The Public

A Journal of Democracy

The Death Throes of the Hapsburgs

Torpedoing Our Labor Policy

Via Dolorosa

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

June 8, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI | **New York, N. Y., June 8, 1918** | **Number 1053**

Contents

Germans are poor psychologists if they count on the visit of submarine raiders to the Atlantic Coast as a terrifying or disheartening influence. New Yorkers felt rather the thrill of adventure when they realized that shells from six-inch guns or bombs from a hydroplane might be added to the other stimulations to excitement which the metropolis offers. They felt somehow privileged, and rather sorry for fellow-citizens whose distance from the seaboard enforced such utter security upon them. The bright face of danger must sometimes darken under the shell fire of the trenches, but for those of us who stay tamely at home the feeling of being even slightly, even potentially, "in it," is no more than a pleasant thrill. And that thrill celebrates the birth of a new fighting spirit, of a new and more personal determination in every citizen to see the thing through to the utter confounding of the Hun and all his works.

* * *

In an interview with the correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, Baron Goto, the Japanese foreign minister, gave his interpretation of the policy of intervention in Siberia. It was clearly conveyed that Japanese action would wait upon proposals on the part of the Allies, but it was equally clear that Japan stood ready, either alone or in cooperation with the Allies, to undertake an expedition. There was some indication of intent in the statement that Japan preferred to act alone on the ground that, "we believe a unified homogeneous army is essential to the success of the expedition." The consideration of national pride is also urged. As regards compensation, Baron Goto is reported as saying: "That depends on the varying circumstances, the size of the army, the breadth of the theater of operations, whether the action is independent or cooperative, and whether intervention is judged to be entirely necessary in Japanese defense."

* * *

In contrast with the attitude of the Japanese Foreign Office, and as indicative of the only policy that can be followed with hope of success, we have a close view of Russian requirements, furnished by Mr. Phillips Price, correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, a most trustworthy interpreter of Russian affairs. He tells us that the proletarian government and its supporters are not only aware that war with the Central Powers is inevitable, but that they are making active use of the respite of peace in preparation for the renewal of hostilities. He says: "The close proximity of the Central Powers makes the latter the most dangerous enemy, and in the natural course of events all the energies of the young Republic will be directed to avenging the crime of the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Of the other capitalist powers the most feared is Japan on account of her proximity in the Far East, while France is suspected of abetting Japanese Annexationist designs in Eastern Siberia. England and especially America are regarded with the least dislike of all. . . . If, therefore, the Soviet Republic could be convinced that England and America have no connection with any intrigue to annex Eastern Siberia, a basis of a possible *rapprochement* between these three States might be found." There is clear warning against any attempt on the part of the Allies to bolster

up the counter-revolution bands, as any attempt of this kind would throw the Soviets into the hands of the Germans. "Assistance must take the disinterested form, for instance, of railway organizers, engineers, instructors of a new army, arms and munitions, thus helping Russia to resist further invasion of her territory by the Germans."

* * *

There is increasing apprehension in England that the Irish situation is drifting to a catastrophe. The declared intention of the Government to enact joint measures of Home Rule and conscription, will, it is believed, defeat both. Sir Horace Plunkett, whose wisdom and moderation have made him preeminent as an impartial judge of Irish affairs, has issued a grave warning. He believes that the intended procedure would bring about the worst situation since the Fenian days, and render a settlement of any kind impossible. On the other hand, he declares that, "even now, at the eleventh hour, it is not beyond the resources of statesmanship to achieve the double purpose the vast majority of both people have in view. . . . There is one, and only one, alternative to the disastrous policy upon which the Cabinet has embarked, and that is to set up at once a responsible government in Ireland." He believes that an Irish government would proceed at once to give the fullest possible military aid. "The Irish people, given their own instrument of government, would quickly show the world what is their real attitude to this war. It may then dawn upon Englishmen that we have in Ireland no pro-Germans except those they have made, not through *malice pre pense,* but through incapacity to understand us." It is worth remembering that this suggestion is in line with the foundation of Grattan's Parliament which came into existence under much the same circumstances. From this distance the problem seems capable of a very simple solution. The Irish Convention laid down principles that did not differ substantially from those of the Home Rule Act of 1914. That measure would go automatically into operation merely through the repeal of the act by which it was suspended at the beginning of the war. If it is true, as Sir Horace Plunkett asserts so emphatically, that Irish military aid would be immediately forthcoming, the whole difficulty would be removed.

The reactionary majority of the Supreme Court has, by its decision invalidating the anti-child labor law, again brought that institution into discredit and reminded us that we have in it a body as archaic as the British House of Lords before its veto power was removed. It was never intended by the framers of the Constitution that the Supreme Court should exercise the power of over-ruling Congress and constituting itself the final spokesman in matters of Federal legislation. That power was taken upon itself by the Court. Chief Justice Walter Clark of the Supreme Court of North Carolina expressed the liberal view of it when, testifying before the Commission on Industrial Relations three years ago, he said: "I have always believed that Mr. Thomas Jefferson was right when he said it was an assumed power and there was no authority to exercise it." Justice Clark's convincing argument for this view can be found in Senate Document 610, Sixty-Third Congress, second session, by those who are interested. Congress should pass a law specifically forbidding the Supreme Court to declare its statutes unconstitutional, and if this act itself were declared so, then the Constitution should be amended to the same effect. Justice Holmes' dissenting opinion in the child labor case, concurred in by Justices Brandeis, Clarke and McKenna, showed clearly enough that the majority, which included Justice McReynolds, not only ignored public policy but reversed previous decisions in which the right of the Federal Government to use its control over interstate commerce for salutary ends had been established. Notable among these were the decisions upholding the Sherman anti-trust law, the Mann white slave act, and the Pure Food and Drug act. Justice Holmes stated the case in a nutshell when he said: "The National welfare is higher than the rights of any State or States, and Congress was clearly justified in using all its efforts along that line." The amazing extent to which the majority showed themselves blind to social and economic facts is shown by Justice Day's frequent characterization of child-labor regulation as a "purely local matter." This is to disregard the fact that cotton mills in the South compete with other cotton mills in New England, California, and other sections, and that their undisturbed right to employ children under 14 has a direct influence in breaking down labor standards in all other competing districts. There

is a small crumb of comfort in the fact that Justices Brandeis and Clarke, the most recent appointees, dissented from the decision. Justice McReynolds' voting with the reactionaries is unpleasant to contemplate. For the benefit of those citizens who do not understand the exact relationships in our Government, Congress by resolution or otherwise should declare promptly its intention to correct the situation created by this decision.

* * *

A solution of the problem of dealing with the meat packing monopoly is merely postponed by the decision of an interdepartmental committee against Government operation either of the entire industry or of the stock yards. Profits are to be published from time to time, and the whole industry is to be made subject to more minute investigation and regulation. It is rather a plan for more carefully diagnosing the disease than for curing it, but the cure will follow if President Wilson follows the course that he has taken with respect to the railroads. And when the remedy is applied there will no longer be any dissent in the face of a showing that every milder palliative has been tried and found wanting. The postponement of an adequate remedy is disappointing. Representatives from the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration in the interdepartmental committee apparently outvoted representatives from the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Labor, who wanted more radical action. Our hope lies in the logic of events and the abundant evidence that the Administration will not long hesitate to take any step that is clearly and indisputably dictated by the public interest.

* * *

An excitable Congressman charges that the Administration's insistence on a new revenue bill is a result of a conspiracy of publishers looking for special privileges, and he receives a friendly letter from Secretary McAdoo pointing out the absurdity of the statement. A woman quite as disinterested as Mr. Kitchin,—a woman who has devoted her life to advancing American ideals in the economic field,—says something equally ridiculous in a moment of heat and is sentenced to prison for ten years. Cannot the Department of Justice do better than this? Must the staunchest supporters of President Wilson and his policies be continually irritated and their enthusiasm be cooled by such instances of unnecessary destruction of individuals? Would it not have been worth the time and fully in keeping with the dignity of some Federal official at Washington to have sat down and dictated an open letter to Mrs. Stokes, pointing out the efforts made by the Administration to abate profiteering and showing the absurdity of a statement that "the Government is for the profiteers"? Of course, Washington authorities can evade responsibility in such cases by pointing out that action was taken by a local grand jury in the Federal Court of Kansas City, and the case prosecuted by a local Federal District Attorney. But if the enforcement of the Espionage Act by Federal district attorneys is not subject to a national policy, formulated at Washington, it certainly should be. And only the cheapest sort of lawyer-mind will reply that the enforcement of law is an inexorable process, in which nothing is left to discretion. Mrs. Stokes is not a disloyal American. She was influenced by the same set of facts that led President Wilson a few weeks later to take steps to guard Congress against the influence of men and interests, who, he himself tells us, have been successfully profiteering. Her statement was sweeping, ridiculous, and grossly unfair to the Administration at Washington. Her mind was intent on a certain set of facts that, taken by themselves, might point to the conclusion which she uttered in a moment of excitement. Price-fixing was, of course, on a tentative basis last year and involved quick decisions, with the possibility that errors on the side of injustice to the manufacturer might prove disastrous to full production. And Congress did hesitate and fail to stop up the gaps in price-fixing by passing an adequate excess profits tax. To interpret this as meaning that "the Government is for the profiteers" is a gross distortion. Yet such distortions are common enough in political discussion, where speakers and writers are in the habit of painting everything white or black. A margin between exact statement and distortion must be permitted if we are to uphold our political institutions. We believe that Mrs. Stokes' transgression came within this margin and should have been dealt with by other means than a harsh application of the criminal law against disloyalists.

Torpedoing Our Labor Policy

A serious crisis in the labor situation of this country is precipitated by the action of the Western Union Telegraph Company in flatly refusing to abide by the recommendations of the Taft-Walsh Board and the principles agreed upon by it for the adjustment of industrial relations during the war. Unless public opinion rallies to the Board, and through some effectual agency forces the Western Union directors to subordinate their prejudices to the national interest, the influence and authority of the Board will be so curtailed as to disqualify it for performing the great and urgent task for which it was created. Labor will place no reliance in it, and neither party to subsequent controversies will feel obliged to respect its decisions. Quite as serious as the action of the Western Union Company is the refusal of the five employer members of the Board itself to approve the report submitted by the Board's Joint Chairmen, Messrs. Taft and Walsh, in which the Company's course was found to be contrary to the principles adopted by the Board. These members repudiate the action of Mr. Taft, who was their own choice as chairman, because Mr. Taft, in applying the Board's principles, refused to assume that these principles were a mere scrap of paper.

