

western races at least, the classic pattern of domination and conflict, succeeding one another in almost rhythmic order. In addition to this, it was evident that physical clash between men strikes sparks of high tension of will, of emotion, of heroism, as the clash of minds in debate and argument sharpens wits and heightens intellectual voltage. Conflict was at last prized for itself and gradually became conventionalized into opposing armies on the field of battle, into opposing parties in parliaments, and into lawyers for the prosecution and defense in the courts.

Yet, all over the world at the present moment there is an amazing tendency to experiment with this

new technique and to see what it can do. The masterful foreman in a factory has been replaced by the personnel director; the domineering pedagogue has fled the field in favor of a new type of educator who evokes the ability of his students, as in medicine the doctor thinks it important as never before to win the cooperation of his patient; the judge of the juvenile court neither acquits nor condemns, but uses every available means, including the moral energy of the offender himself, to rectify a given situation. Everywhere men are eager to find a technique fitted to cope with the extraordinary complications of the modern world.

Nevada—A Prostitute State

By Paul Hutchinson

THE Standard dictionary defines the adjective "prostitute" as "1. Openly devoted to lewdness, especially for gain. 2. Surrendered to base or unworthy purposes." Webster's definition is "Openly lewd; devoted to base purposes; infamous; mercenary." Nevada is a prostitute state. Her citizens will, of course, resent such a designation. One finds them, in conversation, rather bristlingly defensive of their state's "good name." But if language has any meaning, the definition fits Nevada as exactly as a definition can be required to fit. The state has devoted itself to base purposes for gain.

It has done so deliberately. Talk with a dozen men of Reno and you will not find one who says that the state has legalized its present "wide open" condition because the people of Nevada desire to indulge themselves in vice. But they will tell you that the new laws have been framed with one purpose—to entice into the state people from outside who want to take a fling. The new laws are, according to the citizens of the state, a lure for tourists. "Dozens of places on the coast live entirely on the tourist trade; why not Reno?" I was asked that question again and again. But how deflect this tourist tide into this barren, sparsely settled state? Legalized vice is the present answer.

Mr. Lippmann's Philosophy

I do not want to be too harsh in judging Nevada. The prostitute is often more victim than despoiler. And there is not wanting high intellectual dispensation for the course which the state has chosen to follow. It was only last spring, for example, that Mr. Walter Lippmann entered the pages of the Forum to explain that vice is merely a catering to the undercover desires of virtue; that it is the business of supplying the disreputable desires of reputable people that produces the underworld, and that the way to wipe out the vice problem is to place the gratification of what are now generally forbidden desires

easily and legally within the reach of all. Mr. Lippmann specifically mentioned drink, gambling and sexual promiscuity as three matters that might be removed from the list of social problems by legalizing them.

Had not Nevada adopted her "wide open" policy before Mr. Lippmann's articles appeared it might be concluded that the state was but putting into effect the precepts of this distinguished political philosopher. At any rate, the Lippmann theory and the Nevada practice walk hand in hand. It is the belief of Nevada that the nation is full of people who, in the secret of their own hearts, are eager to escape from the social regulations of their own communities in order to indulge in forms of relaxation there taboo. And Nevada is out to cash in on this supposed desire of virtue for vice.

The Mayor of Reno

This is really, I suppose, only carrying the personal liberty argument to its logical conclusion. At any rate, that certainly seems to be the conception in the mind of the Hon. E. E. Roberts, the mayor of Reno. Mr. Roberts is a striking looking individual who once represented Nevada in the house of representatives (the state has only one congressman to two senators) and brought back from Washington the distinction of having become father-in-law of Walter Johnson, then the star pitcher and now the manager of the Washington baseball team. As mayor, Mr. Roberts maintains his law office in the Reno city hall, whose windows bear a large sign indicating that divorce pilgrims can find professional guidance within.

A few months ago Mr. Roberts gained national attention when, in a speech made from the pulpit of the First Methodist church in Reno, he was reported to have acknowledged as his wish the coming of a time when there would be in that city "a barrel of whisky on every corner with a tin cup hanging from it." Such a slogan sounded under any circumstances

would be likely to command newspaper report; uttered in a Methodist pulpit it was regarded as verging on the sensational.

