FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT

When you have finished reading this copy of The Public place a one-cent stamp on this corner and hand the magazine to any postal employe. The Post Office will send it to some soldier or sailor in our forces at the front. No wrapping—no address.

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Railroad Labor Adjustment

By Ordway Tead

Internationalism and Government Ownership

By William English Walling

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

January 11, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Founded, 1898, by LOUIS F. POST *and* ALICE THACHER POST

New York, N. Y., January 11, 1918
Volume XXI Number 1032

Contents

EDITORS:
MRS. JOSEPH FELS
JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER GEORGE P. WEST
STOUGHTON COOLEY SAMUEL DANZIGER
BUSINESS MANAGER: STANLEY BOWMAR

Published Weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.
122 East Thirty-Seventh Street, New York City

Single Copy, Ten Cents Yearly Subscription, $2.00
Canadian, $2.50 Foreign, $3.00

Entered as Second-Class Matter January 11, 1917, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI | **New York, N. Y., January 11, 1918** | **Number 1032**

Editorial

His title to greatness as a national leader has been proved again by Mr. Lloyd George. The defect in the title is that what was done last week should have been done six months ago. Great Britain has at last definitely and authoritatively stated her war aims. One of the curious facts in the political conditions of the last three years is the misconception of leaders as to their responsibilities and functions. The ambition of nearly all has been a quasi-autocracy. The business of a leader of free people is to interpret and formulate what the people want. So when a widespread demand is made that Mr. Lloyd George or President Wilson state war aims, this does not imply any hunger to know what these men as individuals desire to accomplish; it is a demand for them to show their capacity to interpret the national will. And be it remembered that with a free people there is no sacred state to secure obedience through compulsion or a superstition of subservience. The only basis of coordination is *community of purpose.* To have any effective value in serious matters, the purpose must be commended by intelligent judgment and must make its own appeal to the motives that lead to action. People who respond shallowly to so-called " war psychology " may be counted upon to run from any real test. The formulation of war aims is, then, the first and chief function of political leaders, because war aims are the forces with which wars are fought. Any inadequacy in their statement, any failure to interpret correctly, and especially any assumption that the people don't need to know, opens the road to distrust, half-hearted effort, and a sure decay of morale. And the people of Great Britain wanted double assurance that their efforts were not being expended for objects altogether foreign to their wishes. The one thing that could defeat Great Britain in this war would be the belief that the national sacrifice was to be the basis of imperial bargaining.

* * *

But the crucial and critical moment has passed. Three weeks ago the conference of the British labor movement, the most solid and potent factor in the political life of the nation, formulated in categorical terms the war aims of organized labor. This document, in its grasp of the realities, in its vision of the future, in the determination it exhibits that justice and public right shall triumph in the world, takes its place beside Mr. Wilson's message at the opening of the present session. And the fact that Mr. Lloyd George follows this statement with a speech in which he affirms its main provisions, gives the best assurance that there will be no disruption or weakening of effort during the remainder of the war. It is the first time that there has been an unequivocal official statement of British purpose. It is the first time that Britain has declared herself without reserve for a democratic peace. The minor qualifications regarding Alsace-Lorraine and Italian irredentism are unimportant. Alsace-Lorraine is for France not so much a political reality as a deeply inspiring symbol. The independence of the provinces would give complete satisfaction to the French temper.

* * *

The new definition of British aims may be expected to count most usefully in Russia and as a reply to Count Czernin's proposals. Though six months belated and therefore guilty of a most harmful loss of opportunity, the statement comes at the timeliest of moments in the Russian peace negotiations. And it must be said, in reply to Mr. Henderson's somewhat rasping reminder that he warned the government at the time, that

six months ago the labor movement had not arrived at a definitive conception of war purpose, but, with Mr. Henderson, was squabbling within itself and with the government over the right rather than the expediency of attending a socialist conference at Stockholm. No such lead and backing as the statement now has was then possible. The effect on Russia will improbably become apparent in surface events. But it will count in the future—and there is a very big future not only in the Baltic but in central Asia, with which Great Britain as well as Germany is concerned.

* * *

There is an unfortunate tendency here as in Europe to sacrifice clear thinking for peevishness when considering the Russian situation. If Russia is out of the war through material exhaustion, it makes no difference whether an armistice is officially made or not. The Germans have already stripped their eastern front. If there is demoralization, Lenine and Trotzky are its by-products, not its causes. Everyone knows that there is confusion; the evidence of exhaustion is merely assumed. In spite of all the incompetent talk, there is no conclusive reason why Russia should not be on the battlefront next summer. As THE PUBLIC has said before, there is probably nothing in particular to fear from the peace negotiations. The Bolsheviki are playing their highest card, but it would lose if they had to sell Russia for an official peace; an extended armistice and prolonged negotiations will serve their purpose and further their peculiar idea of international activity. The immediate German aim is to keep Russia out of the war while conclusions are tried on the western front. In the conquered regions, a tentative arrangement maintaining the German hold is insisted upon. There are many quicksands in Russian politics. Therefore an armistice suits her purpose also. In the end, under certain circumstances, Germany would prefer to have a friendly neighbor to the east and would grant tolerable terms. Under other circumstances, she must recoup herself at Russia's expense. The key to the negotiations lies in France.

* * *

We have all been dosed with "Mitteleuropa" to such an extent that a small strip of territory in northern France in German occupation has almost escaped attention. That strip, with Belgium, is worth more in an economic and military way to Germany than several Baltic provinces. France as an industrial nation would be eliminated and Germany's power doubled. There is much determined talk in allied countries about "reparation," and not much notice that this slips the cog of evacuation. Prussian logic is simple and should not be difficult to comprehend. It is not within its expectation to be "negotiated" out of France. With relief from pressure on the east, the Germans hope to be able, not to make the much advertised offensive, but to make their present line practically impregnable. They further hope and intend that the Hindenburg line shall be the western boundary of Germany. It would help us Americans to understand this war if we could once grasp the fact that the only way to get the Germans out of France and Belgium is to blast them out. It is the task of the present year, and an undertaking of some magnitude. If we build ships at the rate of the first six months, hindered by the squabbles of "great executives," we can hope to replace a small part of our allies' wastage, and the war will extend to the indefinite future. Those who believe in that wonderful German revolution have sufficient consolation for themselves; it is to be hoped that they keep away from Washington.

* * *

It is a pity that the eastern front must go by default. For one degree of German vulnerability in the west, there are a hundred in the east. And the west would soon succumb if great forces were needed in the east. The Russians are good soldiers, not the argumentative fools they are so often painted. The key to the Russian situation is bread. They need locomotives and cars, they need boots, but they need most of all a large measure of friendly understanding. America could do it if she could only comprehend.

* * *

In delivering his message to the New York legislature Governor Whitman appears to have forgotten the description of a modern statesman's duty, given by him to the Buffalo convention of the American Federation of Labor. He declared it to be the abolition of poverty and the conditions that breed it. It would seem from this to be his own duty as Governor of the State to urge upon the legislature consideration of that

vital problem, and to recommend a hearing of those who have studied the matter, if he has no solution of his own to suggest. But there was no hint of such a question in his message. He urged against hasty and ill-considered legislation, declaring existing laws to be the result of human experience. In the main this is true, but it is also true that some laws remain on the statute books in spite of human experience, and among them are those that create poverty-breeding conditions. Why should not these be altered? In the heart of a civilization where "women faint and little children moan" there is no excuse for delay, especially on the part of a statesman who is not ignorant of his duty.

* * *

Certain sections of Senator Smoot's bill amending the War Revenue act look very much like a bit of camouflage to deceive the public into thinking that excess war profits are to be taxed at the 80 per cent which England takes. He proposes a revision in the rates so that they shall provide a graduated tax of from 10 per cent to 80 per cent. The act as it stands provides a graduated rate from 15 per cent to 60 per cent. Both the percentages of excess and the tax percentages are bracketed, and each tax percentage applies only to the bracket of a specific percentage of excess. Thus, the man who pays 60 per cent does so only on the last narrow bracket, and his actual rate on excess profits as a whole figures out at 31 per cent. England takes 80 per cent flat of every penny of excess profits. By lowering the rate on the first bracket to 10 per cent and increasing it on the last bracket to 80 per cent, Senator Smoot's amendment might increase the aggregate sum paid in taxes by a few concerns whose earnings have shown the most radical increases since 1914. On the greater number it would lower the tax. But, just as specious spokesmen for wealth now insist that we have a 60 per cent tax on excess profits, so, if this amendment were adopted, they would insist that our rate was 80 per cent, or equal to England's. Experience with the present law shows that they would be successful in confusing the minds of many persons.

* * *

At last there is prospect of a hearing on the land question by a Senate Committee. The Committee on Agriculture is said to be planning one in connection with the Curtis bill providing for settlement of returning soldiers upon the land. Since this is a matter specifically dwelt upon by the Secretary of Labor in his recent report, the views of his Department should be heard, and the Committee would do well to embody them in its recommendation to the Senate. There is danger that land legislation may be so drawn as to do more for speculators than for settlers. That can be avoided by withholding from settlers, as Secretary Wilson suggested, absolute tenure rights; otherwise it will be a question of but a few years before the land settled upon will be largely held by a few private landlords and either worked by rackrented tenants or withheld from use.

* * *

Another flood of light is thrown on the patriotism of Mr. E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the Steel Corporation, by his plea before the Commercial Club of Chicago for the importation of oriental labor. Mr. Gary surely knows that this would precipitate another race problem and furnish one more obstacle in the great task of attaining industrial democracy. It is probable that Mr. Gary is not unpatriotic—that he merely sees this country in terms of the men who own and manage industry, and of the relatively small class that enjoy its fruits. From the point of view of these, the importation of a million or so Chinese coolies would be desirable from every point of view. Among other things, they make excellent house servants. The problem is not academic. Because of the Government's handling of the I. W. W. problem, the migratory workers who harvest the wheat and fruit crops of the West and cut its timber are disaffected. There is no need, this year, for them to follow the harvests and subject themselves to the tarring and feathering and other gentle attentions lavished upon them by business men and officials in the Western States. As a result, industries utterly dependent on this army of migratory labor will be in a bad way next summer. California's dried fruits are an important item in feeding the armies. So are the spruce and pine of the Northwest in equipping them.

* * *

Real estate and mortgage investments have fared better than stocks and bonds, and New

York savings banks that have adhered most faithfully to real estate mortgages have passed all the rest in deposits and surplus accumulations. An expert writing in the annual real estate review of the New York *Evening Post* says of a year ago that "we were enjoying excellent renting conditions, which have continued to the present moment." Yet, in an adjoining column Mr. Clarence H. Kelsey, president of the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., writes: "Rents are going up and will go higher. Investors will realize that real estate and real estate mortgages, with all their drawbacks, treat their followers better, in the long run than any other line of investment. . . . Construction, however, should not be resumed for some time. The landlord will have a chance to increase his rents decidedly. Real estate will not go up in price until it pays a better return to the owner, and space will get so scarce that it will command enough to pay the owner a good return on his money. The lenders who have worried about their mortgages can help their own mortgages and their debtors as well by refusing to lend money for new buildings and letting New York stay underbuilt for a few years and give rents a chance to be equalized in price with other things which are not plenty enough to go around." This is not sabotage and disreputable. It is American business as at present conducted.

* * *

Two New York newspapers are distinguishing themselves as reporters of the war. These are the New York *Evening Post* and the New York *Times*. The *Post* is invaluable for its sane and enlightened editorial comment and for its reprinting of resolutions, speeches and documents from liberal and radical organizations and publications in Europe. The *Times*, tory to its finger tips, yet prints the news magnificently. Its Petrograd correspondent cannot understand the Bolsheviki. They infuriate his well-ordered soul as the I. W. W. would infuriate a New York banker. But at the first intimation that Lenine and Trotzky might not be merely German spies, that they might succeed where we had failed in opening the eyes of the German people, the *Times* began to print the cables of Mr. Arthur Ransome from Petrograd to the London *Daily News*, thereby giving us a sympathetic interpretation of the Bolsheviki. Everyone who can afford it will be well repaid for a subscription to these two newspapers. It is to be hoped that the press associations will telegraph the *Times* cablegrams broadcast.