The Western Union controversy centers upon the issue of whether an employe shall be free to join the union of his trade or the employer shall be permitted to make membership in the union a cause for summary discharge. That has been the avowed policy of the Western Union Company for many years. It is carried out through the employment of "spotters," who spy upon the operators and report the names of those who either join the union or show interest or sympathy with the union. Men thus reported are promptly discharged. For a Western Union operator to exercise his constitutional right of belonging to a union is to undertake a course marked by all the thrills of membership in a revolutionary society of the old Russia. The story of the long controversy between the Western Union and the Commercial Telegraphers' Union is full of amazing tales of underground forces at work to terrorize employes and to penalize the more daring by depriving them of their jobs and casting them adrift in a trade-world where the corporation blacklist reaches far and wide. Men once "convicted" of joining a union found doors closed to them in other companies, including many of the railroads. To these telegraph operators came the declaration of principles promulgated by the War Labor Board and proclaimed by President Wilson, with its promise that "the right of an employe to join a union shall not be denied or abridged." That declaration was signed by the five employer members selected by the National Industrial Conference Board, representing every important employers' association in America, including even the National Association of Manufacturers and the Metal Trades Association. As with the rest of us, telegraph operators accepted this declaration by the authorized representatives of their employers as having been made in good faith. They probably supposed, as did the rest of us, that regard for the public welfare had at length triumphed in the minds of reactionary American employers, who had resolved to withdraw from a position that was always indefensible. Many operators promptly joined the union, while others no longer took pains to conceal their membership. As a result, something like 800 operators were discharged. A strike was then threatened. The controversy was referred to the War Labor Board, and by it to the Joint Chairmen, Messrs. Taft and Walsh. After full consideration they submitted to President Carlton a proposal that the men discharged be taken back and that the company receive a committee of its own men and treat with it on hours, wages and conditions. The proposal specifically stated that the company should not be required "in any way to deal with the union or to recognize it." All disputes that could not be adjusted between the men and the company were to be referred to the War Labor Board, and the union was to agree and guarantee that no movement initiated by it looking to better pay or shorter hours should lead to a strike, but should be submitted for final settlement to the War Labor Board. This was the eminently fair proposal which President Carlton and his Executive Board flatly rejected. They took this action with a telegram from Mr. Taft before them in which he had reviewed the facts at length and said: "I think the proposal . . . is one which you should accept in the interest of industrial peace. By it you do not recognize the union or deal with it. You deal with committees of your employes. You take back your men discharged for joining

a union, which, under our principles, an employer should not prevent their doing. The union would agree with the board not to order or permit a strike under any circumstances. . . . Under such a compromise, which would be consistent with our principles, the Board would have the power to secure you against the danger of a strike as completely as practical machinery can provide against it. Thus would be removed the danger of resort to a strike and consequent injury, upon which you have based your obligation to exclude union men from your employ. I ask you to consider this proposal. . . . I deprecate an attitude on the part of an employer of men so widely distributed which may defeat the usefulness of our Board."

It is hard to find words strong enough to condemn the course of the great New York financiers who met with President Carlton and rejected this plea. Their action proves that not fear of a strike, but determination to preserve the autocratic principle in American industry, is the actuating motive of the groups of monopolists who control our basic industries.

They are blind to the signs of the times and incapable of comprehending some of the most important factors that are shaping events throughout the world. In a formal statement defending his action, Mr. Carlton says: "If these principles are interpreted as compelling this company and others in like situation to abandon their settled policies and leaving outside organizations free to work as they may see fit among their employes, then the hands of the employers are tied and the principles of the War Labor Board furnish a cloak behind which a propaganda for the unionizing of labor in every industry may be carried on without let or hindrance. Surely there was no such thought in the organization of the War Labor Board, since to use the moral force of that board in an attempt to unionize all trades would inevitably lead to serious disputes at a critical time in the nation's existence." Mr. Carlton has here stated exactly the import of the Board's principles. Those principles said clearly enough that employers were not to deny or abridge the right of their employes to belong to a union, and only those whose minds still live in the dark ages see in such a declaration anything except the affirmative guaranteeing of a right that should never be questioned. Mr. Carlton's talk of "serious disputes at a critical time in the nation's existence" is nothing less than a threat to sabotage the country in its hour of trial. There will be no "serious dispute" involving curtailment of production or service unless Carlton and his Board of Directors persist in their defiance of the Government, and by so doing set an example to other anarchic individuals who may prove so blind, selfish and disloyal as to destroy the usefulness of the War Labor Board and throw our industrial relations again into chaos. The War Labor Board incorporates in its make-up and principles all that has been learned in this country and England as to the handling of labor disputes in war times. Experience in England has demonstrated that industrial peace and continuous production can be obtained only through voluntary cooperation, supplemented by machinery for prompt mediation and arbitration. Labor has shown its willingness to cooperate and to submit its grievances to a government board. Now, in the Western Union case, we see some of the greatest and most influential financiers in the country standing behind a corporation president in a course which, if continued, is sure to render cooperation on this basis, which is the only possible basis, impossible. Nothing more shameful has occurred in this country since we entered the war.

There is even less to say for the five members of the War Labor Board who in effect repudiated the principles which they themselves had formulated only a few weeks before. The issue came before them in a report from Messrs. Taft and Walsh, reciting the course of the negotiations and the final rejection of their proposal by the company. There were no recommendations in the report except that the report be published together with the vote of the Board upon it. But the final paragraph did state that "the construction of our principles, as set forth in Mr. Taft's telegram to Mr. Carlton, leads to the conclusion that the Western Union Telegraph Company should accept this compromise, as therein stated. It declines, however, to do so." And on a motion to approve the report, all five employer members of the board voted "No"!

We are confident that, probably before this issue of The Public reaches its readers, some action will have been taken by President Wilson to defeat this apparent conspiracy of America's industrial autocrats to nullify every effort that the Government has made looking toward the

securing of that industrial cooperation without which the war cannot be successfully prosecuted. If the corporation directors prove impervious to an appeal from the White House, their business should be taken over by the Government and placed under the direction of men who know what democracy and good citizenship mean.

Fitting Wages to Prices

Most timely and pertinent is the report on the "experience of 377 self-supporting families in New York City in endeavoring to make their incomes provide the essentials for healthful living," rendered by the Committee on Home Economics of the Charity Organization Society. The subject matter is of the widest possible interest at this time, and the authority has never been charged with undue leanings toward doctrines of discontent, whether preached by Socialists, Bolsheviki, or I. W. W.'s. The families investigated are not charity subjects, for the report is careful to say they are self-supporting and live in four blocks in Manhattan. One block is on the lower West Side, in the neighborhood of Greenwich House; one on the middle West Side, near Hartley House; one on the upper East Side, near Union Settlement, and one on the lower East Side, near University Settlement. And to remove any possible suspicion in the reader's mind that an ulterior purpose might have influenced the choice of the committee, the report adds: "Each block was selected by the local settlement as representing medium or better grade residential districts in its neighborhood, and all visiting was done in the name of the settlement and under the supervision of one of its residents."

It is therefore somewhat surprising, not to say disconcerting, to be told at the outset that two-fifths of the families visited had approximately the same income as a year ago; that one-fifth of the families had a smaller income; and that only two-fifths of the families had a larger income than a year ago. The committee, accepting twenty-six per cent. as the increase in the cost of living during the year, undertook to find out from personal inquiry how families, whose incomes had a little less than four-fifths of their former purchasing power, were able to make both ends meet. One is prepared by this preliminary statement to hear that "meat, milk, butter, eggs, fruits and vegetables were reported as being used in much smaller amounts, and frequently certain or even all of these foods were left out of the diet completely"; and that "bread, macaroni, tea and coffee were being used in increasing amounts."

One of the Italians visited said: "We manage to get enough food such as bread, macaroni and vegetables, and once in a while some meat. Cheese and olive oil cost too much to use now." Another: "We used to have eggs sometimes, but we haven't touched them for six months. We just live on beef stew and potatoes." Still another: "Prices of Italian foods have almost doubled, but even now Italians know how to manage better than Americans." Yet another: "We are doing without butter, meat and vegetables, and about everything else but bread, rice and macaroni." An Irish woman says her family lives almost entirely on cornmeal mush, with syrup instead of milk. They like it fried, but can't afford fat. Corn muffins are barred because they require eggs and sugar. Another Irish woman said: "What used to do for one meal I make do for two meals now. No, we don't have much, just bread, potatoes and tea, and a little butter now and then." A German woman told of the much larger amount of soup used. "If it's made with rice or noodles, it's filling," she said, "and we don't miss meat so much after eating it." An Italian woman with a sixteen-year-old boy sick with tuberculosis said: "We're buying milk and eggs for him, but the rest of us eat no milk or eggs, just a little meat and a lot of macaroni." The whole tenor of the report indicates a species of slow starvation because of insufficient food or of an unbalanced diet. It is particularly bad for growing children.

Clothing, rent and fuel present difficulties which, though less acute, are none the less real. Patching, repatching, and patching yet again, prolong the life of clothing and the family linen; doubling up or taking in a roomer helps to meet the higher rent; and using less coal solves the fuel shortage. Amusements, recreation and reading were all more or less curtailed.

If it be said that some of the breadwinners in the families are old, or in poor health, or suffering from some physical infirmity, or unskilled, it is scarcely likely to be true of all of them. Even so, it is well known that there are a large number of persons whose incomes either have not advanced at all during the past year, or not to the

extent of the rise in the cost of living. Had wages been so high before prices began to mount as to offer a generous margin, conditions would not now be so serious; but being then at the point of a bare living, the advance in prices is producing absolute hardship.

It has been quite generally assumed by most radicals that persons associated with organized charity societies had become so identified with palliative measures to relieve poverty that they would not countenance any fundamental changes to remove the cause of poverty, lest they thereby destroy their own means of livelihood. If that was ever true, it is so no longer. The report put out by the New York Charity Organization Society gives no such indication. Nor was there any such inference to be drawn from the recent conference of nineteen hundred social workers at Kansas City, Missouri. On the contrary, the fervent desire of the members was to know how to raise wages and better living conditions of the unfortunates who are at the bottom of the social scale; and no speakers met with a quicker response than men like Lawson Purdy, who had a clear and definite proposal looking to the removal of the cause of poverty.

It is true that the report of the Committee on Home Economics does not suggest a remedy for the conditions it sets forth. It was not necessary. Perhaps it would not have been wise; for the two are separate, and to have combined them in the one report would have brought both in question. What has been done is to show in the name of a conservative institution that economic conditions are wrong; and to ask some pertinent questions, to answer which will mean the laying bare the very heart of the question. "Why," the report asks in conclusion, "should it seem to be increasingly necessary for women to share in family support when the men in the families are still at home and regularly employed?" "Why should it seem to be unusually necessary for the children of these families to leave school as soon as legally permitted?" "Is the twenty-six per cent. increase in living costs during the last year an absolutely necessary increase? . . . How can present costs be reduced and further increases prevented?"

Those are not questions consciously given to befog the subject; they express the gropings of an inquiring mind in quest of the truth. The constructive thing to do is to answer the questions. The present cost of living can be reduced by producing more goods. More goods can be produced by bringing more land into use. And more land can be brought into use by taxing all vacant land, whether in town or country, at a rate so high that the owners will have to use it to get their money back. Vacant land can be put to use only by employing human labor. Hence, to tax idle land into use means higher wages for labor, and more things for labor to consume. Charity is necessary to tide the unfortunate over today and tomorrow; but freedom to use the earth for all mankind is the only thing that will save the generations to come.

Publicity for Incomes

Those who have followed President Wilson's methods have reason to feel assured that he will throw his influence actively behind members of Congress who are determined that no additional burdens shall be thrown on the hard-working and penny-saving masses of the people until excess war profits and surplus incomes have been taxed in such measure as to impose on those who receive them a sacrifice approximating that of the average citizen. We have every reason to feel confidence in the determination of the President and of Secretary McAdoo. The President's address to Congress had the businesslike ring. The Administration is no longer working in the dark as to the amount of excess profits and the size of the incomes which these profits have enormously augmented. The figures are at hand in the records of the Treasury, and we may be sure that they will be used if the occasion arises. Senator Borah's resolution calling for their production at this time merely follows the President's lead when he told Congress that they were available. If Secretary McAdoo and the President should choose to hold them back until the revenue bill is being drafted and the issue is squarely before Congress and the country, we are sure Mr. Borah will not object.

Publication of excess profits and surplus incomes at this time would create a precedent and greatly strengthen the demand that income-tax returns be regularly published. Nothing so simple in itself would do more toward correcting economic inequalities. Incidentally, it would greatly increase the amount of revenue to be collected from this source by discouraging dishon-

esty and evasion. It is a reform that came within a few votes of receiving the indorsement of Congress two years ago, when it was agitated by Mr. Basil M. Manly, Congressman Keating and others. Publication of these profits would undoubtedly shock the country. But it would still further increase confidence in the Administration, whose determination to abate profiteering is known and whose difficulties in the fields of price-fixing and tax-raising during the first year of war are well understood. The amazing thing in the situation is the fact that, only five years after taking over the Government from the Republican Party, the Wilson Administration has so completely freed it from control by the great financial and industrial interests. This is the thing always to be remembered. We have an opportunity to measure some of our gain, and our enormous good fortune, when we turn to the Republican leadership in Congress at this time and its demand for consumption taxes on tea, coffee, sugar and other commodities in daily use. The Republican members are opposed to any revenue legislation at all at this time. They believe the war should be financed by bond issues, and they refuse to drop the absurd argument that by such a course we can pass the cost of it on to future generations. They must know perfectly well that such a program would mean paying for the war ourselves in high prices, with our privileged classes investing their profits in bonds and leaving these as a debt to be paid by the many of the next generation to the few.

