The Public

A Journal of Democracy

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.

Judicial Supremacy and The Constitution

Chief Justice Walter Clark

Josephus Daniels

William E. Dodd

America and Russia

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

June 29, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI | **New York, N. Y., June 29, 1918** | **Number 1056**

Contents

The reasons why a manifesto was issued by the Labor members of the British Government are still obscure, but the incident is generally interpreted by the London press as indicating a possible disruption of the Labor Party. The manifesto urges a continuation of the political truce for the sake of unity in the war, and states that the labor ministers have acted in terms made necessary by the coalition form of government. It states further that they have been hampered by "incessant sniping on the part of anti-national factionists, who have assumed the right to speak for Labor, and who are trying to divide the nation into warring political factions." The position of a leader of Labor holding government office is at the best of times unenviable. He is always held as violating Labor's trust. Apparently there is increasing pressure from the constituencies, conscious of new acquisitions of strength, to break the political truce under which Labor is impotent to carry out its specific measures of reconstruction. The action which the Labor Executive proposes to take at the forthcoming conference to terminate the political truce is probably in response to this general demand. If so, the attempt to label it as a pacifist move is merely a piece of discreditable political camouflage. It would be surprising if so early after the achievement of unity there should be a break between the two great branches of the party, the Trade Union Congress and the Independent Labor Party. Some leaders of the latter group, which has always been socialist in profession, as Philip Snowden and Ramsay Macdonald, are, of course, pacifists, but there is no evidence that they have had of late any extraordinary accession of influence.

* * *

A private organization amply supplied with funds that sets itself up to issue certificates on the loyalty of American citizens and to denounce those who do not meet its private tests is a phenomenon that should be investigated by Congress. If we had as little common sense as the National Security League we should raise the question of whether or not its antics were inspired by disloyal persons intent on stirring up discord and on discrediting patriotism as an attribute of bigots and witch-burners. Its latest exploit is to impugn the loyalty of the University of Wisconsin. We hold no brief for that institution, which has been over-rated and over-advertised as a source of progressive inspiration and constructive radicalism. But the attack upon it by President S. Stanwood Menken and Professor McElroy of the National Security League will not injure the University and merely makes its authors ridiculous. Governor Phillips of Wisconsin, whose loyalty no one ever thought of questioning, disposed of the matter with some plain speaking which must have increased his popularity in the State. "I am tired," he said, "of having this institution accused of disloyalty by a lot of carpetbaggers who come here to unravel their shrivelled-up, kiln-dried oratory that never could reach a human heart, and complain because their efforts are not enthusiastically received, and would have the country understand that this in-

stitution is disloyal. It is a type of impudence that is indulged in by a class of self-asserted patriots who are the greatest menace to the country today, because they discourage what the country needs above all things in this crisis, and that is the hearty cooperation of all the people in support of the war." Congress should inquire into the National Security League and its possible relations with such organizations as the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations. Yet we are not sure that, so long as it continues to lead the agitation for universal military training as a permanent institution, it is not doing the country a real service. It is likely to make any cause it champions unpopular.

* * *

It is hard to live in New York these days without feeling that the election of Mayor Hylan last fall was an excellent thing for the cause of unity in the war among New York's five millions. The names of the innumerable committees engaged in war activities no longer read like the rosters of fashionable Fifth Avenue clubs, with their suggestion of that adherence to the worst of England's institutions which prevailed among a few of our rich. The O'Haras and the Epsteins and the Meyers no longer feel out of it, and needless to say they are proving as enthusiastic and devoted in civil service at home as the casualty lists show them to be on the fields of France. Meanwhile the Citizens' Union, a nonpartisan body of public-spirited persons, finds a good word to say for Mayor Hylan's conduct of affairs, while an organization of taxpayers denounces him as a Bolshevik because his Market Commissioner proposes to curb profiteering tradesmen by entering into competition with them on city-owned land.

