

# The Evening Star

With Sunday Morning Edition.

THEODORE W. NOYES, Editor.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

WEDNESDAY, June 14, 1939

The Evening Star Newspaper Company

Main Office: 11th St. and Pennsylvania Ave.

New York Office: 110 East 42nd St.

Chicago Office: 434 North Michigan Ave.

Delivered by Carrier—City and Suburban

Regular Edition

Morning and Sunday: 60c per mo. or 10c per week

The Evening Star: 45c per mo. or 10c per week

The Sunday Star: 50c per copy

Night Final Edition

Morning and Sunday: 75c per mo. or 15c per week

Night Final Star: 60c per mo. or 10c per week

Collection made at the end of each month or each week. Orders may be sent by mail or telephone National 5000

Rate by Mail—Payable in Advance

Maryland and Virginia

Daily and Sunday: 1 yr. \$10.00; 1 mo. 85c

Daily only: 1 yr. \$8.00; 1 mo. 60c

Sunday only: 1 yr. \$4.00; 1 mo. 40c

All Other States and Canada

Daily and Sunday: 1 yr. \$12.00; 1 mo. \$1.00

Daily only: 1 yr. \$9.00; 1 mo. 75c

Sunday only: 1 yr. \$5.00; 1 mo. 50c

Entered as second class matter post office.

Washington, D. C.

Member of the Associated Press

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches

received by it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news published herein.

All rights of publication of special dispatches herein also are reserved.

## Who Pays It

From the Congressional Record—Mr. Rayburn—I may say to the gentleman that I am one member of the House who will not vote for any tax bill for the District of Columbia that has any ambiguity in it with reference to the question whether or not I may have to pay an additional income tax in the District of Columbia or whether my clerks will have to pay an additional income tax in the District of Columbia when they are citizens of the State of Texas. (Applause.)

This ambiguity, in so far as it might affect the distinguished Majority Leader of the House of Representatives and its clerical employees, was removed through an amendment which exempts the salaries of members of Congress and their employees.

It is not wholly removed in so far as it affects the salary of, say, the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Mr. Jesse Jones, who, though neither a member of Congress nor a Congressman's clerk, is still a sound citizen of the great State of Texas.

Texas has no income tax. Would a citizen of Texas, earning his living in the District, be taxed? Questioned closely on this point during debate on the District income tax bill, Representative Dirksen of Illinois said he could "find precedents and good argument on both sides of the question." But the bill is rather explicit. It says that no credit will be allowed against the District tax on an income which is exempt from taxation in a State or Territory. Mr. Jones' salary, and the salaries of his fellow Texans earned in the District, exempt from income tax by Texas, would therefore be taxable by the District under the bill. These Texans may wish to discuss the question in more detail with their tax-exempt Congressmen.

As for the citizens of the thirty-two States which have an income tax, including Maryland and Virginia, the House bill taxes their salaries earned in the District of Columbia—if they are not members of Congress or Congressional secretaries—but credits them with State income taxes paid. If they are Federal employees, however, and their States have not yet enacted laws to tax their hitherto tax-exempt salaries, they will pay the tax to the District of Columbia without State tax credits. When the District begins taxing salaries of Federal employees, the States will not be far behind.

For thousands of non-residents who earn their living in the District, the bill means a form of triple taxation. The Federal Government takes its full share; the States come next and the District collects what is left. In some cases, the District's share will be substantial. In others, the District will get nothing after credits for State taxes are allowed.

For District residents, the bill carries its own grave threat, with rates that can be hiked at the whim or caprice of Congress. It would be difficult to find a parallel for the bald selfishness shown in the vote to exempt Congressional salaries. The money is not as important as the attitude of legislators who, holding the exclusive power of government over a community of voiceless Americans, effectively claim for themselves complete immunity from the obligations they impose on fellow citizens.

## The American Flag

One hundred and sixty-two years ago today, Congress assembled at Philadelphia adopted a resolution to the effect that: "The Flag of the United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field representing a new constellation." The original design, tradition tells, was worked out by a committee consisting of George Washington, Robert Morris and George Ross. It was executed by Mrs. Betsy Ross, and by August 3, 1777, had received its baptism of fire at Fort Stanwix, New York. There were alterations in the arrangement of its integral parts as recently as 1912, but despite these necessary changes it now commonly is regarded as the oldest ensign in the world.

