The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Syndicalism and The War

Russian-Baiting in Our Ports

The American Red Cross and French Civilians

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

June 1, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI | **New York, N. Y., June 1, 1918** | **Number 1052**

Contents

There is evidence that the press campaign to create an atmosphere favorable to Japanese intervention in Russia is slowing down. The London correspondent of the New York *Times*, who has been most active in representing the British as desirous of intervention, cables on the 27th that "the closer the British Government examines the project of allied intervention in Siberia the less inclined it is to enter on this policy." Officials, while previously "not indisposed to the idea if Washington would assent and Japan was ready to work with her Allies," now, "in the absence of any signs of emergence of a central regime in Russia and the consequent impossibility of procuring an invitation from a representative authority," believe that there is "little to induce the government to embark on a policy the result of which no one could foresee." It is difficult to understand why this simple conclusion is so belated, and there is no explanation of what has become of the danger that Germany would immediately overrun Siberia, threaten Japanese vital interests, and seize the approaches to India. These matters have retreated to a lower drawer of the editorial desk.

* * *

The statement of Mr. John Dillon, leader of the Irish Nationalist party, assists to define the alignment of opinion in Ireland. He speaks in terms of unreserved condemnation of the Sinn Feiners, using as his strongest argument the fact that their activities will alienate from Ireland the sympathy of Americans. There is no doubt that the strength of the extremist agitation was derived from continued belief in the ancient antagonism toward England of Irish Americans. The war issue has become a solvent of this difficulty. It seems, however, from this distance a policy of doubtful wisdom to undertake the complete suppression of Sinn Fein. The accusation that this organization was actively plotting with Germans, needs to be established in a court of law. To get rid of troublesome patriots by the simple expedient of locking them up as traitors, will alienate the sympathy not only of Irish Americans, but of all Americans. There never has been the remotest possibility that Sinn Fein could achieve its end. It has been magnified as an ogre of ferocity and public danger. In practice, it serves the purpose of providing a counterpart to the stupid intransigeance of Ulster.

* * *

It is well that many minds are at work on the machinery of international adjustment through which a league of nations could function. Yet faith in any mechanistic solution of the problem of war is misplaced, as everyone must know who stops to think about it. There is just one way to prevent future wars: to eliminate in every country those privileged classes whose very existence is a denial of brotherhood and justice, and who, so long as they are permitted to survive, will manage to influence the policy of the political state and at times as in Germany today, to use the state as an agent of their acquisitive, antisocial, and so belligerent purposes. This is the negative statement of a truth that can be as well expressed in affirmative terms: political power must pass into the hands of organized common people in at least a clear majority of the nations before we shall be rid of wars. Men who face death in the mines, men who har-

ness the forces of nature and drive them to do man's will in the production of life's necessaries on the farm or in the factory, men who eat their bread in the sweat of their brows—these are our best citizens. They are our keepers of the peace and our preachers of brotherhood. Brotherhood is exemplified in their daily lives, which require cooperation and mutual helpfulness at every turn. They vent their pugnacity, they obtain the muscular reactions which every healthy man needs, without having to resort to making war on their fellows. There is more human brotherhood among the workers in any coal mine than is to be found in the average church. Once fully organized and aware of their common interests, the workers will create a public opinion that will control international relations in the interest of peace and justice. If Kautsky's prediction proves true, the defeat of Germany and only her defeat will bring the revolution that will deliver her own people and the whole world from the menace now inherent in her Government.

* * *

The Masses case gives the Department of Justice a rare opportunity to win the good will of very many thoroughly loyal citizens who are now withholding it because they feel that the Attorney General and his assistants have been too eager to destroy sincere radicals whose early opposition to the war brought them under the strict letter of the espionage act. Max Eastman long ago decided that President Wilson is in very truth waging a war for democracy, and should be supported by American radicals. He has said so plainly in his new magazine, and has recently done much to make the war popular with those rebellious souls whose temperament makes it hard for them to agree with anything that is respectable. The worst the Washington Government can hold against his present course is that he is impudent and egotistical and patronizing in his support. Max Eastman's egotism and impudence may be no asset to us. But the right of individuals to be as egotistical and as impudent as they please within the law is a most precious thing. As a matter of sportsmanship, one would think that the Department would welcome the opportunity to drop these cases, an opportunity which the jury's disagreement at the first trial affords it. War produces a mob tyranny and coercion and a corresponding timidity in the individual that cannot be escaped even in a war for freedom and democracy. It is too easy in these times for the Government to get convictions by the mere act of asking twelve average citizens for them in the name of the Government. When to this is added the common prejudice against Socialism and those who hold "queer" and heterodox ideas, a situation is created which makes for conviction. There is also the archaic survival in our federal courts of jury panels made up of men of substance and property, with wage earners almost invariably excluded or very slimly represented. Undoubtedly *The Masses* editors violated the law,—ten months ago, when it and the war were new and their old habits of irresponsible and violent expression still held. Just as certainly Mr. Eastman is now supporting the President on the war issue. Public policy points to accepting his support and forgetting the past, not to a course that will make it harder for radicals of his type to lay aside their prejudices and cooperate with the President. Eastman out of jail and for the President is a real asset in a situation that calls for cultivating the confidence and support of Socialists in England, France and Italy. The story of Eastman in jail and the manner of his going there would make excellent German propaganda among the very large number of Socialists in the Allied nations of Europe.

* * *

The only question remaining with respect to the railroads is the terms on which their stockholders are to be dealt with. How long will the individual corporations be allowed to keep their identity, and will stock-holdings be converted into Government bonds against the properties? How long will the Government pay the generous rate now prevailing for money invested in railroads, when money invested in ships and other Government necessaries receives only 4¼ per cent? Any discussion as to the return of the railroads is a waste of time. They will never go back to the old anarchic, pseudo-competitive basis, with cliques of bankers ruling for private gain. And we shall never permit the integrated systems to be operated from a central control in private hands. Director-General McAdoo has proved that no respect for wealth or persons or precedent or power will stand in the way of unifying

the roads for service. His "firing" of the railroad presidents gave us a new sense of the power and efficacy of democracy. It almost took away the breath of a generation accustomed to arbitrary power in private hands. One of the next great reforms will, we hope, be a simplification of freight classifications so that traffic experts for great corporations will no longer enjoy any advantage over the smallest competitor or the humblest citizen. The rate increases announced this week are a bit staggering. But on reflection they will raise no question against the new order. For years the private managements have starved the roads of new equipment, first in order to bolster up heavily-watered stocks and then to create a visible, physical argument (in the run-down condition of the roads) for higher freight rates. Meanwhile, the better-managed roads have salted away huge surpluses which should have gone for new equipment. The Government must now make up in a year or two for three or four years of neglect by the private managements. It is a pity that the thing was allowed to happen, but there is no use crying over spilt milk. And it will never happen again.

* * *

The country is awaiting announcement from Washington of what course the Government will take in dealing with the Chicago packers. Meanwhile we have another evidence of the apparently habitual manner in which they and their agents ignore the public interest and even the common decencies of business. Two of the "big five,"—Morris and Wilson,—stand charged by the Federal Trade Commission with attempting to sell rotten meat to a National Army cantonment in Texas. Gossip from Washington has it that the interdepartmental committee which has been considering their case has decided against the taking over of the business by the Government. But the country will demand radical action. The situation requires nothing less drastic than the plan urged by Mr. William Kent, by which the stock yards and terminals would be taken over and operated by the Government, and all meat cattle purchased by the Government, to be slaughtered and dressed by the packers on a fixed percentage basis. There is no question in the mind of anyone who has investigated the situation that the Food Administration has been too lenient hitherto. The packers have been allowed for 1918, 9 per cent on their capital invested on meat products, and 15 per cent on by-products. "Capital invested" is construed to include the value of everything they own, whether it is necessary machinery or real estate, and whether the capital is their own or borrowed. These percentages are based on the President's proclamation, declaring that "a just, reasonable and fair profit is the normal average profit which persons engaged in the same business and place obtained prior to July 14, 1914, and under free competitive conditions." Mr. Cotton, acting for Mr. Hoover, surely realizes that the packers were not operating under "free competitive conditions" when they made these percentages in 1914. Meanwhile, stock growers are receiving in very many instances less than enough to pay them for raising the animals. The Government is preparing to purchase the entire clip of wool for this year. It should handle the meat situation in the same way, pending the time when "free competitive conditions" can be restored in the meat industry.

International Trade

When the resolutions of the Paris Economic Conference of 1916 were announced they were met by repudiation on the part of liberals in Europe and America alike. The measures then proposed seemed calculated to form the Allied countries into a new alliance of commercial aggression, and consequently to defeat the principles and ideals that they were endeavoring to sustain. In reality, these resolutions, formulated in the presence of a decided possibility of German success, were defensive in their import, and moreover provided a basis for economic co-operation among the Allies that was a distinct approximation to a league of nations.

Since the Paris Conference, economic experience of a new order has accumulated, and opinion is everywhere moving in a direction favorable to the formation of a machinery of interference with trade. President Wilson has rightly taken a stand in opposition to what may well be a certain provocative of perpetual warfare; but it would be a mistake to overlook the increasing feeling that Germany can and should suffer commercial boycott, or to regard this as a mere temporary crystallization of war-bitterness. The belief is gaining ground that trade activity, so

far from depending upon fixed and more or less natural laws, can suffer interference in any degree, and that the end of the war will see a measure of state control never before known in the history of commerce. It is reported from England, where the ancient issue of protection versus free trade had been for half a generation acutely in men's minds, that that issue is now dead. Liberals nourished on the Manchester doctrine, life-long protagonists of free trade, feel that the whole ground has gone from under their feet; but those of the opposite party also feel that the ground of protection is gone. What does it mean and what will be the condition of international commerce after the war?

In backsight it is now easy to see that problems of trade had already, before the war commenced, passed beyond so simple a solution as that provided by the existence or non-existence of customs duties. A study of German penetration, so well described in Dr. Gourvitch's "How Germany Does Business," shows that methods of trade war were of the most elaborated kind, of which the tariff wall was only one —the one, to be sure, which served as a point of departure for others. The Prussian bureaucracy beyond any other government, organized, as it was, like a great corporation, was highly adapted to take part in business enterprises and to carry on commercial war. The instrumentalities are now well known: (1) The Government assisted in creating and maintaining a great mechanism of information. Not only was German diplomacy a direct aid to commerce, but the consular service co-operated with experts on market conditions and requirements. (2) Co-operation was given in the purchase of necessary raw materials by the cartel system. (3) There was free entry of materials that were to be manufactured into commodities for the export trade. (4) The operations of the German banking system and the extension, through directorate chains, of German ownership of foreign industries, were carried out with co-operation on the part of the Government. (5) There must be added the tremendous aid that the Government could give through its control of internal transport and its use of shipping subsidies. All of these activities constituted a direct interference with freedom of trade, were indeed the forces Germany used in her very real commercial warfare.

Nor is it to be thought that because England was traditionally the home of free trade that this principle had fully maintained itself in practice. Not so much by deliberate intent as through the lessons of experience, the British Government was gradually drawn into support of British commerce. Sea-power, with its corollary in the necessary maintenance of a great merchant marine, provided the most immediate means of assistance. Anyone who has studied British trade in, say, a South American country like Argentina, is forced to admire the way in which co-operation is effected between shipping, banking, importing, and other agencies. This closer co-operation probably came about through increasing pressure exerted by German methods. Its counterpart at home was a movement to safeguard the trade of the Empire by a system of preferences, thus making a closed commercial ring. This movement did not and could not succeed for the simple reason that the preferential system would have necessitated the placing of duties on the raw materials and foodstuffs that constituted practically the whole of English imports; and it was already discovered that raw materials and foodstuffs came into a different category of commodities.

Experience of the war has, in the main, resulted in an elaboration and extension of the German theory. In the Central Empires themselves there is the clear ambition to secure economic domination first of Europe and then of the world. In this, political control is merely to assist. *Mitteleuropa* is primarily conceived as a great central block of organized economic power to be kept in perpetual conflict with the few other blocks that may be able to maintain themselves. It was the realization of this German intent that inspired the Paris Conference in the dark days of 1916.

But the war has provided other lessons. Germany has been given a full dose of her own doctrine through the blockade. When it began to close down, she realized how inadequate were the great stores she had accumulated, and set about with feverish activity on the part of her purchasing agents to meet the inevitable shortage of raw materials. This was done with success so long as the neutrals were willing instruments. But when the blockade became really effective, life in the independent economic block of *Mitteleuropa* began to display elements of unpleasantness. Not only were certain essential metals

lacking, but foodstuffs, fats and lubricating oils and textiles. This induced a change of view. Even Naumann, chief exponent of *Mitteleuropa*, began to advocate harmonious trade relations with other nations. The chief war aim of even the military party has come to be that of forcing from the enemies of Germany favorable commercial conditions on the basis of most favored nation treaties. There is general recognition not only of the serious situation in which Germany will find herself at the conclusion of peace, but of the fact that economic power may nullify military victories.

