V

When you finish reading this magazine place a 1-cent stamp on this notice, mail the magazine, and it will be given to our soldiers or sailors destined to proceed over-seas. No wrapper—no address.
A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster General.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Josephus Daniels

The Australian Labor Party

Publicity and the Railroads

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

June 22, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI | **New York, N. Y., June 22, 1918** | **Number 1055**

Contents

The annual report of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor is an impressive record of full and hearty coöperation between the Federal Government and organized labor. It is a coöperation that involves substantial gains for labor, the greatest of which is the Government's outright recognition of the unions. The Federation has been practically taken into the Government service and been made a part of the administrative machinery at a time when the Government, either directly or indirectly, is also the employer for a major part of American industry. As a result of this policy, the right of wage earners to organize and bargain collectively is on the way to being firmly established. The average paid-up membership of the Federation for the past seven months is 2,726,478, an increase of 355,000, and this does not include the 80,000 members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who recently joined the Federation, nor other more recent gains in membership. In judging the political shortcomings of the Federation, it must always be remembered that American labor has never won this first elementary right of union organization, and that its present gains in this field are essential as the foundation for effective action in any broader field. Until wage earners have learned to act together on the basis of their immediate common interests in the shop, they cannot be expected to recognize their common interest in the field of political intangibles. This is only to point out the great importance of the year's gains. It is not to excuse the failure of the Federation's leaders to formulate a program of fundamental economic reform and to drive forward toward its accomplishment. So obsessed are the Federation's leaders with administrative duties, so completely are they in accord with officials, welfare agencies and more liberal employers in their complacency with the *status quo,* that it is to wonder whether an entirely separate organization will not be required for labor's political mobilization. A strong general committee entrusted with the working out of a program of economic reconstruction might initiate such an organization, and without conflict with the present machinery of the Federation. Mr. Gompers knows how to withdraw from untenable positions when it becomes necessary. The Executive Council's strong indorsement of health insurance and its recommendation that a model bill be prepared for submission to the next convention shows that. This and its demand for Government enforcement of a universal eight-hour day in American industry mark almost the only advance in policy. The Executive Council is to urge President Wilson to issue a proclamation establishing the eight-hour day, with time and one-half for overtime for all the industries in the country, and to do this as a war measure.

* * *

The action of the Massachusetts State Constitutional Convention in endorsing the principle of public property in natural resources, by an overwhelming vote on June 13, is another chapter in a not unimportant phase of the unending war for democracy. The Convention, after a hard fight last Fall, adopted a constitutional amendment providing for the initiative and referendum

in matters of State legislation, for submission to the electorate in the fall of the present year. The present amendment, which now goes to third reading, provides:

"The conservation, development and use of agricultural, mineral, forest and water resources of the Commonwealth are public uses, for which the Legislature may take or authorize to be taken, by purchase or otherwise, lands or easements or interest therein, including water and mineral rights, and may enact legislation necessary or expedient for securing and promoting the proper conservation, use and control thereof."

This amendment, while far from achieving public ownership or control of natural resources, will be a long stride toward that goal, if finally adopted by the Convention, as seems probable, and by the electorate, as remains to be seen. It is the first step toward the appropriation of economic rent and the development of natural resources for the benefit of the people as a whole. Incidentally, these two amendments place Massachusetts on the firing line in the struggle for the common good.

* * *

We are to have another pacifist of the Wilson-Baker school on the job at Washington. Mr. Henry Ford has accepted the Democratic nomination for Senator, and there is little doubt that Michigan will elect him by a large majority. Ex-Governor Osborne shows a poor knowledge of American political psychology when he attacks Mr. Ford because he never aspired to public office or took much interest in politics. The people themselves took none too much interest in the discredited game that passed as politics in this country until recently, and they will honor Mr. Ford for remaining aloof and busy at his job until Woodrow Wilson's sincerity and idealism drew him into active support. Nor will Mr. Osborne get any further with his slurs on Mr. Ford as the promoter of the Peace Ship expedition. That naïve act of faith had something magnificent as well as ludicrous about it. It was the act of one who believes the best about men until his own eyes and ears have evidence to the contrary. Mr. Ford of the Peace Ship standing behind President Wilson and working overtime to turn out submarine chasers is a moral asset of the first importance. He travelled the road of the best Americans in reaching his decision. His simplicity, his sincerity, his homely personality that in itself is a rebuff to sham and privilege, his gentleness and humanity,—these are traits that the American people have not ceased to honor. Mr. Ford's stature can best be measured by contrasting him with those loquacious lawyer-politicians, with a glib knowledge of the superficialities of American history and a gift for rhetoric, who have so successfully obscured our real economic and political issues in their rôle as jackals for our masters of privilege. We have an idea that Mr. Ford will develop rapidly as a radical as he acquires laboratory experience in the study of politics and economics. He seems to have the mechanic's mind,—bent on testing and trying, and reaching decisions through personal experience, slowly but surely. Such a man never dodges a fact once he has seen it. The same courage and loyalty to an ideal that sent him on the Peace Ship to Europe should send him crusading against the causes of economic injustice. He will not be afraid of making a mistake. Like the President, "he is not too proud to learn." The man who faces a world's ridicule has in him the stuff of martyrs. For it is the hardest of all things to bear, and only the most courageous will chance it.

* * *

If there were nothing more important to distract public attention than the baseball score or a Senatorial talkingfest it would still be bad form for the town rowdies of the West to attack the grange organizations as they have during the last two years. To do this in time of war, when every nerve is strained to pull the nation through the biggest job it has yet undertaken, may well be considered as constructive treason. It is quite plain why these rowdies have resorted to their present course. As politicians and financiers exploiting the farmers in the country and the consumers in the cities they found themselves brought to book by the Non-Partisan League. It has not been a pleasant experience. The farmers have not been gently spoken in their impeachment; but they have at least confined their castigations to words. Not so the town rowdies. Words failed them, and they resorted to force, whipping and tarring and feathering individual organizers, and mobbing mass meetings. The breaking up of the Washington State Grange Convention at Walla Walla was a fine exhibition

of the mob spirit. Had the Grange been represented by four or five members, instead of as many hundred, the country might have been treated to a lynching spectacle. And all in the name of —what? Patriotism! Having no answer to make to the farmers' impeachment, the politicians, speculators, and various kinds of sharpers who prey upon industry have summed up all their rage in that one word; and in the name of a holy emotion they have incited unthinking men to actions which at any other time would have been cause for calling out the militia. Surely we must be nearing the end of this period of lawlessness. It is fortunate for the country, and to the credit of the grange movements, that the men at the head of the organizations have been able to control their members, and keep them from retaliating in kind. But they should not be expected to exercise all the self-restraint. It is time that public opinion was brought to bear upon this rowdyism. No country can successfully carry on two wars at the same time. We must have peace at home, if we are to exercise our full strength abroad. It is to be hoped that President Wilson, whose representative, George P. Hampton, denounces the Walla Walla incident as the "most high handed action" he has seen, will soon find occasion to pillory these town rowdies where they may be seen for what they are.

The Will to Unity

The visit of a body of Mexican editors to the United States displays, in a surprising degree, the progress that is being made in connection with one of the new major principles of international politics. Of all the nations composing the Latin-American groups Mexico has been the most inclined to withhold her sympathies from the American cause, and even to allow the opinion to prevail that she was capable of utilizing German agencies to counteract American influence. There is not only the suspicion accumulated during the years of revolution, but the fact of large American investments, concerning which the Mexican government, endeavoring to reform its economic order, has found, and still finds itself out of accord with our own. In spite of the possible sources of difficulty, in spite of the "phantasm" of American aggression which Mexicans have always feared, there is emerging, as shown by this visit of editors, a new basis of confidence. This trust in disinterested motives was emphasized by President Wilson in his address as the sole ground of peace. He described to the editors his desire and his efforts to draw the American states into closer unity. "I must admit that I was anxious to have the states of the two continents of America show the way to the rest of the world as to how to make a basis for peace." Since the beginning of American participation in the war THE PUBLIC has emphasized the need of a constantly increasing understanding and unity of purpose for all the nations of America. Most of our neighbors to the South have realized that our war is their own; that failure on our part will involve consequences for them of the most serious kind; that if the democracy of the allied countries is destroyed, it will have little chance to flourish in Latin-America. Not only is this identity of political purpose a cogent motive, but the fact of assisting France in her struggle for existence gives claim to the sympathy of all Latin-America. For France is the spiritual mother of all these countries. And nothing can be more important in their view than to protect and preserve the perpetual source of Latin civilization.

In a larger sense cooperation between the American republics will be productive of good. If a new commonwealth of nations is to be borne out of the travail of war, our part on this Hemisphere will surely be to utilize our common ideals of political development to give the principles of international cooperation immediate effect. Just as the British Empire is, within its own limits, forging the machinery of unity for its great dominions and home country, so we, under circumstances that are similar in spite of the independence of the nations concerned, are dealing with a similar problem. And public opinion on both sides of the Atlantic is now ripe for action of a practical kind in the establishment of a league that will include first, those engaged in the war with Germany, and with them the neutral nations that desire to cooperate. The old argument which maintained that no league could exist until Germany was prepared to enter it, is now seen to be absurd. The essential nature of the thing we are fighting is antagonism to the democratic unity of nations, in which international law has a reality. Until Germany can evolve out of the barbarism in which she is now

steeped, she can play no part in a league of free peoples. And, equally, so long as her ideals and institutions continue a menace to the world, must the league of peoples be on the watch against her aggression.

The thing most urgently needed now is an understanding of the new world into which the war is leading. The days of exclusiveness are past. There is at the present moment a degree of unity of the English-speaking peoples, a depth of understanding, that will inevitably transform their whole future. But the existing machinery of cooperation must be regarded not as a series of war expedients, but as instruments of permanent unity. Evidence that Allied opinion is ripe is shown by the attitude of *The New Europe* in the last number to reach this country. Describing the war as a contest of ideals, it says: "In the speeches of President Wilson, and in a lesser degree of other Entente statesmen, we already possess the broad lines upon which the new world order may be worked out. But the vindication of Public Right and the establishment of guarantees for lasting peace must be translated into immediate action. To wait till Germany can be included in a League of Nations would be to wait for 'change of heart' such as only time, and (in the belief of many of her own best minds) probably only defeat, can bring. But there already exists a League of Nations, great and small, whom the stress of circumstances is every day forcing more and more to 'pool' their resources and energies, and slowly but surely to standardize their political ideals as well as their ships and engines. Let us impart to this League without undue delay a conscious form; let us endeavor to insure its permanence as the bulwark of a new order; let us organize its economic forces and supplies of raw material, not for purposes of vengeance or extortion, but as a conscious instrument for rendering innocuous the marauding tendencies of the Prussian dynasty and state."

We have heard sufficiently of Germany's "world-historical mission." It may be one of poisoned Kultur and brutal domination, but at least the German nation believes it has a part in the scheme of things. There is for the Allies a danger that the principle of liberty with self-determination may cut away its own ground. Russia has been needed to demonstrate the fact that liberty is only possible within an inclusive unity. For the individual citizen of any country liberty and law are correlative terms. The whole body of citizens accords to each his rights, privileges, and duties. While fighting for the freedom of small nationalities, it is therefore essential that the principle of self-determination shall not become merely a principle of disintegration. No nation can henceforth have freedom that is not defined by a larger scheme of things. It is of the essence of democracy to deny the old claim of sovereign states to undertake aggression at their pleasure, to deal with each other by the diplomatic menace of force. But it is an error of democratic states to attempt the practice of exclusiveness. No one more than Mazzini brought to the consciousness of Europe the fact that the political structure of a state should be based upon the culture, social institutions, and distinctive ideals of a people. But he did not see merely a one-sided picture. A nation thus constituted he conceives to be "a living task, her life is not her own, but a force and function in the universal, providential scheme." It is the work of the new statesmanship to begin to understand the new "providential scheme" that the war has brought into the world.

Publicity and the Railroads

What the Railroad Administration greatly needs at this time is a good publicity man. We are not thinking of a bright youngster with a typewriter and a mimeographing machine. The Administration probably has that. The need is for a man high up in the management who has the publicity sense, supplemented by the political sense in the best meaning of the term. For the new Federal management cannot succeed without the good will and cooperation of the people. And it is in some danger of losing that at the very outset. The big new office building on upper Pennsylvania Avenue that houses the Railroad Administration and the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington has become headquarters for the greatest single economic organization in the world. Decisions are being made inside that building of more far-reaching effect than almost any legislation enacted by Congress in the years preceding the war. And they are being made, too largely in the dark. The probability is that we can trust Messrs.