Says Joseph W. Fordney, senior Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee: "I do not think we should both fight the war and pay for it. . . . I think that we should not try to raise more than 25 per cent of the cost of the war by taxation, and I shall oppose anything above 30 per cent. Mr. McAdoo told me that he was in favor of collecting 50 per cent of the cost through taxation, and he seems to have won Mr. Kitchin over to the same idea. I think this is entirely too much. Mr. McAdoo told me that most of it could be obtained from taxing luxuries, incomes and profits. I don't see how it is all to come from that source. I also think we ought to be raising from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year from a tariff."

This is the true voice of the Party organization within which men like Senators Johnson and Borah find themselves in such splendid isolation.

The Death Throes of the Hapsburgs

By John Willis Slaughter

The meeting of the German and Austrian Emperors and their agreement upon the principles of a new alliance was an event of much more importance than it finds in current interpretation. It seems to be well authenticated that military unity was the first and most important item in the new arrangement, and the reported memorandum by Ludendorff, which outlines the basis of this unity, is a plan for bringing Austria's fighting strength completely under German domination. The matter is not disposed of by the statement that this merely formalizes a vassalage that previously existed in fact; for this conference and its result are the final fruitage of the last sixty years of the Hapsburg rule and contain the seed of a radical transformation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It can only be described as a second Sadowa.

While the other nations of Europe, especially Italy and Germany, were engaged in the great movement, during the middle of the last century, toward effecting their national unity, the face of Austria was set backward. Her problem was, of course, more difficult than that of her neighbors. There was greater bitterness to be outlived after the events of 1848. But principally it was the Hapsburg desire to maintain the country as a "dynastic estate," ruled according to well-tried feudal principles, enforced by stupid repression, that blocked the road to Austrian unity and greatness. With this was coupled the jealousy on the part of Francis Joseph of the rising power of Prussia. In that rivalry the Emperor encountered the genius of Bismarck, and found himself, while ever evolving plans of revenge and extension of Hapsburg dominion, a plaything of the

Prussian statesman. He was enticed to act with Prussia in the Danish adventure of 1864, and into the subsequent joint rule of the stolen provinces, which Bismarck carefully planned in order to have his pretext for the Austrian war that he saw approaching. Bismarck then applied himself to that political strategy which has determined Austro-Hungarian history to the present day. He capitalized the antagonism to Austria on the part of Hungary and in Italy. He established direct dealings with the so-called Liberal Germans of Austria. The result was that in 1866 he compelled Austria to fight Italy as well as Prussia, and to fight both ineffectively because of internal discord. After Sadowa, the very principles which had resulted in that disaster were embodied in the permanent structure of the State. Francis Joseph had already attempted the reconciliation of Hungary. He was now, in 1867, compelled to accept a settlement by which practical freedom was given the Magyars. The Dual Monarchy came into existence, under which Austria and Hungary were independent kingdoms for all purposes except foreign policy and army administration. But this was a settlement by which the Hapsburg dynasty was caught between the millstones of the two kingdoms. They proceeded to grind when the impulse came from Berlin. It was this fact of direct relations between the Prussian government and the Magyar noblemen, on the one hand, and the Austrian Germans on the other, that has made the Empire, not merely for recent years, but for the past half century, a vassal of Prussia. And this settlement, which Francis Joseph believed would provide him with the moral and material means for revenging himself on Prussia, sacrificed the other great asset in his possession, the Slavic nations of the Empire. The constitution of 1867 gave the Magyars the right of control and exploitation of all the other races in Hungary, and a little later the same principle brought the races of Austria under the heel of the German element.

When he realized his difficulty, Francis Joseph began to seek means of escaping from this entanglement by keeping the threat to German-Magyar domination in the foreground of policy. The whole scheme of things would be upset the moment some one of the other nationalities should be elevated to equal position in the control of the Empire. Francis Joseph turned first to the Czechs, numerically and economically the third greatest race nucleus. In 1870 he promised them a constitution similar to those already granted. But the foreign situation was too complicated to carry internal policy very far. Francis Joseph would have gone to the aid of France had not Bismarck again played his game with the Hungarians and German Liberals. Hapsburg rule was crushed back under the domination of the Dual monster, which it had hastily created and which Bismarck always used. For the next eight years after the Franco-Prussian war the grip of Germany on Austria through its own state structure was never relaxed. In each monarchy those in control were allowed to rule as they pleased, with the sole condition that the army should be supported without complaint. The military establishment was the sole independent imperial function. During this period foreign affairs were dominated by the Magyar, Count Andrássy, entirely in the Prussian interest. His efforts brought about the Austro-German Alliance in 1879, which later, with Italy, became the Triple Alliance, and a determining factor in European politics. Through the Congress of Berlin, Austria-Hungary was granted the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose inhabitants were almost entirely Slavic. This act began to upset the equilibrium of the Empire by raising the problem of southern Slav unity. Francis Joseph was given the opportunity to escape the tangle by Slav assistance, and when the situation was apprehended by the ruling German Liberals, they refused support for the army and were crowded out of office. From that time until 1896 Francis Joseph held his own in Austria by utilizing racial and religious forces. Indeed, this period marked an advance in power of all the subject nationalities. A crisis and open opposition came in 1896 over the Czech language question, and from that time the Austrian Germans, with an increasing orientation toward Berlin, carried on the famous *Los von Rom* campaign. At the end the Emperor won, by suddenly driving through a provision for universal suffrage. The same situation had arisen in Hungary, ruled by Count Tisza. The one thing feared was universal suffrage, which would break the power of the ruling minority. This was the great fight of the Emperor to free himself from Berlin, and he was apparently victorious. Subsequent events were the making of the present war. The Magyars, to secure themselves, started a cam-

paign of aggression upon the southern Slavs. In 1908 came the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the period of open conflict with Serbia and repression of Slav aspirations. The whole world knows how this was focused into the assassination of Francis Ferdinand, under conditions by which it could be charged to Serbian complicity, and the consequent beginning of the European conflagration.

The war has, of course, maintained the reactionary and Pan-German element firmly in power. The subject nationalities were drafted into the army and made to do the will of Berlin. These armies have been broken half a dozen times, not because of any lack of fighting quality, but because they were made to fight unwillingly against their kinsmen. There has, of course, been a progressive decay in Austria-Hungary's economic condition. So when the new Emperor Charles came to the throne he found an impoverished country, an inefficient army, and a political situation which practically deprived him of power. He set himself, therefore, to accomplish two things: to bring about peace, and to check the German predominance. In both these intentions he seemed to be inspired by liberal motives and a genuine detestation of the war; but in truth he was a Hapsburg and only pursuing Hapsburg policy. Peace was necessary for the rescue of his country, and what seemed to be the promise of liberal confederation was certain to be another Hapsburg constitution. In other words, Austria-Hungary was to remain a "dynastic estate." This is possibly too narrow a view of the Emperor's liberalism, but the subject nationalities received his plan with suspicion, and the Western Allies had need to remember the history of the previous fifty years. Even so, political necessity might have brought about a more liberal plan and might in any case have saved the Empire from Germany. But it was doomed to fail. The making of peace was not the function of the Austrian Emperor, nor was it to be secured by a letter to Prince Sixtus. If Berlin had not the power for direct coercion, this was supplemented by the Magyars and German Liberals of Austria. So the Clam-Martinic Cabinet, appointed to carry out the plan of confederation, fell, and the gap was filled by an unknown functionary, Dr. von Seidler. The promise of justice to the oppressed nationalities of the previous administration was revoked, and Dr. von Seidler announced that all reforms should be based on the existing boundaries of the seventeen provinces of Austria. This, of course, meant no reform. The consequence of these events was the intensification of opposition on the part of the non-dominant nationalities. No ruling majority could be secured in the Austrian parliament, and it was therefore adjourned. The Poles, who had always been inclined to play the unscrupulous game of assisting the Magyars, were completely antagonized by the Brest-Litovsk treaty, which allotted the Polish province of Cholm to the Ukraine. At last all the nationalities knew their hopeless position. They had always been powerless because of factional troubles. Unification now proceeded with amazing rapidity. The Czech parties that had seemed irreconcilable antagonists, Agrarians, Clericals and Socialists, now stood together for the independence of their country. This ambition was registered in the Prague convention of January 6. The unity of the southern Slavs is one of the striking phenomena of the year. Threatened for a long time by Italian imperialism, this group has at last, in the recent Congress of Rome, come to an understanding with the Italian government.

Meanwhile the breaks in the ranks of the Austrian Germans were becoming more pronounced. The Socialists had always stood in practice for a perpetuation of rule by the German element, but the infiltration of Bolshevism and growing economic distress carried them into opposition to the Pan-German element. This later has broken into moderates and extremists. The situation is portentous for the future. The food question has created a conflict between Austria and Hungary. In fact, the only cohesive elements in the Empire at the present time are those provided by the subject nationalities. If peace were secured with freedom from Berlin, the Empire would in all probability go into dissolution under pressure of the nationalities. But the old direct relation between Berlin and the dominant groups is able to bolster the existing régime. The position of the Emperor was an impossible one. He fell between all the stools, and had to find his way out somehow. His choice is irrevocable. He has cast his lot with Berlin and the Pan-Germans. The dismissal of Czernin marks the end of any definitely Austrian policy. Active suppression of Czech ambitions started with the redistricting of Bohemia, so as to insure German control every-

where. Certain distinctly German regions have already been attached to Germany for food distribution purposes. Now the Emperor goes to main headquarters and makes his final surrender. Military unity with Germany means much, for in an empire the army is the one distinctively imperial agency.

How does all this concern the policy of the Allies? For one thing, the liberals of England and of France, convinced that military victory is impossible or too costly, are actively accusing their governments of betraying their trust by refusing the overtures of peace advanced through Prince Sixtus. A part of this accusation is that the matter was never brought to the knowledge of President Wilson. What is true is that the peace offer is overvalued because of war-weariness and was based upon an inadequate knowledge of Hapsburg methods. The simple fact is that the destruction of Hapsburg rule had to be achieved before Austria could possibly become a confederation of nationalities, and Vienna is notoriously capable of creating a camouflage of liberalism. And the destruction of Hapsburg rule can now be considered achieved as it merges into Pangermanism, for the present arrangement settles nothing except the definition of policy for the future. The revolt of nationalities can be considered a certainty. As Germany weakens, their unity will grow and become more insistent. In the end they will be a potent factor in limiting the power of Germany. Their revolt may come, as M. Chéradame hopes, in time to assist the Allies to a final victory. There is doubt as to where Hungary will stand. But it may be taken as true that, while the Hungarians are prepared to cooperate with Germany so long as their own purposes are served, they will in the end refuse to become subservient. And after all, the reactionary element in Hungary is a handful of landlords. The Hungarian peasantry has no more privileged position than the Rumanians of Transylvania, and there can hardly be a doubt as to their final alignment.

The greatest problem of all is what these nationalities will do when they secure their freedom. If they proceed, true to the Balkan type, to tear each other to pieces over boundaries and treatment of minorities, Eastern Europe will in the next generation be a welter of chaos and destruction. Liberty is a dangerous thing, if the liberated are left like Russia to the guidance of instinct and dogma. If the Western Allies have any capacity to rebuild the political structure of Europe in the interest of democratic ideals, this capacity will be tested by the explosive nationalities of Austria-Hungary. Indeed, it is being tested at the present moment.