Yet it also is the symbol of one of the youngest nations of the earth. Its connotations are those of energetic youth. Though more than a century and a half the recognized standard of the Republic, it is no mere fetish of a distant or alien past. Instead, it signifies a constantly expanding democratic civilization. Scenes obey a law of mutability, events occur, parties and causes wax

and wane, issues develop and decline, great leaders come and go. The fact of continuity in American history, however, remains a living force; and the flag typifies the bond which links generation to generation, citizen to citizen, in a deathless unity.

It therefore is neither antiquity nor a far tomorrow that men and women, boys and girls salute today. Rather, it is a principle of harmony and fellowship, a magnetic power of cohesion and mutuality which the Star Spangled Banner signifies. No dictator compels the people to respect it. Crowds are not drafted to cheer it borne in parade. Its attraction is natural, and the response a normal reaction of a free society. Public faith and confidence support it uncommanded, uncoerced.

Last evening dark clouds poured torrential rain upon the Federal City. A mighty drama of the skies was played over the pure white dome of the Capitol. But through the storm the flag waved gracefully and proudly, untouched and untouchable in the tempest. Observers, reassured, went their way content and smiling. There was nothing to fear.

## Neutrality Progress

The administration—sponsored Bloom neutrality bill embodying all of the provisions suggested by Secretary of State Hull in his identical messages recently to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees handling neutrality legislation, has taken its first hurdle in full stride. The House Foreign Affairs Committee voted its approval of the measure and Chairman Bloom expects that discussion of it on the House floor will begin within two weeks. There will be strong opposition to the bill on the floor, judging by resistance which developed in the committee. The committee in its final vote divided along party lines, twelve Democrats voting for the bill and eight Republicans voting against it. Incidentally, it will be hard to convince many intelligent persons that this split was a mere coincidence, devoid of partisan considerations. And if ever there was a subject which Congress should consider in the calm atmosphere of politics-free deliberation, this question of American neutrality in a war-threatened world is it.

The sponsors of the Bloom bill make no pretense that they have produced the perfect neutrality instrument. It represents a sincere effort by administration leaders to work out a compromise measure that would stand a reasonably good chance of getting by the formidable isolationist bloc in the Senate. This bloc, led by the able Senator Nye, of munitions inquiry fame, is said to be piling up ammunition for a bitter-end battle against that part of the legislation which contemplates repeal of the existing flat embargo on arms to belligerents. This phase of the fight against the bill will not be drawn along partisan lines, for there are die-hard adherents of the isolationist school on both sides of the political fence. Some opponents will concentrate fire on the proposal that would give the President power to designate combat zones into which American ships and nationals would not be permitted to venture. Behind both drives will be the fear—based on nothing tangible in history—that the President of the United States cannot be trusted to conduct our foreign relations in an international emergency—that Congress, by some magic of clairvoyance not heretofore demonstrated, can fix a rigid neutrality formula that will meet every contingency of the future.

Consider the effect of an inflexible embargo if Germany declared war on England today. We could then ship arms to neither England nor Germany. But Germany, by reason of her seizure of the Czech munitions works, would need no guns or shells from the United States. Only England would suffer by our embargo. There is nothing to recommend a law that in its practical effect favors an aggressor and penalizes the victim, no security for America in a scheme that encourages international lawlessness. The Hull program and the Bloom bill would return the United States to traditional policies of international law, with sensible restrictions on the exercise of rights of neutrals. Our munitions and other goods would be available to all comers—except that belligerents must take title to all purchases before shipment and no American vessels could enter specified war areas. There is immeasurably greater safety for America under such a plan as this, with its additional bans on war financing and other forms of possible involvement, than in retention of the embargo remnant of the 1937 Neutrality Act with which the isolationists seek permanently to straitjacket America's foreign relations.

## The Real Issue

In telling Boston University graduates last night that the New Deal has failed utterly to bring recovery to America, Alf M. Landon undoubtedly sketched what will prove to be the principal issue of the next national political campaign.

Mr. Landon, describing himself as "a small businessman getting smaller every day," insisted that the New Dealers admit their failure when they advance their newest theory "that we are always going to have too much idle money and too many idle men; that we are facing not a temporary condition, but a permanent change in our national economy."