* * *

The doctrine that cheap labor is the most expensive receives its latest demonstration in the Post Office Department. The salaries paid postal employes were comparatively high at the time they were fixed. But increasing cost of living has made them comparatively low. The efforts of employes to better labor conditions in the Department have met with opposition from the Postmaster General, with the results described in the Washington correspondence of Basil M. Manly in the Scripps and other papers. Mr. Manly's investigation leads to the conclusion that the chief cause of the painfully noticeable inefficiency in the mail service is the labor policy of the Postmaster General, which is "causing an unprecedented number of the most efficient employes to leave the service." And he backs this up with figures that prove his contention. It is no longer true, so far as postal employes are concerned, that "few die and none resign." Within the past two years the number of resignations has become great. This is natural. If the Government will not pay as much for efficient service as private employers it must be prepared to lose the best grade of workers. If the Post Office were a competitive business, that policy would be ruinous. Poorly paid labor can seldom hold its own in a fair contest with labor more fairly remunerated.

Class Movements in Politics

The point made by the New York *World* that the National Non-Partisan League composed of northwestern farmers is a class movement may be true. And the prediction that because it is a class movement it will not be able to carry out its program is probably not wide of the mark. But the statement that "the amount of mischief it may do before it shall have run its course invites serious conjecture" is open to an interpretation other than that intended by the *World*. Whatever may be the limitations of the Non-Partisan League it is at least a going concern, and like the Greenback movement, the Populist

party, and the various grange movements it will exercise a political influence that statesmen must take into account.

The nature of the "mischief" that lies in such movements depends much upon the point of view as to what is and what is not mischief. To the eastern capitalist who has investments in the west anything is evil that threatens the security of his investment or interferes with his dividends. To the struggling farmer who has vainly waited for the materialization of the prosperity that protectionists and other self-appointed conservators have promised, the evil lies in some mysterious agency that intercepts the profits that he believes are his due. The Federal Commission on Industrial Relations made it quite clear that the labor and self-denial that fall to the lot of the farmer and his family are out of proportion to the reward. There are well-to-do farmers in the northwestern states, it is true, but they are confined almost entirely to the men who were fortunate in getting land at points where the rise in land values was rapid, and include few who had only their industry and frugality to contribute; for it is the exceptional man who can today rent a farm and pay for it out of his earnings.

It may be true as charged, that the Non-Partisan League is largely dominated by farm owners rather than by farm users, but there appear to be enough of the latter to influence its course; and the two together will in all probability have sufficient power before their interests conflict to secure relief from some of their immediate economic burdens. It is not necessary that such an organization should secure political power in its own name in order to effect its purpose. The Greenback party never obtained control of the National Government, yet it was able to say with some degree of truth in its platform of 1884:

> We forced the remonetization of the silver dollar; prevented the refunding of the public debt into long-time bonds; secured the payment of the bonds, until the "best banking system the world ever saw" for robbing the producer now totters because of its contracting foundation; we have stopped the squandering of our public domain on corporations; we have stopped the wholesale destruction of our greenback currency; and secured a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States establishing forever the right of the people to issue their own money.

Even more may be said of the Populist program; and it is likely to be so of the Prohibition party. May it not be true also of the Non-Partisan League?

This new political movement may do some mischief, as the *World* predicts, but it will also do good; and the amount of good or evil it does will depend largely upon the intelligence of present political leaders in grasping the new situation, and taking advantage of their opportunities. Railing at the members of the Non-Partisan League as though they were enemy aliens to be summarily suppressed will only encourage them by confirming their belief that they are the victims of unjust laws. The Non-Partisan League is not the cause of unrest among northwestern farmers; rather is it the effect of unrest. It is the natural and inevitable effect of legislation that has given over the boundless resources of a continent to the keeping of a few. It is the effect of unrest among labor, among tradesmen and manufacturers, among all industries unsupported by legal privilege. It would be utterly futile to combat the Non-Partisan League, the I. W. W. movement, or the Socialist party by denunciations and appeals to patriotism. Nothing but a redress of grievances can successfully meet them. Class movements though they be, they are a protest against intolerable wrongs; and as those wrongs afflict the poor in all classes and callings, the only way of stopping the continual transfer of voters from the old parties to the new ones is to remove the wrongs. To call upon Democrats and Republicans to unite in the name of America, as the *World* suggests, will avail little. If such a union could be effected it would be only to raise higher the dam and invite the greater disaster when the flood waters do break through. The names "Republican" and "Democrat" have come to mean little to the poor who feel that they are not getting a square deal under present economic conditions, and who are striving in their way to find the cause. Either the present political leaders must master this problem or see themselves swept aside. The grievances are very real, and the stress due to war conditions is sorely taxing the patience of the victims. Enlightened statesmen will not waste time in denouncing the unrest, but will set about removing the cause. It is not a time for name-calling, but for earnest thinking. And the Non-Partisan League of Northwestern farmers is causing political leaders to re-examine their own position.

America's Greatest Need

There is no question that America today holds the leadership of the liberal world, as a result of the statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Wilson is constantly quoted by European liberals and labor bodies to give sanction and authority to their position, and his leadership has been credited with saving the Allied cause from moral bankruptcy by rallying the liberal elements of every Allied nation and giving them preponderant weight in the counsels of their own country. It is this contribution of enlightened political and diplomatic leadership for which Europe is grateful almost as much as for America's material aid. As a consequence, Americans are in danger of living in a fool's paradise with respect to the stage of advance which their country has reached. For, much as we should like to think otherwise, the plain fact as it appears to THE PUBLIC is that the influence of America as standard-bearer for the liberal and democratic forces of the world depends almost entirely on the fortuitous circumstance that Woodrow Wilson is in the White House. That it is fortuitous who can dispute in view of the closeness of the last election and the part played by the Solid South,—the same South that gives us a Burleson and a Gregory? That Mr. Wilson speaks the language of the great mass of the American people is beyond question,—in that fundamental respect his leadership has the firmest and healthiest of roots. What we do question,—what in any frank analysis we must question,—is whether, with Hughes or Roosevelt or Marshall in the White House, our liberal forces are so organized and articulated that they could still function effectually either at home or abroad.

Just now we have the curious situation of President Wilson drawing the chief support that gives vitality to his policies, not from any group within his own country, but from the British Labor movement. American labor has adopted two sets of resolutions, one at a special conference in Washington last Spring, the other at the Buffalo convention in November,—that leave nothing to be desired as to rhetoric. But when we turn to the representatives through whom alone labor in this country can vitalize and execute its policies, we find men whose international creed just now is not far from a demand that all Germans be shot, all Socialists hung, and the Bolsheviki treated with the contempt so richly merited by a body that has departed so far from recognized trade union principles. The demand that labor have a voice in directing the nation's policies apparently means to them primarily that trades union leaders shall sit on boards and committees, the embodiment and visible sign of labor's power and dignity,—not that the common man's impatience with archaic things, his yearning for simple justice, his unconcern with nationalist pomp and ambition, his demand for fundamental economic changes,—shall find continuous and effective expression through them.

While the American labor movement remains silent and passive during all the rapid developments in Russia, Germany and England, what do we find in England? National conference succeeds conference; labor's authorized spokesmen plead Russia's case and Cabinet members not only listen but act; labor's intellectual and political leadership becomes the accepted fact for every liberal force in the land; and the world,—the fermenting world which includes Russia and those 40,000,000 of starving Germans whose patience cannot be endless,—gets from British labor that remarkable statement of war aims, adopted at the special conference in London on Dec. 28, which gave Lloyd George a few days later the opportunity,—and the mandate,—to drive another mighty wedge between the German Government and its people.

That labor's need to speak and act continuously is not so great in this country, with Woodrow Wilson in the White House is true enough. But nothing can be taken for granted. And Mr. Wilson will not always be there. Today his diplomacy could be supplemented and strengthened by the well-timed utterances and pronouncements of a labor movement in full tune with the new forces that are moving the world. American labor could spell out the words that a responsible executive can only hint at; it could add flesh and blood to the skeleton of policies outlined by the Government. It could talk as freely and as warmly and as humanly as the occasion demands to Russia and to the people of Germany. Mr. Wilson conceives it his duty and a national necessity to be the spokesman for all factions and classes of America. His essential international policy needs elaborating for the benefit of Russia and the German proletariat, in language that both in terms and in spirit is beyond Mr. Wilson's con-

ception of what a spokesman for all classes in the nation should use. The history of the war during recent months might have been far different if American labor had performed this function. It is a function that involves no hypocrisy. If the Government's policy by any chance should not square with what has needed to be said, it would devolve on labor to insist that it be made so to square.

It is not too late for the American labor movement to constitute itself a powerful supplement to Mr. Wilson's influence as a spokesman for world democracy. The rank and file should insist on frequent conferences to be held at Washington and attended by the national officers of the individual unions and by delegates from state and city central bodies. It is for American labor to realize that it must emerge politically as the trustee of the hope of the future. It is for its representatives to understand what is afoot behind the scenes in Europe; to read such journals as the *London Nation,* the *London Labor Leader,* the *London Herald,* the *Manchester Guardian,* the *London Daily News,* and by meeting and discussion to come to a new comprehension of the part it is theirs to play.

An Armistice with the Trusts

That the war necessitates a surrender to the trusts on the part of the Government is a reasonable construction of Attorney General Gregory's request that the Supreme Court defer hearing of argument on anti-trust suits pending. If the trusts should be found guilty of violating the law, they would be forced to dissolve. The dissolution would put them to expense requiring additional financing, and this would attract funds that would otherwise be invested in Government bonds. In this way Solicitor-General Davis explains Mr. Gregory's request. It evidently means that the Department of Justice, while convinced that the great trusts are violating the law, feels nevertheless that they must be allowed, temporarily at least, to continue doing so with impunity. At last we have an official confession of the inadequacy of trying to settle the trust question by means of restrictive legislation.

Although war conditions constitute the reason for the Attorney General's request, it does not follow that enforcement of the anti-trust law would be beneficial in times of peace. War makes it harder for the nation to endure the waste that this unreasonable law entails. But the waste is none the less an evil in peace, even though it be one that can be borne.

It is not to be assumed that this breaking down of an unscientific law implies that the trust problem is insolvable. The question would have been settled long ago had Congress begun at the right end. Had it revoked the privileges which give predatory power to aggregations of capital, there would be no cause for concern as to their dissolution. An unprivileged combination must depend for existence solely upon the satisfaction it gives the public, and this must rest on the quality of service. If the Steel Trust were to be deprived of its monopoly of coal and ore beds and of terminals, if its tariff favors were shut off and its other privileges abolished, and if it could still furnish steel products at prices lower than competitors, there would be no public benefit in forcing it to dissolve. The same applies to the other combinations against which the Government wishes to suspend action. Stripped of their privileges, and thus forced to meet competition fairly, they could not monopolize the market, except through merit. That they have such merit is not yet proved.

But Congress chose, and has stubbornly insisted on legislating in a different way. Allowing the trusts to retain their privileges, it has tried to split them by force into small parts, and to compel these different parts to compete with each other against their will. For twenty-eight years this illogical effort has been made, with most disheartening results.

The Unskilled Labor Problem

Developments in the case of the I. W. W., which the Department of Justice is trying to stamp out by the prosecution and imprisonment of 166 of its leaders, have taken a turn that promises to give this case a paramount importance. It looked for a long time as though Mr. Gregory would have his own way in these cases,—that the nation's obsession with the war would permit them to be tried and the defendants committed to prison with a minimum of discussion and with unanimous public approval. THE PUBLIC has pointed out the danger of such a course, but with scant hope that any protest would be more than a voice in the wilderness.

But we underestimated both the numbers and the courage of those enlightened liberals in the United States who know why the I. W. W. exists, who regard it as a phenomenon made inevitable by prevailing economic conditions, and who are determined that the country's real labor problem, —the problem of unskilled immigrant and native migratory labor,—shall not be handed over to the ignorance, stupidity and malice of prosecutors and professional detectives,—aided and abetted by exploiting private interests.

It is now a safe prophecy that before the trials are concluded in Chicago, we shall have had a public exposition and thrashing out of the problems involved in the I. W. W. cases that will have been a liberal education for the American public. Men whose loyalty and devotion to the Goverment are unquestioned,—men of the calibre of Frank P. Walsh, John Graham Brooks, Clarence S. Darrow, Prof. Carleton H. Parker,— have assumed as a public duty their part in seeing that the I. W. W. are not condemned without a hearing,— that the American people, whose love of fair play can be relied upon once the facts are known,—must not be suffered to suppose they have got rid of the unskilled labor problem by sending a few agitators to prison. Exactly what measures these disinterested liberals will take to accomplish this are not yet disclosed. It is enough that their active interest and participation have been enlisted.