Social Zionism

By Bernard A. Rosenblatt

The Zionist Convention which will be held in the city of Pittsburgh, beginning June 23, 1918, may mark an epoch in Zionism—political Zionism may be developed into *Social* Zionism. This is not a mere oratorical phrase, but a matter of vital significance. No one appreciates more than does the writer the splendid results that have been achieved in the field of political Zionism during the last year. The British Declaration in favor of a Jewish State in Palestine, supplemented by the capture of Jerusalem, has convinced the world that political Zionism is about to be realized.

But just because of the marvelous success of Zionism along political lines, the Zionist Organization is charged with new duties and responsibilities. As long as political Zionism continued to be a thing for the future, we might have been persuaded by those who asked us to postpone the consideration of the *character* of the Jewish State to a more favorable time. But now that we are on the eve of realization of the two-thousand-year-old dream of the Ghetto, it behooves us to heed the voices that have been demanding a clear formulation of the social policies of the Zionist state.

As a Zionist, I am not satisfied merely with the growth and development of a Jewish State in Palestine, for such a state might permit the development of the "vested wrongs" of present day society. Certainly the Zionist Organization and the Jewish race will not sanction the growth of any state unless it is certain that it could not duplicate the Russian theory of government un-

der a Czar or the German theory under a Kaiser. So much everyone will admit. But this is only a negative statement, which helps us to understand the kind of a state that we do not want. Social Zionism, however, would have us formulate, affirmatively, the kind of state that we do want.

Without entering into theoretic discussions about Socialism, Singletax and other philosophies, Social Zionism, as the author has presented it, would undertake to translate into concrete state experiences those practical measures which have been tested and have proven of great value. Let us examine specific facts. The land question is perhaps the most important social and economic problem of the present day. As civilization progresses, there is a large increase in population and wealth, and these, in turn, add enormously to land values. So long as raw land is permitted to be held by individuals as private property, we are practically placing in the hands of landlords the power of taxation, since they are permitted to levy upon persons and business activities a tax, in the form of ground rent, commensurate with the necessity for the use of such land. Now the landlord may be a child, an insane person confined in an asylum, or even a criminal serving a jail sentence—so that he could not personally render any service which would help to make his land valuable—yet, in any case, the guardian of this defective person would collect rents not for services rendered, but simply as a tax upon those who might desire to use certain pieces of land to which the owner holds legal title. Thus, tribute is levied upon us by our landlords for every child that is born, for every immigrant who comes to our shores, and for every invention that the age brings forth, because every increase in population and wealth, and every improvement in science and industry, automatically increases land values.

It is obvious that if the legal title to all the land would be in the hands of the community—the State or Nation—the rents or taxes for the use of this land would come into the public treasury. In that event, the income would be utilized for the equal benefit of all, instead of being reserved for the sole advantage of a relatively small class of land owners. For example, the rocky island of Manhattan is the most valuable portion of the city of New York, the raw land (exclusive of any building or improvements, which are separately assessed) being valued at close to four billions of dollars. Three hundred years ago this island was purchased from the Indians for trinkets worth $24. Had the early Dutch settlers realized the advantage of holding legal title (as public property) to the land of this island, the city of New York today would be an enormously rich landlord, and the rentals from ground rent would be shared equally by all residents. An economist has estimated that by simply reserving ownership to the land values of Manhattan (not including Brooklyn, or the other boroughs), the city of New York, without any extra effort on its part, would secure such a large annual income that it would be able to distribute, as a bonus, to every man, woman and child in the city of New York, nearly $4 per week. Such a public income would enable us to abolish poverty.

However, it is a difficult task to revoke the mistakes of the past. Should the present citizens of New York attempt to undo the work of the founders of New Amsterdam and redeem the land of Manhattan, as public property, they would be met by the stern argument of "confiscation" of present legal rights and by the strong opposition of intrenched wealth. (It might even be found less expensive to repurchase the land of Manhattan at the assessed value, rather than engage in a long drawn-out political battle, probably lasting over a generation, when the campaign contributions alone might, in the long run, equal the present land values.) Fortunately no such condition faces us in Palestine. We are almost in the position of establishing our New Amsterdam at the present time, so that we may profit from the mistakes of the past. There is no large vested interest in Palestine which would oppose our efforts, and today we can purchase lands, in the name of the Jewish State, which will prove to be of incalculable value in the future.

Concretely, if Great Britain should assume the guardianship of Palestine (as trustee for the future Jewish Government), the land of Palestine will immediately increase in value to an enormous extent. This increase would be due solely to the conviction that under British control life and property would be safeguarded and the economic development of the country would be assured. Now this increase in land values would be the direct benefit conferred by the new Government, without any help whatsoever from the present day land owners. Therefore, in

logic and in justice, this increase in land values ought to be appropriated by the Government in the shape of a special land value tax. To achieve such a program of just taxation, the commission which is to administer Palestine should be given the right expressly to assess and value all plots of land as of August 1, 1914 (immediately before the Great War). The Palestine commission, and, thereafter, its successor, the Government of Palestine, would then proceed to impose an annual land value tax upon all the plots of land under its control, whereby excess unearned value which might have been added to such land since August 1, 1914 (exclusive, of course, of all improvements made by the owner or the tenant) would go into the treasury of the Government. This would result in giving to the Government the values which society itself (as distinguished from the individual land owners) is creating from day to day, while reserving the rights of the land owners to the values which they held in the best days that Palestine has known in Modern times (immediately before the Great War). Such a system of taxation would eliminate land speculation, since all excess unearned values would go to the Government instead of to land speculators.

In order to understand the full effects of such a system of taxation, let us examine the picture that Palestine might present to us if we failed to adopt land value taxation. Present land owners of Palestine, who, in the main, have done little to develop the country, would reap a golden harvest from the establishment of a new Government; and with the influx of Jews, land values would go sky-high, so that every Jew who migrated to Palestine from Russia, Rumania, or America—a pioneer in the Jewish Renaissance—would be compelled to purchase lands at inflated values or pay exorbitant rents, thereby helping to develop a class of absentee Palestinian landlords, who would be spending their incomes (obtained from Palestinian workers), and idling their time, in the luxurious capitals of the world. In effect, *it would be enacting a law for the restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine*, since it would make it difficult for poor Jews to secure land or living quarters on fair terms. Now there is no reason why we should pour wealth into the hands of those who happen to hold title to lands in Palestine—when the increased value will be due not to labor on the part of the landlords, but to the new Government which Zionists will have established. We should reserve all the rights to the land owners as such land values existed on August 1, 1914, but every increase in land value since that date must, in justice, go to the Government which is making possible such increase. Furthermore, since the Government must have taxes to support it, we will be confronted with the alternative of taking it from the land, which the Government has itself increased in value, or through other methods of taxation (like taxes on sugar, coffee, tea, income tax, customs dues, etc.). In the latter case, we can appreciate the injustice of such action if we realize that it would mean that the working men and women would have to carry the burden of Government in addition to paying for the increased land values which they, and the Government, have made possible.

On the other hand, if taxation be raised from the unearned land values no one would be disturbed in the possession of their lands, but *all land owners would pay taxes, annually, equivalent to the annual rental due to the increased land values (exclusive of buildings and improvements) since August* 1, 1914. This is only another way of saying that the money secured through increased land values will be utilized for the equal benefit of all (in the shape of police protection, schools, municipal theatres, etc.), instead of being diverted for the exclusive benefit of a landlord class.

Finally, since the excess land values beyond that as assessed on August 1, 1914, would be virtually owned by the State, through its power of taxation, it is obvious that whenever the State should find it necessary to secure possession of certain plots of land (by exercising the power of eminent domain), *it will have a fixed price which it should pay to the land owners (besides, of course, paying for all buildings and improvements), namely, the value of the land as assessed on August* 1, 1914.

This system of taxation will give us an instrument for the Jewish resettlement of Palestine which will prove to be of incalculable value, while at the same time it will insure control over public utilities through the power which it will exert over land values. This plan will not deprive any present day landlords in Palestine of any rights and yet it will give to the future inhabitants of the Holy Land, the money equiva-

lent of the increase in land values which they, by their presence and work, will have made possible.

This principle will be formulated in the following resolution at the Zionist Convention:— "That the Palestine commission shall adopt the principle of taxation of land values whereby:— (1) All plots and tracts of land in Palestine shall be assessed according to their respective values on August 1, 1914 (immediately prior to the Great War); and (2) *Hereafter there shall be annual reassessments of all such plots and tracts of land and a tax shall be imposed, annually, equal to the annual rental of such lands (exclusive of improvements and buildings) in excess of the original assessment of August 1, 1914.*"

Kultur and Bohemian Independence

By E. F. Prantner

In the present world transition of economic, religious, educational and territorial conditions, there is one small, though relatively important, nation whose interests and destinies appear to have been lost to sight. That nation is Bohemia.

To present the subject in its true light it is necessary to include Moravia and Silesia with Bohemia. These three states constituted the Bohemian kingdom in the middle ages. Further they are linked not only racially, but economically, religiously and educationally as well. The inhabitants of these states are Slavs. In fact no racial distinction exists between the people of Bohemia and Moravia, and the Slovenes of Silesia are more akin to the Czechs than any other people.

In the height of their glory and power the Bohemians were known for their "indomitable strength, such scorn of death, such passionate faith in their holy cause, that every obstacle must needs fall before them" as they went forth with their standards bearing the golden chalice on a background of black.

These lands form the northern portion of the Austrian Empire. The combined area of their territories is about one-fifth larger than the State of New York, while the population about equals it.

They have given the world great educational, religious, artistic and musical leaders. It is only necessary to point to such men as Comenius, Palacky, Hus, Brozik and Smetana. The Czechs are known the world over for their versatility in the ceramic arts. In major part these countries are agricultural, but almost every useful mineral, except salt, which is entirely absent, is to be found. In traversing the country one is reminded of the beauty of the Mohawk Valley.

In education the Czechs are far more advanced than any other peoples of the Austrian Empire. Illiteracy is almost unknown. It is only of late years, through translations, that their store of legendary lore has come to be appreciated. The University of Prague, a Czech institution, is one of the oldest and most famous continental seats of learning. It is situated in the center of the state, in the city of Prague.

Historically, Bohemia was an independent kingdom until the year 1526, when Ferdinand was called to the throne. His election sounded the death knell to Bohemian independence. About this time Ferdinand was also called to the Hungarian throne through a family compact providing that on the failure of heirs to Louis both crowns should pass to him. Thus, the foundation was laid for the Hapsburg dynasty and empire.

From the time of this unfortunate selection until about the end of the eighteenth century the Czechs were oppressed by the Austrians and Magyars. Their lands were confiscated, when they revolted against the Austrian domination, and handed over to Germans to settle. This process of elimination continued until about the end of the eighteenth century.

About the beginning of the nineteenth century the use of the Czechs' language again came into general use. As if by magic this revival led to a rebirth of the Bohemian liberal arts. This revival brought home the realization of the necessity for racial unity, which had made Bohemia a giant in the middle ages.

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century the Czech language was used almost universally in Bohemia. Its use did not suit the Austrian autocracy, which then had and today still has the

upper hand. Oppression began to be practised with a more refined hand.

The publication of Czech newspapers was prohibited. Most severe taxation practices were then instituted. These covered every turn and move of a person, being such as food, land, income, business and stamp taxes. Bohemia pays the major portion of the entire Austrian tax, while its population is but a small fraction of the Empire's total.

In its political aspect, the present Austrian Empire includes a number of entirely dissimilar groups. These are diametrically opposed to each other. The Czech opposes the German, who in turn opposes the Pole, who again in turn is opposed by the Magyar. It is a crumbling house divided against itself. It is bound to fall, and the sooner it falls the better off will be all of its inhabitants.

There never can be an assimilation or amalgamation of the peoples of this Empire. Their aims, their educational and political standards and modes of living are entirely different. In fact they have nothing in common.