In the opinion of the 1936 Republican presidential candidate, it is the duty of every President of the United

States to harness all the forces of America, to weld all the different groups into one to bring about recovery and to maintain it. But instead of that, he said, the political strategy of the President "has constantly been one of giving us a devil to hate."

The former Kansas Governor was defeated overwhelmingly at the polls in 1936 by President Roosevelt and in New Deal quarters his words now will be discounted. The fact remains, however, that all the figures indicate that Mr. Landon is correct; that millions are still unemployed, that millions are on relief; that relief costs have continued to mount since Mr. Roosevelt's reelection in 1936, and that the New Dealers, from the President down, propose to continue the Government spending policies of the past six years on the theory that the country can spend itself into recovery.

It used to be called "pump priming"—before it failed to stimulate business to real recovery. Now it is called spending for permanent investment. Mr. Landon asked pointedly why there is any reason to believe that such spending will be any more effective in bringing recovery than the "pump priming."

In a time when small businessmen are becoming smaller—and the poor are becoming poorer, along with the rich—it is not unreasonable to ask, as Mr. Landon asks, where the New Deal is leading the country. It is also reasonable to ask why Mr. Roosevelt should be accorded a third term in the White House, as some of his supporters now demand. In the opinion of Mr. Landon, no President, successful or otherwise, should be elected to more than two terms.

Mr. Landon asserted that the safety of the country against domination from a President holding office for more than two terms lies in the hearts and souls of the American people. He said that tradition against a third term has been stronger here than constitutional provisions in some of the republics to the south of us, where constitutional limitations of terms of office have been set aside by dictators. Certainly this has been true up to the present.

## Latest in Destroyers

A new American warship has done some amazing things in preliminary tests in the Atlantic off Fire Island. Latest product of United States naval designers in this streamlined era of speed and efficiency, the U. S. S. Hammann, a three hundred and forty-one foot destroyer costing five and one-half million dollars, displayed the agility of a porpoise when put through a series of trial maneuvers for the benefit of ranking naval officers and selected civilian observers, including Senator Ernest Lundeen, Minnesota, Farmer-Laborite. "Astounding" was Senator Lundeen's word for it, and newspapermen who were given the rare privilege of watching the demonstration used sundry superlatives in describing the ship's performance.

If the press gentlemen are to be believed—and they were on the destroyer when it all happened—the Hammann stepped its powerful turbines up to full speed ahead and the sleek, steel greyhound of the sea leaped through the water at between thirty-nine and forty knots, which means about forty-four miles an hour. That is several knots faster than the top speed expected from the usual destroyer. With the ship racing at maximum speed, the engines were reversed suddenly to full speed astern. The sturdy vessel did not fall apart, as some of the newspapermen feared. The great propeller blades bit furiously into the ocean and brought the fifteen hundred ton craft to a dead stop in less than one minute—fifty-eight seconds, to be exact. The screw continued its reverse motion and in a few seconds the destroyer was doing nearly twenty knots backwards. In another test, the rudder was pulled hard to port and then to starboard as the ship was proceeding at high speed, and the finely balanced vessel responded as gracefully as a speedboat.

To the civilians, all this was a remarkable triumph of fine engineering and of advanced marine research, a demonstration of man's mastery over the sea. To the naval experts it was far more than a stunt. They were appraising the performance from the critical viewpoint of naval strategists. The great value of the destroyer lies in its speed and maneuverability. Its chief mission is to protect the slower battleships from torpedo attacks by submarine or enemy destroyer. To be most effective, it must be faster and more flexible in its movements than its adversary. The Hammann apparently possesses all these necessary qualities. As Senator Lundeen commented, the test proves that American naval designers need bow to none, that their researches, expensive though they may be, are worth the cost. The United States, having committed itself to a policy of large expenditures for naval expansion, should continue these researches with a view to making our Navy so modern and so formidable as to give pause to any potential invader of the Western Hemisphere.

A novelty set of "round the year" towels bears for the February emblem the profile of George Washington. It is not supposed there is any actual law about wiping grimy hands or face on the likeness of the Father of His Country. But a more glaring example of bad taste could scarcely be imagined, let alone found.

Europe is 3,750,000 square miles in area and almost all of it in trouble.

