do it again to-day for double the price.

We are sorry it is so far away from us. If the Canal ran from Texas to California, it would need very little protection, except from Mr. Bryan's Minute Men; but being where it is, and so very

valuable and costly a piece of property, and now so necessary to our domestic commerce, it must be intelligently protected.

So far we have done pretty well, having forts and barracks and equipment that nearly fill the requirements, and, so far, the protection cost has been about \$35,000,000. That is less than the cost of one battleship. The defense forts were built before the World War. Every man understands that an automobile or moving-picture machine designed and built before the war is not of much use to-day. We must not be irritable when we find that the Crozier disappearing gun—that last word in coast defense fifteen years ago—must be sold to the second-hand dealer and a new machine installed if we are to keep up with the times.

One of the hardest things for human

beings to do is to buy when a thing is cheap; I don't care what it is—real estate, cotton, sugar, or Liberty Bonds; we wait until prices are going up—way up—then we buy near the top.

So in Army and Navy protection the cheap time is when there is no excitement about it; when we can consider things carefully, buy deliberately, and install partly with our forces which have little to do.

To-day the Panama Canal is protected by 14-inch disappearing guns which have a very low elevation and, consequently, a short range. An enemy ship approaching the Canal Zone from the Pacific side with a 16-inch gun can anchor outside the range of our 14-inch guns and batter the Miraflores Locks to pieces at leisure. Yes, I know there is no enemy "who would dare," and besides, "We have a fleet of bombing

planes that would take care of Mr. Ship." The real answer is, Now is the cheap time to make improvement.

We have the right to acquire from the Panama Republic the island of Taboga, or enough of it to further protect the Pacific Canal entrance. It is eight miles out in the ocean, and about one thousand feet high. A few 16-inch guns placed on its top or sides is a much better answer to all questions, especially as we have the guns in the States, "left overs" from the World War. (By the way, we made 'em too late to be of any use in France, and at a cost that makes you and me ashamed; now will we refuse to install them at Panama until another tragedy makes the delay and expense another crime?) We shall have to place some on the Atlantic side also.

We understand that the cost of a proper revision of our big-gun defense

of the Canal Zone, with an increase in the permanent quarters of men and officers, and including bringing up the total infantry force to around four thousand men, will cost six or seven million dollars. Some of our soldiers are occupying the barracks erected for the Canal builders in 1908. They were not intended to be permanent, and the ants have proved that they were not. Only concrete buildings are advisable for permanent quarters in a climate where ants, cockroaches, centipedes, mosquitoes, and steaming humidity are among our enemies. We only have half the infantry on the Zone that we should have—we are awaiting Uncle Sam's appropriation. You say a thousand men is more than enough. Exactly so—at present. But, since it will require more later, why not build the houses now, so that when our men do go, they will have

decent barracks, and not makeshift shacks, to live in?

The airplane protection to the Canal is not yet adequate. They have one squadron (eighteen machines), but we should have two more. We have flying fields at each end, but they are not large enough. And, like the Army, we need more permanent buildings for the aviation force to live in.

Those of us who are proud of the building of the Canal, those of us who are interested in the business use of the Canal—yes, and those of us who are looking wistfully to the time when wars may cease—must all join in asking Congress to police Panama against marauders, great or small, until the world skies are clearer, the motives of men are purer, and we feel safe in building our own private homes without locks or bars.

## UG AND N'BIMBI TEACH CIVICS

BY CHARLES K. TAYLOR

"PERSONAL liberty" is the last, final dugout into which a variety of folk take safe refuge when society in any of its representative forms blocks their unrestricted following of desires, emotions, or wishes.

Says society: "You may not publish immoral literature, or show salacious films, or sell habit-forming dangerous drugs, or drink intoxicating drinks," and so on, and up goes the cry, "Our personal liberty is being interfered with!" And so much do we cherish personal liberty that, once safe in that refuge, almost anything can be done with little interference.

After all, what really is personal liberty? And how can it be taught? This may be answered most clearly in describing a lesson or two given as part of a course in "citizenship" in a certain experimental New Jersey school to a class of boys averaging twelve years. The lesson was given by means of the "Socratic" method—the boys, by questioning, being induced to develop ideas and reasons themselves; which is infinitely more effective than any amount of lecturing on this or any other kind of subject. This particular lesson really extended over two periods, a day apart; but for the sake of clarity we will condense the performance, and, by putting question and answer in the form of a drama, bring out, not only the method, but, which is more important, the concept of personal liberty finally evolved.

*Teacher.* Suppose there were a very low-grade savage, thousands of years ago, living in a cave with his family, with no other families anywhere near. Suppose that he and his family kept carefully and suspiciously away from other humans, and that all the other cave men did likewise. Suppose, then,

that our cave man had no chief over him, and hence had no human laws to obey. How much liberty would he have?

*A Boy.* That man would have all the liberty in the world.

*Second Boy.* Sure—he could do anything he wanted.

*Teacher.* What would this cave man and his family do for food?

*A Boy.* Well, he would hunt for game and get meat, and maybe find some fruit and nuts.

*Second Boy.* Yes, and grow grain.

*Third Boy.* Get out! What would he live or while he was digging up the ground and plantin' and waitin' for the grain to grow?

*Fourth Boy.* Yes, and how would he keep animals from eating his grain? He couldn't make fences. He never would have time.

So the class came swiftly to the conclusion that they would live mostly on meats and on such fruit and nuts as might be found.

*Teacher.* How would they get this meat?

*A Boy.* The man would hunt for it.

*Teacher.* What kinds of weapons would he have?

*A Boy.* He would have bow and arrows.

*Second Boy.* And spears, and slings; and he would make traps.

*Teacher.* How would he make his arrows and spears?

*A Boy.* With flint or quartz heads—I have some Indian arrow-heads like that.

*Teacher.* Do you suppose he found these arrow-heads and spear-heads easy to make? And how about the shafts? He wouldn't have a knife, you know—a steel knife such as you have.

*A Boy.* Guess he'd have a hard time. He would have to chip the arrow-heads

and spear-heads, and then grind them against stone to sharpen them.

*Teacher.* Do you think such weapons would be very good? Were they likely to be very deadly? Would it be easy to get near enough to game to use such arrows and spears?

*A Boy.* He'd have to do a lot of sneakin' and stalkin' to get his animals. It's hard to get a rabbit with a gun, and I guess it's hard enough to get a deer with a gun. He must have had a lot of bad luck and misses with his stone-head arrows!

*Teacher.* Do you think that hunting would take up much of his time?

*Chorus.* Gee, yes! He'd have to put in a lot of time hunting!

*Teacher.* But what about making his weapons? Wouldn't that take a lot of time, too?

The general conclusion was that the unfortunate "Ug," as they called the cave man, would have to spend about all his waking hours either hunting or making weapons.

*Teacher.* But suppose he would decide to take several days off and do something else—travel around, for instance, or try to make pottery, or just loaf around and rest. What would happen?

*A Boy.* Why, he'd about starve to death, and his family would starve too.

*Teacher.* But couldn't he do something else besides hunt or make weapons if he wanted to?

*Boys.* No. They'd all starve to death.

*Teacher.* Then how much personal liberty would Ug have?

And the prompt conclusion was that he wouldn't have any at all! It surprised the boys, too, to reach the conclusion that without the co-operation of other humans a man would have no real liberty whatever, and that, though he