The policy of the Austrian bureaucracy is to keep the Czechs down, to instil into them German Kultur, to limit the use of their language with a view to its ultimate extinction. Another policy of this group is to inform the Czechs that it is their bounden duty to accept German Kultur, and after accepting it to preach it. But true to the Biblical parable, the Czechs permit the Kultural teachings to fall "on stony places." They have refused to accept it, and persist in their refusal. These peoples experienced Kultur long before America even heard of it.

Bohemian lands are primarily agricultural. The annual yield of grain per acre in the whole Empire averages about 53 bushels. In the Bohemian lands the annual yield averages 73 bushels per acre. The Bohemian production enables Austria to export grain, as without it Austria would be compelled to import it because its own production is insufficient for home needs. Of the cattle produced, Bohemian yield is one-third of the Empire's yearly total.

The Bohemian mills consumed 75 per cent of the cotton imported into Austria. Its exports, of finished products, constitute 60 per cent of the Austrian total. Financially, it is the giant of the Empire. The deposits in its banks constitute 42 per cent of the Empire's total deposits.

Under the constitution of 1627 the Czechs were to be permitted to vote their own taxes. This has never been permitted in actual practice, but on the contrary the Austrian government fixes the taxes to suit itself. Bohemia suffers from unjust and unequal taxation, more so than did the American colonies under English rule prior to the Revolution. Taking the food tax as an example, we find Bohemia paying 60 per cent of the total tax, though its inhabitants by no means approximate this percentage of the whole population. The direct tax in Austria nets 44,000,000 crowns. Of this total, the Bohemian lands pay 26,000,000 crowns, or 60 per cent. To put it another way, an inhabitant of Bohemia pays a tax of 4.34 crowns, while an inhabitant of any other part of the Empire pays but 1.75 crowns. It must not be assumed that the moneys raised by taxation in Bohemia are spent there. In 1900 these taxes amounted to 518,000,000 crowns. Of this sum 78,000,000 crowns, 15 per cent of the taxes collected, were actually spent in the lands where the taxes were raised.

But it is not on economic grounds only that the Czechs seek independence. Let us consider the educational aspects of the case. The Czechs constitute 67 per cent of the population of the Bohemian lands, while the Germans and others constitute but 33 per cent of the total. There are six universities in these lands. One is a Czech institution, the other five universities are German. The schools are also unequally divided. The Czech schools constitute 53 per cent of the total, while the German schools constitute 47 per cent of the total. Does this appear in any other light than that the iron heel of the Austrian bureaucracy is stamping out the language of ten millions of people?

It is no uncommon sight to pick up a Czech daily with many of the columns entirely obliterated. It merely means that the censor has found something in that issue which is distasteful to the government and has expurgated the objectionable matter. Everything must conform to governmental standards, and woe unto the person who disobeys.

The Czechs have not endeavored to influence the world's opinion in their favor. They have attempted to work out their own destiny. In this they have been unsuccessful. The present time presents as favorable an occasion to realize their ambitions as will ever arise. When peace

terms are to be considered the Bohemians desire a place at the conference table to present their case. They base this claim on the declarations of the Allies and the statement of President Wilson.

Their desire for independence is based not merely on economic and educational grounds but on much broader principles. They demand that they be permitted to develop in science and the fine arts, and given the liberty and rights of small nations. In advancing along these lines they have nothing in common with the Magyars or the autocratic Austrians, their masters, who govern them not because of superiority of intellect, but by force. To develop their music, literature and arts, so that they may approximate their former greatness, these people must have freedom of action. Their expansion must be unhindered, unoppressed. These ambitions must be encouraged and nursed. This Austria does not do, but on the contrary does everything in her power to discourage and stifle them.

The pre-war struggle for equality by the Czechs is too recent to be discussed anew; it was not successful. Austria simply will not place the unkultured Czech on an equal footing with the Magyar. The Czechs and their lands must be exploited for the benefit of other portions of the Empire. These lands, Bohemian, must support it. Take away from Austria the Bohemian people and their lands and the Empire will fall apart, it will disintegrate. The other countries of the Empire are not equal to the economic strain necessary for its maintenance.

Before this world conflagration commenced, the Czechs demanded rights equal with those of the other inhabitants of the Empire. They did not succeed in getting them. Now they demand independence on the broad grounds that they have no desire to be exploited for the economic benefit of other peoples; educationally they desire to progress to their own best interests and according to their ability; racially they have nothing in common with any of the other races of Austria; and lastly they demand that they be not exterminated, or even assimilated through German Kultur. These demands are just and fair. The world must heed them.

What are these people doing to win the war you may ask. From the beginning they have fought with the Russian army against the Austrians, after deserting, because they did not believe in the war as waged by the Central Powers. They also refused to fight against the Serbs, and at every opportunity joined the Serbian forces. They will not fight against brother Slavs. When the Allies announced that the "liberty and rights of small nations" would be recognized by them, the Czechs immediately formed Bohemian regiments in France, under the government's protection. Here they fight under their own flag, the white and the red, and the Hussite standard of black background with the golden chalice emblazoned thereon. What an inspiration to them to have their flag recognized again and carried with honor on the field of battle! Their hope for liberty was now encouraged, stimulated and recognized. Then again we read that they desert the Austrian army to join the Italian forces and fight with them against their oppressors. They forsake everything and risk the fate of deserters to join in the battle for liberty and they go singing Ziska's famous battle hymn:

"Thy heritage reject not,
Thy leader's word neglect not,
Thy comrades bold forsake not;
Stand firm unto the end!"

Via Dolorosa

By Richard Roberts

The man who first saw that "honesty is the best policy" should have been canonized at the time; for he is an important landmark in the moral history of the race. He had discovered something much more dramatic than a maxim of expediency; he had perceived that the nature of things has a moral basis, and with the moral basis a way of vindicating it against those who refuse to respect it. We live in a world so made that honesty alone *pays* in it. This may have furnished but slender encouragement to a heroic ethic; but it was a terrific discovery to make about the world. But being what we are we have endorsed the maxim (without indeed always

living by it), and have not considered the revelation. So the nature of things, having seemingly a concern for us, goes on trying to educate us about itself. But it keeps a costly school.

Take the case of Professor Delbrück. Before the war this learned gentleman, like most academic politicians, pooh-poohed the idea of disarmament. But he is now playing a rather different tune. In the *Preussische Jahrbücher* (Nov. 1917) he asks himself: "Can we really believe that these derided notions, hitherto entertained only by persons of no account, are to be raised to the position of the ruling principle of our time?" And (*mirabile dictu*) his answer is Yes, hedged in by no more reservations than are supposed to be becoming to an academic mind. Delbrück is a shrewd man and is said to be something of a prophet, inspired in the modern sense, that is, not from above but from the Wilhelmstrasse and places like it elsewhere. Can it be that a very old word is coming true again—that the foolish things of the world have put to shame them that are wise? Those "persons of no account" evidently knew a thing or two after all.

Delbrück's conversion seems at bottom to be due to the fact that the war will leave the belligerent nations in a financial condition which will not only make the maintenance of the present scale of armaments impossible but compel a drastic reduction. But the reduction in armaments will require something like a revolution in foreign policy. For the two things go together. A particular kind of foreign policy involves a corresponding scale of armaments; and the state of a nation's armaments very materially affects the tone of its foreign policy. In a word the reduction of armaments will compel the nations to moralize their mutual relations. The Lord knows there is room for it. No one can read the available accounts of modern European policy—say, for instance, the echoes of the Berlin conference in "The Life of Sir Charles Dilke"—without feeling that it has been a sort of glorified cesspool. The old basis of ambition-*cum*-fear backed by force will have to be displaced by a practise of plain dealing and mutual understanding. Since the nations cannot afford the armaments, there is nothing for it but that they learn to behave themselves properly. But what an expensive discovery it is!

Can it be that the only effectual agent of moral education is economic disaster? Is it ordained that we must become bankrupt in order to learn to be honest? Is the market place a more convincing school of morals than the church? It is perhaps not generally recognized that the enormous fabric of credit which sustains modern commerce could never have been built except upon a considerable foundation of integrity. The necessities of business have taught men to be honest; and the business world recognizes that it must at all costs preserve confidence in itself. The guilty defaulter is put out of business; otherwise business itself would become impossible. This is, properly understood, a tremendous revelation. Commerce has divined that the nature of things has a moral basis; and that it must plant itself four-square upon this moral basis if it is to stand the racket of life. Shall we then say that economics is our schoolmaster to lead us to ethics? Lord Morley in his great essay on "Compromise" quotes "that thoroughly competent authority, Mr. Finlay," as saying that "history affords its testimony that neither the doctrines of Christianity, nor the sentiments of humanity, have ever yet succeeded in extinguishing slavery, where the soil could be cultivated with profit by slave labor. No Christian community of slave-holders has yet voluntarily abolished slavery. In no country where it prevailed has rural slavery ceased, until the price of productions raised by slave labor has fallen so low as to leave no profit to the slaveholder." That this statement requires some qualification is plain; but its general truth is not to be gainsaid. Once more it appears that economic pressure has been the organ of moral perception.

Mr. F. W. Pethick Lawrence in *The Contemporary Review* for March discusses the question of "A Levy on Capital" which is being widely canvassed in England at the present time. He shows that it will be impossible to raise by taxation a revenue sufficient to pay the interest on the war debt after providing for the necessary national services; and there appears to be no way out of this *impasse* save by making a levy upon the accumulated wealth of the country. Mr. Lawrence reckons that a levy equal to the debt will require to take something like forty per cent. of the total private capital. The methods by which this is to be done do not now concern us; what is of immediate interest is the

effect of this procedure upon the doctrine of property. It is worth notice that this policy of the levy on capital has been endorsed by Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of the British Tory Party. For "the law and the prophets" of British Toryism has been the inviolable sanctity of property rights. For orthodox Tories the Reform Bill of 1831 promised to be the end of the world, —for as one of them said at the time, they held it to be "a maxim that every government which tends to separate property from constitutional government must be liable to perpetual revolution." * Property was the chief cornerstone of the social structure—and this was indeed no exclusive Tory doctrine. As late as 1888, Lord Acton writes to Mr. Gladstone that he hears "that the skilled artisans of London are hostile to the clergy but not to property." Which latter circumstance he plainly regards as a sign of grace. But now under the exigencies of public need, the sanctity of property rights goes by the board and the State may lay its hands upon anything up to half the private property in the country.

This is revolution with a vengeance,—the State turned Bolshevik! Yet it is essentially only a return to the view of a saner age. The medieval doctrine of the matter was that right in property was not absolute but contingent upon the consent of the State; and this is plainly the view that underlies the project of a levy. But it is probable that this breakdown of the traditional anti-social doctrine of property may under pressure from another quarter lead at last to a more positive ethical conception of it. Behind the proposals of the British Labor Party relating to industry is the principle that production should be primarily for use, and only afterwards for profit. And even profit too should be for use. This is the doctrine of "the surplus wealth for the common good." In practice it means that there shall be no further accumulation of profit in private hands, no increase of private wealth. Private property will be decreasingly available as capital. Professor Hobhouse draws a distinction between property for use and property for power. The right to possess private property can hardly be denied; it is essential to a man's freedom and growth that he have absolute control over a certain number of things; but not over more than may be necessary for that purpose. He may have, that is, property for use but not property for power; he may not have so much property as would enable him to control the life and labor of others. And if the British Labor policy prevails, he is not likely to have so much. Property is to be socialized; and only such socialized property will be legitimate capital. In other words, under economic pressure, the doctrine of property is being ethicized; and to ethicize the doctrine of property is simply to declare property to be wholly subordinate to social ends. The possession of property shall not be regarded as conferring upon a man the right to exploit his fellows for his private ends. Once more, economic pressure is proving a pedagogue.

The moral order is after all very simply described. First and last "we are members one of another"; and to this men and nations must soon or late come, or perish. The hard facts of the economic situation are pointing the way to it; and we should make haste to go that way if only we knew the things that belong to our peace. It is a sad commentary upon our human wilfulness that the nature of things has to put us to so costly a school; but since we apparently prefer to have it so, what other can the nature of things do?

