



Through A Monocle



THE MEASURE OF ELBERT HUBBARD.

I WAS looking through a copy of *The Fra* the other day, and I came upon an article—apparently by “Fra Elbertus” himself—in which the Seven Wonders of the World, as they were enumerated by the ancients, were contrasted with “Seven Modern Wonders” which the writer proceeded to name. Now no one could be more typically modern and American—using the word in its geographical sense—than Elbert Hubbard, of “the Roycroft Inn.” He is the “zeitgeist” of this rushing, making, achieving Continent. He admits at the head of his own magazine that it is an “Exponent of the American Philosophy.” Very well, then. Let us look at his “Seven Modern Wonders,” and put them down beside the Seven Ancient Wonders which the poor benighted people of the past permitted to excite their admiration.

~~~~~

I WILL print them in parallel columns:

| Ancient Wonders.                | Modern Wonders.             |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| The Pyramids of Egypt.          | The Telephone.              |
| The Hanging Gardens of Babylon. | The Trolley Car.            |
| The Tomb of Mausolus.           | The Incandescent Lamp.      |
| The Colossus of Rhodes.         | The Steel-Frame Skyscraper. |
| Phidias' Statue of Zeus.        | The Automobile.             |
| The Pharos.                     | The Hoe Rotary Press.       |
| The Temple of Diana.            | The Typewriter.             |

~~~~~

YE gods and little fishes! And you will not have much trouble in guessing which are “the gods” and which the “little fishes.” The hoary ancients worshipped majesty and beauty of achievement; we worship machinery, which will usually help us to do petty things a little faster and more frequently. Think of comparing the Egyptian Pyramids with the telephone! Comparing mighty tombs, erected to defy the hand of time, with a device for enabling people to ring us up in the midst of contemplation to make a “bridge” engagement. Glancing your eye down the two lists, you will reach the climax when you find the statue of marble, ivory and gold, raised to Zeus in the Temple at Olympia by the great Phidias, contrasted with the automobile. The Phidian statue was—presumably—the last word in art in an age, the very wreckage of whose sculpture we gather up as veritable “precious stones” and preserve in the places of honour in our temples of art. The Venus of Milo, the Apollo of the Vatican, the Venuses of the Capitoline and the Tribuna, were not thought worthy of mention in this list which bears the Zeus of Olympia. But they are all eclipsed—in the mind of “Fra Elbertus”—by a motor car.

~~~~~

THE only useful production in the ancient list is the Pharos, which was a light-house; and I may say that, in the more authoritative lists, the Pharos does not appear. It is replaced by the Palace of Cyrus, King of Persia. But utility is apparently a note which did not excite the wonder of the ancient world. On the other hand, utility is the one test which this American wonder-seeker seems to use. The Steel-Frame Skyscraper could hardly get into the list on its beauty or even its majesty; for it is surely one of the ugliest productions of the builder's skill with which man has yet encumbered the earth and defaced the heavens. Take a look at any picture of New York as a whole, and see how these giant packing-cases, full of steaming, rushing, grabbing human beings, fill the city and mutilate the sky-line. Compare this with a picture—say—of the Law Courts in London, the “Palais de Justice” at Brussels, the Louvre in Paris, almost any building on the great circle of Ring-Strasse in Vienna, and you will see the difference between utility and beauty. Still the Brussels building serves as a court house; the Louvre has Government offices in it; and the City Hall of Vienna is probably as well-ordered inside as it is lovely outside.

~~~~~

I WANT to put the case squarely on the basis of human happiness. Does man get more happiness out of the telephone than he would from the possibility of contemplating such structures as the Pyramids of Ghizeh? Can he be said to get happiness out of a tool like the telephone at all? He

gets more work done; but what is he to do with his leisure? What can he do better than let the majesty of such structures impress the soul of him? So, in a sense, all that the telephone does is to enable him to spend more time looking at the Pyramids. But the trouble is that, in an age and amongst a people in which the telephone is glorified above the Pyramids, the man does not spend his leisure that way. He does not use the speed in achievement given him by his telephone to get leisure at all, but to get more work. And he gets more work in order to get more money; and then he is hard put to it to find means of dissipating his money. Having sold his soul for it, he must let people know that