* * *

Behind the demand for the raising of the maximum draft age to 45 years is undoubtedly a strong movement for industrial conscription. The draft ages must be raised, and it is immaterial what limit is chosen so long as the purpose is that of raising the needed armies. But men exempted from the draft because of dependents should be left as free in their movements as all other citizens. Proponents of industrial conscription should ask for it on its merits. General Crowder's " work or fight " rule was a short-cut in accomplishing a purpose we all approve. It would be better to accomplish that purpose directly by legislation affecting all citizens. In Chicago the Federation of Labor has exposed and denounced a conspiracy between certain employers and police officials to coerce wage-earners into taking jobs to which they had legitimate objections, such as employment in the fertilizer departments of the big packing houses. In New York, some of the local draft boards propose to " request " young men in deferred classes to volunteer their services in the selling of war savings stamps. Until the Government has shown a much stronger hand in shutting down non-essential industries, it should not solve the man-power problem by using the draft for purposes of civil coercion. England quickly discovered that that way trouble lies. It should be unnecessary in this country now that the Employment Service of the Department of Labor is preparing to control labor distribution by requiring that all employers employing more than 100 men shall recruit laborers through the Federal employment offices. This in itself is a drastic measure, to be enforced through cooperation with the War Industries Board and the Fuel Administration, which will cut off employers who violate the Department's regulation. It was made necessary by the large labor turn-over, with the great waste involved in the movement of men from place to place at the call of higher wages. It means a curtailing of labor's bargaining power, which is to be offset by the virtual control of wages and conditions which inheres in the Government through the Taft-Walsh Board. We should have reason to feel misgivings about it if its administration were not under the control of Secretary Wilson.

* * *

No one whose intelligence is worthy of respect will be disturbed by the attempt of one Dr. James A. B. Scherer, a field agent for the Council of National Defense, to discredit Secretary Baker on a showing that he deprecated and discouraged public attacks by federal officials under his jurisdiction on the Hearst newspapers. The country knows that Messrs. Gregory and Burleson are amply able to deal with seditious newspapers, and while awaiting the facts they will accept Secretary Baker's reported action in the matter of the Hearst papers as part of his very wise and sane stand against that spirit of petty recrimination and witch-burning which more than almost any other factor militates against

national unity at this time. Dr. Scherer is a violent partisan of Roosevelt—one of those many little men who have surrendered utterly to that doctrine of force and discipline and fear which, if it should prevail in this country, would constitute the greatest victory which Prussianism could win. Until the war began his chief function was the soliciting of college funds from multimillionaires. We can be thankful that he no longer has an official prestige for his message of hate.

America and Russia

Every day is bringing this country closer to a decision which will affect in vital ways the further course of the war and international conditions following the peace. Something is undoubtedly about to be done by the Allies in connection with Russia, and what that something is to be depends upon the will of America, and specifically upon the judgment of President Wilson. So far, the moral forces that have carried us into the struggle, the motives that seek only the defense of humanity from the great peril, free from the desire of territorial or commercial aggrandizement—these forces have remained unimpaired. It is always easy for the exponents of *Realpolitik* to sneer at the flimsy sentimental character of moral purpose; but the fact remains that without exactly this purpose Allied unity would have been impossible, America would have withheld her hand, and German triumph would have been assured. It will, therefore, be a decision of moment for the morale and high fighting quality of the American people, and for the maintenance on a non-imperialist basis of the alliance against Germany, that President Wilson must make. In this situation calm judgment is made difficult by the attitude of the metropolitan press, which urges with cynical persistence the sacrifice of principle and, profoundly ignorant of the factors in the situation, is making the course of the President one of overwhelming difficulty. The climax may be certainly expected within the next few weeks. The extreme simplicity of marching Japanese forces into Siberia as a practically possible first step, obscures the as yet only partially calculable consequences. THE PUBLIC has never yet denied the possibility of the advantageous use of a Japanese army on Russian territory, believing that conditions might arise that would make this use advisable. It is now convinced that Japanese intervention in any form is in the last degree inexpedient, and calculated to produce precisely the results the prevention of which would be the reason for the expedition.

The attitude of our European Allies is perfectly comprehensible. As the military menace in France continues grave, the need is increasingly apparent that Germany should be attacked from the rear. While this is the prime consideration, others probably play a part: some territorial security for Russia's great indebtedness, and the old greedy feeling that if Russia is in dissolution, the Allied nations should get in while the grabbing is good. American policy will remain unaffected by these latter considerations; it will indeed counter them by its desire to rehabilitate and secure the future of the Russian nation. That the struggle must be resumed on the Eastern front in order that the war may be brought to a successful conclusion in the interest of the Allies and Russia alike, is another matter in the necessity of which THE PUBLIC has consistently believed. The point to be settled is in reality a simple one, easily determined by an inspection of the facts. The Germans can be fought in the East only by Russians or by the Allies cooperating with Russian armies. A Japanese invasion of Siberia would never reach any German forces. Just as the Germans themselves find military penetration a matter of limited possibility when countered by even the unorganized opposition of the Russian people, so the Japanese endeavoring to move westwards would be held by the same buffer. It is clear to all competent observers that if Japanese and Germans should come into military contact, it would be because the Russians invited and aided Germany to repel the invaders.