Hines and Chambers, formerly of the Santa Fé Railroad, as fully as any two men in public life. There is the Interstate Commerce Commission to check up their decisions, and several times a week Mr. McAdoo gets over from the Treasury Department for long enough to make an important decision. But we should like to *know*. Just now these agents of the Government are conducting negotiations with the directors of the railroads looking toward the signing of contracts that will definitely fix the rates of compensation and the terms on which improvements, extensions and renewals of equipment will be made. The Act of Congress under which they are operating leaves much to the discretion of the Contract Committee. We know that issues involving hundreds of millions of dollars are up for discussion and decision. We know little or nothing of what these issues are. How about roads that had accumulated huge surpluses prior to their taking over by the Government? Are these surpluses to be turned over to the directors for distribution as future dividends, or will the Government take all or part of them for new equipment and betterments that should have been provided from time to time with this money that has gone into surplus? Must we follow in the case of each road the plan of paying the stockholders the three-year average for 1915, 1916 and 1917? For some roads that three-year average means abnormal profits of from 25 to 500 per cent. The excess profits tax may get part of these exorbitant profits, but meanwhile Government operation may be discredited if the money for them must come out of the taxpayers. The net operating return for the first three months of 1918 was, for the large roads, only $72,018,935, as against $179,396,348 for the same months in 1917. And when the retroactive wage increases for these three months are paid, at the rate of more than $300,000,000 a year, the operating revenue will be entirely wiped out and a deficit will take its place. As for the 25 per cent. rate increase, the $800,000,000 additional which it will raise will be consumed by the three items of increase in labor, coal, and supplies and material. These are estimated at, respectively, $300,000,000, $200,000,000 and $350,000,000.

Of course, there are great economies that justify optimism for the future, and which will not appear until later. The difficulties are tremendous. Mr. McAdoo's removal of the railroad presidents was no mere gesture indulged in for the purpose of advertising the new régime. There was need for it aplenty, and the disease has not yet been cured. Complaints still reach the Interstate Commerce Commission against railroad officials who cannot forget their old ways, but insist on placing the interests of their own roads before the interests of the best and cheapest service. There is more than a little complaint from shippers that the newly organized traffic committees are arbitrary and brusque in manner, and that there is no one who will adjust complaints in a spirit of fairness and consideration. The new rates have created inevitable confusion and annoyance, and in many instances they threaten to inflict vital damage on specific industries. Already important modifications have been decided upon. Land and water rates for import and export business were boosted to figures that in some instances are ruinous, and the new schedule was inadequately co-ordinated with the intra-state rates. In instances where these were below the interstate schedule the increases total considerably more than 25 per cent. because of an abrupt readjustment and a 25 per cent. increase on top of that. Politicians in opposition to the President find in the railroad situation their opportunity, and popular dissatisfaction will be exploited to the full at the hustings this fall. Leaving the merits of the case to one side, and regardless of the railroad situation as it affects our national well-being, liberals must bestir themselves against any development that might contribute toward the political weakening of the most liberal and most promising National Administration that this country could hope to have.

Would not many of the difficulties which beset the Railroad Administration disappear over night if we had from the Executive or from Congress a bold declaration of policy against the return of the roads at the close of the war? Today the railroad service is full of men who have grown up under the old régime and whose loyalties go out to men and interests who could not, if they would, accept Government operation with a good grace. Every official earning more than $2,000 a year is tempted today to look two ways for the favor of his superiors. There has been bred in him a fine loyalty to his own particular road, and not until he has definite assurance that the railroads are never to go back to the old particularist régime will he wholeheartedly acquiesce

in any action that in the slightest degree sacrifices that road's particularist interests. There survives also among them some of the antagonism engendered during the long struggle between railroad corporations and regulative bodies. "Now take your medicine," they are tempted to say when they see travelers and shippers disadvantaged by recent changes.

It is unfortunate that Mr. McAdoo cannot devote his entire time to the Railroad Administration. Because that is impossible, would it not be well to designate some member of the Interstate Commerce Commission who has political sense to act as one of the Assistant Directors, with instructions to see newspapermen freely and to discuss with them, and so with the public, every detail of railroad operations and of the relations between the private owners and the Government? These are matters that take time, but in the meanwhile the public dissatisfaction and misunderstanding may go far. No step was taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the old days without full public hearings and discussion. The same procedure should be followed now whenever an important decision is to be made. The present negotiations over the form of the contracts should not be conducted in the dark.

Futile Gestures

Like the Rockefeller plan in Colorado, the organization of Western Union employes proposed by President Newcomb Carlton as an offset to unionism is a dishonest pretense of granting what is actually withheld,—the right of the employes to bargain collectively, to interpose their collective power between themselves and the cupidity or harshness of the employing corporation. There is more than the principle of democracy at stake here. Much as our financial and industrial leaders love power, their ambition to make a record in net earnings and profits is even greater. In the case of the telegraph companies, the denial of the right to organize has involved not only an amazing system of espionage and economic terrorism, but also the payment of inadequate wages, long hours, and bad conditions. These are the natural accompaniments of a regime in which a powerful corporation deals with thousands of men on the basis of individual bargaining. They are absent only when ownership happens to be concentrated in the hands of an exceptional man, or, as often happens, when the men in control decide that the only way to defeat unionism is "to beat the unions to it" by maintaining union wages, hours and conditions. Thus many thousands of unorganized workmen receive substantial benefits as a direct result of the efforts and sacrifices of their organized fellows, and the benefits of union organization extend far beyond the ranks of union members. Nothing is more potent in awakening the conscience of the employer than a realization that unless he improves conditions, his men will listen readily to the first organizer who appears on the scene. Judge Gary has thus far defeated unionism in the steel industry by keeping one jump ahead of the organizers. His detectives and employment agents supply the data on which he acts. The Youngstown strike of two years ago showed how opportunistic is his policy. That time he miscalculated, and the two large "independent" corporations that followed his "advice" and declined wage increases paid the penalty, Judge Gary's corporation escaping in the nick of time by virtue of a hastily announced increase. Judge Gary himself was indicted for a conspiracy to keep down wages, but the grand jury's facts did not square with a judge's conception of the law, and the charge was dismissed. For a long time employers intent on defeating an aggressive organizing movement found it unnecessary to go beyond concessions in wages or hours or conditions. But in recent years the principle of collective bargaining, or "industrial democracy," has found such general acceptance that the denial of it has placed employers in a position that they knew to be indefensible. Of 230 employers who testified before the Industrial Relations Commission, all except half a dozen indorsed the principle of collective bargaining in theory, although more than half denied it in practise. President Wilson's affirmative support of the practise mobilized public opinion back of the Colorado miners in the fall of 1914. Mr. Rockefeller's personal attorney in New York realized this, and wrote to his manager in Denver that a mere refusal to accept the President's proposal would be disastrous: some counter proposal must be made. Thus originated the "Rockefeller plan," involving the formation of an "inside union," organized and conducted under the auspices and direction, and with the funds, of the employing corporation. It was obviously a fraud

and a pretense, merely another weapon for resisting the democratic trend and maintaining arbitrary control. Further industrial strife was averted, not because of the Rockefeller plan, but because the miners' resources had been exhausted by their long struggle against subservient sheriffs, gun men, and state troops in the pay of the coal companies. The Rockefeller plan was a plan to save Mr. Rockefeller's face and his conscience.

Today a compelling public necessity intervenes on the side of the telegraphers and of that industrial cooperation which only real union organization makes possible. "It is a patriotic duty," wrote President Wilson to Mr. Carlton, "to cooperate in this all-important matter with the Government by the use of the instrumentality which the Government has set up. I therefore write to ask that I may have your earnest cooperation in this matter, as in all others, and that you will set an example to the other employers of the country by a prompt and cordial acquiescence." President Mackay of the Postal Telegraph Company promptly telegraphed the President pledging his company to accept the decision of the National War Labor Board. Mr. Carlton hangs back and makes public a long, specious document in which he combats the findings of the Board by indirection. He undertakes to make the Government ridiculous by citing the Postmaster General's refusal to recognize organizations of postal employes, and quotes Mr. Burleson's reasons in support of his own recalcitrance. There is nothing to be said for Mr. Burleson's stubbornness in combatting a principle of employment that has been recognized by the President and the major executive departments as a prime essential for winning the war. And until President Wilson insists upon an application of the Government's labor policy to the Postoffice Department, his voice and influence will be weakened when he undertakes to apply it to businesses in private hands. But the two cases are not identical. Mr. Burleson does not discharge postal employes for joining the union, although they have been discharged for union activity. The organizations of postal employes are growing rapidly in spite of, or perhaps because, of Mr. Burleson's opposition, and their petitions for living wages and better conditions, while opposed by Mr. Burleson, find a hearing with another branch of the Government, the Congress. So that postal employes are not without a remedy, although it is an inadequate one. The National War Labor Board asks that the Western Union take back men discharged for joining the union, that it cease to discharge men for this cause, and that it meet committees of its employes. Its proposal contemplates that these committees should be chosen through independent organized action, although the Company is not asked to recognize the union or deal with it in any way. Strikes are to be effectually prevented by an agreement that each side shall submit any controversy to the War Labor Board and abide by its decisions. Mr. Carlton knows that under such an agreement there would not be the slightest danger of a strike. His attitude, it is plain enough, springs from sheer arrogance,—that arrogance which until recently was the distinguishing feature in the attitude of our financial and industrial barons toward public officials who dared to get in their way. Mr. Carlton is not the first petty little autocrat who has regarded himself as beyond the reach of a public opinion which he chooses to regard as the voice of the mob expressing itself through politicians at Washington. He would do well to study the history of railroad rate regulation, and of the various other movements by which we have made a slow beginning in the abatement of special privilege. He is destined to take his place with the elder Vanderbilt and the late Mr. George Baer as one who attempted vainly to resist the rising tide. The public will not be "damned." Mr. Baer and his kind cannot prove title as "trustees of God." And not all the power of Mr. Carlton's masters in Wall Street can prevent the introduction of democracy into American industry. Mr. Carlton's antics are merely the futile and discreditable gestures of a man who pleads a bad cause in the face of defeat.

Pensions as an Industrial Sedative

An interesting analysis of the situation as regards employes' pensions is given by John A. Fitch of the *Survey* staff, in the issue of May 25 of that paper. To stop the excessive turnover among employes, and to hold their good will, many big firms have instituted systems of pensions, based upon various conditions, and worked out in a variety of ways. Some, like the United States Steel Corporation, have provided that the monthly pension is to equal 1 per cent of the average regular monthly pay received during the

last ten years of service, multiplied by the years of service. Thus, "an employe who has been twenty-five years in the service and has received an average regular monthly pay of $60 a month will receive a pension allowance of 25 per cent of $60, or $15 a month." This plan is common among the larger railroads, and with slight modifications is used by a number of corporations.

A more ambitious plan is that of Sears, Roebuck and Company, the Chicago mail-order house. This requires a payment on the part of the employe who wishes to participate into an Employes' Saving and Profit Sharing Fund, to which the company agrees to add each year a sum equal to 5 per cent of its net earnings. It had been estimated that the company would pay into the fund $1.91 for each dollar paid by the employe. Instead, the profits have warranted the payment of $3.09 for every dollar paid by the employes. Thus, the employe who began paying into the fund $12.50 a month in July, 1916, when the plan was started, had to his credit in December $306.75. At the end of 1917 his share of the fund amounted to $943.66. That is, he had contributed $225 in eighteen months, and the company had added $718.66. The employe must be three years in the employ of the company before he can participate in this plan, he may withdraw his contributions with 5 per cent interest at any time, and can take out the whole amount after ten years. Under plans like that of the Steel Corporation the employe must serve twenty-five years and be sixty years old before he can draw a pension. The pension ceases when he dies. Some companies pay a part of the pension to his widow and children under sixteen.

Yet, regardless of the plans and the results, organized labor is skeptical and resentful. Mr. Fitch quotes one union publication as saying: "All of such schemes they (the workers) are wont to look upon as merely on paper, and most of them they know to be designed to break up their organizations and make them as nearly as can be part of the running machinery of the various industries." An inkling of the reason for this comment appears in a quotation from another union paper: "Twenty years of continuous, faithful service are demanded by most pension-advertising corporations before a worker is entitled to a certain monthly or weekly allowance. Twenty years, during which time the slave must always be humble, never grumble, do everything demanded, never think of trying to better his conditions, be always satisfied, and never, never join his fellows in an organization for the purpose of enforcing demands he individually cannot obtain. And this is the kernel contained in the sugar-coated pension pill."