he has it in some way; and we have in consequence the amazing and disgusting competition in display—in ostentatious waste—in boastful extravagance—in which so many of us indulge.

~~~~~

THE greatest good possible to a people is to have the proper ideals. The greatest evil is to have unworthy ideals. It is what we want to be which shapes our innermost souls. If we as a people honour the makers of the beautiful and fix our wondering eyes upon their achievements, we will be a cultured, refined and beauty-creating people. If we honour the useful rather than the beautiful, that is what we will get. Our young people will develop as creators of the useful—and the ugly. Their eyes will come to tolerate the ugly until they think it the beautiful, or until they decide that beauty does not matter. We shall then have more of the material side of life than we can well use; but we shall still continue to go abroad when the soul-hunger for the beautiful overcomes us. We shall remain a “mining-camp” which successful miners flee to spend their winnings among peoples of higher ideals.

THE MONOCLE MAN.

## Sir Edmund Walker's Views

### On the Immigration Report Made by Arthur Hawkes

“O BVIOUSLY an honest report. He has been fair to conditions that have existed and evidently has a sincere desire to project improved conditions. If I have any fault to find, it would be that the report contains so much in such a small space. There is so much meat in it that to expand it would require several books.”



Sir Edmund Walker.

land, he proved to be a competent journalist. He returned to Canada about the time that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were formed and has been closely in touch with Canadian conditions since then. He has intense sympathy with the settler and also with the Britisher who thinks of emigrating to Canada. And when he goes to England he tells the people how to meet conditions here. He was a good man to make the report.”

REFERRING to immigration, in the light of the facts presented in the report by Mr. Hawkes, Sir Edmund mentioned the fact of the great increase in British emigration to Australia and said:

“Canada needs a better trained and more extensive organization. We need to spend more money in the getting of immigrants. Mr. Hawkes realizes that Canada needs workers of all kinds, not merely workers for the farms. We don't want people for Western Canada only; we need them for the East. We are going to see the ten-acre farm in Eastern Canada; and land is becoming so dear in parts of Western Canada that the problem of locating immigrants there has changed. The result of continued settlement in Canada will be to force intensive farming.”

“Mr. Hawkes' statement of ‘the case for co-ordination’ is sound,” declared Sir Edmund. “It doesn't do to have one province making fun of another, or any province saying that it is the best. Rivalry between the provinces is permissible, but we need a body at Ottawa who, by reasonableness and wise dealing, will make all the efforts for immigration as productive as possible.”

“The Dominion Government should be willing to help voluntary bodies who are furthering the getting of immigrants. If, in the matter of immigration, we had voluntary bodies in Canada, it would be right for the Government to contribute to paying the expenses of their work. That principle is carried out concerning schools, libraries and hospitals, and I don't see why the Federal Government should not be willing to pay a stated sum per head for

immigrants brought out by voluntary bodies, as for instance in connection with the Duke of Sutherland's scheme. Carrying out that principle would help to get full value for all the efforts put forth concerning immigration.”

CONCERNING Mr. Hawkes' proposal to have a central immigration board, Sir Edmund said: “Immigration ought to be managed by a commission on which the provinces should be represented.” He agreed with Mr. Hawkes that it is important to exercise Canadian influence in the schools of the Old Land which are being attended by children who are potentially Canadian citizens.

“We want to get children unspoiled by the streets of London, and we want to train them concerning Canada,” he said.

Sir Edmund would advertise Canada in England in much the same way as large manufacturing concerns advertise their products.

“I favour covering the whole country systematically, district by district, in advertising,” he said, “and I would have those conducting the advertising campaign go back to each district after a certain time.”

“Canada could be made well known in England in two years by sending pictures concerning this country to clergymen, school teachers and squires. And those pictures would be very much appreciated, especially in the dull, little villages.”

### English People and Canada

IN his report on immigration, Mr. Arthur Hawkes says that consideration of the question of obtaining immigrants from the British Islands “must be governed by an inflexible adherence to the principle that only persons acceptable in body, mind and character must be allowed to enter Canada. This,” he continues, “involves frank recognition of the fact that, speaking very broadly and not at all invidiously, the English people have the most to learn and unlearn in the way of adapting themselves to Canadian conditions.”

“The presumed unpopularity of the English in Canada need not have existed, if the English could, by instinct, have acquired essential knowledge about Canada, in England.”

Giving sidelights on the knowledge of British school children concerning Canada, he says that a seventh standard boy was asked these questions and gave the answers as follows:

“You have learned a good deal of geography?” Yes, sir.”

“What do you know about India?” “It's a very hot country, sir.”

“And the Ganges?” “A big river, sir.”

“Anything about it?” “It has many mouths, called a delta.”

“Have you ever heard of the Saskatchewan?”

“A little, sir.”

“Where is it?” “In India, sir.”

“Do you know the difference between British Columbia and New Brunswick?” “Yes, sir.”

“What is it?” “British Columbia is a very large place with a few houses in it, sir. New Brunswick is a place with a lot of houses.”

“And where is New Brunswick?” “Close to London, sir.”