War necessity has brought about a transformation in methods of commercial control in all the nations. State operation of industry is of doubtful success, but the power of directing distribution has been found an instrument of incalculable importance. To make the blockade effective it was necessary to bring pressure upon the neutrals, to coerce them into true neutrality. This experience taught the use of two instruments: transport and the licensing of exports. Here are discovered means of trade interference and direction surpassing the old clumsy device of the tariff. One other discovery has been fully realized,—the importance to any nation of a raw material of which it has a practical monopoly. The lesson of German potash has been learned by Germany's enemies.

It is because of these developments that England finds protection and free trade both dead issues. Chamberlainism as a basis of imperial unity was clearly impossible. But a new era of co-operation through controlling facilities of communication is dawning. The next imperial conference will probably elaborate methods for utilizing the monopolies—and they are many—which the Empire contains, for purposes of defense and offense.

The evolution of these new trade methods is now only in middle course, but has gone sufficiently far to afford a basis for looking into the future. If, for example, a league of nations is formed, how can it secure authority over the economic weapon which must manifestly operate through organized national control? If certain industries are regarded as essential, that is, required for subsistence, will these be controlled and maintained by the state? If transport, especially ocean shipping, is the potent instrument of control, does this fact dictate permanent government ownership and operation? If certain materials are important national monopolies that may be effectively used in negotiation, will government control of the distribution of these amount to a constant purchase of the output or a special state enterprise for their production?

Certainly, at the present time, much is being done in elaborating methods of international co-operation. Various boards and commissions are adjusting the distribution of essential commodities. This is the first stage in building the machinery of commercial world organization.

Into this strange and complicated field the war has carried international trade. It does not seem attractive, but if these are the facts of the case, we must be able to deal with them. The league of nations may be a sort of enlarged and modernized Hanseatic league, combining political with commercial purposes. And after progressing through this mass of organization the world may find that the best method is the old one of the individual trader freely exchanging his wares with the traders of other countries.

Labor's Awakening

Any one inclined to be pessimistic about the future of democracy in the United States would do well to send to the secretary of the Joint Legislative Board of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor for a copy of the proceedings of the political convention held last month by organized labor at Newark. Attended by more than 500 delegates representing fifty-seven organized trades, this meeting gave evidence that, in a typical eastern state never noted for radicalism, the organized workers are awake to their opportunities and preparing to take the lead in advancing a program with benefits as broad as society. It was a political convention only in the sense that delegates from every center in the state met for the first time to consider their purely political interests, and to plan a fuller participation of wage earners in the making and administration of the laws that affect their economic interests. That more than 500 delegates journeyed to Newark and set a new record of attendance at state labor gatherings is one proof of the vitality and enthusiasm behind this departure from precedent.

What wage earners everywhere are thinking can be pretty well surmised by the resolutions

which were adopted after full discussion by these New Jersey trade unionists. After renewing a pledge of loyalty to the country, they proclaim that "our democratic institutions can only be preserved by constant vigilance, and in this hour, when the senses of our people are distracted by the excitement attendant on the incomprehensible cataclysm of the war, the task of maintaining our democratic institutions at home falls with increased emphasis on those who have remained at home. While our valiant brothers are facing danger and death to defend democracy abroad, we are under a solemn duty to them, to ourselves and to posterity to see to it that it is in no way diminished here.

"Our appeal, therefore, is to all men and women, whether they be a part of organized labor or apart from it, to undertake with us the great task that this hour casts upon us. Labor today has a broader vision than in the past, and looks not only to the welfare of its own members, but to the establishment of the principles of justice and equality of opportunity for all people everywhere. We heartily commend to the careful consideration of all people, especially every producer by hand or brain that may not be in the ranks of organized labor, such as the clerk, the teacher, the doctor, the minister of religion, the average retail shopkeeper and trader, and all the mass of those living on small incomes, the program adopted by this convention. This outstanding declaration gives a new dignity to the great labor movement in this state, and, with broadened vision and warm sympathy, dedicates it to a nobler service throughout the world.

"We believe the time has come for organized labor to make its influence felt in matters of national and state legislation which affect the interests of organized labor, and also in such matters which affect the interest of all those people outside of organized labor who by labor of hand or brain, or the legitimate employment of capital without any monopoly or other privilege, contribute to the production of the wealth of the country."

We shall go on in a moment to the convention's program. But here in the preamble of the resolutions we have the great thing for which every democrat has been on the alert—labor's willingness to see itself as trustee for the hope of the future and to co-operate with democratic forces everywhere for action that will recover the ground lost for human freedom through those developments that have deprived us of free land and enslaved us to the machine process under arbitrary private control. It is not alone New Jersey. There are somewhat similar developments in California and Minnesota and half a dozen other states. It all means one glorious thing—that the workers of America cannot be quarantined against the promise of the times, that they are preparing to organize labor's unrest as the driving power for a sane, radical program of reconstruction, instead of leaving it as an explosive force with no outlet save the horrors of some future Bolshevist terror.

The New Jersey convention declared for public ownership of railroads and other public utilities, and supplemented their declaration with a keen analysis, well worth attention, of the evils of private control. They declared for a war tax program that would reduce the amount of bonds to the lowest practicable figure by taking at least 80 per cent of excess profits, increasing the income tax upon large incomes, and levying an inheritance tax taking over a much larger share of the great inherited fortunes. As to natural resources, the resolutions read: "We indorse the principle that the great natural resources were created by the Creator for the benefit of all of the people, and therefore indorse the principle that all of these natural resources, such as coal, iron and copper mines, and oil wells, and forests, etc., should be owned by the Government, and either operated by the Government or opened up to private use under conditions which afford all competitors equality of access to these natural resources, which are the foundation of our most essential industries."

It is partly the failure of those who realize the importance of the land question in America that labor has not as yet given its attention to the direct relation between the system of land tenure now prevailing and industrial injustice. But the broad principles of the land reformer are embedded in the resolution just quoted, and the important thing is that labor is turning to these broad principles and their application through labor's political power. We realize that other meetings have been held and other resolutions have been adopted. Let the pessimist croak. He cannot persuade us that, with organized labor taking this course and with its ranks swelling as a result of the victory it is winning for universal indus-

trial democracy, we are not on the eve of the most hopeful democratic movement of our times. It will take years. The Newark convention wisely recognized the difficulties in the way of a labor party and contented itself for the present with a definite program and a campaign to enlist the rank and file for its support. But every speaker, including Mr. Cornelius Ford, Public Printer of the United States, accepted a labor party as the final inevitable outcome and looked forward to the day when labor in the shop will join with labor on the farm in a great movement to sweep away privilege and arbitrary economic power in the hands of the few.

The Walsh report of three years ago put into words for American labor what had been learned through hard every-day experience, and stated boldly the radical remedies which the American democracy must apply. Its recommendations were merely echoed by the report on reconstruction of the British Labor Party. That report has played its great part in hastening the day when American labor shall come to grips with fundamentals. Dismissed as Utopian by Mr. Gompers, it is nevertheless finding its way into the columns of our leading labor journals. The *United Mine Workers' Journal,* official organ for 500,000 organized coal miners, prints it this week, together with an editorial urging that "it behooves us to be ready to stand shoulder to shoulder with our fellow workers in Great Britain, France, and the other allied countries to the end that democracy in full measure in the social and economic life of all the people of the world may come as the fruits of victory in this greatest of all wars that we are waging in the name of liberty and democracy."

The Cure for Profiteering

President Wilson met the issue of profiteering squarely in his stirring address to Congress calling upon it to enact a new revenue bill at this session. "The profiteering that cannot be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country," he told Congress, "can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable." Short of telling Congress specifically that it should adopt the English scheme of taking 80 per cent of war profits, this is as near as the President could come to indicating the course which Congress must take if it is to meet the expectations of the President and the people. As THE PUBLIC has repeatedly urged, this is a matter of expediency as well as of justice. The jailing of agitators without number will be of no avail in safeguarding the nation's morale if the farmer and the wage earner and all other struggling average citizens feel that their traditional enemies,—the financial, commercial and industrial monopolists,—are being permitted to coin the nation's blood and sweat and sacrifice into huge profits.

The President's speech was notable also for his plain speaking as to lobbyists. And no one who remembers the ready hearing that the Senate Finance Committee gave last year to apologists for the owners of great unearned incomes will doubt that the President was thinking of lobbyists within Congress as well as those less harmful ones from without who merely supply specious statistics and arguments to agents only too willing to do their bidding under pretense of serving the public interest. If what he said seems to reflect on the honesty and courage of certain highly-placed Congressmen, it is only a frank recognition of a situation that is common knowledge. There should be no need to remind Congress that "if lobbyists hurry to Washington to attempt to turn what you do in the matter of taxation to their protection and advantage, the light will beat also upon them. There is abundant fuel for the light in the records of the Treasury with regard to profits of every sort." Let us hope that we can accept this as an intention on the part of the President to exercise his authority and make public income tax returns.

Secretary McAdoo is out for a better equipoise between taxes and bonds, doubtless on the ground that the equipoise already attained during the fiscal year now closing resulted from reduced expenditures and increased receipts under and above estimates, respectively, and that this equipoise will be destroyed during the ensuing year unless the amount to be raised by taxation is increased. To continue next year the proportion of bonds and taxes that prevailed during the current fiscal year, which is roughly half and half, it will be necessary to raise at least $10,000,000,000 by taxes next year. Expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year are estimated at $25,000,000,000, exclusive of loans to the Allies.

If the experience of this year is repeated, this figure will shrink to $20,000,000,000 at the most. The revenue act now in effect will raise between four and five billions. In the new bill the rates on large incomes should be greatly increased, and the excess profits tax should be more than doubled. At present excess profits are taxed at from 12 to 31 per cent. The excess is bracketed, and a different rate applied to each bracket on a rising scale, beginning with 12 per cent on the first bracket, and with the last bracket taxed 60 per cent. Excess profits large enough to reach the last bracket pay a tax that works out at about 31 per cent of the total amount of the excess. This cumbersome method should be abandoned, and in its place there should be substituted a flat tax of 80 per cent of every penny of excess, such as England levies. In other words, corporations, firms and individuals profiting as a result of the war should be given 20 per cent profit over and above their normal peace profits, and no more. Stated this way, the reasonableness and generosity of the proposal are obvious. Such a tax would be the final and irrefutable answer to the cry of profiteering. There is no other way to answer it that is half so effectual. The field of price fixing is too vast, and the factors too complex, to permit price-fixing to function as a bar to profiteering. There are sure to be conspicuous, if isolated, instances like Hog Island. From the point of view of national morale and of combatting dangerous propaganda, an 80 per cent tax on war profits will be infinitely more effectual than the putting of people in jail. There are many minds so constituted that, hearing of a Hog Island scandal or the profits of the Steel Corporation, they allow the obvious iniquity of these things to run away with their judgment and influence their whole attitude toward the Government and the war. Sensible folk realize that the Government is doing its best to eliminate the extortions of middlemen and monopolies and to limit profits, but they realize also that the whole motivation of our commercial and industrial life, and of the business men who control it, cannot be changed over night. They realize that there are not enough Wilsons and Bakers and Daniels to go around in the vast governmental organization now existing, and that the handling of intricate commercial and industrial problems for the Government must be placed largely in the hands of experts who, all their lives, have adhered to the theory of large pecuniary rewards as the only incentive to service. The cure for all this is the adoption of England's plan of an 80 per cent flat tax on war profits. It is for liberals to create a demand for such action so insistent that it cannot be ignored.

A Straw in the Wind

Secretary McAdoo's order establishing the eight-hour day as the basis of future wage adjustments for all railroad workers means something more than recognition of the principle that wage earners are entitled to a decent amount of leisure time, and to extra compensation when called upon to sacrifice some of it. So with his order providing equal pay for colored employes. They mean, as do so many other acts of the Wilson Administration in handling the labor situation, the best sort of international statesmanship. They mean recognition by the Washington Government that the workers everywhere are unwilling longer to acquiesce in an economic regime which they clearly see to be subversive of human freedom and happiness, and cruelly and needlessly so. For, while labor in the democracies does not demand revolutionary changes overnight, it does demand of the various Governments a clear manifestation of intention. It is because President Wilson has shown his intention to acquiesce in and even to forward the movement for economic reform that labor in this and all the Allied countries is at his back, and why every new demonstration of his purpose in this regard strengthens the cause of the entire Alliance. Labor in the Allied nations will carry on with enthusiasm and elan until Germany is defeated, or it will endanger the Allied cause by sabotage or even revolution, according to whether or not it is convinced that those in power are actuated by the same ideals to which alone it responds. And these are the ideals of human freedom and of justice between man and man. They are ideals that have been subverted by the closely-related evils of land monopoly and private monopoly control of the machinery of production and distribution, and labor now demands that they be reapplied in terms of labor's everyday economic life. Labor's realization of the iniquity of prevailing economic arrangements is so clear, and its burning resentment against those who blindly resist its demand for reform is so

intense, that it is quite capable, in certain European countries, of losing sight of the German menace and striking out against any class or government that should prove deaf to its aspirations. This is the constant fear of those responsible for the conduct of the war. And where reactionaries like "Uncle Joe" Cannon and many of his Republican colleagues would oppose the danger with bayonets or threats of jail, President Wilson meets labor more than half way and wins its confidence and whole-hearted support. It is in the light of the delicate situation that three years of war have created in France and England that Mr. Cannon's recent attempt to brand strikers as criminals and traitors is to be judged. And we should be immeasurably grateful to Congressmen Lunn, Keating, Nolan, and the other true democrats in Congress who defeated this attempt to coerce in a field where co-operation is the essential.