But the case against the industrial pension is even stronger than put by the union journal, as Mr. Fitch proceeds to show. For not only must the beneficiary surrender many cherished rights and privileges that distinguish the free man from the serf, but even that abasement and humiliation does not necessarily assure the pension. The companies retain the right to discharge the employe, and to abandon the system. Added to these hazards is the possibility of insolvency on the part of the company. Whatever may be the merits of these plans therefore, and however good the impulse that has brought them into being, they clearly are not compatible with that freedom of individuality and self-assertion that must have play if progress is to continue. Nothing has been better proven by experience than that concessions granted as a favor, when they should be accorded as a right, tend to create resentment on the part of those who receive and contempt on the part of those who give.

Any pension worthy of the name, and compatible with self-respect on the part of the recipient must attach to the person, and not to the office or place occupied by the individual, and it should be absolutely free from dictatorial powers of the agency paying the pension. No one should have to forfeit his right to move about or change his condition in order to retain this insurance. All such plans will prevent the turnover of labor only as long as opportunities for employment are scarce. When the number of workers exceed the number of jobs a pension will be an additional inducement for the employe to remain where he is, but it will be at the cost of his self-respect. He will cast off the tie at the first opportunity; and meanwhile there will be rebellion in his soul.

The best that can be said for these private pension systems is that they tend to ameliorate conditions while a new order based upon fundamental principles is being established. It is not likely that many of the men who have been foremost among those who have worked out and established pension systems had any other

thought than to benefit their employes. It is a mistake to charge unworthy motives to all whose actions result in evil. Ignorance is too general to warrant such a conclusion. It is a wrong economic condition that has made what appear to be tyrants and ingrates, but what are in reality victims of outraged nature.

The ill will and discontent in the industrial world are due not to evilmindedness, but to unnatural conditions that have been brought about by unjust laws. Cooperation is the natural order. Since two men working together can produce more than twice as much as either working alone, it is to their mutual advantage to cooperate. And if both be free they will divide the gain satisfactorily. If, however, restraints be laid upon either, or upon both, the gain through cooperation is not likely to be shared equitably; and even though the division be fair, if it be made by one without the equal say of the other there would still be discontent and unrest. In short, though employes want shorter hours, higher wages, and better conditions, they want first of all to be men and women.

It must be evident therefore that all such schemes as private insurance, profit sharing, and industrial pensions will fail of their purpose because they savor of charity on the part of employers, and impose subserviency on the part of employes. All attempts to solve the problem along this line are doomed to failure because they are contrary to the instincts of human nature. Pensions, using the term in the sense of a gift by master to servant, have no place in a free society. But pensions, meaning insurance against want in sickness or old age, must be on the broad basis of citizenship, and must be accompanied by no thought of servility, obligation, or limitation of individual freedom. These conditions indicate government insurance, or an agency with the depth, breadth, and impersonality of government.

But pensions are after all of minor importance. The chief concern is the just division of the wealth produced by cooperation. This division can be made satisfactorily only when both parties to the bargain are free. Society must not grant a special privilege to one of its members, and then try to compel him to deal fairly with his fellows. It must not, for instance, give him the minerals in the earth, and expect him to deal fairly with the man who digs them out. It must not give him the land values in the centers of commerce and industry that the people as a whole have created, and look to him for the people's share. It must not permit him to hold land out of use for speculative purposes, and expect the production and distribution of wealth to be undisturbed. Employers and employes alike are victims of these errors. Some employers, by taking advantage of society's unjust laws, have clothed themselves with the power of monopoly, and have been able to despoil both the public and their employes. But in the main employers suffer along with the employes, and they quarrel with each other when their grievance lies with the holders of special privileges who despoil them both.

Singletax Newspapers

The discontinuance of the *Ground Hog*, the singletax paper published at Cleveland, Ohio, for three and a half years, might be thought by some to indicate a declining interest in the subject. The reverse is true. Experience has shown that just as a definite and specific idea like the singletax finds acceptance among the people it becomes harder, rather than easier, to sustain newspapers devoted solely to the propagation of that idea. It was true of the Abolition movement. William Lloyd Garrison found that as the anti-slavery movement grew it became increasingly difficult to keep the *Liberator* going. His explanation was that in the beginning of the movement the press of the country was so opposed to even a discussion of the slavery question that the Abolitionists were obliged to have their own paper in order to reach the public and to keep in touch with each other. But as the Abolition sentiment spread and papers in various parts of the country opened their columns to a discussion of the question, there was less need of the *Liberator*, and only those continued their subscriptions who were especially devoted to the cause.

A similar experience has marked the course of the singletax movement. In the earlier days when the press was indifferent or hostile to the idea of taxing land values to the exclusion of labor values and a paper devoted to that proposal appeared to be the best medium for spreading the truth, Henry George published the *Standard*. As in the case of the Abolitionists and the *Liberator*, the *Standard* was for a time the only

means through which singletaxers could reach the public and keep in touch with each other; and like Mr. Garrison, Mr. George raised his cause to a high moral plane by his editorials. The paper became not only an authority on the technique of taxation, but an inspiration to the advocates of the new method.

As the principles of the singletax found wider acceptance, however, and general newspapers opened their columns there was less and less need of a special organ. From indifference the press passed to tolerance, and some to endorsement, until there are now many papers scattered through the country advocating the singletax as the only just and rational method of raising public revenue. There was for a long time after the beginning of the movement the need of a singletax paper through which proselyting believers could be given technical instruction and be gathered into the fellowship that comes of a common belief in a great idea. There have always been singletax papers ever since the demise of the *Standard,* but they have led a precarious existence and have come to the same inevitable end. Some of them have been of great merit and have represented an enthusiasm and devotion on the part of their publishers never surpassed in any cause. But always there has been that inexorable fact that although the idea continued to spread rapidly over the world—for the proposal to take land values to defray public expenses is now a live question in all countries—the number of persons sufficiently interested to read a paper devoted solely to propagating that idea became relatively less.

The *Ground Hog* was a unique venture. Its publisher and chief sustainer, David Gibson, being himself a practical business man and successful publisher, conceived the idea that previous singletax papers had been unsuccessful because of a failure to meet the popular demand. They had been, he thought, too technical, too abstract, too "highbrow"; and he argued that a small paper at a nominal price, and telling its story in such simple phrase as to be easily understood by the "lowbrows," could be raised to an enormous circulation. There were millions of people, he knew, who believed in the singletax, and there would be other millions as soon as they heard the simple story. But it was not to be. Mr. Gibson found what Mr. Garrison had found and what the publishers of all such papers sooner or later find, that whereas many persons may accept an idea, only a very small proportion have any desire to read an organ devoted to the propagation of that idea. "Believe in it," a man exclaimed, when asked if he approved of the singletax, "of course I believe in it; but I don't want to bother with a paper that tells me every week that it is true."

The exclusively singletax paper fails to find readers because its opponents do not believe it and its friends do not need it. The only paper that can hope to avoid this dilemma is one that while holding to the principle of the singletax applies it to the everyday affairs of life. Once a person grasps the simple proposal to take for community uses the values created by the community, there is no more to be said on the subject. It is true, it is a fact; and no number of repetitions will make it any truer or any more a fact. But there are countless applications that can be made of the fact. For the land question is fundamental; it underlies all other questions of human interest; and from that point of view the various social, political and economic problems can be interpreted. A newspaper that grasps this fact and makes an intelligent application of it will find readers. Men and women were never more keenly alive than now to the errors and evils of political, economic and social institutions; and a growing number are responding to an attempt honestly to set forth the new democratic ideals that alone square with justice.

It is interesting to note in Mr. Gibson's "Obituary" of the *Ground Hog* his opinion of the present status of the singletax. Declaring boldly that it will soon be here, he says: "It will come through the business man—the manufacturer and merchant. It will not come and should not come through any radical movement nor through the emotional appeal of any political party. Its history will be found to be a repetition of the world's prohibition movement, which finally came as an economic measure rather than as a moral one. It will come more quickly without organized propaganda than with it. First, by the general breaking down of the present system of taxation. Second, by the extension of the present method of manufacturing and merchandising cost-keeping to include the community overhead charges on business. Land values as they stand now are a debit against manufacturing and merchandising; they are absorbing the prof-

its of both active capital and labor. I say that site-tax should not come by any radical movement; for such propaganda is very attractive to those who feel much and think little, who arouse the business world to opposition. I have long been convinced that the only hope for anything approaching a democracy, in so far as institutions are concerned, is in the business world."

It will sound strange to some to hear a man who is himself known as a radical thus extol business; but his words seem to be not without warrant. When the railway manager discovered that the drinking man was a liability instead of an asset, liquor disappeared from among trainmen as quickly as vodka under the ukase of the Czar. From the railroads the prohibition of liquor spread rapidly through the business world. Intemperance limited production and curtailed profits; therefore liquor must go. The private appropriation of publicly created land values limits production and curtails profits; will business be any less ready to apply the remedy when it sees the cause?

Mr. Gibson is right in saying public opinion is almost ready for the singletax. And not only should it come gradually, but considerable portions of it have already arrived. It is now a general custom in this country to assess the cost of street improvements against the lands benefited, regardless of the improvements thereon. Irrigation projects in the arid regions of the West and in California, as well as vast drainage work in Minnesota, are supported by a tax laid on land only. The Federal Government recognized this distinction in drawing up the income tax schedules, where permission is given to deduct from income the amount of general taxes paid, but not the taxes for road and street improvements.

The spread of the idea of taxing land values to the exclusion of labor values has been so rapid it is no longer a question of simply urging the movement on, but of giving it intelligent direction. Little of this guidance can be given by technical organs, for the reason that they cannot obtain a general hearing. It must come from those newspapers and from those leading men and women who, standing firmly upon a foundation of economic justice, endeavor to apply its principles in workable form to present conditions. War necessities are likely to require the marshalling of the full resources of the country, including the absorption of larger and larger portions of land values. By giving this force proper direction it can be made the means of turning all community-created values into the public treasury and thereby establishing equality of access to the natural resources of the earth.

The Australian Labor Party

By G. E. M. Jauncey

The Labor Movement has made remarkable progress throughout the world during the last two years. There has been a great awakening among the working class in England, culminating in the marvelous advance in the prestige of the British Labor Party. There are not wanting signs of a similar awakening of Labor in the United States. As yet, however, the awakening in the United States has hardly got beyond the stage where a large number of the wage-earners and producers feel that some sort of political action is necessary in addition to industrial action in order for Labor to successfully fight its battles. Just what form this political action will take is at present uncertain, but there are those who favor independent political action—in other words, the formation of an American Labor Party. Several liberal journals are concerned that there is at present no nation-wide political organization, of any size, to back up the British Labor Party in its democratic peace program and its proposals for social reconstruction after the war.

A political organization known as the Nonpartisan League has sprung up amongst the farmers of the Northwest during the last three years. The League movement started in North Dakota and is now organizing in thirteen states. In the state of Minnesota the League is working with organized Labor to bring about the election of Farmer-Labor candidates at the coming state election. This movement in the Northwest may be the beginning of an American Labor Party; but whether it is or not, it is highly probable that the formation of some sort of an industrial party

will be discussed in the near future. In this discussion the methods of organization adopted by the labor and industrial parties of other countries will be considered. As an aid in this discussion the writer, who is an Australian, presents the following facts concerning the organization of the Labor Party of Australia:

Australia is a self-governing dominion of the British Empire. It is a federation of states somewhat similar to the United States. The federal prime minister and the state premiers are, for practical purposes, chosen by the federal House of Representatives and the state lower houses, respectively.