When I asked about the "barrel of whisky" speech in Reno several people urged me not to take the mayor too literally. "He's a good deal of a grandstander," they explained. "He will say anything to get the limelight, but it doesn't really mean anything." It is easy to agree with that judgment of the mayor, but I cannot agree as to the lack of significance behind his words. For I find that what Mayor Roberts was discussing before the Methodists was the best way to do away with bootlegging—not an unusual topic in a Methodist gathering. And he was merely applying to the still illicit traffic in liquor the same theory that Nevada has applied to other vices. Put whisky freely within the reach of everybody, urged the mayor, and you will have no more trouble with bootlegging.

Yet I doubt whether Mr. Roberts ever heard of Mr. Lippmann. I wish I had asked him.

A Dissenting Minority

Of course, I do not mean to suggest that every citizen of the state of Nevada is a convert to the "wide open" policy. There is a strong minority in the state which is opposed to the open gambling and prostitution, and would like to see the divorce laws drastically changed. There are ministers in the state, for example, who fought the inauguration of the present policy, and will fight its continuation at every opportunity. There are churches which will throw the influence of their membership against at least the most flagrant of the present abuses. There are educators who are alarmed as to the outlook, and will do all in their power to change things.

But one is still forced to believe that the majority favors the "wide open" state. At least, any majority that can be mustered at the polls. As you circulate about and talk with the people privately, letting them know that you will not betray their confidence, you find a surprising number who question the wisdom of the present policy. However, they themselves admit that the chances of bringing the full force of this opposition into the open are not large. Behind the new laws stand powerful banks and even more powerful political interests. Men are convinced that it would mean social and economic suicide to buck the present order openly. They writhe, many of them, under the reputation which their state is coming to bear. But they writhe in secret.

A certain sort of moralist might, I imagine, advance the theory that Nevada's present condition as a purveyor of legalized vice to the rest of the nation is only a recompense for the political immorality which brought the state into the union in the first place. A territory gained as one result of the bludgeoning of Mexico in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, this huge expanse of almost uninhabited desert was given statehood in 1864 simply in order to provide the stalwart republicans, then girding for the

battle with Lincoln—which fate forced them to fight with Johnson—with two more votes in the senate. If now the state shows little moral sensitivity, may this not be a natural working of its political heritage?

Economic Factors

To this day the state, although sixth in territorial size among the commonwealths, holds less than a hundred thousand inhabitants. Most of these, moreover, live on widely scattered ranches. More than three-fifths of the area of the state is regarded as too worthless to own. It is easy to understand, therefore, how the single city, Reno, with its population of 18,000—plus a suburb, Sparks, of 4,000—can dominate the state. Las Vegas, next in size, with 5,000 inhabitants, may, during the building of the Hoover dam, acquire a new importance. But up to the present, the manipulations at Washington in the 'sixties have succeeded in putting the state largely under the control of Reno.

But this is probably altogether too romantic an interpretation of Nevada's present policy. Rather than a lesson in morals, or political heredity, many observers will find in the state an example of the economic control underlying political action. The state has gone "wide open" because it has lost most of its other means of support. This, as I have already said, is the explanation that Nevadans themselves advance. They point out that their state has had, in recent years, only two sources of income that amounted to much. One of these was raising cattle and the other was mining silver. The state's tax income was especially dependent on the mining. Well, the silver mining industry is practically out of existence today, while cattle raising is in almost as depressed a condition as agriculture. Nevada is already full of ghost towns; to escape becoming a ghost state its citizens will tell you that it has set the traps of its divorce mills and gambling halls to lure money back within its borders.

But all these theories as to *why* Nevada has adopted her present policy are, after all, of minor importance so far as my present purpose is concerned. The bald fact is that this state has suddenly "liberalized" its laws to a degree never before approached by an American commonwealth. Gambling is now a legal occupation; prostitution is licensed; divorce is made available on extremely lax grounds after a residence of only six weeks. It is this state of affairs which has brought Nevada, and especially Reno, so conspicuously into the public eye. The nation wonders whether the facts as to what is going on in this state are as sensational as they have been rumored to be. It is the principal purpose of these articles to give the readers of *The Christian Century* a dependable account of the situation as it actually is.

Visiting Reno

I am reporting in this instance at first-hand. I went to Reno, talked with people there, watched the divorce mill and the gambling halls in operation. I did not pick any particularly hectic time for my visit;

in fact, I went in the middle of July, when things might have been expected to be at their quietest. It was during a period of terrific heat; I am cherishing a headline from a Reno newspaper: "Cooler Weather of 101 Degrees Is Welcomed Today." A good many of the people I would have liked to talk with were, because of the heat and the time of year, out of town. Mr. Jack Dempsey, for example, was not to be found. And there were no such throngs about as I was told had descended on the place when Mr. Dempsey promoted a Fourth of July prizefight there.