## Discusses Principles Of True Neutrality

### Strict Impartiality Toward Nations at War Held Essential Element

To the Editor of The Star:

Our present neutrality act is the child of an isolationist mother and an interventionist father. At the time of its birth, on May 1, 1937, it showed little of the characteristics of either. At the present time, after nearly two years of growth, the isolationist traits that stand out like freckles on a pale-faced girl are those which would prevent the United States from carrying on any trade in arms with belligerent countries, which would prevent our ships from transporting arms to either belligerent, which would tell our citizens that they are not to travel on belligerent merchant vessels except at their own risk and which would declare that American merchantmen are not to be armed during a period of international or civil strife.

The interventionist moles are even more noticeable than the isolationist freckles. When we examine them, we see that the President has been given the powers to decide whether or not a state of war (or civil war) exists between two or more foreign nations, and to bar at his discretion the submarines or armed merchant vessels of the belligerents from the ports of the United States. Furthermore, in the event of an attack by a foreign power on any American nation the act specifically states that none of these provisions is to be operative.

Following the discretionary powers given him by the act the President has decided that for the time being at least China and Japan are not legally at war. He has made this decision, not because he wishes to remain neutral in the struggle, but because his sympathies are with China. He feels that if he invokes the act, it would work to the detriment of China and to the aid of Japan. For, he argues, Japan alone has the ships which would be necessary to transport whatever goods were purchased here according to the "cash and carry" provisions of the act. In effect, then, the President is aiding China to secure munitions of war in this country and to ship them in American ships across the Pacific. Claiming to be neutral, he has not acted with any degree of impartiality or friendship for both sides.

The concepts of isolation and intervention are poles apart and in fact contradict each other. In international parlance isolation connotes a withdrawal of one nation from the internal affairs and external disputes of other nations. It means maintaining a strict neutrality in any war that may break out between these other nations. Intervention, on the other hand, means interference by one nation in the internal affairs and external quarrels of other nations. It means picking out and opposing the nation which is the aggressor and at the same time helping the "victim" of the aggression. As we have seen above, both of these contradictory characteristics are present in our neutrality law.

With such contradictory traits evident in our neutrality law, it is our purpose in this letter to dig into the background of American international law and to find out what neutrality really is and just what it means.

International law, of which neutrality is a very important chapter, springs from the customs of nations, from treaties, from cases settled in the courts and from the writings of authorities on international affairs. To learn just what neutrality has meant to the United States let us turn to these four sources and see what they have to say about neutrality.

For a discussion of the customs of nations let us turn to Emmerich de Vattel, the French publicist whose work, *The Law of Nations*, has been the veritable bible of the United States Supreme Court since the foundation of this Republic on any question of international law. In his chapter on neutrality Vattel states that "neutral nations are those which take no part in a war, and remain friends of both parties, without favoring either side to the prejudice of the other."

So long as a neutral nation desires to be secure in the enjoyment of its neutrality, it must show itself in all respects strictly impartial toward the belligerents; for if it favors one to the prejudice of the other, it cannot claim to be a neutral nation.

The early spokesmen of the State Department formulated this policy in their writings and speeches. John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State, wrote that "the state of neutrality recognizes the cause of both parties to the contest as just—that is, it avoids all consideration of the merits of the contest." In the negotiation of treaties dealing with neutrality the State Department has held to this traditional American view of neutrality. Up to 1938, thirty-seven treaties dealing with some phase of neutrality had been negotiated by the department. All of these were based upon the fundamental thesis that neutrality means a strict impartiality in the treatment of the belligerents.

American courts have held to Vattel's definition of neutrality from their very inception. In 1781 the Federal Court of Appeals held in the case of the *Resolute* that the idea of a neutral nation "implies two nations at war and a third in friendship with both."

Henry Wheaton is the best known early American authority on international law. His work, *The Elements of International Law*, was the first study of the American interpretation and practice of international law. Concerning neutrality he writes that "the right of every independent state to remain at peace, whilst other states are engaged in war, is an incontestable attribute of sovereignty. It is, however, obviously impossible that neutral nations should be wholly unaffected by the existence of war between those communities with whom they continue to maintain their accustomed relations of friendship and commerce. The rights of neutrality are connected with correspondent duties. Among these duties is that of impartiality between the contending parties. The neutral is the common friend of both parties, and consequently is not at liberty to favor one party to the detriment of the other."