The I. W. W. prosecutions can be considered a blessing if they lead to a thorough airing of the conditions under which unskilled or migratory wage earners live and work, of their relations with county, state, city and federal officials, of their treatment by officers of the law and the courts, of the means by which ruthless employing corporations have manipulated public sentiment and controlled local governmental agencies for the persecution and suppression of their spokesmen. Such an airing will disclose vast areas of American industry beyond the influence of the American Federation of Labor. It will disclose the essential solidarity and sympathy existing between the rank and file of trades unionists in the West and the otherwise-neglected migratory or unskilled workers composing the I. W. W., and this in contrast with the bitter opposition to the latter of the national leaders of the trades union movement, their indifference to the problems that brought the I. W. W. into being. It will place on trial, not alone the I. W. W., but the American people, the American scheme of county, city, state and federal government, the American Federation of Labor, the economic régime under which such things can be.

To insist on such a hearing for the I. W. W. does not involve the assumption that the I. W. W. are right and their opponents wrong. This disposing of a social problem by branding one side "right" and the other "wrong" is a piece of fatuity we must leave behind. The defense of the I. W. W. can be left to their lawyers. The duty incumbent upon every one who knows the facts, —as set forth, for instance, by Dr. Parker in his article in the November *Atlantic Monthly* or by Mr. Herbert Quick in his testimony on migratory labor before the Industrial Relations Commission,—is to explain the I. W. W., not defend them. We must adopt the scientist's method, so well used by Dr. Parker, and approach the problem from the point of view of causal sequence. If the American public can have the facts and be persuaded to apply this process of judgment, the gain in the understanding that must precede remedial action will be enormous. Nothing less may result than an entirely new and more adequate orientation of the American labor movement.

Recent developments do not increase confidence that the I. W. W. is to have a square deal. A recent raid on the headquarters in Chicago resulted in the confiscation of a large supply of pamphlets and leaflets and of blank subscription lists that had been prepared solely for use in soliciting funds for the employment of attorneys and the expenses of the defense. And at the time of writing the Department of Justice had taken no action against the corporation officials at Bisbee, Ariz., whose specific violations of federal statutes in connection with the wholesale deportation of striking miners last July were called to the Department's attention by the President's special labor commission.

"Inspiring Prices"

The animus in powerful quarters against Secretaries Baker and Daniels can hardly be exaggerated, and is to be kept in mind during future developments involving attacks on these officials. An anonymous "expert in the trade" reviews at length the copper market of 1917 in

the annual financial review of the New York *Evening Post*. He throws much light on the relations between the big producers and the Secretaries of War and the Navy and the Federal Trade Commission. In March, he recites, Mr. John D. Ryan, managing director of the Amalgamated Copper Company, conceived the idea of supplying the Government's first requirements at the "arbitrary price of 16 2-3 cents, which was the average of the Anaconda sales for the previous ten years. Among the copper producers there was a good deal of demurral about this. . . . Everybody agreed subsequently that this proposal was a mistake, the intentions of the producers being misunderstood by politicians, who took advantage of them, and it would doubtless have been better if the producers had been less alacritous in exhibiting their patriotism." So negotiations were begun with the Government, looking to a price of 27 cents. To quote again: "The negotiations hung fire. Business could be negotiated with the Advisory Council of National Defense, but it could not be consummated. That could be done only by Secretaries Baker and Daniels, and they were swayed by ideas of running a cheap war, saving at the spigot, even if there were loss at the bunghole. Secretary Daniels in particular kept the 16 2-3 cent price for copper in his mind. During June he stated that he was going to leave the price of copper for Government requirements to be based on the average cost of production, allowing a liberal profit to the producers. Not much attention was paid to that dictum, however, the belief being that a price would be reached by agreement, and, through the influence of the men of broader vision in Washington, a price that would be inspiring to the producers to turn out every pound of copper possible in view of the urgent need for maximum supply."

Price, clearly enough, is the source of patriotic inspiration.

Continuing the narrative, this anonymous expert tells how, at this critical juncture, production was greatly curtailed by the breaking out of serious strikes in every copper-producing district in the country except Lake Superior, Santa Rita, Bingham, and Ely. "The net result was the complete suspension of operations in many important mining districts, the very serious crippling of others, and an enormous curtailment in the production of copper. For a while this was not felt, owing to the production of the mines having been in excess of that of the refineries, . . . but by August many of the refiners were obliged to close or operate at a greatly reduced capacity. . . . The loss of an immense production of greatly-needed copper, which cannot be replaced, cannot be dissociated with Washington's bungling policy of price-fixing and the delays, interference and threats that preceded the actual doing of it."

Surely this expert does not wish to intimate that the miners were deliberately provoked to strike in order to curtail production and bring Washington to terms? Yet what other conclusion can be reached? He returns from the strikes to the negotiations at Washington. "In the meanwhile the Federal Trade Commission were examining the producers' books to determine cost of production and advise what price ought to be paid." It made its report in August, "but nothing respecting it was divulged." He continues:

> However, about September 1, the War Industries Board, in behalf of the Allies, entered into a contract for about 77,000,000 pounds of copper at 25 cents, which created a feeling of confidence, stimulated some domestic buying, and advanced the market to 26 cents. There it was when, on September 21, the War Industries Board announced that by agreement with the producers the price for copper for the next four months had been fixed at 23½ cents, net cash, New York, this price to apply to everybody, wages of miners, etc., not to be reduced, and any violation of the agreement to be followed by governmental seizure.
>
> This unexpected bombshell created chaos. The terms of the agreement, quite indefinite except as to the matter of price and wages, ignored the elaborate machinery of the market. Contractual arrangements, the position of importing and trading houses, interest charges, and a multiplicity of conventions were disregarded. It was much as if a crow-bar had been thrown into a delicately synchronizing piece of machinery, and the engineers were told to build a new one overnight.
>
> Just how this unsatisfactory arrangement happened may not yet be told. The concerns that refine copper from crude material that they buy, especially the importers, complained bitterly (and with much justice on their side) that the producers of copper from their own mines had paid no attention to the positions of other interests. The "agreement," however, exhibited evidence of the assent of producers under duress. It is well known, on the other hand, that the War Industries Board did not conform to the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission.
>
> The accountants of that amateurish and humorous body had been as busy as bees for six weeks or so in determining costs of production. The companies were very

open in revealing their books, but these callow youths did not understand the figures they got. How should they be able to settle what experts have been fighting over for years? This much is known, but nobody knows why the War Industries Board should have paid 25c. for the Allies about the beginning of September, why the producers should have been confident of 25c. up to the middle of the month, and why 23½c. resulted. Was there some arbitrary splitting of a difference? The producers had been willing to contract at 25c. in April. Was the reduction of 1½c. worth the delay and disturbance?

The story is concluded with an account of how the copper producers managed somehow to adjust themselves to the 23 2-3 cents price, which still prevails. We have considered it worthy of repetition here because of the light it throws on the patriotism of the men who control our natral resources. The story of Bisbee needs to be kept in mind while considering the attitude of the same men who lynched or deported miners, toward the highest officials of the Government. It raises an interesting question as to whether the Federal Trade Commission is an agent of the American people or a mere advisory body whose decisions can be over-ruled and whose facts on production costs, acquired at heavy public expense, are to be kept from the public and thrown into the waste basket. There is the further fact to consider that the past year has been enormously profitable to the copper companies, whose costs at the new high level do not exceed 10 cents a pound and, in the cases of the largest producers, are about 7½ cents, according to the New York *Times* of Jan. 6.

Bond Issues and Saving

"We are making the strongest effort," says Mr. McAdoo, in a published statement, "to have these Government Bonds purchased for permanent investment by the people at large, to be paid for out of the past or future savings of those who buy them. Purchases thus made not only result in providing funds for the uses of the Government, but they also effect a conservation of labor and material." This plea for bond issues as a means of inducing economy is the nearest any government official has come to answering those economists, farm organizations, and spokesmen for labor who have insisted that bond issues should be kept down to the minimum, and that every cent of excess war profits, every penny of unneeded private income, should be conscripted by the Government through taxation. Mr. Mc Adoo's whole campaign has been a drive on the savings of the "average citizen," with the idea of inducing him to buy bonds, economize, and so release labor and materials for the war. He has been remarkably successful in procuring a wide distribution of the bonds. This has been due not only to the efficiency with which the campaigns were managed and the eagerness of the people to help, but to the cooperation of large employers and of all who, by persuasion or the gentler forms of coercion, could induce others to subscribe. But the test was not as to how many "average citizens" could be persuaded or coerced into buying bonds. It is rather being made now, as to how many of those who bought will retain possession of the Government's I. O. U.'s. And the statement quoted above contains also Mr. Mc Adoo's admission that the scheme is not working to his entire satisfaction. He says: "It has been brought to my attention that numbers of merchants throughout the country are offering to take Liberty Loan bonds of the first and second issues at par, or even in some cases at a premium, in exchange for merchandise. While I have no doubt that these merchants are actuated by patriotic motives, I am sure that they have failed to consider the effect which the accetpance of their offers would have upon the situation. . . . When the bonds are exchanged for merchandise, it defeats the primary object of their sale, it discourages thrift and increases expenditures, thus depriving the Government of labor and material needed for war purposes. In addition to this, such bonds when taken in exchange for merchandise must in most cases be immediately sold in the open market. This naturally tends to depress the market price of the issue and makes it less easy to sell future issues at the same rate."

He might have added, if he were not so warm a partisan of bonds as against taxes, that it also tends to inflate prices enormously by throwing the bonds into currency. This is the inescapable result, and if Mr. Mc Adoo had a more realistic conception of "the people at large" and their needs, he would realize the futility of trying to prevent it. Merchants may quit advertising in response to his appeal, but "the average citizen" with an empty purse, a Liberty bond and a coal

bill to pay will find a way to convert his bond into cash or its equivalent. Wages are high, but the margin between wages and living costs is narrow, and if Mr. Mc Adoo will trace the fortunes of a highly-paid wage-earner's family through the course of a calendar year he will discover that there are not only grocers' bills and rent and shoes and the rest, but also illness and doctor's bills and days or weeks of enforced idleness. The Liberty Bond will come in handy at such times, but it will no longer represent savings. And the rise in prices that it and its kind help to bring will hasten the need for taking it out of the strong box.

Huge bond issues such as Mr. McAdoo recommends will indeed reduce consumption but not by the method he predicts. Wage increases will help those who earn them to cope with rising prices, although already prices have left wages far in the rear. For the great majority of salaried workers there will be no increases. And consumption will fall off. Perhaps such a reduction is necessary. But to inflate prices through bond issues is the worst possible way to bring it about. Prof. Simon N. Patten of Philadelphia has given us a vivid analysis of the process in Germany which Mr. Mc Adoo seems intent on setting in motion here. He writes:

"It has often been remarked how wonderful is the increase of saving in Germany since the war. Issue after issue of bonds has been made in amounts many times as great as the known savings of the German people before the war. But an analysis of the facts will make the explanation easy. With each bond issue has come a rise in prices. The German people were thus forced to reduce their consumption. The high prices, however, made high profits, and these were invested in bonds. The Germans really pay for the war by their reduced expenditure. Their energy is devoted to making war material instead of supplying the ordinary wants of daily life. This is the real cost of the war. The higher prices are the agent of this transformation, but in addition they make a fund which as profits are invested in bonds. War debts are accumulated profits. After the war the German people will find that they paid for the war once by their reduced consumption and that they will have to do it again to liquidate the bonds which bad financial measures have given to a special class. Profits are the only war cost whose payment may be postponed. This process, so plain in the case of all European nations, we are beginning to repeat."

Besides the plea that it will induce saving, the argument most often advanced for financing the war by borrowing instead of conscripting wealth is that it will leave in private hands the surplus funds required for the financing of necessary war industries and extensions. Yet what do we see? Testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee brings out the fact that the Government has advanced $21,000,000, for the construction of a shipbuilding plant at Philadelphia, to the International Shipbuilding Company of New York, and in addition is paying the salaries of superintendents, foremen, and employees, and furnishing also materials and payrolls. The company received a $165,000,000 contract without putting up capital of its own. "They put up the know-how and the organization," explained Admiral Bowles of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Their estimated profits from the building of 120 ships are estimated by the Government at $6,000,000. Now the International Shipbuilding Company is a subsidiary of the American International Corporation, organized two years ago by the Rockefeller National City Bank in cooperation with the Morgan interests to exploit the natural resources and public utilities of South America, Asia, and other countries where the natural wealth has not yet been organized under private ownership and control. It is a corporation that in its brief career has already sought diplomatic pressure from the State Department to procure concessions or contracts in South America. Its promoters are not notoriously poor men. Mr. Rockefeller's fortune passed the billion-dollar mark during the past year. The interests back of it have cleaned up enormous sums since the European war began, and their excess profits for the past three years have been entirely free of taxation. Foreign trade and the control of ocean commerce is one of the company's primary objects. One would have thought that Messrs. Rockefeller, Vanderlip and the rest might have gone out and borrowed that $21,000,000 and by hook or crook managed to meet their Saturday night payroll without government aid. If they cannot do it now, no immunity from taxation of excess profits in the future will permit them to do it. They own the site on which the ship-building plant is operated, and they will manage to retain possession of it after the war unless the Government's archaic prejudice against the use of its powers for other purposes than the further

enrichment of the very rich is weakened in the interim.