* Quoted in Laski, Problems of Sovereignty, p. 70 note.

RELATED THINGS

The Professors' Union

The American Association of University Professors is a body of middle aged men who are established in their profession. Their Association is a defensive union against the increasing power of administrative offices in university life, and against the attempt by vested interests to coerce teaching into indorsement of their investments. The problems with which the Association has occupied itself hence have been problems of academic freedom and tenure. Its committees have promulgated a series of reports that leave nothing to be desired in respectability and judicial fairness. They have gone on record in one instance after another against administrative injustice, and there matters have rested. Administrative action has continued to serve administrative interests and committees of the Association, exercising cautious selection as to cases, have continued to condemn this high-handed service in a manner as eminently inefficacious as respectable.

Now a committee records the attitude of the Association on "academic freedom in war-time." Its chairman is distinguished for care, fairness and plain-speaking, and his two fellow-members, not so well known, are of most conspicuous academic respectability. Their pronouncement has all the qualities of a solemn judicial decision and is a great improvement on that type of document in the matter of style. It consists of a high argument, pointing to the very important rôle of university teachers in determining the intellectual vision and practical conduct of the war; to the menace that the war for democracy abroad may bring to democracy at home, since "The history of all great wars in which popular feeling has been deeply stirred shows that at such a time innocent persons may be unjustly condemned, that the charge of 'treason' may pass as virtually equivalent to the proof of it, that wrongs may be committed even by high-minded men which they will afterward bitterly regret, that the excited and suspicious mood of the public may be utilized by designing men to secure partisan advantage or the gratification of personal resentments, and that the forces of obscurantism and reaction may seize the opportunity to remove secretly some of the established landmarks of liberty." Against this it is a war-time duty of university professors to guard, with the reservation that the necessities of war impose limitations on freedom. The fixing of these limitations is the exclusive business of the government, but the judgment as to when they have been passed is not the exclusive nor prior business of the government. Academic authorities should dismiss men under indictment for the same. They may dismiss men who refuse to desist from propaganda against the draft or against military regulation. They may dismiss men for propaganda against the voluntary activities, such as Red Cross and other subscriptions, the purchase of government bonds, co-operation with the Food Administration and so on, which are necessary to the successful conduct of the war. They may dismiss teachers of enemy alien nationality who violate their parole. All dismissals, of course, should be based on "conclusive evidence."

The difficulty with this position lies in the ambiguity of the word "conclusive." In the case of the dismissal of Professor Cattell by the trustees of Columbia University for "seditious or treasonable acts" the committee finds a "disregard of all the essential distinctions upon which the present report has insisted," "a grave abuse of the power of dismissal," in a word, the use of what is really lynch law. But for the trustees of Columbia University, the evidence against Professor Cattell was "conclusive." No doubt the judicial review by the worthy committees of the Association of University Professors will show in future cases as in this one, that the evidence was not "conclusive," but such a demonstration can do nothing to restore his job to the man dismissed. With respect to all questions involving speech or action in regard to the war, there is only one rule possible: These questions are questions for officers of the government to pass on by due process of law, and for no one else beside. Non-governmental action is lynch law, and it is lynch law that Mr. Lovejoy and his colleagues are advocating when they allow "academic authorities" rights of dismissal. Incidentally, the omission of all mention of Professor Dana's dismissal by the same "academic authorities" that dismissed Professor Cattell makes a thundering silence.

So much for the way in which the academic respectables put themselves on record. They investigate, they analyze, they judge, they protest. And what then? The pertinent question, the question that really matters is: "What are you going to *do* about it?" By this time "academic authorities" have become quite hardened to the reports of the Association's committees. Unless the Association goes beyond reporting it becomes useless. By merely reporting it will remain dignified and respectable, and futile. By taking action, it may lose dignity and respectability but gain something for the dignity and freedom of the academic world.

Will it take action? The question is rather: Can it? The Association is made up of men who, academically, have arrived. Their tenure is hardly likely ever to be endangered, nor their freedom restrained. The cases that come before them are, we are told, largely those of younger men, not members of the Association, and perhaps a generation nearer to life's immediacies than they. These men are to the members of the Association as the unorganized laborers are to the American Federation of Labor—with the difference that the American Federation of Labor is a *fighting* organization: at least it calls

strikes. Among the more youthful masses of academic instructors there is a good deal of scepticism about the Association of University Professors. Let the Association beware lest there appear to shock its judiciousness and respectability an academic I. W. W.

H. M. KALLEN.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Jews: Nation or People

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I would call attention to the many errors in a contributed article, "The Jews: Nation or People," in your issue of May 18.

It is most evident from history that Moses did *not* originate the Hebrew language "which scarcely antedates the time of David" (Remsburg).

No written language existed in Western Asia in the time of Moses. "Not for several centuries after the supposed date of the Pentateuch do we find any proof of the existence of a book or even an inscription in proper alphabetical characters among the nations by whom the Hebrews were surrounded" (Prof. Andrew Norton). The Hebrew of the Bible was *not* "brought from Egypt," but grew in Palestine. "Without doubt it originated in Canaan after the Hebrews had migrated thither" (De Wette).

No book of Moses had been deposited in the ark as stated by the writer of Deuteronomy. When the ark was opened (at the dedication of Solomon's Temple) "there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb" (I. Kings 8. 5-9).

The Pentateuch abounds, admittedly, with literary fiction and was chiefly—by the unanimous verdict of critics—written and compiled from seven to ten centuries after the time claimed, and "in its present form appeared about 1,200 years after the time of Moses" (Remsburg).

Contrary to the work performed by Moses ("as he himself has told us") being the "greatest achievement that the world has witnessed," and that "Moses was not only the greatest lawgiver, but the greatest among the creators of peoples," it is evident that Moses (even if he were not altogether a mythical character) has *told us nothing*—that the laws and codes attributed to him were taken from those of ancient "heathen" kings propounded a thousand years previous to his time; and that if bible records were authentic Moses is shown to have been the greatest autocratic tyrant in history.

In fact "not until 322 B. C. do the Jews appear upon the stage of history, and then only as the submissive vassals of a Grecian king" (Ibid).

The closing paragraph of the article in question savors of either the most meaningless or the most pernicious tendencies of all times—that *we* should "suppress nations as much as can be, in order to put peoples in their stead, and to merge these peoples into one people which will cover the earth, and will be the people of God." Exactly the Kaiser's idea.

What have "we" to do with suppressing nations of the world that they may be merged into one people—the people of God? The maudlin sameness of such an idea is almost revolting. Dr. Fred. C. Howe (amongst other distinguished thinkers) has lately shown the immense advantage and desirability of each nation retaining to the utmost its own untrammeled distinguishing characteristics under home rule in its widest conception, guiding and preserving the particular individualistic abilities of each nation and the natural advantages of their respective geographical, climatic and racial elements from which success and the charm of variety arise; particularly avoiding any tendency to competitive imitation. and as to "a people of God" I challenge history from the "chosen people" mosaic days of butchery and licentiousness, down through the dark ages, to our own day of boasted "kultur" by another selfstyled "chosen people of God," to find a more stupendous hindrance to the universal welfare, happiness and progress of the people than the meaningless superstitious piffle embodied in those last three words.

Kent, Ohio. DONALD GREY.

The Greatest Wastage

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In the issue of March 23, under the head "The Wastage of Peace," I find this, after speaking of conservation and the waste of water power: "But all these, no matter how great they may be, are small when compared with the wastage of unused lands of city and country." Then you go on to speak of the unused lots in New York, placing their assessed value at $567,294,-125, and you say this added to the unused lots in other cities and in the country, 400,000,000 acres of vacant farm lands, makes a "stupendous waste that society needlessly suffers every year." Are not these statements misleading? On the same principle, the fact that most of the lands of Mexico, Central and South America, Africa and Asia, as well as Australia and other islands, are uncultivated may be called wastage. In one sense this is true, but not in the same sense as the wastage which conservation seeks to remedy. Much coal after it is mined is wasted in one way and another. Timber is recklessly cut and handled, and much destroyed by preventable fires. These and other wastes can be prevented by a comparatively small amount of effort. Water running to the sea can be harnessed and made to save coal and irrigate barren acres. But there are not enough human beings on the earth at present to properly till all the land and do the other work needed. Few acres in the United States are made to produce anything like what they might produce by intensive tillage. Right now farmers are complaining that they cannot equal last year's crop for lack of hands. While I do not believe this complaint just, as I think there are enough people idle and partly idle to raise a more extensive crop than ever was planted,

yet there is a shortage of labor as we are accustomed to use it.

The greatest waste in this world is of time. Few persons do as much as they might, or as they ought. The great majority are seeking to do as little as possible. If every individual would only do his best, there would be such a production as the world has never even dreamed about. Food and all other articles, including munitions in these war times, would soon be so abundant the question would be what to do with them. If all in our land could be stirred to earnest action in this great crisis there would be no lack of supplies. If all the inhabitants of the world could be induced to develop and use all their energies, doubtless in the course of the twentieth century the command to subdue the earth might be largely fulfilled.

For 300 years the inhabitants of these states have been trying to tame and civilize less than three million square miles of territory, and the task is only commenced. The work before us looms up big. We have accomplished much, but much, very much more remains unaccomplished, much of it untouched. With improved machinery and mechanical arts the work goes faster and faster; yet the amount waiting the touch of genius and the efforts of labor almost staggers the imagination.

New York needs, sadly needs, better homes for the poor, more sanitary factories, wider streets, more sunlight, less filth and slums. But a building on every vacant lot is not demanded by present conditions. Nor is it desirable to have more skyscrapers.

For these reasons I criticise the statements referred to in the beginning of this article. It is not desirable to have vacant lots in a city provided the streets are of sufficient width. It is not, however, desirable to have dwelling houses crowded together. With rapid transit provided it is better to spread the city over more territory. Henry George's strongest argument in favor of the singletax is that, when one holds a lot until buildings go up nearby, thus adding to its selling price, he is not entitled to this increase which he did not cause, but the community which did by its labors enhance the selling price should reap the fruit of their work. The justice of taxing vacant lots higher than improved ones is very questionable, and whether the public interest demands anything of that kind is equally questionable.

W. O. L. Jewett.

Riverside, Cal.

Conscientious Objectors

To the Editor of The Public:

The Public stands for certain things—spiritual they must be, for they cannot be measured—which are so precious that men should be willing to die for them. These things have to do with our respect for the spiritual value of a man, his liberty, his character, his conscience. Why now do you, who have a pretty stiff job in interpreting and proclaiming the great subject of democracy to a world which as yet knows little of it, go out of your way to strike at the little group of "The Young Democracy" and to defame young men, the "conscientious objectors," as *neurotic egotists?* Do you know these men? I imagine that the War Department would be glad to be assured that this blanket classification fits them, and to dispose of them accordingly, as it would treat any other victims of disease.

What right have you to say that the sympathy of Mr. Dana and his friends is "withheld entirely from the victims of Prussian barbarity and from the boys in the trenches"? Has the process of hysterical Prussianization gone so far with The Public as to give you pleasure in steam-rolling men's honest convictions and all those nice sensitivenesses of conscience, through obedience to which from age to age man's standards and ideals have come to light, and in the preservation of which lies our hope for a real civilization? To old readers of The Public, I assure you, it is a disappointment to read such utterances as your editorial note in your last issue. Do you suppose that your excellent campaign against universal military service has so many supporters as to despise men who bring disinterestedness, earnest convictions and trained consciences to your side? Perhaps The Public will like to make a generous disavowal of a paragraph to which no one can ever look back with any satisfaction? Of course I do not ask you to print this letter, but I believe it would give pleasure to others besides me if you would set the face of The Public toward the light, where it belongs!

Sincerely yours,

C. F. Dole.

Jamaica Plain, Mass.

BOOKS

Bequests to Posterity

The Climax of Civilization. By Correa Moylan Walsh. Published by the Sturgis & Walton Co., New York. Price $1.25.