The Old Order Dies Hard

None of us has failed to note the emergence during the past year of a number of commercial and industrial leaders as prophets of a new economic order and preachers among their own people of a policy of lessened resistance to change. It has been one of the most encouraging developments of the times. How broad and deep this recognition among business men of the principles of democracy in industry and economics really is will be shown by the success of the War Labor Board and particularly of Mr. Taft in persuading employers to apply the principles agreed upon by the five representatives of the National Industrial Conference Board. It is well known that Sir Stephenson Kent and his British colleagues were aghast at the stiff-necked resistance opposed by American employers to their scheme of industrial co-operation during the war. It is known that Mr. Roger Babson reported rather pessimistically on the attitude of the employers after his recent survey for the Government. And Mr. James Emery, counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers, only thinly disguised his repugnance to the Government's labor policy in his address at the annual convention of the Association in New York last week. He, like us, is fond of the terms "industrial co-operation" and "industrial freedom," but he interprets them as meaning the enforced co-operation of individual workmen, unorganized, inarticulate and helpless, and the freedom of the employer to drive the workman to the limit of his physical endurance for as little pay as will keep body and soul together. At least such is the net result of applying Mr. Emery's unctuous and profitable philosophy. We have, too, the reports of the Industrial Conference Board seeking to discredit unionism and combatting the movement for a shorter work day with erroneous statistics.

And we have now additional evidence that the mine owners and mine operators of America, both in the metalliferous and coal branches of the industry, are permitting their organized influence to be used for the cheapest and pettiest sort of resistance to principles that no man of any reputation as a progressive and intelligent citizen would dare to challenge. One of these is the principle that labor is to have a partnership in industry and joint control with capital, to be achieved by the gradual introduction of democracy into industry through unionism. Mr. Norman Hapgood dares to suggest it in a recent article, and is taken to task by the Mining Congress *Journal,* official organ of the American Mining Congress. "It seems lamentably unfortunate," says the *Journal,* "that a serious writer should for a moment justify the possibility of labor having a joint control with capital. First, such a control would be manifestly unjust in that it proposes to take from those whose efforts and privations in the past have made an accumulation, and divide its earnings with those who in times past have wasted or enjoyed the fruits of their labor." Remembering Mr. Rockefeller and the privations of Tarrytown as contrasted with the rollicking spendthrifts of his Colorado coal camps, this would be funny if it were part of the dialogue of a Shaw play instead of the animating and controlling philosophy of the men who have monopolized our mineral resources. We need only remember Mr. James Stillman in Paris or H. H. Rogers on his yacht, and then the copper miners of Butte, working in intense heat 6,000 feet below the surface of the earth to produce the wealth that made the Amalgamated Copper and the National City Bank names to conjure with, so that Mr. Stillman could leave something like $40,000,000 when he died the other day. The *Journal* suggests that labor should go and do likewise. "Labor which desires control and

is willing to assume responsibility," it says, "is entitled to establish and create its own capital and control its own enterprise. Most capital has been thus accumulated and this opportunity is still available to all." The difficulty here is that too much capital has been accumulated by the seizure of natural resources and their capitalization at monopoly values based on the power of their owners to extort. It is true that labor can regain these resources through political action, but that is another story, and one that the Mining Congress *Journal* would not care to hear. The *Journal* goes on to its second objection, which is the old plea that democracy will not work. "The use of machinery and the manufacture on a large scale which is essential to cheap production necessitates executive control; that control must be single, it must be positive. and it must be vested in one more or less conversant with all of the machinery of production, transportation and exchange. . . . To allow labor to have joint control . . . would so impair its productiveness as to take from labor many if not most of the luxuries which it now enjoys." There is no serious proposal before us for the full application of a theory of joint control. And the *Journal* is thinking, as we are thinking, not of any such sudden and impossible transition, but of that gradual building up of democratic co-operation in industry which is the promise and, in its beginnings, the performance, of unionism. But the *Journal* has a third objection: "To give labor the right to joint control in the management of capital is to assume that there is no such thing as right in property. It reaches to the very foundation of our civilization. To grant this right would destroy all incentive to progress. It would tend to undermine the foundation of government. Government must act through its own agencies; to support these agencies requires an income. Incomes are secured by the Government, through the powers of taxation; taxation applies itself to property; without property there would be no income for the support of the Government, and the whole system would fall." The answer to this is too obvious. Property, to these men, is not property at all if it is shared with the general run of mankind. Property is a sacred thing to be held by them as trustees. We never before suspected that their animating motive was to provide substance for the Government to tax, and thus to make it possible for civilization to endure. Yet we suspect even they would balk at a tax scheme that would increase production, augment revenues, and relieve them of the burden of guardianship over the mineral wealth which will be needed by future generations.

The *Journal* here quoted is published by the American Mining Congress, of which Mr. Walter Douglas is president. He is also general manager of Phelps, Dodge & Company, owners of the Copper Queen Mine at Bisbee, and Mr. James Douglas is president of the company. Neither has yet been arrested as a result of the federal indictments returned the other day against twenty-one mine managers and attachés who participated in the Bisbee deportations of last summer. Yet nearly half of the number arrested on these indictments were officials or employes of the Phelps-Dodge Company. The newspapers reported that one arrest, that of an eastern mining man of national prominence, was still to take place. The Department of Justice is entitled to acknowledgment of this belated action, to which it was called by the report of the President's Mediation commission and not by any passion originating within the Department for punishing the originators and perpetrators of this crime.

What will the mine owners and operators of America do about this? Will they continue to honor as their spokesman a man responsible for the policies of a corporation whose officials are charged with the most subversive and dangerous bit of lawlessness that has been committed since we entered the war?

Coal Lands and Public Schools

The coal land owners of Pennsylvania appear to have one of the common characteristics of greed: they rarely have so much but what they want more. It might occur to the casual observer that since the State had given into their keeping, to do with as they will, the stored up sunshine of past ages they would be generous with their neighbors. It might be supposed that they would be at least as generous as those who have worked to produce what they have. But this does not appear to be the case. For the owners of these rich gifts of nature are more eager—and more successful—in avoiding their

share of taxes than those who have earned their wealth.

The County of Schuylkill, in the midst of the anthracite region, has a vast amount of coal lands; but their assessment is so low that there actually is not sufficient money to run the public schools. Yet, though the public revenue is short, taxes on home owners are abnormally high. This was a common complaint in all the counties prior to 1891. In that year the persistent efforts of the citizens in neighboring counties forced the taxing authorities to raise the assessment on coal lands to a figure more in keeping with their actual value; but Schuylkill, being in the clutches of the coal trust, has thus far defied all attempts on the part of the people to secure redress. Thus, the average assessment of coal land in Schuylkill per acre is $362.61. In Luzerne County, adjoining Schuylkill on the north, it is $6,855.66. In Lackawanna, northeast of Luzerne, it is $2,048.06. In Carbon, adjoining Schuylkill on the east, it is $1,797. The highest assessment per acre in Schuylkill is $687; in Luzerne, $10,978.50; in Lackawanna, $3,815; in Carbon, $2,000.

But the worm at last has turned. The Anthracite Consumers' League, through its representative, Frank C. Reese, is taking advantage of the condition of the schools to goad the public into demanding that the assessors and county commissioners observe their oath of office and serve them instead of the coal trust. It is a hard task. The weakness of a democracy lies in its willingness to endure official betrayal and oppressive legislation a long time before asserting itself. But Mr. Reese is going up and down the county making a plain statement to the citizens, and the *Evening Chronicle* of Plattsville, Pennsylvania, is sending his words broadcast. He contends that "the only fair solution of this trouble is to do the same as they did in Luzerne and Lackawanna counties, by placing an assessment value on the amount of unmined coal, making a revision each year according to the amount mined out."

This is as far as the present tax laws appear to go. There would still remain the discrepancy between taxing nature's products and man's products. If a man who has built a house worth a thousand dollars is to be taxed the same amount as a man who owns a thousand-dollar piece of coal that nature has put in the ground, it can only be because of economic blindness on the part of the voters. Pennsylvania has already made one attempt to differentiate between individual values and community values in the law that permits Pittsburgh and Scranton to reduce the assessment on buildings 10 per cent every three years, with a corresponding increase in the tax on land. This principle is as applicable to the improvements and coal lands of Schuylkill County as it is to the buildings and lots in Pittsburgh and Scranton. It is to be hoped that the momentum gathered in the campaign to bring coal land assessments up to other property assessments will carry Mr. Reese and his Consumers' League on to a demand that all taxes be laid upon nature's gifts to the exclusion of the products of labor. Then as the revenues are expended for schools and other public services the bounties of nature, or as some prefer to put it, the provision of a beneficent Providence, will be distributed among all the people.

Syndicalism and the War

By Leon Ardzrooni

At the present time when the battle of the giants is going on, an adequate understanding of the labor difficulties confronting the Administration at Washington and the American people generally would seem to be imperative. For, notwithstanding the reverses suffered by the Allied nations on the Western front, it is still the opinion in well-informed circles that after all the final outcome of the war depends on whether or not America is able to supply the Allies with food and other necessary materials.

To insure the Allies against a shortage of supplies, and more especially of food, the mobilization of the labor power of more than half a million discontented, distrustful and destitute workingmen throughout the West and Middle West is a matter of the first consequence. This is not to be achieved by methods hitherto pursued. And yet, unfortunately, there has been little or no evidence of a reassuring nature pointing in the direction of an intelligent appraisal and administration of the labor problem.

The evidence points rather to an easy and quite unsophisticated optimism among the men of standing, who appear to find a considerable degree of solace in the fact that "in every department of the Government that employs labor and fixes the price that manufacturers shall charge, there is a leading official of the American Federation of Labor on the committee who has as much power as the representative of the capitalists. The president of the United Mine Workers of America is assistant to Garfield, the Fuel Administrator. The president of the Building Trades Unions is on the Emergency Construction Board for building ships. A leading organizer of the American Federation of Labor is on the great War Industries Board which controls all kinds of manufacture. A trade unionist, William B. Wilson, is Secretary of Labor."[1]

Indeed, here is a group of labor representatives to conjure with—a state of affairs most gratifying were it not for the shadow of suspicion that these labor leaders may be counting without their host. Nor is it easy to dissipate such misgivings on the part of common folk by the adroit performance of some of our intellectual leaders, who, "sitting austere and complacent on a dry shoal up stream," indulge in an assiduous but futile dispensation of harmless verbiage and make bold asseverations concerning the attitude of the laboring classes toward the War.

The task of the American people in dealing with the labor situation is rendered difficult, not primarily because of the labor problem itself, but because of failure either through neglect or obstinacy, to recognize the simple but unsavory fact that such a problem exists. The failure of England in 1776 to recognize the American colonial problem cost the British Empire the American Colonies; the failure of the Allies in 1916 to recognize the problem of the Russian Revolution has cost us the Russian Alliance; our failure to recognize the labor problem in the West and the Middle West may cost us the war.

The problems which the labor situation now presents are those involved in the new labor movement which on the European continent is known as syndicalism and which in this country is represented by what is commonly called the Industrial Workers of the World.

Syndicalism is primarily a protest against the current economic order. It is a movement calculated to strike at what it conceives to be the productive and distributive injustice in society. In the second place, syndicalism is a challenge to all other working class organizations which profess to strive for the realization of the same ends. In effect, syndicalism is the expression of a strong feeling that these other organizations have been weighed and found wanting.

In their impeachment of the existing industrial order, the syndicalists are probably more pronounced and more vituperative than the socialists or trade-unionists. In the main, however, their arraignment of present-day society coincides with that of the radical socialists.