The Australian Parliamentary Labor Party is some twenty-five years older than the British party. It was not until 1906 that a definite Labor party made its appearance in the English House of Commons. Before this date there were individual Labor members in the English parliament, but their number was not sufficient to warrant the term Labor Party. Even now, in 1918, there are only some forty Labor members in the English House of Commons, which consists of 670 members. In Australia, however, a definite Labor party was established in the parliament of New South Wales in 1891, there being 36 Laborites in a house of 141 members. Shortly after this date Labor parties made their appearance in the parliaments of each of the Australian states, and in 1901, when the six Australian colonies were federated, it was found that there were 16 Laborites in the first federal House of Representatives. During the years 1891-1909 there were three parties in the Australian parliaments—Liberal, Conservative and Labor. During these years the Labor parties in the various parliaments held the balance of power between the two old parties. By a judicious use of this strategic position the Labor party was able to obtain much progressive legislation. In 1909, however, the Liberal and Conservative parties decided that it was time to quit fighting one another and to combine against the common enemy, the Labor party. The Liberal Union party was formed in direct opposition to Labor. Since 1909 the issue at all elections, with the exception of those held during the last two years, in which new issues due to the war have arisen, has been for or against Labor. As a result of the coalition of the two old parties at the federal election of 1910, the Labor party obtained a majority in both federal houses. In 1915 there were Labor governments in the legislatures of five out of the six states and in the federal parliament as well. The progressive legislation for which Australia is noted is due to the fact that organized Labor has entered the arena of politics.

The Labor party organization varies somewhat in the different states, but the scheme followed in the state of New South Wales is fairly typical of the organization in all the states. In New South Wales the basis of the party organization is the local or district Political Labor League. A league is formed in each election district. All trade unions in the district willing to join are affiliated with the league. Residents in the district who support the party, but who are not trade unionists, can become members of the league on signing the platform of the party and on payment of a small subscription—about a dollar a year. The unions contribute so much per capita to the funds of the league. In this way the Labor party finances the political campaigns of the Labor candidates at the elections. The platform of the party for a state election is drawn up by a conference, composed of delegates from every local league. The questions to be considered at the state conference are thrashed out in the leagues and unions before the selection of delegates. The conference instructs and criticizes Labor members of parliament and elects the state executive council. This executive keeps in touch with members of parliament and deals with all matters arising between conferences. The state conferences are convened annually unless something unforeseen occurs in the political field, when a special conference may be called. A federal conference is called every three years. The delegates for the federal conference are chosen at the various state conferences immediately preceding the federal conference. Each state sends six delegates to the federal conference. The federal conference is called only once in three years, because the life of the federal parliament is three years. A special federal conference may be called if new issues arise.

There are no primary election laws in Australia and political parties are not recognized by the law. At a state election in New South Wales the elector only votes for the candidate for his district. There are at most four names on the ballot paper. Each candidate may receive the endorse-

ment of a political party, but these endorsements have no recognition on the ballot paper. Some three or four months before the state election the candidates for the Labor endorsement for a certain district are required by the party to sign the following pledge:

"I hereby pledge myself not to oppose the selected candidate of this or any other branch of the Political Labor League. I also pledge myself, if returned to parliament, on all occasions to do my utmost to secure the carrying out of the principles embodied in the Labor platform, and on all questions, especially on questions affecting the fate of a Government, to vote as a majority of the Labor party may decide at a duly constituted caucus meeting."

The caucus mentioned in the pledge consists of the Labor members of parliament.

The names of the candidates for this endorsement are then submitted to the state executive for their approval. This approval is given unless there is some particular reason for not giving it. The names thus approved are then submitted to an exhaustive ballot of the party members in the district. If some one candidate does not get a majority, a second ballot is taken after the name of the candidate with the lowest number of votes in the first ballot has been struck off the ballot paper. The third and fourth ballots are taken if necessary. The candidate who obtains the Labor endorsement then files for the parliamentary election. All Labor candidates must be members of a league or trade union of at least one year's standing and these candidates are chosen in the way explained by the rank and file of the party in the respective districts.

The Australian Labor Party is a people's party. In the federal election of 1914 there were about 1,050,000 votes cast for the Labor candidates. Australia has woman suffrage, and therefore there were about 550,000 men's votes cast for the Labor candidates. In 1914 there were 523,000 trade unionists in Australia. The great majority of these are men. These unionists are members of the party. At the lowest estimate sixty per cent of the men who vote Labor are members of the Labor party. The situation is somewhat the same as if of the 9,000,000 electors who voted the Democratic ticket in the United States congressional election of 1916 there were 5,000,000 dues-paying members of the Democratic party. A Labor member of parliament in Australia is looked upon rather as an instructed delegate than as a free representative. The Labor members are continuously responsible to the people who elected them.

Josephus Daniels

By William E. Dodd

Josephus Daniels is a Christian and it distressed a large element of the country for a long time that a Christian should be Secretary of the Navy. He is also a democrat, and the difference is really not noticeable. If a man is a Christian he cannot avoid being a democrat; if he is a democrat he is apt to be a Christian. Daniels is both. Not a Christian who simply goes to church and pays his dues; but one who takes the Sermon on the Mount seriously. Not a Democrat who swears by Jefferson and then talks of the fallacies of the Declaration of Independence, but a democrat who believes in equality, economic, political and even social in large measure.

Of course, such a man in American public life was something of a surprise in 1913; it was one of the many surprises that Mr. Wilson had in store for the country and for which the great war has finally prepared the minds of most people at last. It was not in the nature of things that New York should fall in love with a man who believes that "do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you" is a good rule of life. But New York has never voted for the present régime in Washington and New York is entitled to its view, but not to run the Government. The country, however, likes Daniels and it may be worth while for New York to learn the reason for this unexpected reaction.

Born at Washington, North Carolina, in 1862, he was taken a few years later by his widowed mother to Wilson, North Carolina, where he became at the early age of eighteen editor of the local paper, a weekly of considerable importance in that section of the State. From Wilson, Daniels went to Raleigh in 1885 to become the

founder of *The Chronicle,* another weekly paper and one which made its editor, then only twenty-three years old, a well-known figure in his State.

At that time there was an eminent physician at the head of the State Hospital for the Insane at Raleigh. Employes and visitors to the institution reported again and again that grave irregularities and abuses prevailed. An investigation was ordered by the legislature. Young Daniels had paid no attention to the matter till on the investigation it appeared that witnesses were intimidated and members of the legislature persuaded, after the manner of the time, to let things go. Convinced that there was something radically wrong in the situation, Daniels gave the whole weight of his paper, then just beginning to count in public affairs, to the demand that a thorough investigation should be made.

He found at once that all the powers of the political machine, the machine of his own party, were enlisted and that the Governor and leading gentlemen of the "best families" of the State, the influence of powerful religious and social organizations, were all bound up in the support of the Director of the Hospital. To clean up the situation it was necessary to arouse the better element of the Democratic party, to get a Governor and new leaders around him who were ready to have the truth published. It took courage to stick to the fight. But Daniels has never lacked courage. He made a state-wide campaign and won. When the truth became known, a reorganization followed and the editor of the little weekly was one of the conspicuous leaders of his state.

In 1890 *The Chronicle* was converted into a daily and its influence greatly increased; but those were the years of greatest economic distress in the South. Few people in North Carolina could afford to take a daily paper. Beginning without money and entering upon the venturesome sea of daily journalism brought more debts than advertisements, and in 1892 *The Chronicle* was sold. But Daniels could not keep out of his profession. He established *The North Carolinian,* another weekly. It is still published by the Secretary of the Navy and its name is familiar to almost every citizen of the state. Mr. Daniels made the *North Carolinian* a personal organ after the manner of Colonel Henry Watterson of the Louisville *Courier-Journal.* It was not only a political power, but it was an influence for education and the promotion of all sorts of state undertakings. What Mr. Daniels said came to count because he said it.

On the second inauguration of President Cleveland, Mr. Daniels went to Washington to take an important position in the Department of the Interior. It was the critical time when young William J. Bryan was making his spectacular fight on the tariff. Bryan and Daniels became friends. They were in full agreement in politics. They were knight errants in democracy. Their ideal was that of Jefferson, involving the notion that privilege of every sort should be put out of American life. If any one will but study the records of the early nineties there will be no escape from the fact that privilege ruled as completely in Washington as it has since ruled in Germany. Cleveland struggled vainly with his party on the tariff. Gorman, the boss of the Democrats, united with Cameron, the boss of the Republicans, and made a joke of the recent election which had turned on the question of tariff reform.

Daniels was indignant. The enemy of bosses at home, he now saw what bosses on a large scale could do. But more was coming. The panic of 1893 was at the door. President Cleveland signed the famous agreement with New York financiers whereby the Government was to purchase gold for the depleted treasury by the issuing of bonds. This was too much for Daniels and Bryan. They felt that their party had been sold to the financial groups of New York and London. They were Democrats, but Southern and Western Democrats were selling their produce at prices that meant near-starvation for themselves and families. Only the very best of farmers in any part of the country could make expenses. The farmers of the country were still in the majority; they had lost faith in their Government. They organized farmers' alliances by the thousand. A revolution was in the air. The South was about to unite with the West. If they did so, the farmers would take control of things in Washington. What they would do was not a matter of great speculation. They would inaugurate a war of extermination upon what began to be called "the interests."

There was a meeting of the independent Democrats of Congress to protest, like Chase's similar protest in 1854, against the turning of the Government over to the enemies of the people.

An organization was quickly effected. Bryan went upon the stump in the South and West. A great conference was held early in 1896 at Memphis, and Bryan, John Sharp Williams, old Southerners like Isham G. Harris and Westerners of the type of Vest and Bland, who were leaders of the farmers as well as of the silver states, made common cause. They prepared for the coming Democratic convention which was to meet in Chicago and make Bryan the leader of a rejuvenated party.

Daniels gave up his work in Washington. He had already bought the oldest newspaper in his state, borrowed money on his good name, and made it the organ of the new movement in North Carolina. From that time he was an ally of Bryan and a leader of the Democratic party in the country. Many other Southerners joined the movement; in fact, nearly all Southerners became ardent supporters of the proposed reforms, reforms which became known everywhere as the Bryan policies. *The News and Observer* became and remained one of the most important progressive Democratic papers in the South. Day after day it iterated and reiterated the common feeling that the United States was not living up to its reputation as a great democracy. The effect was to make North Carolina democratic at least. Never did the great corporations get a firm grip on the affairs of the community, and Daniels was regarded by common consent as the greatest single influence in keeping the state fairly clean.

It passes without saying that Mr. Daniels became the leader of the North Carolina delegation in the famous Chicago convention and that delegation exerted much influence to nominate the Nebraskan. Whether one likes Bryan or not, it is the sober verdict of history that his nomination at Chicago and the remarkable campaign waged in the summer and autumn following marked the beginning of a new era in our history. Daniels accompanied Bryan on many of his campaign tours both in 1896 and 1900.

But there were many years of long and earnest campaigning for Daniels between the Chicago convention of 1896 and the fruition of that early work in Wilson's cabinet. The defeat of Bryan in 1896 and again in 1900 proved unlike other political defeats; for Bryan, unlike most other leaders of our history, could survive defeat. In this he was like Clay, who was three times defeated for the Presidency after being formally nominated; and, like Clay, Bryan was always a formidable candidate for nomination in any Democratic convention that met. The secret was that the country was undergoing a slow revolution and Bryan represented the plain people of the West and South to such an extent that he could not be destroyed. Daniels was always a powerful and earnest friend and supporter. And he was a member of the Democratic Executive Committee during the whole period and had a large share in the management of the party campaigns.

When Colonel George Harvey began to preach the political predestination of Woodrow Wilson, Daniels was early interested, not because the brilliant editor of the then *Harper's Weekly* favored Wilson; but because, as national committeeman, it was a part of his business to look candidates over. He had been sadly disappointed in the nomination of Judge Parker, and he thought the party could not survive if one or two other such nominations were made.

Colonel Harvey claims that he arranged a dinner at Southern Pines, North Carolina, especially to catch the editor of the *News and Observer* and pin him to the car of Wilson. The fact is that Daniels had already made up his mind a half year earlier that the President of Princeton University would be a good candidate. The writer of this article was in Raleigh the summer of 1910 before Wilson was nominated for the governorship of New Jersey and heard from Daniels himself that he favored the nomination of Wilson for the Presidency in 1912. But the *News and Observer* did not raise the Wilson flag in some time, doubtless because its editor was national committeeman and constrained to a caution not imposed upon Colonel Harvey.

When the *News and Observer* did come out for Wilson, it meant that Bryan was not averse to the nomination, although that was not publicly known. The bringing together of these two men was an important event in the history of the campaign of 1912. At the Baltimore convention Daniels was an enthusiastic Wilson man. He did much to influence the Virginia delegation to abandon its attitude of loyalty to the reactionary wing of the party. In the campaign which followed there was never any serious doubt that Wilson would be elected; but Daniels spent the summer in New York and Chicago working for the cause which might, after all, fail if effort was suffered

to relax. As director of the publicity work of the campaign, in touch with the press of the country, he rendered effective service, and if any one was entitled to rejoice at the final happy outcome it was Josephus Daniels. Sixteen years of unwavering devotion to progressive Democracy had brought its reward, a progressive President.