What do the American people think about this? Let the Governor of Kansas answer. Writes Governor Capper over his signature:

With from 15 to 20 billion dollars of war appropriations to be spent yearly in this country during the war, nothing is surer than that big business will prosper. But to take only 1,200 million dollars from incomes, and only 1,220 millions from excess profits—a little more than 2 billions as the share of big business in paying for the war—and to demand 17 or 18 billions from the people as their share, is so rank an injustice and so reckless a war policy, that it almost makes profiteering safe and respectable by comparison.

It is demanded of the new Congress not simply that it shall put teeth in profit regulation and enforce it from top to bottom, but that it shall increase the war tax on big incomes, on excess profits, and on inheritance taxes of large fortunes. When the American people catch their step in this war and the casualty lists begin to roll in, woe to the men, or set of men, who stand in the way of winning the war by the best possible methods.

We must begin right. If we adjust the burdens of the war so fairly they will not crush nor heavily oppress anyone, it means we shall shorten the war and lessen the carnage. You cannot make a pint measure hold a gallon. You cannot shift the rightful war taxes of a host of middlemen and the giants of big business on to the backs of the consumer, the wage-earner and the producer—you cannot let the profiteers and the fuel robber and the stomach robber hold the necessities of life and of employment out of their reach—and have a strong, an enduring and a united Nation fit for the greatest war of all time.

But give the people a chance to live and work under supportable conditions, let them be convinced their government means to enforce a square deal in the division of war burdens and they will go through every Hindenburg line until they reach Berlin. Anyone who says the people of Kansas, or of any other state in the Union, are not backing their government every step of the way in this war, is proved a colossal liar by the facts. The common people have given Uncle Sam nine-tenths of his army and to date nine-tenths of the sinews of war. Far too much of the burden rests upon them. Now let the one-tenth, which owns most of the wealth and property of the United States and has supplied the men for one-tenth of the army, hand over its share. And if it won't, make it. Let's all be equally patriotic, each giving according to his means to the war and giving all he can give. That policy will not take from any man more than he is able to give and should give, but it will take that much. It will make the Nation unconquerable. It will save thousands of lives. It will win the war.

If Congress adjourns without heeding this demand, it will pass into history as one of the most venal and short-sighted bodies that ever helped to drive a people into sullen disaffection.

Railroad Labor Adjustment

By Ordway Tead

Existing machinery for the adjustment of railroad labor controversies has virtually broken down. Every new demand of the several organized groups of employees throws the country into a mild panic of uncertainty and disquietude. Few feel qualified to pass upon the merits of these complicated disputes; but many whose patience has been sorely tried are sure that something drastic and forceful should be done to rid the country, once and for all, of the danger of interrupted transportation. The recent demands of the trainmen and conductors have given popular force to this cry for firmness, and the present Congress will in consequence be asked to consider a variety of strike-preventive measures. Advocates of the iron-hand will be at hand to favor the forbidding of strikes, the jailing of strikers and the trial of strike leaders for sedition or restraint of trade. Friends of the Canadian Act, which makes strikes illegal pending compulsory investigation and report upon disputes, will acclaim its applicability to our own situation. And there have already been many to propose that all labor troubles of common carriers be turned over to the already over-burdened Interstate Commerce Commission. Amid this diversity of suggestion there sounds, however, one common note—the note of the imperative. Compulsion in one form or another is held to be essential to the securing of uninterrupted service. The public right and the public interest are invoked, not so much because there is a clear parallel regard for the public duty or responsibility as because a declaration of the paramountcy of the public interest is conceived as rendering further concern for the rights of the several parties at interest unnecessary. But it is this reluctance to visualize those other, if subordinate, rights, and to recognize public responsibility for their protection which is at the bottom

of our confusion and of this insistence upon the necessity for compulsion.

Clearly, some legislation is imperatively needed; but even more essential is some preliminary agreement in the public mind as to the fundamental nature of the industrial enterprise. The labor problem is at bottom a problem of divergent interests and their adjustment; there exists inevitably a conflict between certain interests of employees, managers, investors, shippers and the traveling public. Recognition of this conflict does not imply the wilful fomentation of discontent; it is simply the result of an honestly realistic analysis of our economic life. And it is timely to add in passing that the problems of divergent interests exist independently of questions of ownership. The government ownership of an industry has the effect not of reconciling interests, but only of reducing the number of parties involved in a particular situation.

If, then, there are conflicting interests at work in the operation of industry, and if those several interests are numerically and humanly important, no headway will be made until we give the most frank and legal recognition to those interests and create some sort of common tribunal or meeting-ground where the conflict may at least be defined and the several parties be brought face to face in that orderly and dignified manner which is consonant with the importance of the common task on which they are engaged. Moreover, enough is known of the first principles of sound management to lay it down as well nigh axiomatic that harmonious operation requires compliance with three conditions. First, the field of labor adjustment and personnel management must be recognized as one separate and distinct from the fields of financiering, price-fixing and manufacture or operation. Second, the parties at interest must reach agreement as to certain terms and conditions of their relationship; and third, provision must be made not only for arriving at these terms but for administering and adjudicating concerning them.

Specifically these principles of sound management mean that the problems surrounding labor affairs are of co-equal importance with other managerial problems, and that separate provision must therefore be made for their administration and regulation. Agreements entered into by managing executives and representatives of the employees must be overseen in order to assure that they make proper provisions concerning conditions of employment, the basic terms of employment, the methods of negotiation beginning with the local shop committee and ascending to a national body, the time limit (if any) upon the operation of the agreement, the methods of enforcement, amendment and interpretation of the agreement, and the extent to which the parties agree to abide by the decisions of any arbitrating body they may create or recognize. In other words, what is required for the successful government of an industry is the creation of a body, or bodies, charged with legislative, administrative and judicial powers in industrial relations, and governed by the deliberate recognition of this triple function in the delegation of duties. The legislative body is needed to make and to amend the terms of the agreement, protocol, constitution or contract; the administrative body is needed to inspect and to enforce the operation of the agreement; the judicial is needed to interpret the basic document and to decide upon its application to particular cases.

If these, then, are the considerations which must be met in an attempt to bring into the open all the problems, forces and factors which are involved in managing the personnel difficulties of an industry, we can approach the railroad situation more intelligently and incisively. And we can outline what legislative proposals are necessary, sound and expedient.

Obviously, the first need is for a Railroad Labor Board. To relegate matters of such critical moment as human relations to the consideration of the Interstate Commerce Commision in the fag ends of its time would be a great mistake. The task of a supervisory body in the personnel field demands individual attention. Seven members are needed on full time; and they might well be selected so that two represent employing interests, two represent the workers, two represent the shipping and traveling interests respectively, and one as a member delegated from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Presumably the choice of the President, the members of this Board might perhaps be selected from panels of nominees submitted by the respective parties. And a fairly long term of office and a sufficient salary are necessary to preserve this body's requisite dignity and status.

The second provision of this new labor legislation should relate to the manner of effecting

agreements between the railroads and the representatives of employees. It should require that in every craft or suitable division of work (or regardless of crafts, on every railroad system as a whole) accredited representatives of management and workers should, before a certain date, meet together to draw up an agreement or contract in which some specific provision is made regarding (1) working conditions, (2) basic terms of employment, (3) structure of negotiation procedure on grievances, etc., from shop to national organization, (4) the scope and subject matter of joint dealing, (5) date of expiration of present agreement (unless both sides agree to the protocol arrangement which assumes an indefinitely continued contract), and (6) the extent to which the parties agree to abide by decisions of the arbitrating body created in the act, that is, the Labor Board itself. Explicit in the requiring of these contracts would be the legal provision that this Board would also undertake their enforcement, interpretation and public registration. The Board would, again, while having no veto power over the contracts, be required to supervise and make public criticism of them while they were in the making. And finally, although having no power to enforce its decisions without prior mutual consent of the parties, the Labor Board would be empowered to pass upon and give detailed decisions in cases where decrees of the lower tribunals had proved unacceptable. And, of course, while the first agreements were being drawn the Board would be required to arbitrate differenecs as to their contents, which do not prove susceptible to conciliation. To ensure alacrity of review it should also be provided that in cases where the Board hands down no decision within thirty days after its jurisdiction is reached, the parties may proceed to settle their troubles in any way that is within their power.

Stripped of its complications this requirement will be seen simply to involve compulsory collective contracts for all branches of employment in the common carriers; and the fewer there have to be the better. If, notably, the four brotherhoods prefer to negotiate with the railroads under one working agreement, that will be less cumbersome than if four constitutions have to be framed. The actual division of jurisdiction will, however, have to be worked out empirically. The difficulty of putting such a scheme into operation is heightened by the present lack of organization in certain departments of railroad labor and by the dangers of jurisdictional disputes. But these difficulties have been surmounted in other industries and they can be surmounted here. The values inherent in the requirement are too great to let problems of administration prove insoluble. For seen in its entirety the plan is far-reaching and inclusive in the problems that it faces; and it is fundamentally preventive of acute and violent disturbance in any but the most exceptional circumstances.

These preventive aspects are doubly significant since they go far toward repairing the weaknesses and shortcomings of our present confused methods. The provision for public registration of contracts makes all terms and conditions of employment matters of public knowledge and precise record. This greatly simplifies the task of enforcement. And the insistence upon continual first hand investigation of all labor situations acts not only as a corrective but as a means of fore-arming the public with information about matters which may show incipient signs of causing trouble. The legislation should, of course, make definite provision for an effective method of publicity not only of special reports on impending stoppages but upon such adverse terms and conditions of employment as would be helpfully improved by publicity. The guarantee of definite channels of complaints is a further matter of no small importance, especially to the unorganized or weakly organized groups. And the provision in the law of the land for the creation of a formal and systematic machinery of joint control over matters in the labor realm would go far toward procuring for all railroad workers at a stroke those assurances of fair dealing without which conflict and stoppage cannot be minimized.

But, it will be objected, there is in this plan no explicit enunciation of the primacy of the public interest or of the criminality of stopping work upon public carriers. It is true that no such statement has been made, and so far as the latter assertion is concerned none is warranted or intended. The reasons for the omission are simple. In the first place, in the present state of public opinion and of our legal guarantees no compulsory employment would be tolerated by the workers. And in the second place, by making provision for collective dealing on all controver-

sial questions, by assuring enforcement of agreements and publicity of unsound working arrangements as well as of the merits of every important dispute, the occasion for strikes is very substantially reduced. All parties to a controversy will think twice before allowing themselves to be put too patently in the wrong in the public eye. Corporations and employees alike are, after all, extremely sensitive to effective public opinion and neither are anxious to give their opponents more than one chance to question their judgment or discredit their methods. To be sure, each side will carry its case as far as it believes it can and "get away with it," but considerable shrewdness has always figured in determinations as to the nice point where public disagreement gives way to aggressive and successful public opposition.

For our compulsion and compulsory measures we must rather look in other directions. The public interest can safely become the prior consideration, does indeed only become the prior interest, when the public responsibility for a functionalized organization is accepted. What we must compel is representation of all interests, guarantees of equal bargaining power and the creation and use of instruments of public knowledge and influence over the conduct of subordinate groups. We cannot compel subservience to the terms of a contract. But we can compel the formulation of contracts in which the terms are reached by mutual consent and public oversight.

Our trouble has always been in regarding industrial problems as excrescences on our political life. The converse would be more nearly true. Once the idea gains currency that the work of the common carriers is an integral function of the community to be organized with an eye to its frictionless and continuous operation, we will be at more pains to make the organization fit the function. In the conduct of our railroads adequate account will then be taken of the interests of the several parties, and we will create a constitutional structure in which those interests may be adjusted so far as possible to the common purpose of providing satisfactory and uninterrupted transportation.

Internationalism and Government Ownership

By William English Walling

The only kind of government ownership advocated in a democratic country is democratic government ownership. The other kind of government ownership, known as State Socialism or Bismarckian Socialism, has for many years reached a high state of development in that country to which all democratic civilization is most diametrically opposed—and with which it is now in a life and death struggle. As a result of this war, the world will be dominated either by autocratic culture and the militaristic government ownership of Bismarck and the Kaiser, or it will be dominated by democratic culture and the government ownership of Australia and New Zealand. No democrat and no inhabitant of a democratic country would accept militaristic government ownership at the expense of democracy. If offered a choice, there is not one per cent. of the American people who would not even prefer our present anarchic and individualistic democracy to that system of servitude.