The basis of the discontent of these classes is practically the same in every country where class-consciousness has been developed to any great extent. In almost all civilized countries, in spite of the marked improvement in the productive processes, the relative economic position of the laboring class has not materially changed. That is to say, the discrepancy between their wants and their means of satisfying them has, if anything, changed for the worse. At the same time, tested by this standard, the material condidition of the well-to-do class has improved. The result is increasing economic inequality among the various classes in society. Even if the contention be accepted that the working classes of today are in better material circumstances than they were ten or twenty years ago, the grounds for the discontent of these classes is not removed, for the formula of well-being is now expressed by the ratio of requirements to the means or ability to satisfy them. At any rate, the question is not whether the laborers *are*, as a matter of statistics, more prosperous than they may have been in the past; the question is whether they *think* they are.

The syndicalist movement, both in Europe and in America, is viewed by the socialist with much concern, because of its scathing criticism of modern socialism. The principal charge urged against socialism by the syndicalists is that by indulging in politics it has lost its revolutionary spirit and has become ineffective. Naturally, so the argument proceeds, because the political game involves "compromise and concessions" at every turn. The thirst for power and dominion has insidiously displaced the larger and nobler aim with which socialism set out. In-

[1] Loyalty Leaflets, No. 2, published by American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, New York.

stead of holding fast to the cause of the enslaved laborer and suffering humanity, socialism, it is argued, has degenerated into a mere political party and the masses are used as tools by their leaders, who no less unscrupulously than the leaders of other political parties, resort to rather dubious practices to obtain and hold high offices.

As a climax to these treacherous perversions of aims and methods, it is alleged that socialism is scarcely to be distinguished from any of the current *reform* movements which are characteristically middle-class endeavors and subservient to middle-class interests. They do not represent the proletarian aspirations.

In so far as socialism is looked upon by the syndicalist as primarily a reform movement, it is distrusted. It is viewed as playing the rôle of a sycophant and panderer—much the same as the dominant political parties. The syndicalist has lost faith in reforms, regardless of the party promising them. He points with derision to the failures of early communistic colonies. He scorns the modern agitation for "employers' liability," "workmen's compensation," "profit-sharing," etc. The very fact that these measures are deemed necessary is regarded as a strong indictment of the existing order. These emendations are regarded as mere anaesthetics administered to the suffering social body by a designing physician. They are no cure for ills.

The situation appears no less desperate when the syndicalist turns to trade-unionism. It is maintained that these unions are usually made up of highly skilled and specialized labor. With their elaborate rules, exorbitant dues and initiation fees, they succeed in keeping out many laborers, with the covert purpose of protecting themselves against an "excessive" supply of labor. This being the case, the trade unions no longer represent the laboring class, but only the pecuniary aristocracy of labor. The trade unions have become a "vested interest."

The conditions which have to a large extent helped to bring about this change in the point of view of a large section of the laboring population have been the modifications in the practical fields of economics and politics. In France, for example, the birthplace of Syndicalism, the growth of the movement has been largely due to the numerical and financial weakness of the French trade unions. These represent only a small percentage of the male working population. In the United States the syndicalist movement has been favored not so much by the absolute decline of trade-unionism but rather by the increasing inadequacy of the trade unions to meet the requirements of constantly growing new elements in the labor market.

In this country, as almost everywhere else, the laboring population may be broadly divided into skilled and unskilled laborers. The trade union has been for some time and continues to be primarily an institution of the upper working class. Except in sporadic instances, it excludes the unskilled group of laborers almost automatically. On this account, there have been intermittent agitations on the part of the lower laboring classes to induce the trade unions to extend their "sphere of influence" so as to embrace the entire working population. The pressure, however, has been not very appreciable until within recent years since this country has been flooded with large streams of immigrants. Combined with this phenomenon of immigration, there is the further fact of substantial technological improvements in the productive processes which have narrowed down the distinction between skilled and unskilled labor. The industrial requirements for special training have thereby grown less rigid. As a result of these two factors, unskilled labor has come to be a formidable force in the economic life of society and especially in the labor market. As far as it concerns the trade unions, they are forced to face the dilemma of either absorbing the additional labor supply and thereby weakening their strategic position, or of furnishing the employing class with a powerful lever by not recognizing the new labor force. A third course is open to the unions: They may make peace with the employing classes and thus reduce the dimensions of the labor struggle to a mere family feud (between the two groups of labor). In which case, of course, the result to the unions cannot be reassuring, since there is no reason to suppose that peace under such circumstances can be obtained from the employers except at the cost of substantial concessions.

As a matter of general policy, the trade unions seem to have elected the second course, technically known as the "closed union" policy. The result of this policy has been, on the one hand, to force the unskilled group of workers on their own resources in their struggle with the em-

ploying class, and, on the other hand, the trade union finds itself in the unsavory predicament of having to wage war against both capital and labor.

There is also to be considered the more remote influence of the form which the industrial organizations have latterly come to assume. Since the beginning of the century, there has been a phenomenal development of the corporate form of organization. The simple business corporation which grew out of pools and combinations has given place to the holding corporation and interlocking directorates. This highly centralized form of business management has come to dominate the productive process generally and serves as a model for a rather compact organization among the laborers. Labor, like capital, marches in phalanxes.

Turning to the field of political activities, the situation seems no less disheartening to the lower working class. The prospects for immediate relief through political maneuvers seem no brighter, according to the vision of the syndicalist. For instance, he observes that the handful of men sent to the legislative bodies seldom if ever devote their efforts to the interests of the working class. The syndicalist very frequently sees the erstwhile plutocrat, after a political defeat, metamorphosed into a champion of the oppressed classes. But from the moment when the votes of the proletariat have enabled him to obtain a sinecure at the hands of the people he becomes an enemy of the proletariat.

Thus disowned by the trade unions and deceived by the politicians, the syndicalist seeks an anchorage in the "unseen music of the night." His only solace he finds in the ecstatic contemplation of a workingman's heaven on earth and is ready with the zeal of a religious devotee to hasten the day of deliverance. Usually weak in numbers and material resources, without property interests and conventional attachments, the syndicalist becomes an easy prey to the germs of a doubting, despondent, and destructive intellectual environment.

If the foregoing analysis is correct, it should be clear that the syndicalist movement is not of accidental origin. Nor is it altogether the result of temperamental peculiarities of a particular class of people. Admittedly, racial traits and special local conditions have had some share in the development of this new phase in the labor movement, but these factors cannot be regarded as sufficient cause for this radical change in the point of view of the laboring classes, especially when it is remembered that not all the laborers identified with the socialist movement are of the same class and predisposition.

In the main it seems that the origins of syndicalism are to be sought in the changes in the general cultural situation. It will not do, therefore, to regard the movement as a phenomenon of momentary concern and necessity with only a momentary possibility. The official deliverances of labor leaders notwithstanding, the ferment of this new labor movement is already working its way into the rank and file of trade unionists, which seems to point to an early disintegration of the orthodox trade union form of labor organization.

In normal times, and much more in times of national crisis such as we are witnessing at present, it is the better part of discretion for the country to reconcile itself to the new situation and to recognize it as the inevitable result of changes in habits of thought superinduced by changes in social, industrial and political exigencies of the times.

"Lest We Forget"

By William S. Howe

Russia is in torment. She has finally thrown off the régime which held her in the stagnation of poverty and ignorance for ages, but the effort has rent her asunder and left the fragments helpless, confused, disunited. She has formally made peace and lifted the siege of the Central Powers. Even though this action may be considered that of a faction liable at any time to be displaced by another of a different type, Russia is so weakened that the Allies have abandoned all thought that any appreciable military aid can be expected from her. In consequence, many have turned upon the Russians and pronounced them either traitors or insane. But no amount of abuse

will reveal the reasons for their action, nor give rise to the sympathetic understanding of Russia's present impotence, which must exist if our policy toward her is to be both expedient and just. Rather should we make an honest attempt to realize how valuable her past services to the Allied cause have been, and how the very greatness of her efforts has contributed in a certain degree to her undoing.

1. When the Germans seemed to be carrying all before them in the series of operations culminating at the Marne, the Russians invaded East Prussia, although not properly prepared for such an enterprise, and attacked the Germans so fiercely that they withdrew at least a few divisions from France (where every man then counted) and sent them to the East. The Russians were badly defeated at Tannenburg, but their sacrifice had helped to relieve the pressure on France and the crisis of the Marne was safely passed.

2. The Russians soon after routed the Austrians in the battle of Lemburg, in which it seemed, for a moment, as though they had cut to pieces the main army of the Dual Empire. They followed this up by overrunning Galicia and again attacking East Prussia. This series of events caused the Germans once more to send vital forces to the East just when they were making this second attempt in France.

3. In the spring of 1915, the Russians took Pryzemysl with its garrison—the most considerable capture of the war—and fiercely assailed the Carpathian defenses. This was one—possibly the most decisive—of the reasons influencing Italy to enter the war at the time she did.

4. The Germans, now apparently realizing that the East had become the most important theatre of the war, began their famous offensive, and for six months the Russians, ever fighting, were pushed back in the most disastrous series of defeats of the war. Their losses in men ran into the millions and one of their greatest manufacturing districts passed into the hands of the foe. Warsaw, Brest-Litovsk, Kovno, Grodno, Vilna, Kovel, all fell. They finally halted far in the depths of their own country. While this great disaster was overwhelming them, the French and English in the West were apparently unable to move effectually to relieve the pressure on them.

5. The result of the foregoing was the entrance of Bulgaria on the side of Germany and the quick campaign that annihilated Servia and Montenegro and opened the way from Berlin to Constantinople. England left the Dardanelles.

6. At this moment when events on all sides looked the darkest for the Allies, the Russians in one of the sharpest, most brilliant actions of the war scaled the snowy Caucasus and captured the chief stronghold in Turkish Armenia—Erzerum. This was not in one of the main spheres of fighting, but, coming at such a gloomy moment, it may be called the Trenton of the war.

7. In the late spring of 1915, when the shadows still rested on the Allies—the Somme offensive had not begun, the English surrender at Kut had occurred, the Germans, though at enormous cost, were still progressing at Verdun, and, worst of all, the Austrians were driving the Italians before them from the Trentino and had reached the edge of the fertile plains of Lombardy—the Russians suddenly began what can justly be called one of the grand offensives of the war and made two great breaches in the Austrian line, retaking Lutsk and threatening Kovel. The effect was magical. The Austrian offensive against Italy ceased at once (of course the Italians by this time had managed to realign their troops to meet the Northern menace, but it is doubtful if they alone could have stopped the advance), and the Verdun attacks lost force. The Russians slowly fought their way on until they overran Southern Galicia once more and again attacked the Carpathians. At the same time they made a further advance in Asiatic Turkey, capturing Trebizond and Erzingan. The consequence of this series of successes was that Rumania felt the moment propitious, and, at last, allowed herself to be drawn from her neutrality to the side of the Entente.

8. The Russians managed to send small units to fight with the Allies at Salonica and in France, chiefly valuable for the moral effect.

9. During the war the Russians established national prohibition, almost finished double-tracking the Trans-Siberian Railway, and built an entirely new railway to the Port of Kola, near Norway. They increased the manufacturing facilities of the country.

10. Their great accomplishments were secured in spite of a weak monarch and strong reactionary court party opposed to all reforms and containing a large pro-German element. They

produced no statesman who could be called great, in the sense that Lloyd George or Briand is great. Their military leadership was good, but there was no one to measure with Hindenburg or Mackensen. In fact, it was a people's war with Russia; it was first of all the stupid, but steady and enthusiastic, determination of the Russian masses, backed up by the employment of all the talent that the merchant and professional classes could muster, that carried on the war for almost three years. Peasant co-operative societies, chambers of commerce, district councils, labor organizations, Red Cross institutions, all put their shoulders to the wheel and the vast efforts had their effect, in spite of the mediocrity at the top.

On the whole, it seems fair to say that for two years Russia bore the brunt of the war for the Entente; the English fleet was vital; without the unexampled valor of the French all would have been lost—in fact, the three Allies were mutually indispensable. But the Russians seemed to carry the greatest burden, confronted from the first by practically the entire Austrian army, the larger proportion of the Turkish army, and a fraction, amounting for long periods to almost a half, of the German forces. They fought the vastest battles, sustained the greatest defeats, and won the greatest victories. Up to the fall of 1916 it seemed that it would be their steady, ever-increasing, glacier-like pressure that in the end would wear down the organized efficiency of the Central Powers and make possible some brilliant stroke by the French and English in the West that would end the struggle.

But such was not to be. The Tsar's government went from incompetency and oppression to terrorism and treason. The Russians were forced to turn from their external to their internal enemy. They succeeded in throwing off the hampering incumbus, but at the cost of national strength. Their own heedless actions and announcements have taken from them the fruits of their efforts. Their unexampled sacrifices are to have their reward, not in an accession of external political strength and influence, but in internal liberty which, though at first synonymous with chaos, may later blossom into ordered freedom. But they are threatened with a new autocracy, more dangerous because more efficient, than the old. In heaving off their own bureaucracy they have put themselves at the mercy of the German. It is for us, the Western Allies, who at last, by virtue of their efforts and sufferings, are in a position to win the victory unaided, to avert the impending catastrophe. We can not abandon the Russian democracy. We must look through and over its present madness in its new garb of freedom back to the recent period, when, garbed as a slave, with the dead weight of a cruel and incompetent master on its shoulders, it grappled with a terrible adversary and so battered him as to make our triumph certain.