(*To be continued.*)

A Plan for a Universal Training for Citizenship

By Eleanor W. Hutchison

It seems fairly certain that after the war we shall see the conflict between the advocates of compulsory military service and those who long to concentrate all their efforts on a reconstruction so democratic as to exclude any permanent institution dangerous to freedom. Both sides will claim to be working in the interests of democracy.

The militarists will not only bring forward the necessity of preparedness to again defend democracy from external enemies; they will point to the benefits to our young men of the regular life, the physical training and discipline of the army; to their courage and endurance, and, above all, to the spirit of service and the consciousness of working with others for an ideal. All these benefits are undeniable.

The other party will see only the evils and dangers of militarism; the injurious effect on the individual of blind obedience, the suppression of individual initiative, and, worst of all, the increased probability of other wars through the maintenance of armed forces and the perpetuation of the military spirit.

In his essay, "A Moral Equivalent of War," Professor William James suggested a service which should make permanent the good qualities developed by military training while avoiding its evils. Let us consider whether such a Universal Training for Citizenship might not answer the demands of both parties.

The party opposed to a permanent compulsory military training will claim to be the more democratic of the two. How shall it set to work to better establish at home the ideals of democracy for which we have been fighting abroad? Where shall the beginning be made? If one of the first principles of democracy is equality of opportunity for all, how shall we set to work to establish such equality of opportunity? Are all our young people given the education necessary for the most favorable start in life? When we come to select those things most essential to the equipment of every citizen we find that the whole burden of this education cannot be laid on the schools. For what are the things that for the best good of the individual and of the nation *everyone ought to know?* I submit a list of these first essentials of the training of every citizen:

1. Reading, writing, arithmetic.
2. First principles of citizenship.
3. Physical training.
4. First principles of hygiene,
   - (a) Cleanliness.
   - (b) Prevention of disease.
   - (c) Housing and sanitation.
   - (d) Care of sick and injured.
   - (e) Sex hygiene.
   - (f) Responsibilities of parenthood.
5. Practical constructive or productive work (elective?)
6. Self-expression in art (recreation).

On examining this list it will be seen that most of these subjects cannot be as well or as profitably learnt at school, as just at the age when young men and women are not only sufficiently mature to grasp their significance, but are about to have to apply them practically to the adult and more or less independent life on which they are entering.

How many of these essential subjects do we see to it that *all* our young people are taught? Only the first. Many of the schools make a brave effort to teach first principles of citizenship, but in many schools nothing of the sort is required. Ought not *every* citizen to be taught this? As for physical training, that is the great benefit of the military system. But could not the same training be undertaken for constructive instead of destructive purposes? It seems as if, when we see what a difference it has made in our young men, all must agree that universal compulsory physical training is necessary for the youth of our country. It is their birthright. And along with the best physical development, should

not the elements of hygiene be the common property of all our citizens? The schools in many places try manfully to encourage and exact cleanliness, but it is hard to enforce it as it is enforced in the army. Yet every citizen should have experienced a period when cleanliness was exacted of him or her. What do the mass of our citizens know about the most elementary precautions against the spread of diseases? It is essential that this knowledge should be required of every one, for thus universally disseminated it would prevent a great and unnecessary waste of life and power.

The young man or woman starting out to earn a living must have a place to live in. If any one doubts that a very great number of our citizens do not know what they have a right to demand when they go in quest of lodgings, a brief experience of furnished room seeking in the lodging-house district, from, let us say, West 35th to West 50th Streets, in New York City, would convince him. If it is true that the demand creates the supply, it is evident enough in the region just mentioned that there is *no* demand for rooms that are regularly aired and regularly cleaned or for properly regulated toilet facilities. With few exceptions, these rooming-houses, when the front door is opened, belch forth every variety of stale and sickening odor. If a new generation demanded more sanitary conditions an improvement would surely be forthcoming. The elements of housing and sanitation should be familiar to every citizen.

The war has done much to diffuse knowledge of the care of the sick and injured, but this should always be a part of the equipment of every man and woman. Also, while it is more and more generally recognized that it is of vital importance that a knowledge of sex hygiene should be given to all young people, how many never have the subject presented to them in the right way, and carry through life a distorted notion of the fundamental facts that condition life itself. And how few and feeble are the scattered attempts to enlighten any one on the allied subject of the responsibilities of parenthood! Can anyone maintain that these questions are of minor importance? They are the great questions, the *problems that confront every individual* and that affect the life and vigor of the nation more than any others.

We cannot afford to leave these things to the haphazard workings of sporadic attempts at improvement. Where is the equality of opportunity when some favored few are in possession of the most vital first principles of living and the rest are handicapped by a more or less complete ignorance of these principles? It is sometimes argued that by teaching reading to all children this knowledge lies open to all who seek. The answer is that experience proves that our present system of education does not successfully inculcate the idea that knowledge of these subjects is worth seeking.

If an elementary knowledge of these subjects is necessary and desirable for all citizens, is it possible to evolve a system whereby it may be given them? It has been possible in European countries where compulsory military service prevails to take all the young men for two or three years and put them into almost totally *unproductive work,* and while economic conditions have suffered from it, the result has not been economic ruin. If, then, the youth of other countries can be called upon for two or three years of military service, it is clearly not an impossibility to call upon our youth for *one* year of service and training *which can be made productive.* Professor James discusses the possibility of substituting for military service a patriotic service for peace times which should develop the same good qualities as military training, but with the additional object of developing the resources of the country: fighting the forces of nature instead of other armies; irrigating, mining, lumbering, farming and generally improving the condition of the land; and calling upon courage, loyalty, energy and enterprise for the service of the nation. In this way the economic loss felt in European countries from the withdrawal of young men from the individual farms, etc., would be offset by the gain to the nation resulting from the above-mentioned improvement of the land and the development of resources. It would be possible for the government to pay something to families which would suffer from having their sons and daughters withdrawn. Thus the families would suffer no economic loss by the year of service and the nation would gain.

As for the individual, he would serve his country in one of these practical ways, and in return would spend a year in a model cantonment, where he would learn how to live under hygienic, sanitary conditions and would be taught the elements

of those branches of practical knowledge which would be of such inestimable benefit to him all his life.

It would not be only the men of the nation who would be required to serve and be trained in this way. Women should receive a similar training, with work physically less strenuous and with stress laid on diet, care of children and the sick, and the duties of motherhood.

This year of service and practical education should not be a hardship. In spite of the horrors of war, the military life has a great charm for most young men, and living and doing definite work in groups, with the idea ever present of the relation to the larger group which constitutes the nation, should be a happy and inspiring experience. As the *first principles only* of each subject would be taught, the intellectual side of the programme need not be over strenuous. Only what *everyone ought to know* would be taught, with no attempt at specialized training in any field. Wholesome recreation would be an important feature of the life, and there would be opportunity for encouraging and developing individual talent in various arts. Mr. Granville Barker, in his lecture, "Art and Democracy," has forcefully presented the intimate relation between democracy and self-expression in art, and shown how evil are the effects of conditions under which artistic expression, even in primitive form, is made impossible. The spirit of service, the performing of useful work, collective activities, educational advantages, a healthy life, and wholesome recreation can safely be counted on to make normal young people happy, and there is little reason to suppose that reluctance to leave home for this year of service would prove a serious obstacle. Especially if a government pension to families dependent on the labor of the young man or woman made paid substitutes possible. And with this practical training universally established competent substitutes would be easy to find. Whether an unbroken year between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one should be required or whether two six-month or three four-month periods should be permitted is a question to be considered.

When the war is over we shall have the machinery of conscription and of physical training ready to our hand. If this plan for a Citizenship Training throws any light on the direction which an effort for a better democracy might take, we cannot begin too soon to put it into as practical a form as possible in preparation for the day when all our strength can once more be turned into constructive channels.

The Married Woman Teacher

By R. R. Smith

America has been called the land of waste and improvidence. She should not be so greatly blamed for this as pitied, because she must for generations to come pay the penalty for her lack of thrift and providence.

In nothing has she been more improvident and wasteful than in her failure to utilize the energies of the married woman teacher. All over the country, year after year, women, who, by natural endowment and by preparation, are able to do superior work in the schoolroom, are kept out because an inane prejudice in most communities has decreed that the marriage of a female teacher shall terminate her contract.

And why? Is it that the state of matrimony in itself unfits the teacher for her work? Is a woman less able to keep order in a schoolroom because she is married? Is she less able to drill facts of geography and history into the brains of the children? Is she a capable teacher at four o'clock p. m. when school closes, and does she become an inefficient teacher by eight o'clock on the following morning because she gets married?

If you pin the average school director or school superintendent down, he will be able to give you no good reason for refusing a married woman a job. The most frequent reason given is that there is a sentiment in the community against the married woman's teaching, a reason that usually cloaks the director's prejudice in the matter or the prejudice of the superintendent.

But let us examine some of the other reasons that are put forward against the proposition and estimate their worth. A few of them follow: (1) It will throw some married man, who has a family to support, out of a job. (2) It will throw

some single woman, who has her own way to make in the world, out of a job. (3) It destroys the sanctity of the home.

In accordance with the first argument, every single man, then, should ascertain before he accepts a job whether there is a married man without one. Every school board should diligently search the country over for married men before they venture to employ a single man. Does the reader happen to know of any single man who turned down a two thousand dollar job for fear he was keeping a married man out of it? Or does the reader happen to know of a board of school directors who turned down a two thousand dollar single man in order that they might give the place to a thousand dollar married man so that he could support his family? The theory is all very beautiful, but schools are not and should not be given out on that basis.

In accordance with the second argument, the schools are run to furnish employment for single women, regardless of their qualifications. The good of the children who are to be taught is not to be considered.

The argument concerning the sanctity of the home deserves more consideration than either of the others, but even it is not much of an argument. We grant immediately that a woman with a very small child has no time to spend in the schoolroom. But is that any reason why she should be deprived of the privilege of teaching before the child comes and after the child is old enough to go to school? Then what about the woman who by nature should not have children? Suppose a man and woman marry, both of them highly intelligent, so highly intelligent that by their knowledge of the laws of heredity they know that their having children will weaken the nation's strength rather than add to it, should the woman be deprived of teaching because she chooses to marry instead of to remain single?

On analysis we find that the whole conclusion, just like the former conclusions concerning the vote for women and the shorter working day, has been reached as a result of sentimentality or greed instead of as a result of reason.

School directors and superintendents have refused to argue the matter out on logical grounds. They have refused to face the fundamental issue: Will this married woman be able to do more for the child than her single sister? They have left the child out of consideration entirely. When they choose a cook, they ask one question. Can she cook? When they choose a physician, they ask one question. Can he cure? Strange that they are not much concerned over how many children the cook has to support or whether the doctor needs the fee more than some other one.

But suppose we, you and I, argue this matter out on the basis of the child's good, basing our conclusion on the one issue: Can this teacher, man or woman, married or single, teach the school in question satisfactorily?

What shall we find? First, let us eliminate the married woman, who, before she was married, taught, not because she loved the work, but because she had to do something and followed the line of least resistance. Let us eliminate those married women who have not prepared for their work. After disregarding these classes and all others except just those who are born teachers and who have made professional preparation for teaching as a life work, we shall find in every community college trained women, born teachers who have made special preparation for teaching, women who are being deprived of the opportunity of teaching. They have had from five to ten years of experience. And in all work experience is granted to be an asset. Yet this experience is being thrown away. They have pleasing personalities, for the fact that they were desired as mates is rather indicative of that. Yet preparation, experience, personality are all cast aside—because the woman is married. The child is not considered as a factor. A woman with no experience, perhaps with little college preparation, and many times with a poor personality is chosen instead. In this case the married woman is the wife of a merchant, a lawyer or doctor, and in all probability does not need to teach as far as money is concerned, but is simply deprived of the right to do that work which she is fitted to do more effectively than the other fellow. She uses her energy in club movements, sometimes of value, sometimes of none.