No collectivist, no democrat and no radical has failed to note that the prospects of a democratic government ownership have been improved 100 or perhaps 1,000 per cent. by the present war. In the documentary work on State Socialism, edited by Mr. Laidler and myself, we showed a steady world-wide tendency toward government ownership and related policies in all countries of the world. We showed that the rate of development in this direction was rapidly increasing in every country. But the rate of progress there noted did not indicate that the leading nations of the world would have entered into a period of advanced collectivism or government ownership before a quarter or perhaps half a century. *Now* there are hardly any thinking persons who do not feel that the chances are excellent that all the leading countries of the world will have become collectivist as soon as the readjustment after the war has completed itself, that is within five, ten or fifteen years.

This is why collectivism or government ownership has become the leading question of the

* Paper read before the Conference of the National Public Ownership League (Carl D. Thompson, Secretary, 4131 North Keeler Avenue, Chicago).

day after the question of international relations and permanent peace.

Now why has the war brought us so near to an era of collectivism and government ownership? The first reason is obvious to everybody. The keen competition between the nations in war time has made necessary the organization of every nation so as to bring about the maximum degree of national industrial efficiency, which means the organization and control of all important industries by the nation as a whole, that is by the Government.

But there is a second reason somewhat less familiar and almost as important. Government ownership and collectivist social reform require that vast sums of capital should be absorbed and expended by governments, either in the form of taxes or loans. Up to the beginning of the present war nearly all governments devoted a large share of their incomes from loans and taxes for the purpose of military armament. Here we see the essential and inevitable opposition; *collectivism versus militarism.* If we have a society of democratic nations or a democratic league to enforce peace after the war we shall have complete or partial disarmament. This means that vast sums in loans and taxes formerly going to militarism can then go to collectivism and related social reform policies.

If collectivism is to predominate and take the place of militarism, militarism must be completely overthrown, which means of course that Germany and the other autocratic governments allied with her must receive a 100 per cent. defeat and that peace must be dictated wholly and exclusively by the democratic nations, which can alone be trusted to frame a wholly liberal and democratic peace.

Not only can the vast sums going towards militarism and military preparedness be thereafter devoted to the purposes of collectivism, but the far greater sums drawn from the citizens of each nation for war purposes since the war has set a precedent for similar vast expenditures after the war for other purposes of exceptional national importance. If we expend a billion dollars *a month* for war will it not be possible in democratic countries to get a billion dollars *a year* from the national government for the purpose of subsidizing the nation's public schools—especially in the direction of true industrial education, which would more than pay for itself in the form of increased individual efficiency within ten or fifteen years of the original outlay.

A third and almost equally weighty reason why the victory of democracy in the war will lead towards collectivism is that as the war proceeds the ruling classes of every democratic nation are forced more and more to appeal to the good will of the masses. It is not sufficient to draft the masses as soldiers and industrial workers; it is necesary to have them exert their maximum powers both in the army and in industry.

The whole-hearted support of the masses can be obtained only by very definite promises and installments of radical social and democratic reforms, all working in the direction of democratic collectivism. And one of the chief kinds of reform now being promised and granted in part during the war is a strengthening of political democracy in every direction. This brings us back to collectivism. For the only fear of collectivism on the part of the masses has been their hostility to the militaristic State Socialism of Germany and other autocratic countries. Once a radical political democracy of the Australian and New Zealand type is assured, all popular hostility to government ownership and the program of social reform making for the increased industrial efficiency of the individual will disappear.

We now see that the complete victory of democracy in the present war gives the one great hope, and the only early hope of collectivism.

In autocratic countries the right to strike is a mere phrase. The thoroughly organized and aggressive police and military powers are so overwhelming that even what we know as labor revolts are infrequent when compared with this country. Here, it is true, labor is often beaten in such revolts and State governments take the side of capital, but this is not always the case and there is often a compromise. In Germany, Austria and Turkey labor never goes as far as a revolt knowing the utter hopelessness of any resistance to the existing autocracy.

In the same way the condition of the workers under the governmentally owned industries of such countries is always inferior to the condition of the workers in the same industries in semi-democratic and relatively free countries like the United States and Australia. It is for

this reason that railway employees of America are notoriously opposed to government ownership. Not only would their right to strike be taken away, but their condition would be in every way inferior and they would be under a system of constant espionage and terror if the German form of government ownership were introduced. Nothing could so relieve this popular opposition to collectivism as the disappearance of all autocracies from the face of the earth, and the further democratization of the semi-democratic governments—which is being so greatly accelerated in all the countries at war and will be further accelerated by the complete victory of the relatively democratic or semi-democratic powers.

A leading feature of collectivism is social insurance. The social insurance systems of the relatively democratic countries, Australia, Great Britain and France, are superior to those of the autocratic powers at nearly every point, especially as to the larger amount given by the State and the smaller contributions required from the individual workers. If the autocratic powers began this reform first the reasons for this are very clear. It was desired by means of some small pittance to increase the loyalty of the workers, whose good will was needed for future wars. It was desired in particular to prevent the physical deterioration which threatens the lowest tenth of the population in all industrial countries, in order that this submerged tenth should be able to supply suitable cannon food in war time. This physical deterioration, it must be noted, does not affect the great majority of the industrial workers, who were very much better off in the democratic than in the autocratic countries, in spite of this insurance. And finally this system of insurance, early put in practice by the military olegarchies of Central Europe penalized emigration, as the emigrant would lose all the considerable sums which he had been compelled to pay to the various insurance funds. It will be readily realized that none of these governmental motives would prevail in a democracy, and that, therefore, their insurance systems would be on a widely different and a far more social basis.

The same generalization applies to the municipal social reform in Germany and Austria-Hungary. As Frederic Howe has pointed out: "The ruling class in the city is the business men —the men of large means, the real estate owners and house owners. Just as the junker rules Prussia in his own interest so the business men mold the city to their own interest." Just as the farmer takes care of his cattle and horses so the united and highly organized business interests of Prussia and the German cities, in full and assured possession of the powers of government see that their working and fighting cattle are kept in a certain minimum state of physical health and efficiency—a minimum state far below the average attained, without any compulsion by the relatively free working people of Great Britain, France and America.

And finally in the semi-democratic countries of western Europe and America the most important branch of collectivist reform, namely, the public schools, are infinitely more available to the masses of the people than they are or ever could be in any autocratic country. As we read in Elmer Roberts' work, "Monarchical Socialism in Germany" a work advocating German State Socialism: "While the ministers of education and commerce seek to stimulate the children of those of the lowest levels to become skilled workers [in order that they may produce a larger surplus for the governing class and the government]. The effort is also made *to prevent* too many going into the highly technical fields."

As we read in Frederic Howe's book on Germany: "Elementary, secondary and technical education partakes of the same caste system, the same state control. The individual child is educated for the station in life to which he is born. Schools are classified accordingly. The choice once made is in the majority of instances irrevocable.

"The child is molded by the state, to the State's idea of what is best for the state, and only incidentally what is best for the child. There is uniformity rather than variety, and in consequence that initiative so characteristic of America is almost wholly lacking in the average child.

"Prussia has ironed out personal individuality by the educational system described. And this is a terrible loss, as is any system that fails to awaken and keep alive the spontaneity and resourcefulness of the people.

"Caste rules in education. This is possibly the most serious criticism that can be made

against the educational system of Germany. It affects the universities in which conformity is the open door to advancement. This destroys criticism, it censors the intellectuals, it identifies the entire scientific world with the state, and the state as interpreted by the ruling caste."

This does not tell the whole story of the backward education of Prussia—and it is even more backward in Bavaria and Austria-Hungary. It is only in the German cities, where the burden of taxation is thrown upon the lower middle class by means of a radically undemocratic system of income taxes, that the people's schools are progressing. The Prussian State does its best to hold them back. Not only is individualism ironed out, but a horrible religion of Hohenzollern worship is inculcated in the children, as well as a narrow type of theological instruction—the whole system being under the control of the Ministry of Religion! Moreover the school teachers are drilled into a humble servility by the identical methods employed in the barracks, on the railways, and in all other governmental institutions. And worst of all, in the agricultural sections, the schools are under the direct and indirect influence of the junkers themselves. Cases of schools where one teacher had charge of 200 children have occurred in recent years, and cases where more than 100 children are under one teacher are common! We can see from this that the instruction of the Prussian peasantry is probably inferior to that even of the most backward schools in our own South. Indeed it seems possible, from the democratic standpoint, that the complete absence of instruction which we still find in our Southern mountains is preferable to the perverted, superstitious and militaristic instruction of a considerable portion of the practically enslaved peasantry of Prussia.

The overwhelming defeat of all these military autocracies which now seems certain, will finally destroy any remaining prestige of this kind of collectivism—and by this fact will put an end to the remaining opposition to true collectivism among the masses of the democratic nation. The point of view of the majority of our organized and intelligent working people is that if collectivist reform is what they have in Germany, then we want none of it here. When the German type of social reform is finally discredited, and we turn our eyes toward Australia and New Zealand and other democratic countries which are experimenting in collectivism, the last remaining argument against us will have fallen away.

We see then that the best hope for a rapid progress towards collectivism lies in the overthrow of autocracy. This is why no 50-50 American, no weak-kneed pseudo-internationalist, no half-hearted supporter of this war, and no advocate of an early or German peace can be a genuine collectivist, any more than he can be a genuine democrat, progressive, or radical. Collectivism, like any other element of progressive civilization, depends upon the decisive and unquestioned victory of the democratic nations in the present war, and upon peace terms, built at every point on a foundation of democracy and democratic internationalism.

No organization whose governing body is largely or partly composed of individuals who, at the best may be described as "neutral," who, if loyal at all, or loyal only under compulsion, can hope effectively to advance any democratic or progressive cause, whether that cause is Socialism, democratic collectivism, internationalism, or peace.

RELATED THINGS

A Southern Slav Manifesto

In the *New Europe* of December 13 appear extracts of an interesting document which the Socialist delegates of Croatia and Bosnia to the Stockholm Conference presented to the Petrograd Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, shortly before the Leninist *coup d'etat*. This is especially significant as the authors were sufficiently trusted by the Austro-Hungarian government to be allowed to go to Stockholm. Among other matters these delegates discussed the basis of a league of nations in the following terms:

"The delegation is in favor of an international League of Nations, resting on the following foundations:

(a) Suppression of secret diplomacy.
(b) Democratic control of foreign policy.
(c) Disarmament.
(d) Freedom of the seas.
(e) Obligatory international arbitration,

with obligatory delays for the pronouncement of decisions.

(f) Internationalization or neutralization of world routes of communication (straits, canals, etc.)

(g) Free trade.

(h) The 'Open door' in the colonies.

(i) Regularization of world production.

(j) General democratization of public life.

(h) Political emancipation of women.

"In order that the peace of tomorrow may be a real peace, conceived in accordance with the principles laid down at the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates in Russia—namely, a peace without annexations and contributions, based on the free self-determination of the nations—we claim, in the name of the Southern Slavs (Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes), and in the interest of the proletariat as a whole, as also of world peace, that the Southern Slav nation should also be politically independent—a sovereign State provided with all the attributes which are proper to it, so that it may join the republican confederation of all the other Balkan States, and may, in the future, serve to the best of its powers the cause of universal peace. All this in conformity with the decisions of the first Inter-Balkan Socialist Conference. This we regard as the sole definitive solution of the Balkan problem as a whole."

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending January 8

Congressional Doings

President Wilson appeared before Congress on January 4 to report on the taking over of the railroads. This action, he said, was the assumption of a very great responsibility, but not so great a one as to have failed to take it. Unification of the railroad systems was necessary. The railroad heads were willing to bring this about but "There were some things which the Government can do and private management cannot." Only under Government administration can the systems and their equipment be thrown into common service, can there be unrestricted and unembarrassed common use of all tracks, terminals and terminal facilities and construction and development of new terminals without regard to requirement or limitation of particular roads. While serving the public interest the interest of the railroad property owners would also be guarded.

It is right and necessary, he said, "that the owners and creditors of the railways, the holders of their stocks and bonds should receive from the Government an unqualified guarantee that their properties will be maintained throughout the period of Federal control in as good repair and as complete equipment as at present, and that the several roads will receive under Federal management such compensation as is equitable and just alike to their owners and the general public." He recommended legislation guaranteeing to security holders income equal to the average for three years ending June 30, 1917. It is necessary, he said, that the values of railway securities be protected, since they constitute a vital part of the structure of credit. A bill embodying his recommendations was at once introduced in both Senate and House. It was prepared by the Department of Justice and the Interstate Commerce Commission. [See current volume page 22.]