Russian-Baiting in Our Ports

By André Tridon

The organization of a committee, whose purpose will be to aid Russia and co-operate with her, was welcome news to those who wish Russia well and to those who hope to see close bonds of friendship uniting this country and the great Slav republic.

One of the tasks that committee should undertake at once is to counteract the wave of anti-Russian feeling which seems to be carrying ill-informed people off their feet and causing them, by rash and indiscreet acts, to create useless friction between both lands.

I allude to the treatment two Russian ships, or as the yellow reporter had it, Bolshevik ships, received within the past three months in American ports.

A few months ago, the Shilka reached a port on the Pacific coast. She was loaded, the yellow reporter stated, with gold and artillery for the I. W. W. A small panic resulted from that announcement, the police searched the ship, members of the crew who ventured on shore were insulted, some beaten, several arrested. Failing to discover any Bolshevik rubles or Bolshevik guns, the police finally lost its interest in the Bolshevik crew. The Shilka sailed away, taking back to Russia a disgruntled lot of seamen, who may not wax lyrical when they tell their kin and cronies in Russia about our hospitality.

Viewed from the human angle and from the commercial angle as well, the whole incident was regrettable, to say the least.

The crews of the Tula, Nizhny Novgorod and Kishineff which reached Seattle in March fared even worse. Those men went on strike for higher wages, were charged with mutiny and arrested. They never were tried; after being kept over two months in jail they are being deported to Russia on Japanese steamers in small groups of ten.

The Atlantic coast has now shown itself to be even more unhealthy for Russian sailors than the Pacific seaboard.

Some time in January, the steamship Omsk came to Newport News and was laid up for repairs. In March she loaded a cargo of gun cotton valued at six million dollars, and consigned to Liverpool, England.

During their stay in this country, the Russian sailors found out that the American scale of wages for seamen was some 50 per cent higher than the Russian scale of wages, not to mention a 50 per cent war bonus. The crew then called on the master and demanded an adjustment. The captain promised to consider the question before sailing day. The date of the ship's departure, however, was postponed for various reasons. In the meanwhile, the collector of customs decided, for safety's sake, to send three bluejackets on board the Omsk, as long as the ship with its enormous load of explosives would remain within the harbor.

An unfortunate incident happened then which prejudiced the population of Norfolk against the Russians. Three of the Omsk's sailors returned on board intoxicated and, flourishing loaded revolvers, drove the bluejackets off the ship. The collector of customs asked the immigration inspector to arrest them but his request was denied.

Two weeks later, the ship's captain called upon the collector of the port. He expressed the fear that, when on the high seas, the crew would seize the ship and take into a German port the ammunition consigned to England. His men, he stated, had decided to manage the vessel as the majority of ships of the Volunteer Fleet have been managed since the November revolution, through a committee superseding him in every respect except as a navigator.

The police and a detachment of marines went on board the Omsk that night, roused the men out of their bunks, lined them up on the pier, searched them, sent them back for their clothing and then marched them off to the city jail. Ten days later a hearing was held before United States Commissioner Stephanson. No evidence was produced, but the men were held at the request of the man who was formerly Russian consul in New York City.

R. H. Mann, district attorney for the Southern district of Virginia, decided then to make a technical charge against the Russians, and held them for a violation of the Espionage Act. When the ship was seized by the marines, it became technically "sealed" and no one but legal guardians could be allowed on board. When the men were sent back for their belongings, they did, by accepting the permission granted them, commit an infraction of the customs rulings, and technically violated the Espionage Act.

Thus far the story of the Omsk is perfectly uninteresting and lacking in the news element.

An enterprising reporter, in the employ of Customs Collector Hamilton, who happens to be the owner of a Norfolk daily, injected into this dull case of petty persecution the much needed touch of melodrama. A copy of *Solidarity*, an I. W. W. paper, had been found in the bunk of one of the sailors! The next morning the front page of the collector's daily was occupied by a gruesome story of an I. W. W.-Bolshevik plot to seize the cargo of explosives carried by the Omsk and turn it over to a German raider. After which there was apparently nothing to do except to keep such desperate characters under lock and key.

And they were held for two months, in one of the vilest and worst kept jails in the country, until a group of New Yorkers sent an attorney to Norfolk to investigate the case.

The collector of customs of Norfolk referred Charles Recht, the attorney, to Judge Waddell of Richmond. The judge declared that while the men were innocent of any wrong doing, their "tendencies" made it a risky business to release them except in the custody of a Russian consul. And there is no such official in the United States at present.

On May 23, at last, the case came for trial. Judge and attorney came to an agreement according to which *the fifty-three sailors* would plead guilty of the offence charged to three of them ("Russians, you know, are like Chinamen, they all look alike"), and they were given five days in jail. When released they will have been two months and twelve days in the Norfolk prison.

After which they will be shipped to Russia "as soon as arrangements can be made," in small groups of five or six, for, as Mr. Halstead, director of the customs division of the Treasury Department, put it, it is inadvisable "on account of their dangerous character" to let them ship again on the Omsk or return together on the same ship to Russia.

Thus the lamentable farce goes on. The story of the Shilka was deplorable; and so was that of the three Seattle ships. The story of the Omsk caps the climax. And those stories will spread over Russia. German propagandists will see to it that our democracy, that our courts are made a laughing stock in Russian revolutionary circles.

And then some day, whether the present form of government endures or not, merchants from the Pacific and the Atlantic coast towns will send travelers to Russia to win the good will of Russian buyers.

I dread to think of the welcome which will be accorded to those trade ambassadors. The blood-and-thunder yarns which the imagination of two hundred sailors, gently helped by the shrewd advice of German propagandists, will evolve out of the Shilka, Omsk, and Tula incidents, will make attractive reading. Radical and conservative Russians alike will remember the impudent interference in the affairs of Russia of which Seattle and Norfolk were guilty, when they rebuked and mistreated two hundred Russians suspected of sympathizing with a Russian party which is now in power.

How indignant we would all be, if the Bolsheviks should jail Americans suspected of conservative tendencies, or if a conservative Russian government presumed to arrest citizens of this country, suspected of sympathy for, say the Democratic party! Retaliation would be advocated at once and resentment would obliterate all party lines.

Baiting Russians because some of us do not approve of the turn taken by Russia's national politics, is not only childish and unamerican. It is most unprofitable. It is even treasonable, for nothing could be better calculated to offer help and comfort to the military and commercial invaders of Russia.

Those who cannot be moved by ethical or humane considerations might harken to the call of business.

RELATED THINGS

The American Red Cross and French Civilians

In France, as in Italy, the American Red Cross has acted on the conviction for which Major Grayson M-P. Murphy found words after six months' administration: "That side will win the war whose civilians *don't crack!*"

Civilian work began in July, 1917, with aid in rescuing children from the gas-bombed country near Toul. Today, it extends to over ninety French communities, and the Red Cross Department of Civil Affairs cares for about a thousand patients in nine hospitals of its own and for thousands more at thirty-six dispensaries—not to mention much greater numbers served through French, British and American hospitals partly supplied or endowed by the A. R. C. The policy is to strengthen the earlier established institutions working on good lines, rather than to duplicate them; this is particularly true in the case of French organizations, with which there is most friendly collaboration.

The battle for frontiers seems to many Frenchmen no more vital than the battle for the future France, expressed in childhood. At thirty-seven points the civilian branch of the A. R. C. reaches the children, several health stations being in Paris, where also school lunches are served to youngsters whose mothers are doing work. Medical care for children round Toul and Nancy, as also at Nesle (in the Somme), includes hospitals, dispensaries, and motor dispensaries to reach nearby villages. A war on wheels is waging against tuberculosis and infant mortality in the provinces, where the A. R. C.'s ally in health propaganda, by word of mouth, printed matter, motion pictures, and practical demonstrations, is the Rockefeller Tuberculosis Commission.

There are in France not less than a million and a quarter French and Belgian refugees and repatriates, to say nothing of the much smaller number of Serbs, with whose welfare the A. R. C. is equally concerned. At Evian, the old, the weak and very young—Germany's industrial discards—are repatriated into France from behind the enemy lines—thirteen hundred of them in a day. Often half are children, many of whom, after examination by American doctors and nurses, receive medical care at Evian, or, needing

convalescent care, go to one of the American hospitals near Lyons. Up to March 1, 1918, forty thousand repatriated children had been examined by the A. R. C. at Evian, 980 had been treated at its hospital, 1,750 at its medical and dental dispensaries. But at the request of the French Ministry of the Interior, the A. R. C. helps to receive and place adult refugees also, when relatives or friends cannot take them in. Over fifty provincial representatives of the Red Cross are working at this task in forty-four departments. These look to the housing of refugees, and to supplying them with furniture—the latter on the instalment plant, preferably. At Paris, apartment houses, unfinished because of the war and the moratorium, are being rushed to completion under A. R. C. guarantees. Hundreds (ultimately thousands) of families, especially large families, receive their chance to conserve the family life and self-respect.

Four hospitals directly express the Red Cross wish to help France meet the tuberculosis problem. Institutions recently opened are the Edward L. Trudeau Tuberculosis Sanatorium and Preventorium near Paris, an institution for refugees (capacity doubled since opening on Christmast Day, 1917); the Asile Ste. Eugenie, near Lyons (repatriated); the Chateau-Hospital at Yerres. In and near Paris, the state's drab hospital barracks for the tuberculous were far from being filled. Brightening these barracks and supplying comforts and recreation, the A. R. C. has helped to bring about *an increase of 235 per cent in attendance* since September, 1917. More than thirteen thousand tuberculous patients in 170 hospitals have been reached through grants of considerably over half a million francs' worth of goods, supplies, books, games, etc.

The war-wrecked area includes some of France's richest fields, and the A. R. C. is assisting in the repair of houses, stables, etc., and in the re-establishment of family and community life by providing supplies still lacking locally. Buildings at Croix-Moligneux, Y, Matigny, Quizancourt and Quivieres are being restored. Throughout the liberated region is being fought a war for more beet fields and wheat lands, vitally needed for revictualling France. For reconstruction work, delegates serve in six districts, in which they have opened warehouses and established a delivery service by Red Cross trucks. The work of members of the American Society of Friends (incorporated in the A. R. C.) includes hospitals and dispensaries as well as repairing, the erection of portable houses, and practical agriculture.

Most French soldiers are ex-farmers. A model farm of 500 acres near Tours serves as a school where maimed soldiers learn to use American agricultural machinery.

CORRESPONDENCE

Menial Servants During Wartime

To the Editor of The Public:

Professor Veblen's article in your issue of May 11 is highly interesting, also your editorial comment thereon. It is a subject that I should like to see discussed further in your columns.

Perhaps the war will help change the undemocratic relations of master and servant along with other undemocratic institutions. Professor Veblen's suggestions, if carried out, would work much hardship, of course, but war generally does work hardship anyway, and no unfortunate method of doing things can be changed without hurting somebody.

I cannot help wondering if it would be for the general good of the community to have a substantial increase in the number of families who live in some form of multiple house. That, of course, would be the result of forcing adults who have never learned to do their own work, or who do only a part of it, to get along entirely without servants. It would be the result because such families would find cooking and cleaning an arduous matter at best and would promptly seek small quarters. That is perhaps a minor matter, and perhaps too would prove a temporary one.

A more serious feature of Prof. Veblen's proposition is in regard to families where there are children. It is my firm belief that most mothers with small children need a helper whether or not there are five people in the family. Many a mother with only one baby needs help—a sister or servant or nurse or someone. You may remind me that thousands of mothers get along without. True, and thousands of babies die in the first year of life. Statistics show that vastly more deaths occur under five years of age than at any other age period. It has even been shown that a soldier in the trenches has a better chance of life than the baby in the cradle. Those countries with the lowest baby death rates are the ones that have the most public health nurses—the most help for mothers in other words. The proper care of any baby takes much time, and many babies keep their mothers awake half the night. Then, when all the housework is added, it often makes more than the mother can manage, especially if there is another child. This is true in spite of the fact that there are mothers who manage well alone. Not all mothers—not all good mothers even—can manage well alone, but if forced to try must either neglect their children or lose their own health. You

see, even a woman who is not very strong can often bring healthy children into the world. I think of one now, with two bouncing children, healthy as anyone could ask. If allowed one or two servants, this mother can doubtless have and rear other healthy babies; otherwise in all probability she cannot, from simple lack of physical ability to stand the strain that the care of children involves. For when it comes to babies, the wife of the "common man" needs more help than she has now, and it will be a short-sighted war measure that would tax away the needs of any young mother to obtain such help as she needs for her child or children under five.