This book of 140 pages contains a survey of the rise and progress of civilization, with an analysis of the physical conditions and moral forces that have contributed thereto, more complete in detail than is usually accomplished within so small a space. Yet, despite a sense of gratitude for useful information received, many readers will, like the present reviewer, close the book with mixed feelings. The author's description of the trees is good, but one is not so sure that he has seen the wood in its true relation to the surrounding scenery. Experience warns us, too, that he who reports details faithfully is seldom capable of taking those long-focus, bird's-eye views in which the broad relations of things appear in their true perspective. Mr. Walsh has evidently started his thinking with a preconception or theory of whose truth he was honestly convinced; and under the confident expectation that the facts of history would fit themselves into this theory, he, of course, found them to do so, as is usually the experience of deductive philosophers.

The theory which appears to have obsessed the author's mind, and which we take leave to challenge,

is that of the cyclical recurrence in the rises and falls of civilizations, with the implication that our existing civilization must inevitably go the way of the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome. There are, of course, sufficient instances recorded in history to give color to such a theory, but the danger in the use of analogies or similes is that we lay hold of points of similarity and lose sight of the points of dissimilarity. It is not true to fact to assume that those civilizations that are supposed to have risen and fallen have "vanished like the baseless fabric of a vision and left not a wrack behind." The culture of Greece is with us today. The civil laws of Rome still form the basis of British and American jurisprudence. The alleged cycles of advance and collapse were never completed by the obliteration of that which constituted the life or vitality of the old civilizations, but only by the destruction of the fungi, the excrescences, the rottenness and corruption. It may be that in the onward march of the race it is necessary to get rid of impedimenta by a periodic shake-up, but to concede this is a long way from acceptance of the cyclical theory. It is recorded that a second adventist met Emerson and said, "Do you know the world is coming to an end?" "Don't worry," said Emerson, "we'll get on nicely without it." If civilizations come to an end we shall do nicely without them, for we shall retain all that was good in them.

When recalling the ups and downs in human progress, why should we not as appropriately liken them to the course of a ship on the ocean, which may be a zigzag of a thousand tacks, yet seen from a sufficient altitude becomes a straight line from Liverpool to New York? But, says Mr. Walsh, "If the theory of a single progressive movement of humanity were true, there could be no science of history and no foresight into the future, since science must have a multiplicity of repeated instances from which to draw generalizations; but according to this theory every step ahead is into something new and without precedent." No one will for a moment suspect Mr. Walsh of having unscientifically adopted the cyclical theory because it affords a basis for prediction; but in all friendliness we suggest that he may not have approached the subject with an open mind.

But the main objection to the theory of cycles, even if it be assumed that the movement is a spiral one, is not that it stands upon weak historical foundations, or that it leads to depressing conclusions—impoverishment of soil, exhaustion of minerals, loss of human vitality through luxury, etc. If we are facing toward the maelstrom, we ought to realize it and bend our energies, as Mr. Walsh recommends in the last chapter, to retard the final and inevitable disaster. The weakness of any theory that attempts to construct curves of tendency from historical data, and by projecting them to forecast the future, is that it takes no account of the illimitable possibilities in the development of human powers. What would have been the value of such a prophecy made a hundred years ago while yet railways, iron ships, electricity or scientific farming were unthought of? Until a few years ago it appeared certain that by a rigid natural law man's movements must be along the ground or on the surface of the waters. Now he has discovered the way of escape from this apparently closed circle of law into the larger one that governs the movements of the birds. Where are we to place a limit on his power of enlarging his environment? "The creative power of thought," even though we use the expression in no mystic sense, is past imagining, and must invalidate any prediction or generalization based upon past human achievements. When, therefore, Mr. Walsh tells us that "the world has several times before passed from a period of warfare to a period of peace, from a state of militarism to a state of industrialism, and in every case the latter era ashered in the decline and fall of civilization," we accept the historical fact and reject the inference, conceiving it as more reasonable to believe that progress in civilization is one continuous upward movement which comes more and more under human control, even though, like all else in the universe, it is subject to the law of rhythm.

We are informed at the outset that this book is the first of a series of three, the others dealing with Socialism and Feminism, respectively. Mr. Walsh does not predispose the readers of the first book to take up the other two, as the prejudice against these movements, which he makes no efforts to conceal until he comes to deal with them, does not suggest the judicial or unbiased mind that is necessary to investigate such subjects. At the close of the preface he gives a warning with regard to this and the following book, "and especially the work on Feminism," that no euphemisms will be employed, and that "where there is need to speak of a spade, the name of the spade is spoken." We congratulate him on having completely avoided the weakness of calling it "an agricultural implement," but deplore that he has come perilously near to describing it as "a d——d shovel."

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

Amity Between America and Japan

Rising Japan. By Jabez T. Sunderland. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Price $1.25.

Dr. Sunderland's long study of the civilizations of the East should qualify him for treatment of the question of international relations between the United States and Japan. That he has the knowledge will be apparent as the reader proceeds; that he considers the problem dispassionately and draws sane conclusions will be evident upon the completion of his book. If he appears to be a little too zealous in championing the cause of Japan in the earlier part of the work, the reader may rest assured that this feeling will wear off as he digests the cumulative evidence presented for his consideration.

The author argues that war between America and Japan will not come because of the fault of that country for three reasons. First, Japan is a civilized nation; second, she is a kindly nation; third, she would have no chance of success in a physical contest with a country so much larger and richer. His evidence that Japan is a civil-

ized nation comes near to being a weakness in his book through making his case too strong. Upon every test in his comparison of the Japanese people with American people the former are not found seriously lacking upon any count. He boldly challenges the fiction that Japanese commercial integrity is so low that Chinese clerks must be employed for positions of trust in banks and commercial houses. He goes so far as to say that he has found no evidence of this, and concludes that the impression is due to some early misunderstanding and the love of the dramatic in story tellers.

As an evidence of the kindliness of the Japanese the author submits the precepts of her teachers, the utterances of her statesmen, and the daily life of the people, particularly their love of children and respect for the aged. They appear to be in all respects healthy-minded, normal human beings, all of which leads Dr. Sunderland to the conclusion that the Japanese people and their leaders have a natural desire to maintain friendly relations with the rest of the world, and most of all with the United States.

The hopelessness of the invasion of the United States, that has so often been predicted by certain trouble-makers, the author proves beyond a peradventure. But better even than showing the futility of such an undertaking the author essays to prove from the words of her representative statesmen and from her international relations that she fully measures up to other nations in her conception of national responsibility.

It would appear from the author's treatment of the California situation that he does not fully appreciate the economic element entering into the problem; but taking the world as a going concern, he does discern the human motives that lie back of this racial friction. To meet the situation he makes two proposals: First, such Federal legislation as will give the national Government control of aliens; and second, the admission of Japanese to citizenship. The need of the first has long been recognized as a means of enabling the Federal Government to carry out its treaty obligations to other nations. The contradiction of a national government with power to make treaties and to assume responsibilities, yet unable to cross a State boundary to protect a citizen of a foreign government—as in the case of the Italians who were mobbed in Louisiana—should long ago have been removed.

The question of citizenship will not be so easily met because of the racial prejudice involved. It is not unlikely that the results of the war will embrace a settlement of this question. The revival of nationalism along with internationalism may lead to such modifications of the rules governing admission to citizenship that all races can be fairly treated. To stand stolidly by the arbitrary discrimination drawn by Congress years ago that admits to citizenship the lowest African or European, while denying the same right to the most cultured Asiatic is little to our credit as a nation of reasoning people.

Meanwhile Dr. Sunderland makes an eloquent appeal for sanity in our thought of the Japanese. He bids us understand them for what they really are, and not what a few jingo politicians and jingo newspapers have represented them to be. By taking counsel of the wiser statesmen and publicists of both nations, who have striven to promote this understanding, we shall find Japan as friendly and helpful as any other nation. It is in this spirit that "Rising Japan" makes its appeal.

George Sand

Madame Sand. A Biographical Comedy. By Philip Moeller. Published by Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1917. Price $1.25.

A play like Madame Sand is as pleasant to read as to see acted, its character delineation is clear, its stage directions brief and realistic, and it has a distinct literary value. There is little in the way of plot, and such as there is, is somewhat monotonous; the book owes its charm to the sympathetic and humorous presentation of the character of the heroine, to the author's recognition of the man and the woman in her. The woman in George Sand was all passion, sensibility and tenderness, but behind it we see the master mind turning all her vagaries to good account. In a very adroit way the author expresses this looker-on, that even in the great crisis of its own life sees the situation dispassionately, appraises and registers, and finds in it material for copy.

"Friendship is love without its wings," says the old French proverb, but the ardent temperament of George Sand could not endure a wingless friendship, hence the flights which form the theme, or themes, of this play. When it opens George Sand has already left her commonplace husband and is planning her elopement to Italy with Alfred de Musset, which she successfully carries out after having overcome the opposition of his mother. In the second act she is in Venice, has tired of her lover, as he of her, and is desperately in love with the handsome but monosyllabic Italian doctor, Guiseppe Pagello. In the third act she has left de Musset, and returned to Paris with Pagello, by whom she is unutterably bored, and she is scheming to send him back to his home and his mistress. This act contains the beginning and rapid ripening of her love affair with Chopin, and ends with her taking the "poor tired boy" home in her carriage.

The setting of this play has much to do with its charm. George Sand's apartment in the Latin Quarter in Paris, with the towers of Notre Dame seen in the distance, the huge gloomy moonlit room in Venice, the elegant drawing-rooms of the Baron de Rothschild, furnished in the somewhat severe style of the eighteen-thirties, make admirable backgrounds for this woman of many moods. And there is a lyric quality in the play, which is accentuated by, though not dependent on, the strains of music which are heard in snatches during the different acts, accompanying incidentally, as music should, the fateful moments of life.

Compared to the rich and generous nature of George Sand the personality of Madame de Musset, the mother of the poet, a woman of aristocratic traditions, seems thin and conventional, but George Sand herself suffers when compared to Lucretia Violante, the mistress of

Pagello, beside whose direct and desperate passion her own infatuation seems like shallow sentiment.

The atmosphere of the past is introduced without apparent effort. Even the humor of the period lives again in the dialogue, while that of the present, somewhat more subtle, finds expression in the way the author handles his puppets, if one can so refer to such very living beings, "marionettes hung from the nimble fingers of the gods," as George Sand herself says — or "of George!" Heine mischievously interpolates. He alone seems able to read this fascinating, inconsistent, turbulent creature, so strange a combination of the passionate, the predatory, and the maternal.

VIOLET B. DISMORR.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending June 4

Congress

Leaders in the House and Senate plan a vacation from the latter part of June till the 1st of August, during which time the Ways and Means Committee of the House will draft the new revenue bill which is to raise between seven and eight billion dollars for next year. Members believe the bill can be disposed of by October 1, which would give Congress another holiday, with a little time for the campaign. The Ways and Means Committee announces that it will hold public hearings at Washington, beginning June 6. The Senate on the 28th passed the urgent deficiency bill, carrying $123,000,000, including $60,000,000 for housing Government workers. The bill had already passed the House. The House on the 31st passed the largest American army appropriation bill in history, carrying $12,041,682,000, and authorizing the President to call into military service all men who can be trained and equipped. The measure provides for an army of three million men during the coming year, in accordance with the Government's revised program for rushing soldiers to France. (See current volume, page 707.)