* *

A bill to amend the war revenue law was introduced on January 5 by Senator Smoot of Utah. It changes the excess profits tax so that it will fall on profits actually made without regard to capitalization. It eliminates the zone system in computing second class postage rates. The changes, Senator Smoot figures, will increase the receipts. A resolution directing the Committee on Commerce to investigate wages in war industries was introduced on January 4 by Senator King of Utah. Excessive wages paid in these industries. Senator King explained, are affecting other industries. The object of the investigation is to find means of "stabilizing remuneration." In the House, on January 4, Representative Jeannette Rankin introduced a joint resolution declaring that the United States "recognizes the right of Ireland to political independence and that we count Ireland among those countries for whose freedom and democracy we are fighting." A bill was introduced by Senator Fletcher of Florida on January 5 empowering the Government to build homes in the vicinity of shipyards for employes, to requisition houses already standing, to control transportation and maintain a barred zone at these places.

* *

The Senate passed on January 7 the Walsh-Pittman Oil and Coal Land Leasing bill. It now goes to the House. It provides for leasing by the Secretary of the Interior of coal, phosphate, oil, gas and sodium lands, Provision is made for payment of royalties to the Government, and lessees may buy the lands under certain conditions.

The Investigations

Food Administrator Herbert Hoover appeared before the Senate Committee on Manufactures on January 2 and 3. He believes that the sugar supply for this year will be 300,000 tons short of the estimated demands and that it may be necessary to limit per capita consumption to three pounds per month, although he does not consider the principle of limiting personal consumption sound. He denied a statement made by Senator Reed that he had made it possible for the American Sugar Refining Company, through E. D. Babst, to buy 50 per cent of the Louisiana sugar output without giving other operators a chance to buy any. [See current volume, page 22.]

Before the Senate Committee on Commerce on January 2, Rear Admiral F. T. Bowles of the construction department of the Emergency Fleet Corporation told of a contract made with the Sloan Shipbuilding Company of Olympia, Washington, on May 18 last. Although the corporation had performed but three per cent of the work contracted for it had been advanced $1,724,000 up to December 1 out of a total due of $7,840,000. Of the amount advanced $400,000 was to enable the company to pay a brokerage commission to the Churchfield Navigation Company for obtaining the contract. Meyer Bloomfield, head of the Shipping Board's industrial service section, said that labor had assumed its share of responsibility and there had been no organized labor attempt to profiteer. But he said that labor shortage in the shipyards had been caused by profiteering housebuilders seeking high rentals for homes in the neighborhood of shipyards.

* *

Shortage of blankets and overcoats at national army camps is the fault of the Quartermaster-General's Department, according to the testimony of Charles Eisenman of the National Defense Council's Supply Committee, before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on January 2. He contradicted the testimony of Quartermaster-General Sharpe who attributed the shortage to failure of contractors to deliver. Mr. Eisenman said some camps had an oversupply while others were short. At Camp Deven, he said, there were 79,000 blankets for 2,100 men. Mr. Eisenman admitted being a stockholder in mills with which contracts for cloth had been placed. Evidence developed that other members of the Council of National Defense were interested or had relatives interested in concerns which had contracts. A brother of Samuel M. Kaplan of the Council is interested in the Base Sorting Company of New York which has a $400,000 contract. A. E. Scott and a Mr. Bailey were members named by Mr. Eisenman as being interested in contracts, but they had resigned when the contracts were let.

* *

Francis J. Heney, counsel for the Federal Trade Commission, produced on January 4 copy of a letter from Hugh J. Robertson, manager of the American Agricultural Chemical Company, to one of his agents, tending to show that that corporation was the chief agent in an alleged combination of meat interests to force independent concerns out of business. On the same day Ira A. Lindville, assistant treasurer of the D. B. Martin Company, of Philadelphia, an independent packing concern, testified that it was practically impossible for his company to ship dressed beef to New England points unless cars owned by the Swift Company were used. Mr. Heney announced that he would not allow Mr. Robertson to testify before the Commission, because even when such witnesses waive immunity the Courts have allowed them to escape indictment. In a public statement on January 6, J. Ogden Armour, of the Armour Packing Corporation, denounced Mr. Heney, saying that the packers are helping the Government to carry on the war, and that to foment public discontent concerning them injures their efficiency.

Anti-Trust Prosecutions Halted

Suspension of the hearing of all important anti-trust cases was asked of the Supreme Court on January 2 by Attorney General Gregory. The cases affected are against the International Harvester Company, the Eastman Kodak Co., American Can Co., Quaker Oats Co., Corn Products Refining Co., United States Steel Corporation, and the United Shoe Machinery Co. The reasons for the request are stated as follows:

> In order that the Government in this time of stress may not meet with competition from private enterprises in its financial operations and the flotation of its loans, the Treasury Department has been constrained to urge that all private financing on a large scale shall be avoided so far as at all possible. Thus, in his annual report on the finances for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the Secretary of the Treasury makes the following observations:
>
> The Government must, if necessary, absorb the supply of the new capital available for investment in the United States during the period of the war. This, in turn, makes it essential that unnecessary capital expenditures should be avoided in public and private enterprises.
>
> It is quite clear that the dissolutions which are sought in the pending cases will require financial operations on a large scale if they are to be genuine and effective. Important as the remedy sought in these cases is believed to be, it must give place for the moment to the paramount needs of the hour.

European War

Weather conditions have slackened activities on the western front, particularly in Flanders. Artillery duels continue near Ypres, and in the Cambrai and Verdun sections, with minor infantry engagements. On the Italian front the Austro-German advance appears to have been definitely stopped. The British and French as well as the Italian forces have made advances and taken numerous prisoners on the Piave River front. The increased activity on this front is taken as a forerunner of an effort to strike a decisive blow while the enemy is handicapped by snow in the mountain passes. [See current volume, page 23.]

* *

The peace terms submitted by the German delegates at Brest-Litovsk have been rejected by the Russians because of the refusal of Germany to withdraw her troops from Russian and Polish territory, and because of the evident intention on the part of Germany to annex this territory. Russian Foreign Minister Leon Trotsky declared that the Germans had nullified their own proposal. He suggested that the negotiations be transferred to Stockholm. The Germans object to Stockholm, and are reported to have proposed Berne, Switzerland. Conferences of German officials with leaders of the Reichstag indicate the serious view taken of the interrupted peace negotiations. The Pan-Ger-

man press exults in the failure, and declares such generous terms should never have been offered, while the radical press condemns the delegates as blunderers, and calls for their dismissal. The Socialist leaders are demanding that the Government stand upon the declaration of the Reichstag for peace without annexations or indemnities. They denounce the German reply to the Russian delegates as a denial of the position taken by the Reichstag.

* *

Premier Lloyd George outlined Great Britain's war aims on the 5th in an address to the Trades Unions of the United Kingdom. The Premier said Great Britain was fighting for a lasting peace, which required three things: First, the sanctity of treaties re-established; second, territorial settlements based on the right of self-determination or the consent of the governed; third, creation of an international organization to limit armaments and diminish the probability of war. He declared Britain was not fighting to destroy the German constitution, nor to destroy her great position in the world, but to turn her aside from schemes of military domination. To this end there must be complete restoration of Belgium, political, territorial, and economic, with such reparation as can be made. Restoration of Serbia, Montenegro, and the occupied parts of France, Italy and Roumania. Alsace-Lorraine must be restored to France to correct the wrong done to her in 1871. Subject nationalities in Austria-Hungary must be recognized. Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine must have separate national existence. Poland, including all genuinely Polish elements must be independent. The inhabitants of African colonies must be placed under an administration acceptable to themselves. The disposal of all the German colonies must be by a conference. British and French opinion is almost unanimous in support of the Premier's position, which is spoken of as a complete indorsement of the position taken by President Wilson.

* *

The toll of British merchant ships lost by mine and submarine during the week was eighteen vessels over 1,600 tons and three vessels under that tonnage. The arrivals at British ports were 2,111, and the departures were 2,074. Weather conditions are given as a reason for the high toll. Nine French ships were lost by mine or submarine. Naval men report that more submarines were sunk in December than in any previous month. German activity is ascribed partly to the desire to compel acceptance of the peace offer made by the German Government.

* *

The report of Colonel E. M. House, head of the American delegation to the Paris inter-Allied conference, was given out on January 2. The report shows that the conference succeeded in its purpose of reaching a definite working plan for the prosecution of the war through the cooperation of the governments represented in the various fields of activity that embraces the marshaling of resources and the avoidance of waste. This coordination includes naval forces, the military, diplomatic, financial, shipping, war trade, war industries, and food, on all of which the delegates arrived at a complete understanding.

Russia

The Bolsheviki Government appears to be gaining in strength. The Ukrainians have come to an agreement with the Petrograd Government in which they promise not to aid the Cossacks under General Kaledine, if the Bolsheviki troops are withdrawn from Ukraine territory. No definite news regarding the Cossack rebellion has been received by the press. The Petrograd Government has added the Moscow banks to those of the Capital in their nationalization program. England, France and the United States have asked the Government what disposition is to be made of the foreign property owned by the banks when they have been nationalized. Accompanying the reports that matters are proceeding well are other reports that there is much disorder and lawlessness throughout the country. A meeting of the Constituent Assembly is announced for January 18, if a quorum of 400 is present. Another republic has been formed in the Black Sea territory, with Novorossysk as the capital. Finland's independence has been recognized by France and Germany. Rumors are current that the Allied countries are considering some recognition of the Bolsheviki Government.

Supreme Court Upholds Conscription

The Conscription law was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States on January 7. The Court holds that the articles of the Constitution granting Congress the power to declare war and "to raise and support armies" carried with them authority to conscript. It quotes in support the decisions of the courts of the Confederate States which upheld conscription by the Confederacy during the war between the States on identical grounds, the Confederate constitution containing the same articles as the Federal Constitution. The Court waived aside without argument, merely asserting that they are "without merit," the arguments showing the act to be in violation of the prohibition of involuntary servitude, and also of the prohibition of religious tests or of an established religion, and that it delegates Federal powers to State officials, vests administrative officers with legislative discretion and confers judicial powers upon them. The decision was unanimous. The decision affects the cases of those who failed to register for the draft. It does not apply to appeals from conviction on charges of conspiracy.

NOTES

—Samuel J. Gompers, son of the president of the American Federation of Labor, was appointed chief clerk of the Federal Department of Labor by Secretary Wilson on January 7.

—The number of insurance policies held by American soldiers and sailors on January 4, was 362,941,

representing insurance to the amount of $3,105,776,500, an average of $8,557 a policy.

—Seats on the New York Stock Exchange, which sold for $95,000 in 1906, ranged in price during 1917 from $77,000 down to $45,000. Seventy-two changed hands during the year, the lowest price being for the last one sold.

—The seventh war loan put out by Hungary, which was intended to raise $1,600,000,000, produced only $600,000,000. Most of the subscriptions, it is reported, were forced on the leading banks by the government; only an insignificant portion came from the people.

—Revolutionary movements are hinted at in news from Spain. It is reported that 1,500 officers of the minor grades have been forced to resign or were discharged from the army. Premier Alhucemas announces that the Government has the situation in hand.

—Guatemala City again suffered earthquake shocks on the 3d and 4th that added much to the devastation of the shocks of December 25. Incomplete reports say the cathedral and bridges are down, and that 300 persons have been killed. [See current volume, page 25.]

—Canada in assembling her national army of 100,000 under the conscription law has issued a call for 25,000 men. Because of severe weather in Canada the intention is to send the men to England or France for training.

—The domestic trade of the United States, which amounted to $7,200,000,000 in 1895, rose in 1917 to $64,100,000,000. The increase of 1917 over 1916 was $18,300,000,000. The foreign trade of the United States increased from $1,626,529,483 in 1895 to $9,050,000,000 in 1917.

—Former army officers in Petrograd have organized a union, and are accepting work as baggage handlers and street cleaners. Unemployed educated men, especially lawyers' clerks and former officials, are also organizing a union, and will offer their services as laborers.

—Earl Reading, Lord Chief Justice of England, has been appointed British High Commissioner in the United States. Besides taking over the work of the British Embassy, in Washington, he will have charge of the work of the British War Mission and its establishments in New York and Washington.

—John B. Densmore, of Montana, was appointed National Director of the Employment Service by Secretary of Labor Wilson on January 7. His assistants are to be Robert Watson, of Massachusetts, and Charles T. Clayton, of Maryland. The task of this new board will be to recruit workers for farms and for war plants.

—Speaker Champ Clark, in a letter made public on January 7, to Nathan Straus, vice-chairman of the Palestine Restoration Fund, offered his aid and support to the movement to establish a Jewish state in Palestine, and expressed full sympathy with the aims of Zionism.