Troy, N. Y. ELLEN A. FREEMAN.

The Conscientious Objector

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I have been for about a year a much cheered and comforted reader of yours; and a grateful one, too, because I was the obliged recipient of a subscription I could not have afforded to pay for. Though a pacifist and Socialist and an admirer of the internationalism of the Bolsheviki, and accordingly often finding my own most cherished convictions condemned by you, I was cheered and encouraged by your grave, able, impartial and generous espousal of democratic liberties. Sometimes I drew a breath of utter satisfaction as I realized the constructive aid you were giving all the most courageous and humane ideals of the President, and of his most progressive associates in the Administration.

But small as my discomforts in reading THE PUBLIC are in comparison with the comforts I have received, I must, I think, question, in a direct protest to the editors, your denunciation, in the last issue, of the conscientious objector. In the course of criticizing the propaganda of the Young Democracy, you reprove the writers of it for finding fault rather warmly with the treatment of conscientious objectors, and take occasion to call them rather scornful and severe names.

I cannot think why you do so. Remembering the days when I believed in war as a wise and honorable institution of human justice, I can well imagine how you might think the objectors wrong-headed; but "neurotic egotist" sounds much more like Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Sunday than like THE PUBLIC; and I cannot but think it an expression bestowed at random, like the one "maudlin sympathy" in the lines above, and the statement below that the American Defence Society and the National Security League at least have red blood in their veins.

I do not believe THE PUBLIC judges young men whom, probably, it does not know personally, quite so cavalierly as this. I do not believe that THE PUBLIC considers twenty-five years in prison a trifling inconvenience, or one which the bravest soldier in France would not feel a very sore trouble. Twenty years, fifteen, ten, or even five—even two—would not, I believe, be faced by any free man or woman without a sinking of the heart. If THE PUBLIC will remind itself that to this a great loss of public esteem and of all the hopes and dreams of achievement must be added, I think the writer of this contemptuous paragraph will reconsider his language.

My own heart is heavy for the pain and sacrifice of the soldier and of the civilian alike; of the militarist and the pacifist; I cannot find one thought of scorn for any human misery, or for the misery of any beast. If the ignoring and weary-long imprisonment of the pacifist seem to make a special appeal to his more fortunate —or perhaps more desired—fellow-pacifist outside the walls of the jail, it is only on the principle that close ties of blood, opinion, or association seem to the average acting human heart to involve special claims and effort.

I shall be sorry indeed if I am obliged to think THE PUBLIC's mantle of tolerance and sympathy has been cut down or reefed in.

SARAH N. CLEGHORN.

Manchester, Vt.

The Socialist Party

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I believe you wish to be fair and truthful, and that if you sometimes do injustice it is not intentional. For this reason it seems worth while to ask you to correct the inaccuracies contained in the closing paragraph of your editorial on "The Socialist Congressman" in your issue of May 18.

For one thing, Mr. Germer is not, as you state, one of the members of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. For another, that committee did not, as you state, propose a conference of state secretaries of the party to be held in August; such a conference is provided for in the party constitution, and the Executive has no option in the matter. So much for matters of simple fact. Now as to matters of opinion, which you base at least partly on your misunderstanding of these facts.

It is hardly worthy of you, who are being damned as "pro-German" in many quarters because you stand for a certain measure of economic progress and of civilized political liberty even in war time, to join with the Bourbons in hurling the same cheap epithet at those Socialists whose views on war questions differ from your own. I know that the action of the party at St. Louis was not determined by pro-German influences. I doubt whether there is a growing demand "for a repudiation of the St. Louis platform." There is certainly a desire for a restatement of the party's position, in view of things that have happened since St. Louis; but I, who am one of those desirous of such a restatement, feel that there is nothing "specious" (if that word means insincere) in the argument that, under existing legislation and in view of the attitude very generally taken by certain departments of the Government and by some very influential manufacturers of public opinion, those who disagree with me would be at a great disadvantage in any public discussion of the matter. If you can give us good grounds for hoping that really free discussion would now be possible, you will render an appreciable service. Unless you can do so, however, it is by no

means just for you to question the motives of those who are unwilling to draw their fellows into a dangerous position, while themselves playing safe.

ALGERNON LEE.

New York, May 20.

Monopolizing the Press

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In a recent editorial you point out the danger of the steady increase in newspaper consolidations. The consequent decrease in newspapers leads to the control of public opinion by a few.

The heavy, increasing costs of publishing a newspaper nowadays, combined with a selling price below the cost of production, and a reliance on advertising for revenue, that is often uncertain or transient, has forced the weaker papers in each city to disappear or to sell out to the stronger ones.

Competition in the newspaper field means combination, as in business. We can let a few men control our oil supply, but not our supply of public opinion.

May I, therefore, suggest the following measures, which I think will enable most newspapers, by *co-operating*, to keep editorially and financially free and uninfluenced:

1. By co-operation in each city; to raise the price of the papers up near, or to, the cost of production. Newspapers in many cities have already taken some big steps in this direction.

2. Co-operative purchasing of machinery, newsprint paper, type, etc., to lower the cost of production.

3. Co-operative effort to train men for efficient newspaper work; and extension and correspondence education for men already in the game.

4. Co-operative delivery systems in each city, whenever possible.

The really important factor in a *free* press is that it shall be supported by those it serves and exists for—by its readers. That involves raising the price of papers—and that can be done only by co-operation.

JOHN A. PIQUET, CORPORAL.

Vancouver Barracks, Wash.

An Issue in Embryo

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Your article entitled, "An Issue in Embryo," of April 20, contains the most far-sighted views of the true and actual substance of the issues of this war I have yet heard expressed. While seemingly many of the organizations devoted to journalism today love to cater to and caress the leading characters of modern "big business" and high-water finance, and certainly do make every attempt to placate them when their material interests are in the slightest affected (even if the effect would favor the major portion of the common people), there are still published some magazines earnestly defending the "rights of man," and yours is one of them.

The other day, the Washington *Herald* of this city contained an extract from an address by an Illinois business man (highly eulogized by the *Herald*), in which the leading spirits of the Administration were characterized as weak and incompetent; aggression for foreign markets after the war was recommended, and above all—and worse than all—compulsory universal military service. No thinking American citizen doubts for a moment what these fellows insisting on the two propositions mentioned are "driving at." They desire the resources, human and material, to be organized for the acquisition of disputed or disputable fields of commerce, and to tie the American people to the selfish interests of "big business" through an enormous military system, which if established, could be used to quell any organized resistance to nefarious schemes planned by the "benevolent" gentlemen who control the resources created by the Almighty, and the distribution of them to the millions for whom those same resources were created.

What a Godsend we have a man in the White House who does not "fall" for every proposal from Wall Street, and the stock exchanges and boards of trade over the country! The American people—"the plain people"—are thinking silently, but hard. If your magazine with others keeps up the onslaught against the insidious propaganda emanating from unpatriotic, selfish sources, the people will not be allowed to fall asleep at the switch. When German Military Despotism is crushed, American Commercial and Financial Despotism must be crushed likewise. Keep up the good work, the faithful will not fail you in the day of trial!

E. L. MCCASLIN.

Washington, D. C., May 9.

The Prohibition Amendment

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

As an old time singletaxer and a reader of THE PUBLIC for many years, I regret very much that your able journal has little or nothing to say in favor of the Prohibition Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Some of your contributors have even spoken against the policy of urging it at this time.

Next to the singletax I look upon prohibition as the greatest and most urgent reform now in sight. It is a great anti-poverty movement, a great anti-crime movement, a great movement against corruption in politics; and THE PUBLIC dumb on the subject! This silence is surely not due to a lack of evidence of the influence of the liquor men on political affairs. Do you not live in New York where there is a saloon on prominent corners over a great part of the city? Perhaps you are in favor of the personal liberty of some men to make a prey of others and of these men who are a prey going home drunk to helpless women and children, or leaving them without food and clothing while they drink up the earnings that would have supported them in decency. What is the matter?

W. J. COLEMAN.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

BOOKS

Public Control in England

Wartime Control of Industry. By Howard L. Gray, Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College. Published by The Macmillan Co., New York, 1918. Price $1.75.

This book might be described as an account of the negotiations of the British Government with British Capital and British Labor concerning the terms on which they would agree to co-operate in preventing a German conquest of Great Britain.

Capital seems to have fared pretty well and if the arrangements made were not entirely satisfactory it should be remembered that the Government had to deal with a complicated situation. For example, in the coal trade, the Government undertook to supervise wages, profits, prices, transportation and distribution; to allow everybody fair compensation as nearly as circumstances would permit. Imagine what this means when we find that 20 per cent of the output of 79 concerns was being turned out, according to the auditors at a loss or without profit, 50 per cent at a profit of less than a shilling a ton and 15 per cent at a profit of 2 shillings 6 pence, while, at the same time a large firm of "coal merchants, coal exporters and shipowners," reported net profits of 40 per cent.

The woolen men, ship owners and others admitted their prosperity, while some others were inclined to argue the point. The farmers, for instance, were "dumfounded" at a proposal to fix the price of beef for 1918 at only 63 per cent higher than the price in 1914, and they managed to secure a substantial increase. On the whole it does not seem that capital was unusually discontented.

Labor can hardly be said to have been happy at any time. Wages advanced but so did the cost of living; experts might disagree, as they generally do, about which advanced the more rapidly. The Secretary of the Boiler Makers' Union found, in 1916, that wages had advanced 15 per cent and the cost of living 45 per cent. In 1917 it appeared that the "poorer classes were paying absurd prices for footwear," which may be regarded as a straw showing which way the wind was blowing. But there were other straws showing a contrary direction. It is claimed that in 1916 everybody knew that the "higher wages of the working classes had enabled them to indulge, regardless of prices, in more sweets than ever before."

In the coal mining industry "avoidable absenteeism" was said to be responsible for a shortage in the annual output of ever 13,000,000 tons, and appeals to the patriotism of the absentees had comparatively little effect. Then there was the question of liquid refreshment. When Lloyd-George said "We are at war with Germany, Austria and Drink," he would have been safe in repeating Kitchener's prediction that the war would last at least three years.

Labor, of course, wanted to defeat Germany but apparently could not forget that it had a prior and still unfinished quarrel with Capital. It lost no opportunity to charge Capital with profiteering but at times was willing to patch up a truce in consideration of a "war bonus," which goes to show that a settlement may be reasonably satisfactory without being logical. There seem to have been reasons why Labor should not have cast the first stone at Capital but it is an undeniable fact that Capital presented a shining mark. In the meantime there were men in the trenches who were not negotiating about the terms on which they would save the country.

Of course there is another and a very important point of view from which the whole matter may be regarded. The primary object of the Government was to prosecute the war; to get more supplies for itself and for consumers generally than could be expected from uncontrolled industry, and to get the supplies at lower prices than would have to be paid in the absence of control. Professor Gray finds that some measure of success was attained. This undoubtedly is the general impression and if, at the end of the war, it is still the general impression, we may expect a strong movement to continue government control under peace conditions. Ideal price regulation will not be expected, yet, sooner or later, those who are struggling with the problem will have to ask themselves what they mean by a fair price and they may conclude that they do not know and wonder if any one does. They will find some hints in this book of the difficulty of ascertaining costs and they will find more elsewhere if they go into the matter more deeply. For all that, the movement to regulate and control industry will probably go on. It is a question for the prophets whether it will achieve such success that it will become a permanent governmental feature or whether, sooner or later, there will be a *laissez faire* reaction with revised views of *laissez faire*.

Professor Gray has given what seems to be a careful and impartial statement of the results shown by British experience so far as the facts are yet ascertainable and his book is, therefore, a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

WM. E. MCKENNA.

Population and Subsistence

The Small Family System. By C. V. Drysdale, D.Sc. (London). Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York. Price $1.50.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Huebsch has prejudiced the puritan type of mind against this book by quoting on the cover from a *Smart Set* reviewer who poses by implication, those who differ with the author's conclusions as "professional moralists and mountebanks." The question of family limitation or birth-control is too deep and fundamental to be disposed of in this light and airy fashion. The pros and cons of the problem extend far beyond mere consideration of the household income or the physical health of the community. To the mind of the believer in the perfectibility of the species, its ramifications reach to the outermost limits of all that the human spirit may aspire to. That those who perceive this and hesitate to rush in where angels may well fear to tread, should be so contempteously pilloried—is neither politic nor polite.