America's War Preparations

Government war expenses for May, including loans to the Allies, exceeded $1,500,000,000. Tentative estimates of expenditures for the six months beginning July 1, amount to $11,000,000,000. Two hundred thousand men of draft age who, because of minor physical defects, have been held by examining surgeons over the country for limited military service are to be employed in producing or handling equipment for the army. Conscientious objectors are to be segregated, according to the announcement of Secretary of War Baker, and brought before a board of three men, Major Richard C. Stoddard, of the Judge-Advocate-General's office; Federal Judge Julian W. Mack, of Chicago, and Dean H. F. Stone, of the Columbia University Law School. Men who are sincere and desirous of serving their country will be furloughed without pay from the Government for agricultural work. To provide technical men for the engineer, signal, medical, quartermaster, and ordnance branches of the Negro regiments to be formed in the new draft the War Department has announced that Negro soldiers will be sent to schools and colleges this summer for special training. Nearly 157,000 Negroes are now in the national army, and it is expected that eight regiments of fighting troops will be made out of the draft calls to be made this year. The torpedo boat destroyer Ward was launched at the Mare Island Navy Yard, San Francisco, seventeen and a half days after the laying of her keel. Sixteen ships in Pacific coast yards are to be launched on July 4 by way of celebration. More than 400,000 tons of shipping have been released to the United States and Allies by Sweden under terms of commercial agreement by representatives of Sweden and the United States.

Federal Child Labor Law Invalid

The Federal child labor law of 1916 forbidding interstate shipment of products of child labor was declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on the third. Justices Holmes, McKenna, Brandeis, and Clarke dissented. The Court also held that dividends paid to stockholders in corporations out of surplus earnings accumulated prior to the income tax law of 1913 are not income and are therefore not taxable under the act. The Court sustained the Wisconsin decrees upholding the State Corporation Income Tax act.

Illinois Lynchers Acquitted

The eleven men charged with murder in connection with the lynching of Robert Paul Prager, enemy alien, were acquitted by a jury on the 1st at Edwardsville, Illinois. The attorney for the defense said the present war had developed a new "unwritten law," which had been invoked by the men who hanged Prager because of his alleged disloyalty. The Judge emphasized that the war should have no bearing on the case, which he said was one in which a helpless prisoner was taken from a jail and murdered. The jury was out forty-five minutes and took two ballots. The lynching of Prager, a German, on the morning of April 5 was the culminating tragedy of a series of demonstrations which for several weeks had been held in southwestern Illinois as a warning to disloyalists. [See current volume, page 476.]

Independent Social Science School

A prospectus has been issued setting forth the need for an independent school of social science for men and women. It is proposed to establish such a school in New York and to begin courses a year from next fall. The school would be under faculty control, and the best men in the country in their various lines would be set free to study, write and teach. The organization committee is composed of Mrs. George W. Bacon, Mrs. Ruth Standish Baldwin, Dr. Charles A. Beard, Mrs. Henry Bruere, Emory R. Buckner, Charles R. Burlingham, Thomas L. Chadbourne, Winston Churchill, Joseph P. Cotton, Herbert Croly, Felix Frankfurter, Mrs. Learned Hand, Alvin Johnson, Mrs. George Haven Putnam, Mrs. Raymond Robins, Mrs. Charles C. Rumsey, Mrs. Willard Straight, and Mrs. Charles L. Tiffany. Mrs. Victor Sorchan is secretary,

and her address is 267 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mooney Resentenced

Thomas J. Mooney, convicted of murder in connection with the Preparedness Day bomb explosion in San Francisco in 1916, was resentenced on the 28th to be hanged on an indeterminate date not less than sixty nor more than ninety days from that date at San Quentin Prison. Mooney's case now rests with Governor Stephens, who has a pardon petition before him and a request from President Wilson for executive clemency, based on findings of a Federal commission that questioned testimony that contributed to Mooney's conviction.

European War

The German assault begun on the 27th swept southward from the line north of the Aisne until it reached the Marne River on the 31st. The pace slackened on the 1st, as the forces turned westward. On the 2d slight progress was made; and on the 3d none at all. The net result is the acquirement by the Germans of a triangular piece of territory with its base extending fifty miles along the line from Rheims to Noyon, and its apex resting on the Marne at Chauteau-Thierry, about 42 miles from Paris. The point of deepest penetration is about 35 miles. The Germans were unable to extend their line past Rheims; but on the west they pushed it to within a short distance of Noyon, and included in their captures the ancient city of Soissons. Berlin claims to have captured 45,000 prisoners, 400 guns, and "thousands" of machine guns. The Allied line held at all points except on the Aisne, and the retirement at that point was in good order. It stopped as soon as sufficient re-enforcements arrived. One of the brilliant minor engagements reported was the advance of the American forces holding the line west of Montdidier. The Germans were driven back beyond the village of Cantigny, which has been held against counter attacks. Two hundred and forty prisoners were taken by the Americans. The losses in men sustained by the Germans in this advance are reported to be very great. A Berlin paper publishes a letter from a German Colonel, who says: "Our success naturally has cost much, and will continue to cost much more blood. That some units have suffered very heavily no one will deny." The reorganized Greek army had its first important engagement when it captured 1,500 Germans and Bulgars in an advance on the Struma front in Macedonia. (See current volume, page 708.)

* *

Keen local interest on the part of Americans was awakened by the announcement on the 3d that German U-boats had been operating off the New Jersey coast since May 25. Ten vessels, from 325 tons to 7,000 tons are reported sunk. Only one man is definitely known to have been killed, but 400 are still missing. A considerable number of fishing boats have not reported. Two submarines are definitely known to be on the Atlantic Coast, while as many as five have been reported. Secretary Daniels of the Navy states that such a raid has been provided for, and will be handled without recalling our fleets in European waters. Shipping will be held in Atlantic ports till the danger is over. An American skipper held prisoner eight days on board a U-boat after his schooner had been sunk was told by the German captain that he would not use torpedoes for anything less than a troop ship, and that he had sufficient oil and supplies to last him a month. The troop ship President Lincoln was torpedoed 600 miles out from France on a homeward voyage. Three officers and 23 men, all members of the crew, are reported missing.

* *

Casualties in the American forces from the beginning of the war to June 3, as reported by the War Department, are: Killed in action, 868; killed by accident, 279; died of disease, 1,147; lost at sea, 291; died of other causes, 83; total, 2,668; wounded, 3,715; captured, 100; missing, 219; total casualties, 6,702.

America Sympathizes with the Slavs

Regarding the Congress of Oppressed Races recently held in Rome, Secretary of State Lansing said: "The Secretary of State desires to announce that the proceedings of the Congress of Oppressed Races of Austria-Hungary, which was held in Rome in April, has been followed with great interest by the Government of the United States, and that the nationalistic aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs for freedom have the earnest sympathy of this government." The resolutions of the Congress declared that each of the peoples proclaimed its right to establish its own nationality and state unity, that each recognized in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy "the instrument of German domination," and that each recognized the necessity for "a common struggle against the common oppressor."

Germany and Her Victims

It is announced that all licenses for imports into Finland must be approved by German officials. The Deutsche Bank has established a branch office at Helsingfors for the control of financial operations. Russian Foreign Minister Tchitcherin has notified Germany that the Russian Government accepts the German proposal that Finland cede to Russia Forts Ino and Raivola in the Province of Viborg, on the Russian promise not to fortify these places, while Russia cedes to Finland the western part of Murmansk and an outlet to the sea. This means a German port on the Arctic Ocean. Swedish vessels leaving Stockholm for Petrograd have been stopped at Helsingfors in order that the German authorities might search them. The new Finnish cabinet is so completely under the domination of Germany that General Mannerheim, commander of the Finnish troops, has resigned. Opposition of the Ukraine peasants to the Germans and to the Russians supporting the Central Powers is reported to be growing rapidly. The peasants are firing forests, destroying buildings and otherwise hindering German bands that are trying to commandeer food.

Russia

The financial congress at Moscow, called to devise plans for financial reorganization to be submitted to the fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, which is to meet in Moscow on June 20, named a commission of four Bolsheviki and two Social Revolutionists to frame a plan, but the Social Revolutionists quit the congress because the representation on the commission was not in proportion to their membership. The congress instructed the commission to devise a temporary scheme of taxation, pending the adoption of permanent measures. The local Soviets will continue to levy contributions, provided the Provincial Soviets approve the levies. There appears to be a more friendly feeling toward the Allies and greater hatred of the Germans; but there is as yet no move toward inviting the cooperation of the Allies in resisting the policy of German penetration. Secretary Lansing, answering the charge of the Russian Foreign Office that the American Consul at Vladivostok had assisted anti-Bolshevik movements, states that American representatives have kept faith with the Russian Government, and adds in its instructions to Ambassador Francis: "The Department desires you to reflect the friendly purposes of the United States toward Russia, which will remain unaltered so long as Russia does not willingly accept autocratic domination of the Central Powers." (See current volume, page 708.)

India Awakening

P. Mucherji, a business man of Bombay, India, on a visit to the United States, says that India sent 200,000 men to Europe at the beginning of the war, and has since added 500,000 more. It would be possible to send 5,000,000. Regarding the effect of the war on India he says:

> India is extremely prosperous at this time and a bright future is in store for her after the war. It is a great grain and cotton producing country, but before the war lacked facilities for manufacturing cotton goods. We imported large quantities of cotton goods from Manchester before the war, but in the past few years manufacturing has increased at home and we are improving this condition every month.
>
> There has been a great awakening in India, and we believe that home rule is bound to come for us in the near future. The war has brought us in close touch with the United States, and the outlook for our foreign trade with this country after the war is very good.

Ireland

Sixty-nine Sinn Feiners have been sent to England for internment, according to Edward Shortt, Chief Secretary for Ireland. The Irish Home Rule bill will not be ready for introduction in Parliament for a few weeks; meanwhile conscription will be held in abeyance. The Lord Lieutenant has issued a proclamation asking for 50,000 voluntary recruits, and thereafter 2,000 to 3,000 monthly to maintain the Irish divisions. It is reported that quiet and order have followed quickly on the appointment of General French as Lord Lieutenant. Chief Secretary Shortt is said to have made an excellent impression. [See current volume, page 708.]

Denmark and Women Legislators

The first Rigsdag assembled under Denmark's new constitution giving equal suffrage to men and women was formally opened on the 28th by King Christian. Interest was added by the fact that for the first time nine women members were present. The address of the King emphasized the Government's intention to continue its policy of strict neutrality, expressed confidence that the Iceland question would soon be settled amicably, and referred with satisfaction to the co-operation of the Scandinavian countries.

NOTES

—To the airplane mail service between Washington, Philadelphia and New York has been added an airplane service between New York and Boston.

—The American Red Cross second campaign for $100,000,000 totals $166,439,291, with reports yet to come that are expected to raise the amount to $170,000,000.

—The steamer Faith, the largest concrete vessel in the world, recently launched on the Pacific Coast, is reported to have "behaved like any other vessel" on her trial trip, and to have convinced those in charge of the success of concrete ships.

—President Ramon Valdez, President of Panama, died of heart disease on the 3d. First Vice-President Ciro Urriola becomes acting President. Dr. Valdez became President of Panama in 1916. In April, 1917, he signed a proclamation committing Panama unreservedly to the assistance of the United States in the defense of the Panama Canal, and at the same time he cancelled the exequaturs of all German consuls in Panama.

—The United States is now producing, according to a compilation of the National City Bank of New York, two-thirds of the petroleum of the world. The production in this country for 1917 was 342,000,000 barrels of 42 gallons of crude oil. The world's production for

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.

1917 is estimated at about 500,000,000 barrels. More than 25,000,000 barrels of crude oil were imported by the United States during the year, mostly from Mexico.

—Mrs. Rose Pastor Stokes, found guilty by a jury in the Federal Court at Kansas City, Missouri, for violations of the Federal espionage law, was sentenced on the 1st to serve ten years in the Missouri State penitentiary. Her attorney was given sixty days in which to prepare the case for the Court of Appeals. If the lower court's findings are upheld an attempt will be made to carry the case to the United States Supreme Court.

—Three national forests were established in the East by proclamation of President Wilson on the 30th. One is the White Mountain, embracing about 391,000 acres in Maine and New Hampshire; the second is the Shenandoah, about 165,000 acres in Virginia and West Virginia, and the Natural Bridge, about 99,000 acres in Virginia. The Pisgah National Forest, in North Carolina, and the Alabama National Forest in Alabama, were the only national forests in the East. The new reservations are made under the law of 1911.