—Charles B. Henderson, an Elko, Nevada, banker and attorney was appointed by Governor Boyle on January 4 United States Senator to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Newlands. The appointment is for the interval until the general election in November.

—The potato crop of England and Wales, upon which the food department depends to conserve bread and flour, is turning out better than had been expected. The yield is reported to be 3,339,995 tons, a 38 per cent increase over 1916, and the largest crop recorded since 1885. The yield per acre is given as 6.57 tons, which is three-quarters greater than last year.

—The National Maritime Board of the United Kingdom has adopted, with the approval of the Shipping Controller, the following rates of pay for seamen: Carpenter, $68.13; boatswain, $63.26; boatswain's mate, $58.40; lamp trimmers, $58.40; quartermaster, $58.40; able seamen, $55.96; donkeyman, $63.26; storekeeper, $63.26; leading firemen, $60.83; firemen, $58.40.

—Irrigated lands in the lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas, promise the largest winter truck crop ever known. By moving up the planting season a month it is hoped to escape the freezing weather that comes in February. The cultivated area this year is several thousand acres larger than heretofore. Two crops of corn are harvested from the same land, averaging fifty bushels each.

—The Bureau of War Risk Insurance has issued, since its creation September 2, 1914, to December 31, 1917, insurance of more than $1,000,000,000 on hulls and cargoes of American vessels. The number of policies written was 13,844. The premiums received by the Government exceed the total losses by $12,888,420. A great service is claimed for the Government because its moderate rates compelled similar rates on the part of private companies.

—Food conditions in Germany are reported to be very bad. The Government is combing all occupied territory for every particle of food, and is limiting citizens to smaller rations. Speaking of illicit trading the Brunswick *Volksfreund* says:

> As soon as an order is issued three-fourths of the population seek how they may evade it. They have lost faith in official promises, and the fear of starvation has them in its grip. For ham, eggs, butter and honey senseless prices are being paid, and the rich alone can get them.

—In his address to the Massachusetts Legislature, Governor McCall on January 3 urged preparations to win the war, but added that nevertheless "it would be far better to consider an offer of peace, even fraudulently made, than to refuse to give an honest proposal. If an enemy fairly tells us what he will give, and it is too little, let us tell him what we will accept. Otherwise we may make ourselves responsible for the further drifting of the universe, and for the continual deepening of the night that is settling upon civilization."

—The sentence of death passed by a court martial at Camp Dix, near Wrightstown, N. J., on Rudolph J. Vrena, a drafted soldier, was suspended on order of Brigadier-General J. S. Mallory. Vrena had refused, as an international Socialist, to sign his assignment

card and declaration of a soldier. General Mallory first recommended reconsideration of the verdict, but the members of the court declined. As power to commute sentence rests with the President alone, he issued the order suspending sentence, and at the same time advised Vrena to consider the consequences of adhering to his attitude. So far the prisoner has refused to change his position.

Resignations of postal employes for the six months from July 1 to December 31 of 1917 were 1,559 as against 2020 for the full year preceding and an average of 1,271 a year for the five years before that. Resignations of carriers are at the rate of 1,188 a year as compared with 627 in the highest previous year and an average of 465 a year for the five years including 1912 and 1916. In a statement to the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* President Gilbert Hyatt of the National Federation of Postal Employes charges Postmaster General Burleson with driving competent men from the service, and states that the civil service lists no longer supply enough new men, so that these must be secured from ordinary channels and being untrained, are inefficient and responsible for poor service.

—Statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the eleven months ending November, 1917, as given by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for November, 1917, were:

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	
Merchandise .	$5,638,829,711	$2,724,567,483	$2,914,262,228	Expts.
Gold	367,345,748	535,388,500	168,042,752	Impts.
Silver	74,005,404	47,185,884	26,819,520	Expts.
Total	$6,080,180,863	$3,307,141,867	$2,773,038,996	

The exports of merchandise for November, 1917, were $488,240,626, as compared with $516,167,324 in November, 1916, and $327,670,353 in 1915. The imports for November, 1917, were $220,533,575, as compared with $176,967,749 in November, 1916, and $155,496,675 in 1915. [See current volume, page 25.]

CORRESPONDENCE

From Railways to Coal

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The world is now discovering that modern warfare is an altogether different matter from all wars hitherto known. The President of the United States has pointed out that the concentration of the entire productive power of the nation is required to wage it effectively. The employment of every advance in science and the utilization of every power in the prosecution of war only makes it more true that "War is Hell!" If we must now go through "Hell" to make democracy world-wide it must be that new burdens of weightiest character will be imposed upon our people. As ours is a democratic government a special responsibility is put upon us to rightly meet those burdens. This puts a present obligation upon those who realize how far short of fulfilling democratic ideas our government has been, because such burdens must be offset by gains secured for the people. To be successfully democratic government must rest upon a widespread and intelligent public opinion. The prosecution of a war brings out of necessity the weak points in a government, and it is the duty of those who believe in the gain from the fuller application of fundamental democratic principles to make clear the true remedy for these weak points as they are brought before the minds of the people by the crises of the war. It is thus that an intelligent public opinion can be formed and produce the irresistible force which enables the officials of the Government to go forward with confidence and courage.

It is a matter for profoundest congratulation that in such a world crisis a man with rare knowledge of history and exceptional preparation for a task calling for supreme judgment and true wisdom should be in the position of peculiar power now occupied by the President of the United States. Was it not one of the greatest triumphs of democracy that the United States should, through so thoroughly democratic a method as was the primary campaign in 1912, and the electoral campaign which followed, have chosen to be President such a man as Woodrow Wilson, whose extraordinary sagacity, patience and resolution have been demonstrated during the past five years with such effect that the whole world now recognizes his pre-eminent fitness to be the leader in a fight for world democracy? President Wilson has shown his profound belief in the necessity and dominance of public opinion as the one force to bring about real progress in government and sustain an Administration to make democratic principles effective. He has shown the rare and dauntless courage to go forward as far and as fast as an intelligent public opinion will warrant.

Our war experience has aroused the public mind and brought about a concentration of public opinion, which is shown in the general approval now given to the President in his taking over the control and operation of the railroads of the United States. Railroad stockholders and officials, the great labor organizations and the great commercial and producing classes all agree that the President has done wisely the absolutely necessary thing. This means that his patience and deliberation in giving a fair trial, with every advantage of co-operation, to the privately owned systems was justified as a means to demonstrate the facts to the public, and thus to create an intelligent public opinion.

A serious obligation now rests upon all those who have influence to do their full part to strengthen and buttress the public opinion of the country so that all having authority and official responsibility at this time may be properly aided to attain the most effective utilization of the transportation facilities which it is generally realized are vitally necessary to modern life, in peace as well as in war. The step already taken by the President is so great in its vast implications that only absolute necessity should add further steps, but if there be further steps necessary to be taken it is important that an educated public opinion be promptly developed to justify the Government in the earliest action practicable.

The critical condition of the homes, the railroads and all industry and commerce, because of the present short-

age of coal, compels immediate consideration of the problem of the proper method of handling the natural resources so vital to every interest of the country. War certainly makes clear how immediately vital it can be. Surely a public opinion should be developed as to the wisest course for the Government to pursue with reference to coal. The universal suffering from high prices makes it of the first importance to reduce the price of everything that is absolutely necessary to life and the business of life, so that a second immediate necessity is that the price of coal should be kept at the minimum possible.

It is vital to the welfare of a democracy that labor shall be well rewarded and that the hours of labor shall not be too long. Labor in mines is of the very hardest and offers many hindrances to the best development of character and family life. Miners' wages, therefore, should be relatively high. Now that the Government controls transportation the movement of coal may be assured at practically cost. It becomes necessary, therefore, in order to assure the lowest possible cost of coal to the consumer that the profit accruing to monopolies should be taken off coal. Can this be done in any other way than through ownership by the Government of all coal mines? Thus only can we secure an average cost. Many mines can produce coal more cheaply than others, and the proper sorting out of the bone and other matter which increases the cost of fuel to the consumer can be more certainly assured only by unified ownership.

The writer believes, after personal experience of many years and much study of the question, that a successful railroad management must have the control of the coal supply. There seems no answer to the argument that the Government in control of railroads must, with the least delay possible, take the further vital step of taking over the coal mines. If one stops to think of the hindrances involved in thousands of owners of coal properties to be dealt with by the Director of Railroads, or his representative, it is easy to realize the impossible complications. The present situation is complicated enough without continuing such an immense difficulty.

Coal is the gift of nature, and its location is without relation to the industries and population that need it. It is wise, therefore, for a country to unify the ownership and control of coal so that miners shall be paid a high average wage, without reference at this time of necessity to the profit of mining, and, in order that the consumer shall have the proper advantage of average cost by reason of shorter haul and the taking of the fat with the lean; that is, mines cheap to operate and mines more expensive to operate. Only unified ownership and control can bring this about. Surely delay will be an injury to every consumer and to the Government as the great consumer.

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

The Queen of Hawaii

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In your issue of December 14 you printed a letter entitled "The Queen of Hawaii" by R. F. Pettigrew, which showed such strange ignorance of its subject, and therefore involved such cruel misrepresentation of facts, that I venture to write a word of correction. Let me say that I am a cousin of Judge S. B. Dole of Honolulu, to whom Mr. Pettigrew's letter does serious injustice. Let me also say that I have been a vigorous opponent of all imperialist enterprises on the part of the United States, and have never favored the annexation of Hawaii any more than the taking of the Philippine Islands or the Danish West Indies. I wish no territory held as a dependency. I have also talked with men in Hawaii who stand on opposite sides regarding the question of overthrowing the government of the late Queen, and I can easily see how honorable men could highly respect each other and yet differ upon that subject.

Now, as regards Mr. Pettigrew's "facts." First, Mr. S. B. Dole never went to Hawaii "as a missionary;" he was born in the Islands, studied law in Boston, Mass., and has always had the unquestioned confidence of his community as an honest lawyer. The story of his being interested "with twelve others" in the raising of sugar and in the employment of thousands of Chinese and Japanese laborers is an almost amusing bit of fiction. He has never belonged to any group of wealthy sugar planters; he has never made the slightest use of his position as President or Governor or Judge to make money and, while generally respected and beloved by the natives, to whom he has always shown himself a good friend, as well as by the rest of the community, he has always remained comparatively a poor man. Moreover, I think any man in Honolulu would laugh at the idea of his ever having "sneaked" through the streets of the town. He would be the first to laugh at such a caricature of the revolution!

Now, the revolution is too long a story for a letter in THE PUBLIC. It is enough to suggest that the presentation of the other side would doubtless give Mr. Pettigrew a lesson of caution against entering the field of historical criticism without having full information. The beginning of the revolution was made by the autocratic effort of the Queen to set aside the constitution of the little kingdom. It is safe to say that pretty much the same class of people in the Islands who now support the war against Germany, and who correspond identically with the people in these States who are most resolutely behind the Administration, were with the party who proposed at that time to make the Islands "safe for democracy." Does Mr. Pettigrew believe that we are now using the best and most democratic means for establishing genuine democracy? If so, I suspect that he would see excellent reasons for overthrowing a reactionary monarchy, which might have landed the Islands (who knows) in the hands of Germany or Japan. I do not deny that there is another view of this question, along with a more radically human thought of democracy, but this has not yet become popular anywhere.

Jamaica Plain, Mass. CHARLES F. DOLE.

* *

A child inherits its parents' nature not as a special punishment, but by natural law.—*Henry Drummond.*

BOOKS

Democracy's Prophet

Woodrow Wilson and the World's Peace. By George D. Herron. Published by Mitchell Kennerley, New York, 1917. Price, $1.50.

Mr. Herron's book consists of four papers written for continental European readers within the year 1917 explaining to them President Wilson's notes to Germany and to the Allies, which culminated with his address declaring war. These are prefaced with the author's to many well-known eulogy of the President published in the New Age of June 7. There is also an appendix, which should be read by all the Peoples' Council pacifists, originally addressed to Romain Rolland and his satellites. The book as a whole ought to be in the possession of every thinking student of world politics and particularly in that of every fundamental democrat who recognizes that the world war is in itself a prelude to a greater struggle of industrial and international policies and social philosophies which no treaty of peace will be able to prevent.

To those who have read these articles here collected as they appeared the book will be interesting as a continuous interpretation, written with surprising insight, of perhaps the most trying months of a great man's career. It is almost unbelievable that the author never met Mr. Wilson. It is almost certain that he has interpreted the man as he truly is and has been. Most of us have misjudged nearly everyone this past year. Our fluent writings of January, 1916, would look quite silly this January. Not so with Mr. Herron. He understood all the while and what he has written still stands.