But still, the place was running at a pretty good gait. They granted 89 divorces the day I arrived; not a record, but still a pretty fair day's score for two judges. They were using 27 messenger boys at the

Western Union office; I doubt whether there are many other towns of 18,000 people that can equal that. There never seemed to be a time after ten in the morning when there was any parking space on Center street or Virginia street. I hung around one night—or rather, one morning—until half past three, and the gambling "clubs" were still full, with all their games in operation. Take it all in all, it seemed like a fair enough time to size up the situation. In succeeding articles in this series I wish simply to try to tell what I found.

In next week's issue Mr. Hutchinson will discuss Nevada's legalized gambling, as it is to be seen in Reno.

B O O K S

Five Sides of India

COME WITH ME TO INDIA! By Patricia Kendall. Charles Scribner's Sons, \$3.50.

A SURVEY of the history of India from the dim days of the Aryan invasion down to the round tables; a study of the questions at issue between the Indian nationalists and the British imperialists; an evaluation of Indian culture and Hindu religion, both past and present; and a colorful record of personal travels and observations in all parts of India—all these are combined in this important volume. More simply stated, it is a polemical tract in condemnation of everything that India is and has ever done and specifically in criticism of Gandhi and all his works, and in praise of Britain's benevolent guardianship. India's case without the British valor and virtue that are freely employed in her behalf would, one is led to believe, be helpless and hopeless. "Mother India" gave an unflattering portrayal of one aspect of Indian life. Mrs. Kendall thinks no better of the sex mores of India than did Miss Mayo, and she thinks just as badly of many other things.

The story of the successive invaders who have swept through Khyber pass—Greek, Scythian, Afghan, Moslem, Mongol—dispels the illusion of a peaceful, prosperous, highly civilized and united India for a thousand years before the British invasion. There have been unwise and exaggerated claims by Indian nationalists to a glorious history of an idyllic age such as never existed for any extended period in either India or Europe. Mrs. Kendall interrupts her narrative too often to refute statements by Gandhi, or even by Dr. Jabez Sutherland, but she writes sound history in this section. The great Mogul empire did indeed give India two centuries (the 16th and 17th) of comparative peace and great splendor. This is the pre-British India which fancy and propaganda extend to cover millenniums, and its glory was due to a foreign conqueror who set up a dynasty. When that broke up, Afghan invasions began again, to be checked only by the British who have had to keep constant watch on the northwestern frontier, and still do.

It is perfectly certain that Mrs. Kendall is going to be criticized on the ground that she has presented a false and libelous picture of India by omitting all favorable features and exaggerating the unfavorable ones. The impression is

given that infanticide (of girls) is not only common in practice but generally approved by Indian opinion. When Mrs. Kendall visited the Rajputana district, an "envoy" of the maharana expressed regret that the barbarian British have forbidden the self-immolation of widows and was surprised and sympathetic on learning that suttee was not permitted in England either. Without casting the slightest doubt upon the historicity of the reported conversation, one may be permitted to hold the opinion that it tells practically everything about the "envoy" but practically nothing about present-day India.

Mrs. Kendall finds nothing but disinterested service to humanity in Great Britain's activities in India, past or present, and nothing deserving of criticism in the Amritsar incident. There is no use in arguing about that. Sir Michael O'Dwyer's report (here reprinted to the extent of ten pages) did not satisfy England, and it can scarcely convince America.

As a compilation of data all on one side of a two-sided question, this is probably the best pro-British book that has been written on India. Its style is admirable, its descriptions are excellent, its historical materials are valuable and its annotated bibliography will be very useful to those who desire to make a further study of the subject—as all readers of this book ought to do.

MODERN INDIA. Edited by Sir John Cummings. Oxford University Press, \$1.40.

For a calm, clear and wholly dispassionate summary of Indian conditions from the standpoint of experienced and well informed British administrators, this volume is perfect. Every one of the seventeen contributors has been long a resident of India and, with one or two exceptions, a member of the Indian civil or military service for from twenty-five to forty years. Each is an expert in his field. Controversial topics are not avoided and the conclusions are in general pro-British, as would be expected. The salt tax is defended; the "drain" of Indian wealth to Britain is denied; the necessity for the maintenance of the present army under British control for the protection of the northwestern frontier is asserted. Amritsar is not mentioned. Gandhi and the nationalist movement are barely mentioned. Obviously these British officials and ex-officials do not paint a complete picture of the mind of India today. They do not profess to do that, but rather aim to describe underlying conditions. Full