But let us consider another case, that of a teacher's wife. Thousands of men in the teachers' profession marry without a salary adequate for the support of two. They do this because a government which can raise billions for war, as she should do when war is needed, cannot solve the problem of paying teachers salaries adequate for their support. Their wives naturally have, in most cases, been teachers and in many cases are

women who have prepared to make teaching their life work, women with college degrees and who have had several years of experience. They are women with pleasant personalities. They have every right in the world to teach, yet they are denied this right. The combined salary of the man and woman would mean comfort, not the comfort of a lawyer's household, or a doctor's, or merchant's — but comfort, nevertheless. The man's salary alone means poverty—skimping in every way.

Who is the loser? The married woman certainly. But the one who suffers most by the injustice is the American child. Will the war bring the nation to its senses on this question, as it is doing on many others?

RELATED THINGS

The Land Question in Eastern Europe

[*On 5 April the Arbeiter Zeitung published the following highly suggestive article on "The Social Meaning of the Peace in the East." It throws light upon a factor no less fundamental than the racial question in the future development of Eastern Europe.*]

"The Russian Revolution has dispossessed the great landowners and declared the land of the churches and monasteries, of the nobility and capitalists, to be the property of the people; this has already been carried out throughout Great Russian territory. Whatever may be the fate of the revolution, the landowners will not recover their land, and it will remain in peasant hands. . . . As the French reaction after 1815 could not dare to deprive the French peasant of the land which he had taken in 1793; as the Austrian counter-revolution after 1848 could not dare to restore Robot (forced service), tithes and seignorial courts, so, too, no future Russian Government will be able to restore the nobles and bishops to their former property.

"If Livonia and Courland, Lithuania and Poland were not to-day held by German troops, then the Russian agrarian revolution would naturally have a powerful influence on these countries also. In the two former the peasants are Letts and Esthonians, the proprietors Germans. The peasants are not owners but tenants, and the landlords still enjoy rights against the peasants such as recall the golden age of feudalism. What a terrible hatred prevails there between landlords and peasants was shown by the bloody horrors of the revolution of 1905. *If German troops were not in occupation, the Russian agrarian revolution would at once spread to the Prussian frontier.* . . . And if the ducal caps of Courland and Livonia were really united to the German Imperial crown, then the German barons will have permanently saved their land. For German suzerainty will naturally find its support in the German barons, and not in the Letts and Esthonian peasants who, after centuries of class rule, are full of wild hatred of the German. Germany will naturally not be able to dispossess the class on which alone her rule can rest. This, then, is the social significance of the union (*Angliederung*) of Courland and Livonia to Prussia; it secures the country from the infection of agrarian revolution, and secures the land of the big proprietors from peasant expropriation.

"In the same way in Lithuania the German soldier is protecting the land of the Polish *Schlachta** against the Lithuanian and White Russian peasants; and, in the same way, in Poland the landlord is seeking the protection of the Central Powers against the peasantry, which can very easily be infected by the Russian poison. . . .† The order established by the Central Powers throughout the East has everywhere the important social result of guaranteeing the property of the landlords against peasant risings.

"This fact is of the greatest importance for the Central Powers, above all, Prussia. Even before the war the agrarian constitution east of the Elbe was being more and more fiercely attacked. Powerful currents inside the German people demanded the 'internal colonisation' of the East Elbe districts, which belong almost entirely to the Junkers. These currents would certainly be irresistible if, throughout Eastern Europe, the large properties had been divided up among the peasants. Not merely because the example of such an upheaval would have awakened the greed of the Prussian agricultural laborer, but, above all, because the agrarian revolution in Poland, Courland and White Russia would have

* Nickname for the large Polish landowners who, till 1907, enjoyed a monopoly of political power in Galicia, and are still extremely powerful. Here the phrase is applied to landlords throughout Poland.

† We omit here a false analogy with Roumania, which does not affect the central argument.

deprived the Prussian Junker of the labor without which he cannot exist, for the East Elbe *Rittergut* rests on the exploitation of East European labor. For long past the Junker has not been able to find enough German workmen as his slaves. He can only keep going owing to the fact that every year hundreds of thousands of Polish, Lithuanian, Little and White Russian peasants, cottagers, and workmen emigrated to Germany and worked the Junker's fields for a meagre wage. As long as the peasantry in Poland and Lithuania has so little land that it cannot live on its own produce, the Prussian Junker is sure of finding pliable material for exploitation among these wandering workmen, the so-called *Sachsengänger*. But if the land in Poland and Lithuania were divided up, and the peasants could live on what they produce, the stream of wandering workmen would dry up. . . . The *Rittergüter* would have to be parcelled out, and soon throughout East Germany, where to-day the Junker rules, there would be a series of peasant properties. . . . And with the land policy of the Junker the Junker's dominion would also collapse. Thus it can be understood what an interest the Junker had in separating Poland and Lithuania from Russia and protecting them from Russian infection. In protecting the property of the *Schlachta* he is saving his own property and his own rule. This is the social meaning of the Peace of Brest.

"And the Eastern Treaties have the same meaning for Austria and Hungary as for Prussia. Imagine the Russian agrarian revolution having spread to Poland; it is clear that in that case the property of the Polish *Schlachta* throughout Galicia would have been untenable. Imagine the land of the boyars in Roumania divided among the peasants; and it is obvious how difficult would be the position of the big Magyar landowners in Transylvania who are sitting upon Roumanian peasants. And this shock to the landed interest in Galicia and Transylvania would also have placed the Bohemian feudal nobility and the Hungarian magnates, the great lay and ecclesiastical landlords all over Austria and Hungary, in a very uncomfortable situation. For them, too, the order dictated in the East by the sword of the Central Powers has a good meaning.

"The Eastern peace treaties do not, of course, merely mean this. They have set free the great masses of troops which are now dealing heavy blows against England in the West. They have placed large territories at the disposal of the Central Powers which will supply us with food and raw material and take our industrial products. But they are also of great social importance. They have prevented the extension of the Russian agrarian revolution to the territory of the border peoples, and have thus averted imminent danger from the landed interest in Germany and Austria-Hungary. They have erected a dam against the demands of the peasantry. If ever any peace had a counter-revolutionary effect it was this one. The Baltic barons and the Polish *Schlachta,* the Prussian Junkers, the Magyar magnates and the Roumanian boyars—all can enjoy the fruits of this peace."

THE NEW EUROPE.

CORRESPONDENCE

Irish Home Rule versus Separation

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

What foundation in fact is there for the claim of the advocates of separate nationality for Ireland, as distinguished from Home Rule, that it is impossible for the people of Great Britain and those of Ireland ever to get along happily together, for the reason that they are of different race, one being mainly Anglo-Saxon and the other mainly Celtic? Is it not the fact that the trouble has been and still is political and economic —a long record of misgovernment and tyranny, which, when finally done away with and relegated to the past, may be succeeded by the best of relations?

Examining the contention that the difficulty is racial, let us turn our attention to certain facts capable of ready verification: Where did the millions who in the past left Ireland to better their condition go? Almost invariably to countries essentially Anglo-Saxon. I do not refer to the Irish nobility and "gentry," but the masses of Ireland. Very few indeed of these—relatively, a mere handful—went to countries of other civilization, such as the Latin countries of South and Central America and Mexico. The overwhelming preponderance of Irish emigrants left their native land to go to the United States, Canada, Australia, England, or Lowland Scotland. In nearly every instance, therefore, they settled in a country distinctively Anglo-Saxon, but in which the political and economic conditions were decidedly better than in Ireland, cursed with alien landlordism, excessive taxation, invidious discrimination in industry, religious intolerance, and government against the consent of the governed. Under *essentially different political* and *economic conditions,* the poor Irish emigrants throve wonderfully, and their rapid advancement is one of the marvels of modern history. It should be remembered, too, that the Welsh and the Highland Scots belong to the same

great race family as the Irish, and that they, under more favorable political and economic conditions than have, in the past at least, fallen to the Irish, get along pretty comfortably under the British flag—as comfortably as the descendants of the early Anglo-Saxons and Danes.

Economically, Ireland's welfare is bound up with that of Great Britain. In this field each needs the other. Ireland is essentially a dairying country, and manufacturing England and Scotland furnish a ready market for all the butter and cheese, every egg, and every pound of bacon and mutton she can produce. England imports vast quantities of butter, eggs and cheese from Holland, Denmark, North France, and even the Scandinavian countries. Ireland cannot successfully compete with the United States, Canada, Argentina and Australia, in raising the staple grains and ordinary cattle, and the vast manufacturing areas of England and Scotland are her one large available market—a market, too, which offers room for almost indefinite expansion. Ireland has at present only one manufacturing industry of first rank—shipbuilding. The country is almost without coal, and until and unless she develops her considerable water power, manufacture on a large scale seems out of the question.

Finally, Ireland and the Irish enter into the very warp and woof of the British social fabric, so that they cannot be detached without mutilation. Irish soldiers have fought Britain's battles the world over. Irish statesmen, notably Edmund Burke, have "wrought mightily" in the great work of making the British Empire a vast civilizing force in the world. Ireland's contribution to English literature is peculiarly rich and valuable, and wherever the English language is spoken it has an assured place. The writings of distinguished Irishmen are as well known in England as in Ireland. Pick up, at random, a school reader used in the public schools of England, and note the selections from Irish writers—Dean Swift, Oliver Goldsmith, Thomas Moore, Sheridan. With the possible exception of Robert Burns, the songs of no other writer are as generally known in England as those of Tom Moore. And so in other fields. Then, what of the Irish scattered throughout England, Scotland and Wales? There are said to be some two millions of them and their immediate descendants. It is stated that there are in London twice as many Irish as there are in Dublin, and in every great industrial center of England, Scotland and Wales are Irish by the tens of thousands. These people are deeply interested in Ireland and things Irish. The sentiment of the people of a large part of the north of Ireland as regards separation need only be mentioned.

Those friends of Erin who, like Parnell and Redmond, use their heads as well as their hearts when planning for Ireland—who take counsel for her future more than they dwell on her past—may well say of the secession movement in this little country (fortunately, not shown to be backed by the majority), "That way madness lies."

GEORGE A. WARREN.

Washington, D. C.

Farmers on War Finance

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Will you kindly announce the organization of the Farmers' National Committee on War Finance with Governor Arthur Capper of Kansas as Chairman. The Committee comprises representatives of most of the important farmer, live stock, and other organizations of the country, and will make a vigorous campaign to compel the privileged interests of the country to pay their full share of the cost of the war.

The slogan of the Committee is: "Equality of Financial Sacrifice."

It will urge the taking of all incomes in excess of one hundred thousand dollars, and if necessary, of fifty thousand dollars, temporarily heavy taxation of excess and war profits and the complete elimination of profiteering. The Committee claims that ten to twelve billion dollars can be raised in the revenue bill Congress is about to enact.

The Committee is conducting an educational campaign among the farm organizations of the country, and will see that Congress secures the opinion of the people back home on this matter.

BENJ. C. MARSH,

Executive Secretary, the Farmers' Open Forum.

Washington, D. C.

Conference of Social Workers

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The Conference of Social Workers, held at Kansas City from May 15 to May 23, was the forty-fifth annual gathering of a body known until recently as the Conference of Charities and Correction. But it was the first that the writer had attended. He approached it in the spirit appropriate to Missouri. And he was shown.

The proceedings throughont were marked by such unanimity of acceptance of enlightened but determined radicalism as to be a constant satisfaction and inspiration. Problems of child welfare, of housing, and of kindred subjects in which what have been called the Interests are generally suspected of having sinister interest were approached frankly and fearlessly. The remedies suggested, and the methods by which these remedies should be obtained, were not palliative makeshifts, but constructive and determinative proposals. That opposition to certain parts of the program might be expected was acknowledged, and the source of such anticipated opposition was disclosed. But every announcement of readiness to fight to a finish was signal for spontaneous and general applause.

Nor were these manifestations confined to the sectional gatherings. Of the mass meetings held in the vast Convention Hall each evening, which were attended by large numbers of the general public, the most successful was that at which a distinguished visitor from England outlined the reconstruction program of the British Labor Party. Such quick response was shown to each point registered by Mr. Ratcliffe that it was necessary for the speaker to request that applause

be omitted lest he use more than the time allotted to him.

To the stranger within the gates, the Conference was something of surprise, but much of satisfaction. When the Proceedings are published in book form they should find a place in the library of every student of political economy.

ERNEST F. BODDINGTON.

New York.

Conscientious Objectors

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

As one of your admirers, may I express my sense of deep disappointment in your attitude toward Conscientious Objectors. It is, to my mind, one of the most discouraging signs of the times that a magazine which has always stood with your courage for real spiritual values in life, should be unable to see anything in conscientious objection but neurotic egotism.