It may be conceded that from the medical point of view, and, let us say, from the viewpoint of the sincere sympathizer with the struggles of the poor to make small incomes feed and clothe large families, Dr. Drysdale makes a good case. The curse of the poor is in their poverty, and poverty is largely a matter of relation between dollars and lives to be sustained. The difference in cost of nervous energy, spiritual wear-and-tear, worry and anxiety, between maintaining a small family and a large one upon a given wage, may be to the parents incalculable; not to speak of the difference in the domestic environment of the children. Who then, that has ever visualized the undignified scramble by day and by night that passes for domestic life in the house of a laborer with a constantly increasing family, will have the courage boldly to deprecate what is advocated in this book—the removal of legal restrictions to the spreading of information as to how, without injury to health, the number of births may be kept within the limits of the power to do duty by them? The crucial question is of course, as the author recognizes, as to whether any possible evils arising from the abuse of such information would outweigh the very obvious existing evils of overcrowding among the poor with the consequent degradation in health and character. Our only complaint of Dr. Drysdale's conclusions is that he fails to recognize among the possible results, that which some of his opponents intuitively feel and fear—a loss of that elusive sense of having made a square deal with natural laws, a loss of that consciousness of straightness that not only must underlie all integrity of character, but which forms the necessary substratum of the imaginative, the aesthetic and the religious faculties.

But, however deeply one may sympathize with the author's advocacy of an emergency measure to meet certain definite evils that undoubtedly confront us, a protest must be entered against the assumption underlying the whole argument but appearing most prominently in the title-page note on Malthus, and in the opening sentence of the book, i.e., that poverty is due to over-population. The author assumes this in apparent unconsciousness that he has crossed the border-line which separates the sphere of the practical philanthropist from that of the social scientist. It is as though one were to recommend temporary war measures—food restriction, price fixing, railroad control—and then assume that lack of such measures in the past had caused the war, and that their perpetuation would prevent future wars. Dr. Drysdale ought to be aware that many political economists, professional and unprofessional, regard the Malthusian theory as the most pernicious and misleading fallacy that has ever been foisted upon the too-credulous human mind. It's falsity has been proven both in theory and in fact; in theory because it had been discovered inductively that man differs from all other animals in that he produces his own sustenance instead of taking it passively from Nature's hand, and that his power of production increases faster than his natural increase in numbers—in fact, because those who have opportunity to observe, know that the worst periods of unemployment and destitution have occurred when granaries have been choked with food-stuffs, warehouses stacked ceiling-high with unsold clothing, houses lacking tenants, and money lying unused in banks with the rate of interest at a minimum. If Malthus had lived and written in this generation, his "Theory of Population" would have been laughed out of court. For we now know that since, through the facilities of ocean transit the world has become a unit as regards its production and consumption of all we call wealth, population has never pressed against the means of subsistence; no families, however large, have ever lacked food because of food-shortage, or shivered because of scarcity of clothing, or been houseless for lack of shelter. The historical memories of local famines that survived till Malthus' time, give some justification for his having slipped into a false line of reasoning, but none for educated men of today adopting a theory that is contradicted by common sense and experience.

The dread under which Dr. Drysdale suffers in common with most Neo-Malthusians, that mankind may outrun the means of subsistence, would be dispelled by a due appreciation of Herbert Spencer's great generalization that "Fecundity and Individuation vary inversely." In a shoal of herring there is practically no individuation, and each will lay a million eggs; rats and mice are notorious for the number of their progeny; while at the other extreme the families of the most highly intellectual human parents are almost invariably small. Full consideration of the bearing of this natural law would have modified Dr. Drysdale's assumption that the reduction of the birth-rate among the well-to-do classes is due to artificial restrictions. On the other hand, where the opportunities for individuation or self-expression are at a minimum or are non-existent, as must be the case in the under-world of the slums, we ought as reasonable beings to expect just what happens, an over-pressure of population as compared with the means of self-expression we allow them.

A walk from the East Side of New York to the marble palaces of Fifth Avenue should convince all who have seeing eyes and understanding hearts, that poverty is due to one cause only—to Privilege and Monopoly in all its protean forms. When Malthus promulgated his theory, the science of political economy was in its infancy, and this illustrating truth had not dawned on the human imagination. But the ugly fact of poverty stared men in the face, and the awakening consciences of the rich required a sedative. This the Malthusian theory supplied and hence its ready acceptance. It laid the blame on the broad back of natural law, and left nothing to be done but to advise the poor to restrict their families voluntarily lest disease and famine should do it for them. But that the ugly falsehood should again raise its head under the guise of a natural law, is intolerable; and the present reviewer protests vehemently against its being tacked on to an argument of mere expediency, which, taken by itself, some reasonable sociologists might be willing to consider.

ALEX. MACKENDRICK.

Vestals

The Unwilling Vestal. By Edward Lucas White. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1918. Price $1.50 net.

This story depicts the life of a Vestal Virgin at the period of Marcus Aurelius. It is difficult to think of the Vestal Virgins of Roman times as prototypes of the "bachelor girls" of the present day, but it is as such that Mr. White presents them. They were women of good family and had independent means, and to mark their sanctity, or, as Mr. White seems to suggest, to compensate for their deprivations, they were granted powers and privileges almost startling in their character.

As typified by Brinnaria, the heroine of this story, they seem to have developed some of the less pleasing characteristics of their modern sisters: restlessness, worldliness, love of material comfort, love of sport, lack of reverence, impatience with weakness—traits hardly consistent with the sanctity attached to the office of a priestess on whom the welfare of the nation depended. The one unforgivable crime of a Vestal was, of course, unchastity, but at the end of her service she was allowed to marry. The day before her wedding, for which she has waited thirty years, Brinnaria says: "I am finding out why so few Vestals ever leave the order. When I realize that after today I shall have no lictor to clear the streets for me, that I may go out in my litter daily, but even so without a runner ahead, that I may never again drive through Rome, that I have been driven up to the Capitol for the last time and may go there hereafter only afoot or in my litter, I am almost ready to change my mind and give up freedom and matrimony and Almo and all and cling to my privileges." It seems a fitting reward for such a woman that the emperor should put at her disposal for the honeymoon "Trajan's own private suite." Brinnaria's attitude towards her religious duties is that of a conscientious and capable government employee, there is no spiritual fire, and even the passion of revolt which might have given depth and force to the character and the story is subordinated to Brinnaria's practical commonsense. There is nothing suggestive of the stark pagan defiance of the cry inscribed on the memorial tablet of Procope, "Procope manus lebo contra deum qui me innocentem sustulit."

The conditions of the life of the Vestal Virgins are represented with fidelity and vividness, but against this archaic setting stand out characters so strikingly modern in idiom and gesture and above all in their views of life that the result is incongruous and unconvincing. That this was felt by the publishers is evidenced by the fact that *two* forewords were considered necessary to prepare the reader for the shock. It is well that the classics should be popularized, and in order to gain a correct idea of Roman social life we must divest our minds of the cramped trivialities of the classroom, and of the hush and chill of the Roman Room of a museum; but the unprejudiced reader must feel that this picture is hardly more adequate than the other, in spite of its historical accuracy, for it lacks the true feeling of its own time, and the substitution of the modern spirit cannot make up for it.

One is tempted to think of this book as humorous in intention, but its two serious prefaces seem to discourage that interpretation. Failing this, one feels that its true sphere is the moving picture theatre; a glance through its chapter headings shows what an admirable scenario it would make, and it leaves one with the impression that one has seen the various thrilling episodes flashing out from the screen.

VIOLET B. DISMORR.

Labor Questions in Perspective

American Labor Unions. By Helen Marot. Published by Henry Holt & Company, New York, 1914. Price $1.35.

This informative and dispassionate book is of more value today than ever before. For now the world is visibly passing through an industrial revolution in the direction of industrial coordination, and Miss Marot furnishes trustworthy material in small compass and logical and readable form for understanding it all.

She gives us the story of labor agitation in the United States down to the beginning of the world-war, which is at its heart a defensive war for advancing industrial democracy against medieval despotism. We may reasonably hope that the War Labor Board, of which Mr. Taft and Mr. Walsh are joint chairmen, will produce an industrial adjustment under the sanction of public opinion, pursuant to which the business relations of "capital" and "labor" will be amicably and equitably arranged with reference to existing industrial conditions. By ending all necessity for militant trade unionism, this would clear the field for that larger economic coordination of which our industrial adjustments for war purposes are singularly prophetic. It is in expectation of this highly probable contingency that the information and explanations which Miss Marot furnishes are especially useful at the present time; and not only to economic students but also to industrial specialists of every class, whether known commonly as workers or as employers.

The American Federation of Labor, for instance—what is its place in the rapidly unfolding history of industrial relationships? And why the Railroad Brotherhoods as distinct organizations? Or, what is this "I. W. W.," of which so much is currently written and so little told? And women in industrial organizations, the sympathetic strike, the "closed" shop and the "open" shop, the union label, the boycott, arbitration, sabotage, and scientific management—what do these things mean, these terms that are so familiar yet so weirdly apprehended by the average newspaper reader? What do they mean to the men and the women who eat bread in the sweat of their own faces?

The American citizen who does not care, might as well be a Prussian, for all the civic use he can possibly be to the growing democratic possibilities which this country is fighting to preserve. The American citizen who does care will find all these things clearly yet sympathetically and sincerely and candidly explained in Miss Marot's book.

LOUIS F. POST.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending May 28

President Wilson on War Revenue

President Wilson appeared before Congress on the 27th to urge the drafting of a new revenue bill at the present session. He told of the necessity for a larger income to meet the enormous expenditures, and assuming that this would come from taxes on incomes, war profits, and luxuries of 1918, he said, the people should know as soon as possible what the new taxes are to be in order to meet them. He stressed the fact that enormous expenditures stimulate industry, producing inflations and extravagances that lead to unsound financial conditions. Warning the members against men who would take advantage of the country's necessities at such a time, he declared that "the profiteering that cannot be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable." Speaking of the determination of the people to win the war, and of their willingness to make the necessary sacrifices, he said:

> We need not be afraid to tax them, if we lay taxes justly. They know that the war must be paid for, that it is they who must pay for it, and if the burden is justly distributed and the sacrifice made a common sacrifice from which none escapes who can bear it at all, they will carry it cheerfully and with a sort of solemn pride.
>
> I have always been proud to be an American, and was never more proud than now, when all that we have said and all that we have foreseen about our people is coming true. The great days have come when the only thing that they ask for or admire is duty, greatly and adequately done; when their only wish for America is that she may share the freedom she enjoys—when a great, compelling sympathy wells up in their hearts for men everywhere who suffer and are oppressed, and when they see at last the high uses for which their wealth has been piled up and their mighty power accumulated, and, counting neither blood nor treasure, now that their final day of opportunity has come, rejoice to spend and to be spent through a long night of suffering and terror in order that they and men everywhere may see the dawn of a day of righteousness and justice and peace. Shall we grow weary when they bid us act?

Congress

A compromise was effected in the Senate on the question of investigation of war activities, the Senate confining its probing to aircraft preparations, and the Administration withdrawing objections to that. As the President's special investigator, Charles E. Hughes has asked free scope, the Senate Committee is trying to keep out of his way and avoid duplication. The House Military Committee agreed upon an appropriation bill for the army for the next year of $11,000,000,000; to which may be added $3,300,000,000 for fortifications, and $1,500,000,000 for ordnance and supplies, and authorization for the War Department to spend $7,118,562,466. The total for the army is estimated at $23,000,000,000. The Senate passed the naval appropriation bill carrying $1,610,000,000, which is $226,000,000 more than the House authorization. The Administration food production bill, authorizing the Agricultural Department to spend $10,864,000 to increase food production was passed by the House with a provision that the principal appropriation of $6,100,000 for the expenses of county agents shall not be available unless the President issues a proclamation forbidding the use of foods for the manufacture of liquor in any form. The Prohibition advocates passed this amendment by a vote of 177 to 133. A bill was favorably reported to the House authorizing the expenditure of $18,000,000 for taking the fourteenth census in 1920.

America's War Preparations

There are now 2,078,223 men and officers under arms, according to a statement made in the House by Representative Caldwell, member of the military committee. In a year, he said, the army would number between four and five million men. Liberty motors, pronounced by Henry Ford to be the best motor ever made, have entered upon quantity production. The Ford plant is producing 100 motors a day; other factories will be producing as many more by June 15. Production will run up to 400 or 500 a day. Airplanes have also entered the quantity production state. Large numbers of the Liberty motors have been ordered by England and France. Provost Marshal General Crowder has directed that a survey of the industries of the country be made in order that men of draft age may be removed from non-essential industries and be sent either to the army or to essential industries. The shifting of jobs will be done with the aid of the United States employment service, wholly under the direction of the Labor Department. In the first twenty-three days of May, 29 steel ships aggregating 174,662 tons were put into active service. Director-General Schwab of the Emergency Fleet Corporation expects the yards to turn out four ships a day, beginning June 1.