Our cynical press has not been unconscious of these facts, and has buttressed its demand for intervention by marshalling the opinions of Russians in this country. These gentlemen are for the most part unemployed bureaucrats, who see an opportunity in the proposed adventure for personal participation advantageous to themselves. The proposal now seems to be that this group, with whatever volunteer army might be assembled in this country, should go to Vladivostok, initiate a counter revolution, and form a Russian screen behind which Japan might freely act. This is presented in colors that

strongly commend it by Leo Pasvolsky in a recent letter to the New York *Times*. He proposes that the Kerensky regime should be reestablished in Siberia, and from Siberia should move westward against the Soviets and Germany. Undoubtedly, if intervention is found to be inevitable, this method is better than a barefaced invasion. But even so, there is no indication from the first step what the second and third would be; all proposals for military intervention are magnificent departures with nowhere in particular to go. Is nothing else possible?

The time element is now conceived to be important, but not to the extent that New York papers hysterically pretend. A prostrate Russia being rapidly engulfed by the German monster is a positive torture to the ignorant. Russia is not so easily swallowed. At the same time German intention is perfectly clear. She desires to secure possession of resources that will aid her in the war against the Western Allies. Incidentally, she desires to control internal affairs by taking advantage of factional differences and throwing her weight to the group that will be most subservient. What was done in the Ukrainian *coup d'état* will be repeated wherever opportunity presents itself. On the other hand, the time element is undoubtedly mitigating the extreme attitude of the Bolsheviki. The class struggle is becoming more and more a perfunctory phrase. The difficulty of practical administration of an impoverished country takes the edge off dogmas, and the outlook toward the future is so completely one of despair that the need of outside help is toning down doctrinaire ardor. Two factors are, therefore, at work: Germany is doing her utmost to secure a hold, but those in control of the Russian government are giving up their intractable attitude.

Is there not still another course open to America, if not to the Allies? Is there no basis by which cooperation can be effected with those who control Russian affairs? German treachery and oppression may be counted upon to keep hostility sufficiently alive. Russians know that they must fight Germany in order to live. They claim that only the impoverished condition of the country prevents resumption of hostilities. The Allies have little faith in the Soviet military capacity, but at bottom they most distrust and dislike the Soviet government. This is the real point, and it is worthy of examination. When Professor Lomonossoff, head of the Russian Railway Mission, sent to this country by the Kerensky government, made a speech at Madison Square Garden last week, in which he argued the need of cooperating with the Soviet government, he was treated by our press almost as a traitor. But his views are worthy of the most careful consideration. He is opposed to Bolshevism with its methods and gospel of violence. He considers the dictatorship of the proletariat a disaster to Russia, but he has knowledge of the facts, and an understanding of the ways by which America can help to achieve redemption of his country. He frankly tells us that there is no alternative to cooperation with the existing powers, namely, the Soviet government. Whether or not formal recognition is conceded is unimportant. That this country should give aid on the basis of a practical understanding and in cooperation with the Soviets, is the great necessity.

We of this country, like Englishmen and Frenchmen, persistently ignore the fact that Russia does not possess a middle class. We think of government so naturally in terms of the professions and of prominent business men that we are unable to conceive any country maintaining itself without them. We naturally presuppose a middle class. It is the "real Russia" of the New York *Times* that awaits our help. This "real Russia" simply does not exist. We may exterminate the Bolshevist leaders a hundred times over. But so long as the masses remain in control there will be no such government as we desire for Russia, and we can hardly exterminate the masses.

