



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ceived with the idea of securing enough revenue to pay the expenses of Government economically administered, and in such a fashion as to assure a reasonable share of prosperity to the country and not duplicate the work, duties, and expense of the two Congressional committees and three other agencies named. It must be apparent, however, that the distinguished and wise gentlemen who are working so hard to attain to such a consummation are walking all around the curbing of the well at the bottom of which the truth is reposing. That well is the Constitution of the United States. Until and unless it is amended, I repeat, no effective tariff commission can be established in the United States, apart from politics. Perhaps not then.

N. B.—If every citizen would carry in his pocket a copy of the Constitution, consult it freely and memorize its important paragraphs, he would be able to confound many men who are wise in appearance, because no one has the disposition to quote article, section and paragraph of that great state paper with which all our laws must square and by which all of our activities must be governed.

GEORGE GILBERT.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

### THE MUSICAL "FUTURISTS"

SIR,—Mr. Gilman's ascription of "ribaldry" to the pseudo-art of the musical fakirs—Ornstein, Stravinsky, *et al.*, in a recent issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, is wholly undeserving, and would be thought very flattering indeed by the perpetrators themselves and their equally guilty accomplices. Can one in very truth, in all these impotent strivings and feeble half-attempts at articulate expression, discern anything of meaning at all? For my part I fail to see in nine-tenths of all this musical rubbish that is put forth to-day and foisted upon us, aught that is worthy of receiving even passing mention or notice by the reviewer of musical events. With an honorable exception here and there, it is all hollow, empty pretense and sham—inconsequential to the last degree and utterly beneath contempt.

Messrs. Ornstein, Stravinsky, etc., to whom Mr. Gilman so scathingly refers, are hardly to be taken as seriously as all that. He is crediting them with really too much marked achievement—positive accomplishment—in charging them, as he does, with desecrating the Temple of Music. Their musical scrawlings are of too infantile an order to do more serious damage and harm to the edifice up to the present time than merely deface its exterior: these are disfiguring marks that there will be no serious difficulty in effacing by a generous application of soap and water.

MORRIS WALDMAN.

NEW YORK CITY.

[Mr. Waldman takes us too seriously. Our remark about the "ribaldries" of Messrs. Ornstein and Stravinsky was "writ sarcastic" (a dangerous practice) and was intended to voice the horror of the aesthetic Bourbons at the proceedings of these musical rebels, rather than to express our own more tolerant and enlightened views. For though the doings of the musical Futurists are far from engendering in us a joy too great to be borne, we should not dream of seriously charging these gentlemen with defacing the august walls of the Temple of Music. It is a vast and hospitable temple, and what seem to one generation to be mere

*gamineries* scrawled upon its walls, may prove to be of precious significance and beauty to a generation yet unborn. Nor are Mr. Ornstein and Mr. Stravinsky lightly to be damned together. They are alike only in their disrespect for aesthetic traditions; in the character of their musical speech they are incomparable.—L. G.]

#### COMPETITORS IN AMERICANISM

SIR,—In a recent REVIEW, Mr. James P. McGee goes out of his way to attack Americans of British birth as a danger to the country because they are slow to become naturalized. So far as I have observed and read, the great danger to the country arises not from those citizens who are most deliberate in transferring their allegiance, but from those who are in such a hurry to get their snouts in the public trough that they rush to be naturalized the day after they land.

Mr. McGee tells us that he has five children who were born in this country. It is quite certain that they are classed and class themselves as Irish-Americans, and this will be so for we don't know how many generations to come. I have seven children and they are just as American as the *Mayflower* descendants. There is the difference between some immigrants and others. I am content to leave the question of their relative danger to be settled by Americans.

I WAS YORKSHIRE.

BOSTON, MASS.

[We disagree with our slightly choleric friend. As to the question of "relative danger" between American residents of foreign birth who are slow in becoming naturalized, and those who are prompt in so doing, we think the latter are decidedly less "dangerous." If you intend to become an American citizen, why delay?—EDITOR.]

#### THE GERMAN THREAT AGAINST EGYPT

SIR,—In a recent issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW you publish an article, "The Problem at Suez," which, I believe, omits to state the fundamental factor among the causes that might impel the Germans to turn their attention toward Egypt. The author, Mr. Charles Johnston, in his concluding paragraph says: "The Teutonic threat against Egypt involves an expedition . . . which, even if ideally successful, would be wholly futile for the real purpose Germany has in view: the breaking of the chain of steel which is throttling her to death." That the Germans would be enabled to break "the chain of steel" by the capture of the Suez Canal may be a possible reason which might induce them to make a second attack, but a far more powerful reason which is likely to enter into their calculations is the psychological effect an invasion of Egypt would have not only upon the natives, whose fickleness is proverbial, but also upon the European nations, which would be profoundly influenced by a successful campaign carried out under German auspices against the Suez Canal. The "chain of steel" might, to be sure, not be severed; but at least the fickle ties of affection for British rule would be stretched to the breaking point.

VERNAM HULL.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.