Reorganizing the Railroads

Director-General McAdoo on the 21st removed every railroad president in the country on the ground that they were beholden to the stockholders and directors of the roads, instead of to the Federal authorities. Those who are required will be reappointed as representatives of the United States Government. The Director-General, acting on the recommendations of the Railway Wage Commission, has ordered the increase of wages and salaries of nearly 2,000,000 employes, to take effect January 1st last, and amounting in the aggregate to more than $300,000,000. The eight-hour day is recognized. Women are to get the same pay as men for the same work, and Negroes are to receive the same as white men for similar employment. To carry out the purpose of this order, and to adjust it to the varying conditions and circumstances there has been established a Board of Railroad Wages and Work-

ing Conditions. To offset the increase in the cost of railroad operation, estimated at nearly $900,000,000, Director-General McAdoo announced on the 27th a horizontal raise of 25 per cent in freight rates. Practically all passenger fares are raised to 3 cents a mile. reduced fares and excursion rates are abolished, and mileage tickets are raised to 3 cents a mile. A special charge in addition will be made to persons travelling in standard sleeping cars and parlor cars. The new passenger rates will go into effect June 10, and the new freight rates, June 25. Mr. McAdoo asks the public to accept the increases in rates as a part of the war burden.

Red Cross Campaign

The week's campaign to raise the second $100,000,000 for the American Red Cross closed with $143,453,621 reported, and nine divisions incomplete. New York City, whose allotment was $25,000,000, raised $33,434,730. In 1864 the city raised $1,000,000 for army relief work under similar circumstances.

European War

The second assault of the present campaign in the West was begun by the Germans on the morning of the 27th. The main attack was made on a thirty-five-mile front extending from Rheims to a point north of Soissons, and succeeded in pushing the Allies back to a depth in the greatest extent of five miles. The retirement was orderly and with unbroken front. A lesser attack was made at the same time in Flanders, south of Ypres, between Locre and Voormezeele, a front of six miles. Slight initial gains were overcome by counter attacks of the Allied forces. These two attacks are interpreted to indicate an intention to break through into the Ypres plains, and so on to the Channel ports, and to reach Paris through the Aisne front. Coincident with this attack the long-range bombardment of Paris was resumed, which had been interrupted since April 17. The Italian forces made a successful attack on the Trentino front north of Lake Garda, taking two peaks, a town and 870 men. The German forces in southern Russia are pushing on into the Don country, in spite of protests from the Russian Government. British dispatches announce successful operations in Mesopotamia, where their forces have driven the enemy from fertile districts at a time when the crops are ripening. Eight thousand prisoners have been taken, together with cannon, machine guns and booty by the British forces operating in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers since March. [See current volume, page 676.]

* *

Dr. von Kühlmann, the German Foreign Secretary, in a speech to the Berlin Chamber of Commerce, said the Roumanian treaty gave Germany control of Roumanian mines, railroads, the Danube, ports and cables. Speaking of the agreement by which Germany secured the Roumanian harvest of 1918-19, and an option on the Roumanian harvests for the next seven years, the Secretary said: "One can look forward to the whole food question with a certain amount of confidence. . . . Formal war indemnities were not demanded by Germany, but the numerous privileges we secured are equivalent, in the opinion of experts, to anything which would have been yielded by indemnities."

* *

The British Admiralty announced on the 21st in the first monthly report since April 24, that the Allied and neutral ships lost in April totaled 84,393 tons. During the same period a year ago the loss was 220,709. The gain of ship production over submarine destruction continues to increase, while the destruction of U-boats outruns construction.

* *

Airplane activities assume ever greater importance. Reports at present indicate that the Allies have the larger force and are able to prevent the German planes from crossing the line except at night. Allied planes have dropped large quantities of bombs on depots and military works behind the German lines. Reprisals have been made also in return for German attacks on open towns in France and England.

* *

Costa Rica declared war on the Central Powers on the 24th. This brings the number of nations at war with Germany up to twenty-two. All of the Central American countries have declared their position. Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Costa Rica have become belligerents. Honduras has severed diplomatic relations with Germany, and Salvador has remained neutral, explaining that her neutrality is friendly to the United States.

Ireland

The crisis in Irish affairs remains. The British Government states that both American secret service officers and British have discovered plots in which members of the Sinn Fein had made plans to rebel against the British Government with the aid of the Germans. Action was to have taken place when the last drive on the West Front showed signs of success. Both the American and the British Governments withhold the evidence upon which the Irish leaders have been taken into custody because of pending operations. Nationalist leaders are absolved from any participation in the pro-German movement. John Dillon, Nationalist Leader, bitterly denounces the Government for its conscription policy, and promises resistance to the last degree to its enforcement. [See current volume, page 677.]

Russia

Little news that is definite or encouraging is coming out of Russia. Great need of outside assistance appears, but the way to render it is still uncertain. President Wilson's declaration that he would stand by Russia as he would by France has met with a warm response at home and abroad. Growing friction is apparent between the Russians and Germans. Even some of the radical German papers berate their Government for its foolish and needless oppression of Russia, and its dis-

regard for the terms of its own treaty dictated at Brest-Litovsk. The White Russian Republic is announced. It embraces a large and vaguely defined territory to the east of Lithuania, and north of Ukrainia. No details of the government or organization have been received, except that it has the sanction of the German Government. Premier Lenine, addressing the All-Russian Soviets, at Moscow, declared the Government should no longer depend upon the printing press for money, but should resort to taxation. He favored a general income tax, collected monthly. The present money, he said, would soon be replaced by new money on the basis of ruble for ruble where persons hold small amounts, but at a discount in the case of those holding large amounts. [See current volume, page 677.]

Mexico and Cuba

Mexico recalled her Minister to Cuba on the 24th. The explanation given for this action by General Aguilar, Secretary of Mexican Foreign Relations, was the desire of his Government to avoid embarrassing Cuba during her participation in the war. He said that country would be obliged to do many things that a Mexican Minister would have to protest against if present. He avowed great friendship for Cuba, and hoped by this means to avoid friction. Cuban officials attributed the action to a desire to strike at the United States on account of trade restrictions adopted as war measures. The Cuban State Department announced on the 27th to Cuban diplomats in all foreign countries that diplomatic relations between Cuba and Mexico had not been ruptured. It was stated that a cablegram had been received from Mexico asking that the Cuban Chargé d'Affaires at Mexico City be allowed to remain for the present.

Bohemia

Professor Thomas G. Masaryk, president of the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Europe, addressed a large meeting in New York City on the 25th, where he made clear the meaning of the rioting and confusion mentioned so often of late in dispatches from Bohemia. The nineteen nations of the Balkans, he said, must be free and independent before there can be lasting peace. Austria-Hungary he denounced as "an organization of violence," where the minority of two nations ruled a majority of seven nations. Bohemia, he said, would not be satisfied with autonomy, but must be independent; the world must be rid of Austria-Hungary and the Hapsburgs. Bohemia is an old and independent nation of ten million people, and is eighth in point of population among the nations of Europe. The recent re-districting of Bohemia is one of the worst cases of gerrymandering, and is done for the purpose of giving the Germans representation out of all proportion to the number of inhabitants. Hence the rioting by people who will no longer submit to the evil.

The Public
A Journal of Democracy

Founded and Edited, 1898-1913, by LOUIS F. POST and ALICE THACHER POST

EDITORS:
MRS. JOSEPH FELS JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER
GEORGE P. WEST STOUGHTON COOLEY
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.

Chino-Japanese Understanding

Regarding the pact signed by China and Japan the Chinese Government announces that owing to the fear of an eastern movement of the German forces since the conclusion of peace between the Russian and German governments, China and Japan felt that they must take joint action against hostile military movements in Siberia or Manchuria. The agreement is to terminate with the present war, and it will not be enforced unless the influence of the enemy actually penetrates Siberia. The convention does not involve the sovereign territorial rights, and it grants to Japan no privileges. Details are not announced because of their military character. Japan entertains hopes that the present accord will develop into closer economic relations between the two countries.

The Restoration of Palestine

Charles Boissevain, nestor of Dutch journalism, and chief editor of the *Algemeen Handelsblatt*, published at the Hague, says in a recent defense of the right of the Jews to a political nationality:

> In the liberation of Jerusalem and in the declaration which the English Government has made in the name of the Entente, I see the triumph of the principle that the small nationalities shall be made members of the League of Nations. Justice to the small nationalities would lose its entire prestige if the oldest and the most famous of these small peoples should be left to the mercy of Turkey. The renaissance of Israel will be one of the triumphs of this war. . . . As a new independent state, it will richly develop along every possible avenue. And we in Holland, who have profited so much from Jewish scholars, physicians, artists and authors, will greet the new Hebrew University in Jerusalem with sincere sympathy and enthusiasm.

NOTES

—The War Department has let contracts for the establishment of two picric acid plants, one located at Brunswick, Ga., to cost $7,000,000, and one at Little Rock, Ark., to cost $4,000,000. Picric acid is used in making certain explosives.

—Official announcement of the appointment of Mr. Felix Frankfurter as agent of the Federal Government in co-ordinating the labor policy of the various departments, and as chairman of a Labor Policy Board, shows that his title is to be assistant to the Secretary of Labor.

—Tobacco, which heretofore has been purchased by the soldiers or issued by the Red Cross or other agencies, is to be made a part of the regular rations. The War Department has taken this action on the recommendation of General Pershing. The ration will be four-tenths of an ounce of smoking tobacco and ten cigarette papers. Certain articles may be substituted.

—The American Peace Society, at its ninetieth annual meeting in Washington on the 26th, adopted resolutions pledging its whole-hearted support to the Government in winning the war. Representative James L. Slayden, of Texas, was re-elected president, and W. H. Taft, W. J. Bryan, Andrew Carnegie, Theodore E. Burton and J. H. Ralston were re-elected vice-presidents.

—John Murray and James Lord, two of the three delegates of the American Federation of Labor, were received on the 24th by President Carranza, who was much interested in the development of American labor. The delegates report labor conditions there better than they had expected to find, and expressed confidence that the Mexican Federation of Labor will co-operate with the American order.

—Charles Knight, the Negro riveter of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, who drove 4,875 rivets in nine hours on the 16th, was awarded the prize of $125 offered by Lord Northcliffe. Tom Horn of the Moree Shipbuilding Company, San Francisco, is reported on the 22d to have driven 5,629 rivets; and on the 23rd it is reported that William Moses of Vickers, Barrow, England, drove 5,804 rivets in nine hours.

—Statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the ten months ending April, 1918, as given by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for April, 1918:

	Exports	Imports	Balance
Merchandise	$4,893,676,259	$2,362,480,034	$2,531,196,225 Expt.
Gold	184,549,176	85,900,946	98,648,230 Expt.
Silver	84,239,001	59,230,581	25,008,420 Expt.
Total	$5,162,464,436	$2,507,611,561	$2,654,852,875 Expt.

The exports of merchandise for April, 1918, were $500,118,062, as compared with $529,927,815 in April, 1917, and $398,568,532 in 1916. The imports for April, 1918, were $279,008,927, as compared with $253,935,966 in April, 1917, and $218,236,397 in 1916. [See current volume, page 614.]

The Public in the Camps

WHEN a fund was opened to get THE PUBLIC to the camps, the frequent comment was that soldiers would have no time or inclination to read, especially the more thoughtful publications.

Six months has proved that both these guesses were bad guesses. The men in camp have four or five hours of leisure out of every twenty-four. Most of that time comes in an unbroken interval between the end of the days work and the time of putting out lights in the barracks. The individual soldier spends most of these free evenings on the reservation, and the facilities for amusements other than reading cannot provide for more than a small part of the men at one time.

The American Library Association's figures show that 40% of the men use the Camp libraries and our own correspondence with librarians and secretaries and soldiers indicates very clearly that THE PUBLIC is being used extensively.

From three to twelve copies have been going to every reading room (Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus and American Library Association). The fund to be used for this purpose was closed for a time because we had sufficient on hand to take care of all camp libraries then open in this country, and we were—and are still—unable to get official lists of reading rooms in France.

Now the camp-library subscriptions entered last October are falling due for renewal. Between four and five hundred ended in March and April—others end this month.

It is important that these subscriptions be continued and that new subscriptions be entered for reading rooms recently opened.

Mail Today to THE PUBLIC, 122 East 37th Street, New York

The boys use up your valuable paper as soon as it arrives. If you would send 12 instead of 8 I know they would be used in an appreciated manner. [*From Camp Gordon.*]

It is impossible to say just how many copies of THE PUBLIC I would use, I might say that I have so many calls for it that I would not want to appear hoggish. If you can consistently send me more I assure you they will be appreciated.
[*From Camp Wheeler*]

THE PUBLIC is as different to the ordinary journals as sugar is different from salt and for this reason it is sought after by the man whose desire is for better knowledge of the times.
[*From Camp Wheeler*]

I enclose check or money order for $....., as a contribution to the fund to send THE PUBLIC to camp-libraries.

It is understood that these subscriptions will be entered at a rate that does not exceed cost of paper and printing; and to everyone who contributes $3.50 or more, we will send a copy of Edward Howard Griggs' new book, "The Soul of Democracy" [published by Macmillan's at $1.25].

Name .....

Address .....