## THIS AND THAT

By Charles E. Tracewell.

"ALEXANDRIA, Va.

"Dear Sir:

"In your column the other evening I noticed a report of unusual bird happenings. I wish to give you this one:

"One afternoon while killing time by feeding pigeons in the shadow of Andrew Jackson across from the White House, I happened to hear the plaintive cheep of a sparrow.

"Looking down close to my feet I noticed two sparrows who had come in between my feet to pick up the small crumbs that fell as I broke up the nuts for the pigeons.

"One had gotten several of the larger pieces caught in his throat.

"He lay with his wings outstretched and fluttering with his beak open.

"The other sparrow looked at him a moment and then proceeded to pick the crumbs out of the other bird's throat.

"I regret to say that I have seen humans who would not do as much for fellow humans in distress.

"And they call nature cruel.

"Sincerely, J. W. C."

The evidence for altruism is not so clear here as in the instance reported several days ago of a starling which rescued a sparrow from drowning.

A guess is that the kind sparrow in the present instance simply was getting something to eat where he could find it.

The fact that the suffering bird lay with its beak open, exposing the crumbs, led the other bird to make a grab for them. Perhaps this was nothing more than instinctive.

Yet to the watcher it must have looked quite heroic. And truly no other person would be in a position to make a final judgement.

As in all such matters, the possibility of understanding and quick action in an emergency might have been present.

Not long ago there was a story which came out of a nearby State to the effect that a Baltimore oriole had rescued a goldfinch from getting run over in the road by grasping it by the wing and pulling it out of danger.

Maybe the oriole was attacking the goldfinch, who knows?

That the larger bird could have understood the danger of the modern open road, and have taken quick steps to pull the smaller bird out of the way is rather open to doubt.

The bird mind, such as it is, doesn't function that way.

If we look for normal explanation of such seeming heroic acts, we must try to understand what a bird understands, and no more.

If the observer fails to do this, he is

in danger of putting too human a construction on bird actions.

If a bird is actually saved, however, what shall we say?

In one case, a bird is saved from drowning.

In a second, a bird is saved from suffocation.

In the third, a bird is saved from getting run over.

Whatever the motive, or lack of motive, these are the facts, the accomplishments, and surely no bird lover would want to detract any. The only question is did the hero do what he did as an intelligent deed, or did he do it merely by chance and for some other reason?

Whatever the explanation, such occurrences always make a great "hit" with human observers.

We know that dogs often make such rescues, with almost human sagacity. They seem to realize fully the situation, and to act instantly with just the right performance.

They we call heroes.

Surely the bird which does the right thing at the right time, and rescues a fellow bird is a bird hero, after all.

No doubt there are many more of these performances than ever find their way into print.

Heroic deeds are performed every day by mother and father birds in attempting to guard their young from marauders.

That sometimes these efforts prove in vain speaks nothing against the heroism of the parents, which do the best they can with the limited means at their disposal.

Young birds are always hungry, and usually express their desire by plaintive chirping sounds which do a great deal to give them away to enemies.

The older birds can do little except fly at the enemy, with great wing beating, and keep up a clamor, in which they are aided by birds of other species in the vicinity which sense the common danger to all birds.

Often this distraction is enough to give the baby a chance to flutter to the concealment of shrubbery or flower border.

Robin young are very large and quite helpless on the ground, although we saw one escape in this manner just the other day.

The cardinals, among the most beautiful of birds, are also among the dumbest, in the sense of lacking intelligence; both the parents and the young seem to lack ordinary good bird sense. This column would like to have the findings of others in regard to this species at this time of year.

## Letters to the Editor

Gives More Information

About "Walling Wall."

To the Editor of The Star:

In the issue of June 5 Mr. Lobingier offers some argument and authority on my former statement as to the "walling wall" of the Jews being a part of the original temple walls.

He quotes a late Jewish encyclopedia, which recites that the lower part of the wall—six courses—is a remnant of Herod's Temple, and that the middle portion—three courses—is Roman, and the upper portion is Saracen.