Much difficulty would be removed if we could differentiate between the Soviet and the Bolsheviki. The Soviet type of government may be foreign to us, but it has its roots deep in ancient Russian democracy, and may in time prove a new contribution to governmental system. In itself it has nothing to do with the Bolsheviki, as Professor Lomonossoff says: "Today the majority in the Soviets may be of the Bolsheviki. Tomorrow it may be of the Social Revolutionists, or even of the Black Hundred. That the Soviets are becoming more conservative is as certain as the law of the pendulum." Since the beginning of the revolution each government in turn has drawn its influence and power from these councils. They began with industrial

workers and are still controlled by them in the interests of Bolshevism, but they have spread throughout the peasant masses. This differentiation is emphasized in a pamphlet recently published and privately circulated by a close student of Russian affairs. He tells us: "The political strength of the Soviet organization lies in the fact that its base rests upon local self-governing bodies. The organization cannot be destroyed except from below. This is in striking contrast to the government of the Czar and to the coalition governments which followed the revolution, all of which were based upon the principle of Central authority imposed from above, whether by force or consent. In order to destroy the Czar's government it was only necessary to deprive it of the support of the Army. In order to destroy the Kerensky government is was only necessary to surround his ministers in the Winter Palace. In order to destroy the Soviet government it will be necessary to destroy cohesion between the local Soviets, which constitute through their representatives the central Russian government." He assures us further that, "if the Soviet form of government prevails, the peasants will ultimately change its leadership. Upon the distribution of the land the peasants will cease to be revolutionary and will desire above all things a stable, conservative government. This class is in a position to directly control the Government through the local Soviets. The Bolshevik party finds its permanent support almost exclusively in the industrial class, which is not sufficiently numerous to control the peasants when they wish to assert themselves. The best hope for representative democracy in Russia is that the Soviet form of government shall prevail and become representative of all classes."

Taking all these facts into consideration, the problem of practical cooperation with Russia should not be so difficult. Professor Lomonossoff is asking for three classes of commodities: shoes, locomotives, and agricultural machinery. These would insure to Russia her livelihood, and would reestablish her means of distribution. The pamphlet quoted above, discussing possibilities of aid, urges another kind of assistance: "A commission equipped with financial support and personnel sufficient to render assistance to the Russian people, through cooperation with the Soviet Government in reorganizing and reconstructing its internal affairs, should be sent to Russia at once. Such a commission as this in cooperation with the Soviet Government will be able to exercise control over the use and disposition of Russian resources which are vitally needed by Germany. These resources are needed in Russia and should be used there. With American assistance the Soviet government in reconstructing the process of commercial distribution will willingly use its utmost efforts to assist in the distribution of such resources to the Russian people, and will willingly give control of surplus products to America in exchange for shipments of agricultural machinery and other products vitally needed for consumption in Russia. Such a commission will be able to influence the organization of forces which if not adequate to defeat Germany will be at least sufficient to hold many German troops on the Russian front. If such a force can be created it may then be possible for such a commission as this to so handle the situation that Allied intervention on a cooperative basis will be invited in order to fight Germany. Such a commission may be able to bring about the reestablishment of Allied trade via Murmansk and Archangel, sending materials and supplies vitally needed in England and France from these ports in exchange for the things which Russia needs in order to reconstruct her internal situation. Such trade may perhaps result in an actual saving of tonnage in the transportation of supplies to England and France, but that question can only be determined after careful study and consultation with the Allied shipping control. In any event it is worthy of careful consideration." This general attitude is supported by no less prominent an authority than Professor Masaryk, President of the Czecho-Slovak Revolutionary Government. He tells us in the New York *Times* of May 27th: "Whoever would aid Russia must be on good terms with the government now in power, and that government at present is composed of Bolsheviki. I do not mean necessarily that this government should be formally recognized; that is not so important, but the recovery of Russia is essential, and the work done to that end must not be frustrated. You cannot work against the government."

Out of this complex of facts and opinion emerges a plan for the only kind of intervention that America can undertake or can assist.