You might well argue that in the particular case of this war, the Conscientious Objectors were sadly mistaken in the course they elected to pursue, without taking an attitude of contempt for conscience and minority opinion which endangers the whole future of orderly social progress. It is hard to see any hope for the kind of world you want, if the religion of the State, even of a good state, is to have such an ascendancy that its heretics merit only contumely and abuse. Many of these men you call "neurotic egotists" are passionately desirous not primarily to save their own souls, but to witness to their faith in a way that is better than war, and thus to serve their fellows. By all means try to convert them to your point of view by honest argument, but do not think that bitter contempt for them is a weapon of truth.

You have already been generous enough to publish Dr. Dole's letter of protest, and may not care to do more; but I am anxious to record my own personal regret that you, who are so loyal a servant of democracy, should so lack appreciation of what loyalty to individual conviction must mean for the individual and for democracy.

New York City. NORMAN THOMAS.

Political Action

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I thoroughly agree with Mr. J. B. Bengough in one of your recent issues that we should have political action on the singletax to supplement the work which is being done by lecturers and other workers for the cause.

Careful study based on extended experience and observation in lecturing and in continuous activities in other directions in pushing singletax has convinced me beyond any doubt that the great mass of inert adult minds in this country whose votes must be had to carry singletax can be reached in no other way than through a political campaign and newspaper publicity.

ALFRED N. CHANDLER.

Newark, N. J.

BOOKS

American Political Ideas in the Second French Revolution

The French Assembly of 1848 and American Constitutional Doctrines. By Eugene Newton Curtis, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Modern European History at Goucher College. Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Vol. lxxix, No. 2. Columbia University, Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York. Price $3.00 (Paper).

We Americans like to think that we have contributed considerably to the political principles of France and their embodiment in her republican institutions. And it is natural to presume that, having so much in common in these matters, and this without a common cause in raee, language, traditions, or historical antecedents, our likenesses should be due to influences of one people on the other, or of both mutually. Dr. Curtis has made a study of the influences of American constitutional doctrines upon France in that fateful year 1848. That was the year not only of France's second revolution and second effort to set up a republic, but of democratic agitations, disturbances, and revolutions or reforms through Europe generally. In France the revolution was more radical in its demands than was that of 1789; for it was an uprising not only against the monarchical system of government, but against the system of society as well in matters of wealth and industry. Ideas of Utopian socialism were behind this revolution; and when they failed of realization in it, the Marxian socialism with its class struggle took their place. The constitution of the United States was earnestly studied, and was frequently mentioned in the debates of the French Assembly, sometimes with warm praise and at others with derogation. Who praised it, and why? and who looked coldly upon it? Was it followed much, in form or principles, in the new constitution for France that issued out of these debates? Did those who favored it do so because it seemed to them to be a bulwark against reaction to monarchy, or on the contrary, because they thought of it as a support to conservative institutions as opposed to radicalism? To answer these questions is the aim of Dr. Curtis' study.

The first chapter gives a comparative view of America and France in 1848, and the third a report of what France thought about the United States. This introductory portion is well worth reading on its own account, even if one were not interested in the rest of the book. The subject matter of these two chapters is clearly and fascinatingly presented. Between them, however, comes chapter two, in what seems an unnatural order, taking up matters that are dropped in the third chapter, and resumed in the fourth. It may be, however, that the author adopted this arrangement in order to refresh and stimulate the reader's interest before he is plunged into the drier and more perplexing pages, and to induce him to persevere in his reading by the hope that he will now and then find other passages of equal lucidity and charm. But though the reader's interest may possibly be stimulated in

this way, his memory and understanding are weakened and confused by it.

From chapter four onward almost to the end, we find a vast, heterogeneous, and not very orderly mass of biographies, voting statistics, debates in Assembly, classifications of Assemblymen and of newspapers, and editorial comments. A disorder now and then of sequence, and a lack of indexing or cross-references adds much to the reader's perplexity. We are told of seven bills that, in the author's opinion, furnish fair test votes by which the political attitudes of the members are likely to be ascertained. These bills are described. But to the knowledge of the members' votes on these bills we must supplement, it is said, a knowledge of the facts of their lives, in order to be sure to what political group they belonged. So, between the description of the bills and the table of votes are interposed the biographies of 55 representatives and 15 members of the constitutional commission. After these 70 biographies, which of course nobody could be expected to remember, follows the table of votes, the bills being listed under the names of their respective proposers, but without indicating what they are. The reader, to understand this table, must turn back to the descriptions of these bills, and then write their purport at the foot of each column.

The object of this table is to indicate to what political group—for there were no definite parties—liberal, radical, socialist, conservative, or legitimist, the listed representatives belonged. But as this classification depends in part on the biographies, which of course cannot be tabulated, the table is hardly convincing in itself, but one must accept the author's classification on faith or else study the biographies again, to form his own conclusion. The test questions of this table include one—the first—that is given, the author states, "not so much for a party test, as for convenience in determining the member's attitude on the American example." In this statement there is a suggestion of a possible reasoning in a circle; and there is more than suggestion of it in the cases of the second and third test questions, as they equally with the first indicate the voter's attitude toward the United States Constitution. The first test question is a proposition for a legislature of two chambers instead of one. The second and third for the election of the President, not by popular suffrage, but by the legislature. It is evident then, that an affirmative vote on the first question, or a negative vote on the second and third, offers a presumption that the voter favors the constitution of the United States as an example. But the author uses the votes on the second and third questions at least, and on the first "not so much" but perhaps a little, as evidence of the political attitudes of the voters, and then, having classified them partly on the ground of these votes, proceeds to inquire whether those whom he thus decides to be liberals, or radicals, or socialists, or conservatives, or legitimists, favored our constitution or looked coldly upon it. Such reasoning establishes nothing.

Succeeding chapters report what was said about our constitution in the debates, and the comments on it in contemporary newspapers. It is brought out that our constitution was much discussed, both favorably and unfavorably, in their Commission and in the Assembly itself. It was discussed also extensively and quite earnestly in the press, and some of the journals published complete translations of it. There were also books about our system of government, the most important of them being the famous work of de Tocqueville, which had passed through ten editions and secured its author a membership in the French Academy.

After this, it is with surprise that we read that the influence of our constitution upon the French constitution of 1848 was but slight. Eighteen Articles in all, out of a total of 116, bear such a resemblance to parts of our constitution that they might be regarded as possibly modeled from that document. "But in many cases," we are told, "this resemblance is no doubt accidental." Only when there is direct evidence "in the arguments used in the Commission or on the floor of the Assembly," can we be confident that the article in question was based upon anything in our constitution. Such direct evidence he finds for only 6 of the articles. It seems to be quite conclusive then, we must admit with Dr. Curtis, that there was very little direct copying of our constitution, and he might in addition have pointed out that the French constitution of 1848 is quite unlike ours in its literary arrangement. But if, following the title of his work and his brilliant introductory chapters, we look for "American constitutional doctrines" rather than for a detailed copying of our constitution, the number of resemblances where there might possibly be imitation is not of much consequence. It would seem, however, to be of some significance, that the French constitution of that year maintains in every way a strict separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, according to our constitutional doctrine. Strictly in accord with that doctrine, it was laid down that the President should be elected by the people and not by the legislature, and that his term of office should not be the same as that of the legislature, and that the higher judges should be appointed for life. In accordance also with American doctrine, the President was given a large amount of power, and had the appointment of the higher judges, attorneys general, commanders-in-chief of army and navy, prefects, governors of Algeria and the provinces, diplomatic agents, and his ministers. On the other hand, in accordance again with our constitution, he could not declare war without the permission of the Assembly, nor could any treaty go into effect until it was approved by that body. These are important resemblances. There are others of less consequence. The most conspicuous difference is that the French constitution provided for a legislature of one chamber instead of two. But it was contended in the debates, that our second chamber is necessitated by our federal system, and would be out of place in France because that nation is not a federation. It would seem then, in spite of Dr. Curtis' arguments, that the French constitution followed in the main our constitutional principles; and that this was not accidental we have

the evidence of the deep interest that was shown by Frenchmen in the study of our system of government.

In answer to the question, Who favored our constitution, and why? the author states that the liberal republicans were cold toward it, the radicals and socialists actively hostile, and the legitimists also hostile. The ex-Orleanists, he declares, were the only really pro-American party. As this judgment is based partly on his question-begging statistics, we cannot accept it with entire confidence. As to their reason for favoring our constitutional principles, he says it was to support their plutocratic ideas; and so he concludes that the influence in favor of our system was, with hardly any exception, "conservative in politics, individualistic in economics." Before accepting this judgment, even if we were entirely convinced that the ex-Orleanists were the only warm friends of our constitution, we should like to know when their interest in it began—whether after the revolution or before. If they admired our institutions while Louis Philippe was king, it shows that their interest in them was not conservative and plutocratic, but that they were at heart all the time more republican than monarchical; and this was certainly the case with de Tocqueville, whose book on American democracy was first published in 1835.

On the whole then, it would seem, on the basis of Dr. Curtis' data, but against his conclusions, that our constitutional principles had a good deal of influence in the second French revolution and the framing of the republic that followed it; and that, though this influence was not working for the social along with the political revolution, it was nevertheless not reactionary in its nature or purely plutocratic in aim, but proceeded in some instances at least from a generous interest in political democracy. We still have reason to think then, that the second republic of France, and indeed the present third republic also, were inspired to some extent by our example and modeled on our principles.

JOSEPH C. ALLEN.

Images

The Retinue and Other Poems. By Katherine Lee Bates. E. P. Dutton and Company, New York. Price $1.50.

A Cabinet of Jade. By David O'Neil. The Four Seas Company, Boston. 1918. Price $1.25.

The Divine Image. By Caroline Giltinan. The Cornhill Company, Boston. 1918.

Although the amount of war poetry that is of real literary value is so small compared to the output, enough has been produced to set an exceedingly high standard, and, compared to the work of John Masefield, Rupert Brooke and Alan Seeger, very few poems seem to hold the requisite depth and fire. This volume of verses by Katherine Lee Bates contains but one poem of a truly impressive quality, "The Retinue." Its fine and poetical theme is stated in the opening words:

"Archduke Francis Ferdinand, Austrian Heir-Apparent
Rideth through the Shadow Land, not a lone knight
errant,"

and in flowing lines, in a metre reminiscent of old ballads, and suggestive of the swing of passing hosts, the writer describes the ghastly but gallant company, made up of men of every race, that follows in his train. The rest of the war poems in this book, though some express much feeling, and most have pleasing versification, are too journalistic in their nature to be of lasting interest. Exceptions may perhaps be found in "The German American" "The Purple Thread," and "To Canada," with its striking phrase, "The tragic crimson on your maple-leaf."

There are two other sections in this book: "Overseas," which deals with cultural European subjects, and shows in places a genial sense of humour, and "From Spring to Spring," which contains some vivid descriptions of the moods of nature, such as this from "A Mountain Storm,"

"Pilgrim processions of bowed trees that climb
To sacred summits, in the clashing hail
Shuddered like flagellants beneath the flail."

The delicate restraint that is associated with oriental art is to be found in the imagistic poems by David O'Neil, which are as pleasing a contrast to much present day writing as is a Japanese print to a succulent modern oil painting. Each form of expression has its place, of course, the print may leave one cold while the painting may exhilarate. The images presented in these lyrics are clear-cut and definite, yet not lacking in atmosphere; and each suggests a single idea or mood. The form of free verse in which they are written, with its subtle inherent rhythms, gives distinction to the subjects treated, though in a few instances one is inclined to suspect that the novelty of the technique may hide some want of originality in thought or figure.

The arresting quality that characterizes a good many of the poems in this book appears in the lines on "Solitude."

"Youth!
If there be madness
In your soul,
Go up to the mountain solitudes
Where you can grow up
To your madness."

"Without," "Field Flowers," "Immortality," are verses noticeable for their graceful imagery; and inspiring and vigorous thought are present in "Wantlessness," "The Blind," and "Our Son Jack."