There is no controversy over the destruction of Solomon's Temple or that of later temples on the same site. Mr. Lobingier emphasizes the fact that Solomon's Temple was "totally destroyed." This cannot mean that the materials of the temple were destroyed, nor can it mean that all the walls were "totally destroyed." In the court of the gentiles in Herod's Temple stood Solomon's Porch, quite a large and substantial open arcade that was so named from the fact that the materials of which it was built were salvaged from Solomon's Temple.

The fact that the encyclopedia quoted states that some 15 upper courses of the "walling place" wall are of more recent work does not militate against the statement that this wall is a part of the original Solomon's Temple wall. One writer says this wall as it appears is 56 feet high; nine of the lower courses of stone

friends who are at war with each other, and to grant or refuse more or less to the one or to the other. If I am neutral, I ought not to be useful to the one, in order that I may hurt the other."

Thus far we have seen what American neutrality meant to those agencies which gave the spirit and form to our foreign policy. Those modern writers who have been unaffected by the League of Nations' theory of sanctions against the aggressor have followed this original policy. In 1897 Chief Justice Fuller in the case of the *Three Friends* remarked that "neutrality, strictly speaking, consists in abstention from any participation in public, private or civil war, and in impartiality of conduct toward both parties." He went on to say "that neutrality was the relationship which exists between the belligerents and the states which take no part in the war."

In 1914 President Charles Stockton of George Washington University, who formerly had been a rear admiral in the United States Navy and who was the outstanding naval authority on international law, wrote that "the status of strict neutrality in war may be described as a complete abstention on the part of neutral states from any participation in the war, coupled with absolute impartiality toward the opposing belligerent states in all other matters."

For ten years after the World War neutrality was dormant. When it became evident that the system of collective security was no guarantee of peace, neutrality returned to its old place in international law and today we find it the topic most discussed and least understood of all the problems of our foreign relations.

In conclusion, then, the American conception of neutrality recognizes that peace, and not war, is the normal condition of mankind and of all nations. By invoking neutrality one nation continues this state of peace with those nations who are making war on one another. In order to continue the state of peace the neutral nation treats both belligerents with exact impartiality and does not pretend to judge the merits of the controversy. W. GERALD DOWNEY.

June 12.

Letters to the Editor must

bear the name and address of

the writer, although the use of

a pseudonym for publication is

permissible. Please be brief!

consist of huge blocks; above these are

15 courses of smaller stone.

Many years ago Edward Robinson discovered the footing or spring of an arch of the bridge of Herod's Temple, resting or braced against the great wall. This arch is 40 feet below the level of the present "walling place" and the wall still extended below the place of the arch.

"Upon these immense stone blocks, lying at that depth upon a rocky foundation, there were discovered Phoenician quarry marks," Robinson says these stones were "beveled," indicating great antiquity; they were laid without mortar and fitted so closely that a knife blade could not be pushed between them. According to a Palestine fund exploration account this wall had been examined 40 feet below Robinson's arch, a total of 80 feet below the present surface of the "walling place." Mr. Geike says that at least 70 feet of rubbish lie heaped over the ground where the masons assembled.

It would seem a high act of folly to assume that this great wall, originally at least 80 feet high, was "totally destroyed." If the wall extended below the place of the Robinson arch at the time the bridge was built, it could not have been destroyed before that time. As the Robinson arch is still intact it is certain proof that it has not since been destroyed. J. W. THOMPSON.

June 10.

Cites Bad Trash and

Parking Condition.

To the Editor of The Star:

John I. Nau has a few lines in The Star on the trash condition as it exists along his part of Kenyon street. If the conditions are as bad as they are along the 1300 block of Kenyon no wonder Nau registers a complaint. . . I have been longing to do the same for several years.

The worst condition we have in this 1300 block comes from parked cars, and parking is permitted from 24 hours to three weeks. Cars get parked and the occupants begin tossing out all sorts of trash . . . paper bags containing garbage . . . waste paper . . . cardboard boxes empty or full of trash . . . one car not so very long ago set out a filled garbage can and a city scavenger had to be called.

Night comes and the "sports" park along the curb . . . they drink "flicker" and toss out the empties.

Next morning along come the children, who pick up an empty and bang it goes on the sidewalk. The little fellows know no better and like to hear the crash of broken glass.

Our alley is not so bad . . . one could spread his breakfast there and eat it . . . if he had bristles on his back and his mouth full of grunts.