Mr. Herron explains Mr. Wilson very simply. He is a mystic, recognizing the cosmic folly of persons who think "common sense" is greater internationally than ideals, force a stronger thing than right, expediency and compromise short cuts to success. He is one who believes that in *Weltpolitik* the law of love and mutual sacrifice is a thing not merely desirable but practically feasible and hard-headed. He is a democrat by conviction. Democracy to him is Christianity expressing itself in life. He therefore has the courage and the wisdom to stand as a prophet, holding out to the world the folly of war fought for anything else than democracy and international peace, and the idiocy of letting this war end in such a world situation as will perpetuate the silly old national jealousies. To this end he prevented our American capitalists from forcing war with Mexico. To this end he patiently waited until our self-seeking nation was so exasperated as to send us into a war with Germany which could be spiritualized.

Mr. Herron is convinced that Mr. Wilson also stands for industrial democracy and will effectually prevent the using of this war as a prop to fortify capitalism, imperialism, and what else would be a dying commercialism in America itself. Of course he touches on this briefly. His subject is international democracy and the President's relationship to that. One wonders, though, whether America is really going to be big enough to rise to the call of the prophet. Already Mr. Wilson is covertly being attacked by the capitalist press, attacked with the subtle innuendo that he is noble but unpractical. It was Tagore, was it not, who said America had sacrificed her soul to efficiency? There are increasing numbers of estimable people who look disgusted and bored when told that Germany will be defeated as much by the moral equation as by arms.

After all, Woodrow Wilson and America are not synonymous terms. He has come through the testing fires that the nation is just entering. Is our prophet to be an Isaiah or a Jeremiah? On us depends the answer.

At any rate, this book makes very clear the beauty and the sanity of what the prophet has been saying.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

An Old Romance

Rinconete and Cortadillo. By Miguel de Cervantes. Translated by Mariano J. Lorento. Published by The Four Seas Company, Boston. Price, $1.50.

It is a genuine pleasure to call the attention of book-lovers to a recent translation from the Spanish, of a novel by the author of the immortal *Don Quixote*, that is not yet familiar to the English reading public. The reader's imagination is drawn across the intervening chasm of three and a quarter centuries of that mysterious "form of thought" we call Time; and is there presented with a charming little vignette giving a picture in vivid coloring and lifelike drawing of a section of the social under-world of the ancient city of Seville, in which its picturesque customs, costumes and language serve as settings for the throbbing human life so like in its essence to that which may be found under similar conditions in our own day. Rinconete and Cortadillo are two lads who start out as gay and irresponsible gentlemen of fortune, the one equipped with a high degree of skill in the delicate art of card-sharping, the other having graduated as a master in the equally difficult art of pocket-picking. After some days of more or less profitable operating on their own account, they encounter another young chevalier of their own order who introduces them to the head-quarters of a thieves' brotherhood at the house of Senor Monipodio. This remarkable character wields the sceptre of an autocrat over the fraternity and administers their affairs with due regard to the giving of alms and the observance of all the ordinances of the Holy Church; settles all disputes as to the division of plunder, and exercises an authority that is obeyed without question. The head of this brotherhood is in sympathetic relations with the chief constable of the city and his house is recognized as a legitimate sanctuary for the predatory specialists whose services are occasionally enlisted by the authorities for the detection of crimes committed by enemies of society unconnected with the privileged brotherhood—all of which bears a curious resemblance to happenings we hear of in our American cities of to-day. The translator "strongly doubts" the suggestion that Sir Walter Scott "imitated" Cervantes in his description of Alsatia in *The Fortunes of Nigel*

with its autocratic ruler "Duke" Jacob Hildebrod. Mr. Lorente's opinion should undoubtedly outweigh that of an ordinary reader of *Rinconete and Cortadillo*, but to the average mind the parallelism of ideas will seem fairly complete. Scott was certainly not an imitator, but any literary artist is amenable to suggestion, and after making due allowance for the difference in social atmosphere and the plentiful lack in East London of that picturesqueness that is so characteristic of Spain, it seems at least probable that the thought of Alsatia and the "Duke" was inspired by that of Senor Monipodio and his "children."

This little volume, valuable and complete as it is in itself, is enriched by a preface from the pen of that distinguished writer, Mr. R. B. Cunninghame Graham, and an introduction by the translator. As an achievement in literary craftsmanship the translator's introduction calls for special commendation. Mr. Lorente, who is now a naturalized American citizen, is Spanish by birth and early education, and has acquired his mastery of the English language as an adjunct to that of his native tongue. This makes it the more remarkable that he writes with a fluency and facility in the selection of words that may well excite feelings of envy on the part of native-born Americans. The introduction is largely filled by the discussion of opinions as between the present translator and a previous one, on the particular shade of meaning to be attributed to certain original Spanish words, but apart from this, it provides an excellent foreground to the story. To all in whom the ever-increasing cataract of modern novels has not quite drowned out the taste for classic story-writing, we commend this little book.

ALEX. MACKENDRICK.

A Tribute to France

France Bears the Burden. By Granville Fortescue. The Macmillan Co., 1917. Price, $1.25.

Secretary Lansing has impressed on the American people the fact that they are fighting their own battle, a truth which should be brought home to those who think we should not concern ourselves with any interests but our own. But it is fortunate that while we are defending our own honor and our own interest—two things which are closely connected—we are also striking a blow in behalf of nations worthy of all the aid we can give them; Belgium, for instance, unjustly attacked and barbarously treated, and France fighting with a heroism which makes some of her warmest admirers feel that they have never until now appreciated her.

Major Fortescue's book is an earnest tribute to France. He has seen the victors of the Somme and Verdun—"the greatest battle of the greatest war of all time." He has seen the desolation of the Argonne. He has seen the human wrecks of the war striving cheerfully to continue the battle of life and he bears witness to the wonderful aid that modern surgery has been able to give these broken men. He has seen the meetings of wives, mothers and children with men home from the trenches for a brief rest. He has seen the fire of battle in the eyes of munition workers, men and women, who feel that they are part of the great army defending France. As a soldier he can appreciate and describe the wonderful development of the French military organization and he expresses the opinion that "under the stern demands of war France has brought into being a system of transport and armament that surpasses that of Germany.

And yet we are told "the Frenchman hates, despises, abhors war." "The cultivated Frenchman will take pains to explain to you how illogical, unintelligent, uncivilized is war; yet you will see this same cultivated Frenchman wearing the uniform of his motherland racing like fury to the muzzles of the machine guns."

Throughout these pages we have the picture of a nation fighting for life. If we were mere spectators our sympathy should go out to her. But we are more than spectators. We, too, are a nation in peril from what Major Fortescue calls "the German threat against the world" and if our peril is much less than that of France it is partly because France has fought so valiantly and successfully.

WM. E. MCKENNA.

"DER TAG"

For years the Prussians have drunk a toast to "Der Tag," —the day when the German army should advance upon her enemies.

When they return, that remnant who remain,
Purged of all fear, made wise through pain and fire,
Think not, O Rulers, these will faint or tire,
Whom demon Anguish so inures to pain.
For in the lulls on War's ensanguined plain,
These men, obedient, keep a silent ire,
And in their dreams looms up a conflict dire,
Lest all who bleed and die shall fall in vain.

Let not the sleepy folds of Luxury
Enmesh your eyes, ye lords who stand in power,
But be ye mindful of the approaching hour
When these your chattels turn to challenge ye:
Pale in the shell-blast, Death's boon comrades, they,
Drinking, in blood and tears,—"*the Day—the Day!*"

RICHARD WARNER BORST.

* * *

It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Every State again is divided into counties, each to take care of what lies within its local bounds; each again into townships or wards, to manage minuter details; and every ward into farms, to be governed each by its individual proprietor. . . . It is by this partition of cares, descending in gradation from general to particular, that the mass of human affairs may be best managed for the good and prosperity of all.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

Books that We Recommend

"WE PAY THE POSTAGE"

By Woodrow Wilson

History of the United States.....$12.50
The New Freedom..... $1.00
Mere Literature and Other Essays..... $1.35
Congressional Government $1.25
On Being Human..... 50c
When a Man Comes to Himself..... 50c

By Frederic C. Howe

High Cost of Living.....$1.50
Socialized Germany $1.50
European Cities at Work.....$1.75
Why War? $1.50
The City; the Hope of Democracy.....$1.00
The Modern City and Its Problems.....$1.50
Wisconsin: An Experiment in Democracy..$1.25
Privilege and Democracy in America....$1.50
The British City.....$1.50

By Herbert Adams Gibbons

The New Map of Europe. Six double maps $2.00
Paris Reborn $2.00
The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire..$3.00
The Blackest Page of Modern History.. 75c
The New Map of Africa.....$2.00
The Little Children of the Luxemburg.. 50c
Reconstruction of Poland and the Far East $1.00

By Bolton Hall

Money Making in Free America.....$1.00
Things as They Are.....$1.00
What Tolstoy Taught.....$1.50
Life and Love and Peace.....$1.00
Three Acres and Liberty.....$1.75
The Gift of Sleep.....$1.25
Thrift $1.00

By Mary Fels

Joseph Fels; His Life Work.....$1.00

By Brand Whitlock

Abraham Lincoln 60c
Forty Years of It.....$1.75
Enforcement of Law, 50c. Ten copies..$3.50

By John P. Altgeld

Oratory, 50c. Ten copies.....$3.50

By Herbert Quick

The Good Ship Earth.....$1.25
The Brown Mouse.....$1.25

By Henry George

Progress and Poverty...cloth, $1.00; paper, 30c
Social Problems .....cloth, $1.00; paper, 30c
Protection or Free Trade
cloth, $1.00; paper, 30c
The Land Question....cloth, $1.00; paper, 30c
A Perplexed Philosopher
cloth, $1.00; paper, 30c
The Law of Human Progress
leather, $1.00; cloth, 50c
Complete Works in 10 Uniform Volumes
cloth, $12.00; leather, $17.00

By Louis F. Post

Ethics of Democracy.....$1.50
Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce 75c
The Taxation of Land Values
cloth, $1.25; paper, 50c
Social Service .....cloth, 75c; paper, 40c
Trusts, Good and Bad.....paper, 15c

By Ray Stannard Baker

Adventures in Contentment.....$1.50
The Friendly Road.....$1.50
Adventures in Friendship.....$1.50
Great Possessions.....$1.50

Miscellaneous

My Story. By Tom L. Johnson.....$2.00
My Neighbor's Landmark. By Frederick Verinder..... ....Cloth, 85c; paper, 40c
Towards the Light: Elementary Studies in Ethics and Economics. By Lewis H. Berens 80c
The State. By Franz Oppenheimer....$1.25
A History of the Singletax Movement in the United States. By Arthur Young.$1.50
The Orthocratic State. By John Sherwin Crosby $1.00
The Art of Living Long. By Luigi Cornaro $2.00
The Little Grandmother of the Russian Revolution. Reminiscences and Letters of Catherine Breshkovsky. Edited by Alice Stone Blackwell.....$2.00

Poetry

Songs of the Average Man. By Sam Walter Foss $1.50
Dreams in Homespun. By Sam Walter Foss $1.50
The Uncommon Commoner. By Edmund Vance Cooke $1.50
Impertinent Poems. By Edmund Vance Cooke $1.50

All Books Sent Postpaid

Any Book Reviewed in The Public can be ordered through

The Public Book Department 122 East 37th St. **New York, N. Y.**

Our Plans for 1918

THE PUBLIC began last year with 11,000 subscribers. For the first issue of 1918, it had 15,500: a clear gain of 4,500.

Though the subscription rate has been advanced to $2 per year, we will retain our old subscription slogan—"*Three* new subscriptions for *Two* Dollars."

This year each of these (club) introductory subscriptions will be entered for *six* months. But remember the old slogan stands—"*Three* new subscriptions for *Two* Dollars."

"Business as usual"?—No. "Business as last year"?—No. Neither of these will do. This new year for THE PUBLIC must show growth that no other year has shown. The need and the opportunity are greater, and The Public's Circulation Department, and its magnificent group of readers who feel a high compulsion to co-operate, are determined to, and can, and will beat all previous records.

Special campaigns will be announced from time to time, but the steady effort is always the basis of Circulation Success.

Two Dollars pays for three subscriptions, six months each. The coupon tells the story.

THE PUBLIC,
122 East 37th Street,
New York.

Enclosed find $2 for which send THE PUBLIC for Six Months to the three new subscribers herewith.

Name .....

Address .....

80 THE WILLIAMS PRINTING COMPANY, NEW YORK