The little poem, "Wanting so the Face divine," with its blend of human feeling and devotional fervour, gives the keynote to "The Divine Image," which, from its title and binding one would expect to find of a purely religious character. The poems are of unequal merit, but the volume justifies its existence on account of some of the lyrics which have a sincerity and passion not unlike those of Charlotte Bronte. In them, as in Charlotte Bronte's novels, one is conscious of a kind of stifled cry, like of that of one starving; they seem to express the same heart hunger and capacity for rapture, and the same conscientious

repression of fundamental human impulses that do not accommodate themselves to the conditions of life. This verse from the poem called "Shackled," is characteristic:

"In stress and strain and whirr of things
That complicate life so,
We hide an instinct's perfect wings
And dare not let them show."

and this from "The Sisters":

"Why need my heart fight against me?
For succor I reach out my hand
To her whom they stoned in Samaria...
God! how we two *understand!*"

VIOLET B. DISMORR.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending June 18

Congress

The Senate voted down, 41 to 34, a rule to limit debate during the war to one hour and a half for each Senator, with an extension of time by a majority vote of the Senate. The Senate Agricultural Committee voted to eliminate the Randall amendment requiring the President to prohibit the use of foodstuffs for the making of beer or wine, and decided to hold hearings on the proposal for a national prohibition amendment. In response to an appeal of Secretary Lane that plans be made for reclaiming arid, swamp, and cut over lands for returning soldiers, a resolution was introduced appropriating $1,000,000 for a survey of the lands in question. The House passed the Sundry Civil bill carrying $1,761,701,000 for the shipbuilding program; $50,000,000 for the President's emergency war fund; and $1,250,000 for the Committee on Public Information. The total of the bill is $2,915,000,000. [See current volume, page 770.]

America's War Preparations

Reports to the provost marshal general's office show that 744,865 young Americans who became of age during the past year registered on June 5. It had been estimated that the number would be nearly a million, but as 200,000 have volunteered before registration day, that number should be deducted from the estimate. Provost Marshal General Crowder told the Senate Military Affairs Committee that by August 1 the American Army would number 3,000,000 men. During the past six months $25,173,417 have been spent on additions and improvements to hospital service for the army. Charles M. Schwab, Director General of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, expects from fifty to seventy ships to be launched on Independence Day. Peru has seized 50,000 tons of German ships in her waters. Negotiations are under way with Argentina and Chile to obtain the use of the German ships in their ports, which amount to about 200,000 tons. A commission from Denmark is in conference with the War Board at Washington regarding the use of 500,000 tons of Danish shipping. Most of this tonnage is now in service. Official dispatches from London state that the Liberty motor has met tests satisfactorily, and a large number of the engines will be ordered by France and Great Britain. The Treasury Department on the 15th extended new credits of $175,000,000 to Great Britain, and $9,000,000 to Belgium. This makes the total credited to the Allies $5,954,550,000, including $3,170,000,000 to Great Britain and $121,550,000 to Belgium.

European War

The Western front has seen spirited local fighting during the week, in which American troops are credited with brilliant execution, but all engagements were of secondary importance. On the 15th the Austrians began a general attack on the Italian front. The assault included 100 miles along the Piave River and across the Asiago plateau. It is estimated that the assailants had 700,000 men in action. The contest on the third day nets the Austrians very slight gains of territory at three points on the Piave. Temporary gains were made in the mountains, and 18,000 prisoners taken; but the positions were recovered and 5,000 Austrian prisoners taken. Confidence is felt in Italy that the army that was overwhelmed last year has recovered its morale. British and French troops are on the Italian front, but no Americans. [See current volume, page 772.]

* *

Submarines have sunk four more vessels off the Atlantic Coast, all being small Norwegian ships. The U-boats have operated in this field from May 25 to June 14, during which time they have sunk 20 vessels. Yet American troops and supplies go forward without interruption. More than 500,000 men have been sent over since March 21.

* *

The German press has returned to a less confident tone. Indemnities receive no attention. Austria's internal affairs occupy first place. Correspondents in Vienna picture the dual empire on the point of collapse. The suppressed nationalities grow bolder daily, and should there be a signal defeat on the Italian front the whole structure might go down. Scarcity of food adds to the distress and discontent of the people. The fourth rejection by the Prussian Lower House of the democratic franchise reform for Prussia by a larger majority than before has added to the discontent in Germany. Chancellor von Hertling has threatened the House with dissolution and an appeal to the electors if it does not pass the bill. Maximilian Harden continues to goad the Ministry, and to predict disaster if it does not heed the signs.

* *

American casualties to date, as announced by the War Department, are: Killed in action, 1,253; died of disease, 1,238; lost at sea, 291; died of accident, 423; total deaths, 3,205; wounded, 4,572; captured, 116, missing, 231; total casualties, 8,124.

Russia

The Central Executive Committee at Moscow, in its attempts at solving the food problem has voted to

create committees of poor peasants for the purpose of taking a census of grain and other food necessaries in villages, confiscating all above requirements, and distributing food and machinery among peasants they decide to be needy. The committees are to be formed by the local Soviets, and only the poor can become members. Their activities are to be directed against rich peasants, who are declared to be hiding grain, and against the bourgeois opposed to the Soviet government. Armed detachments of workmen have been formed to enforce the measure. A provisional peace treaty is reported to have been signed by the representatives of Russia and the Ukraine. Berlin notified the Russian government that Czecho-Slovak troops who fought in the Russian army must not be allowed to leave the country. Attempts to carry out this request are said to have resulted in a disastrous defeat to the Bolshevik forces. The Czecho-Slovak troops are reported to be in command of a large part of the Siberian railroad, and to be preparing to make their way to Vladivostok. Meanwhile German forces have inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Bolshevik troops near Taganrog, a port on the Sea of Azov. The Finnish Government announces that it has no intention of taking aggressive action against the Mourmansk Railroad, but it will not undertake not to try to unite Russian Carelia with Finland. Carelia, lying northwest of Petrograd, and along the eastern border of Finland, is largely inhabited by Finns. [See current volume, page 771.]

Ireland

Comparative quiet has reigned since voluntary enlistment was begun in place of the threatened conscription, which is held in abeyance for the present. The enlistment campaign is entirely in civilian hands drawn from all political parties. Notable among the workers is Sir Horace Plunkett who, as chairman of the recent Home Rule convention at Dublin, did so much to bring the factions to an agreement. The Irish Nationalist members of Parliament, who withdrew from that body when conscription was voted, have signified their intention to return and take part in the debates on the Sinn Fein arrests. No steps have yet been taken to bring the prisoners to trial. [See current volume, page 740.]

Would Retain General Gorgas

Memorials and petitions have been forwarded to President Wilson asking for the retention in active service of Surgeon General Gorgas, who will reach retiring age October 3. Three medical associations that met in Atlantic City, May 29, passed resolutions asking the President to keep General Gorgas at his present post, and similar resolutions have been passed at the annual convention of the American Medical Association, which met at Chicago on the 11th. General Gorgas, who drove yellow fever out of Havana, and who made the Panama Canal Zone as healthy as places in the temperate zone, is now doing similar work for the United States training camps and cantonments; and those who know his work do not wish to see him leave his present task before it has been completed.

Suffrage a Fundamental Right

A delegation of American suffragists presented the President with a memorial from a French Union of suffragists asking him to proclaim the principle of woman suffrage as one of the fundamental rights of the future. The President expressed himself in complete accord with the petition. He declared that the democratic reconstruction of the world would not be completely attained until women are admitted to the suffrage. "As for America," he said, "it is my earnest hope that the Senate of the United States will give an unmistakable answer to this question by passing the suffrage amendment to our Federal Constitution before the end of the session."

Mexican Editors

The tour of the Mexican editors has awakened a cordial response in this country, and appears to be doing much to remove the misunderstanding between the two countries. From Boston, where they were entertained on the 17th, they will make their way to the Pacific coast, and thence home. Carlos Gonzales Peña, a novelist and editor of *El Universal* of Mexico City, who is one of the party, says he would have in Mexico a popular propaganda to correct the misconceptions about the United States, and would have in this country a campaign to counteract the popular opinions about Mexico and its people. He would promote excursions from each country to the other, and would have more books translated. There should also be an exchange of professors and students in the universities. It is reported that the United States Government will invite a similar delegation of business men to visit this country. [See current volume, page 771.]

Organized Labor

The long standing controversy between the telegraph companies and their employes over the right to organize has been brought to a head by the findings of the National War Labor Board, which decided:

> (1) The employes have a right to join a union if they so desire, and men discharged for joining the union should be reinstated. (2) The company should not be required to deal with the union or to recognize it. (3) Committees of employes should be recognized in presenting grievances. (4) Where employes and employers fail to agree, the question in dispute should be determined by the National War Labor Board. (5) The telegraphers' union should not initiate strikes or permit its members to initiate them, but should submit all grievances to the National War Labor Board.

The employes accepted the award, but the companies refused. The men appealed to President Wilson, who addressed the companies in behalf of the country. The companies have answered the President, but it has not been made public. The Western Union company has issued a call for its employes to meet in Chicago, July 10, to consider the formation of a self-governing union.

* *

The thirty-eighth annual convention of the Amer-

ican Federation of Labor and the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy met at St. Paul on the 11th. A resolution asking President Wilson to take over the Western Union and Postal Telegraph companies to avoid the threatened strike was passed by the American Federation of Labor. A proposal to increase the executive council to thirteen, and including two women members, was voted down. Resolutions were passed asking for executive action in behalf of Thomas J. Mooney, under sentence of death in California. There were resolutions also for free Bohemia and independent Ireland. Four resolutions concerned the national child labor law recently declared invalid by the Supreme Court. There appeared to be close accord between the members and the Administration at Washington.

War Labor Agency

President Wilson has officially approved of the plan recommended by Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson for a centralized national agency to recruit workers for war needs. The President appeals to all employers engaged in war work to refrain after August 1 from recruiting unskilled labor in any other manner than through this central agency.

Caring for Soldiers After War

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, has addressed a communication to the President outlining a plan to provide for the soldiers when they return from the war. The Secretary notes the sharp difference in conditions now and at the close of the Civil War when the nation had a vast domain of fertile public land. Yet he insists that there will be the same demand for land on the part of a great number of the men, and that some provision must be made to satisfy the demand. Plans should be laid now, he urges, in order that the country may be ready to absorb this vast host of men when they come home. For this reason he wishes immediate steps taken to prepare the arid, swamp and the cutover lands. He cites the experience of European countries, and of Australia and New Zealand; and he quotes Dr. Elwood Mead, who is putting the latest land settlement plans into operation in California. Mr. Lane particularly disclaims all ideas of charity or bounty, but seeks to place at the command of the returning soldiers the advantages of science and the aid of government cooperation.

NOTES

—The magnetic observation yacht Carnegie, representing the Carnegie Institute, has arrived in Washington after a three-year cruise in the North and South Pacific gathering scientific data.

—A corporation to be known as the Asia Banking Corporation has been organized under the laws of New York to do a banking business in China. It has a capital of $2,000,000, and a paid-up surplus of $500,000. The Capital Issues Committee of the War Finance Corporation has approved of the issue of the stock.

—Cooperative stores operated on the Rochdale plan are not required to pay United States income tax on dividends to members of these cooperative societies, based on purchases by such members, but only on profits derived from sales to non-members. This ruling has been made by the Treasury Department in a case submitted by John H. Walker, president of the Central States Cooperative Society.

—Platinum so essential in the arts relating to war is now so scarce that the War Industries Board has ordered that seventy-five per cent of the stock of platinum in the hands of manufacturing jewelers be commandeered, and also the complete stock held by refiners, importers and dealers. In addition, every possible agency has been set to work to induce people not to wear jewelry containing platinum.

—In defense of the right of illegitimate children to the same care as the legitimate, the Children's Bureau has issued a pamphlet giving the Swedish law regarding the illegitimate child, which provides that "the child shall be entitled to bringing up—maintenance, training, and education—from both its father and its mother." The law looks upon illegitimacy as a child-welfare problem that must be solved for the sake of the child and the state.

—A survey has been taken of the dollar-a-year volunteers at Washington with a view to putting them on a substantial salary. These men have received this nominal wage because the Government cannot accept service for nothing. Secretary McAdoo, who believes the nominal pay system leads to divided allegiance between Government and private business, has already transferred all but three or four war assistants in the Treasury to salary rolls.

—More than 69,000 masters, officers, and seamen employed on America's merchant vessels have been insured by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department to an amount exceeding $115,000,000. The claims made since last June, when the season's section was established, are in excess of $180,000. Insurance is compulsory on ships traversing the war zone; the rate is 25 cents per $100. The amount of insurance must be twelve times a man's monthly wages; the maximum being $5,000 and the minimum $1,500.

The Public
A Journal of Democracy

Founded and Edited, 1898-1918, 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.