Mr. Gompers and the Weekly Press

Mr. Gompers' attack on three weekly journals, of which THE PUBLIC is one, at the St. Paul convention of the American Federation of Labor has more than a little significance. Heretofore Mr. Gompers has been able to identify the demand for a broader and more radical program of political action for American labor with relatively small groups of Socialists of great personal unpopularity within the ranks of labor—an unpopularity compounded of race, religion, and their faculty for following a needlessly pestiferous course of opposition. Mr. Gompers has always triumphed in a roar of applause because he was "a regular fellow" and a two-fisted fighting-man, while his opponents usually subsided after they had achieved a gesture and got a few words into the record to satisfy their recalcitrant constituencies. Also, Mr. Gompers has triumphed for the same reason that conservative forces would triumph in the nation if the next generation should be forced to live under the menace of a victorious Germany. The unions have led an embattled existence, with the employers all but successfully challenging their right to live, and while the conservatives in the unions were good administrators and hard-hitters in an emergency, the aforementioned Socialists were ceaselessly disputatious and bent on stirring up an internal strife that appeared discreditable in the face of the enemies without. And the recognition of the Federal Government and the aid of the Taft-Walsh Board will not immediately bring the unions such security as to remove the disadvantage under which men who can be branded as troublemakers must work.

But now Mr. Gompers meets criticism from a new quarter. The rise of an independent and radical weekly press coincides with and expresses a new development in American politics —the emergence of a large and important group of radicals who can be called pragmatic because they are concerned with practical consequences and unwedded to dogma. It is a particularly useful word in this connection, because Mr. Gompers can approve of its application in another meaning. For Webster's dictionary says that, among other things, a pragmatic person is "an officiously busy person, a meddler, a busybody; also an opinionated or conceited person." And that expresses exactly his opinion of the editors of *The New Republic, The Survey,* and THE PUBLIC. But "pragmatic radicals" sounds altogether too formidable, and we leave it to *The New Republic.* There is really nothing new about this group. It is made up of the men and women who most cherish our American tradition, and who are reacting today to the evils and injustices of modern industrialism and land monopoly just as their forefathers reacted to the evils of human slavery sixty years ago. The number of those whose eyes are opening to the facts of our economic regime and whose wills are enlisted for radical reconstruction has grown very rapidly. And as they cast about for leadership and organization they see in the labor movement the most available and the most effectual nucleus for an army of social reconstruction. They have shared labor's purposes and fought labor's battles in the press and on the platform, and they look to labor now to take the leadership at this promising stage in the struggle for economic democracy. In England they have not looked in vain. In many States of this country they have not looked in vain. But in the broader field of the Nation they have seen labor's influence manipulated for the attainment of what they conceived as inadequate ends, and they have looked in vain for a basis of cooperation, for a development that would permit them to say: "We stand with the Federation on this program; we ask you and all men and women who cherish American traditions to join us in support of what organized labor is asking. For it is comprehensive; it is fundamental; it is just; it will free all human society of evils that oppress us all." And they have refused to believe that the rank and file of organized labor want less for labor than they do, and they have criticized very severely the leadership that stands in the way of cooperation between organized labor and all the other democratic forces in America that are intent on mobilizing their political power to remove some of the obvious causes of poverty and inequality of opportunity.

Organized labor has nothing to fear from this awakening of the great unclassified multitudes of American men and women who are today reapplying democratic principles in the economic field. It has everything to gain from their support. It would always remain the dominant nucleus. The purposes of cooperation would be

fixed and clear, and these would be such as would attract no selfish interests, no peddlers of half-way measures and palliatives. Organized labor must make just one sacrifice in order to bring this cooperation about: it must sacrifice a leadership that is too complacent in the enjoyment of personal distinctions and flattering perquisites to desire very ardently any material change in the status quo. Mr. Gompers should quit the seats of the mighty now and then for a few weeks among the working-class families whose undernourishment is reported to us from time to time by such conservative authorities as the physicians of the health boards and the agents of charity organization societies. Mr. Gompers revealed all that was lacking in the American Federation of Labor not long ago when he resented as a reflection on his life work the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing that real wages had not gone up in this country.

Justice Clark on the Supreme Court

The day must come when Congress will successfully challenge the right of the United States Supreme Court to set aside its enactments on the ground that they conflict with the Constitution. Experience has shown that every piece of legislation marking a social advance presents some feature that can be made the subject of legalistic hair-splitting by a Supreme Court whose prejudices are disturbed, so that in effect we are at the mercy, in matters of Federal legislation, of five elderly men exercising authority to nullify the popular will as expressed by Congress and the President. Nothing is so well designed to shake popular confidence in our political institutions as this assumption and exercise by the Supreme Court of the power to nullify acts of Congress. We are a very numerous and greatly diversified people, spread over a vast geographical area, and the difficulties in the way of procuring action by Congress in such matters as child labor are great enough without adding to them the possibility that, after Congress and the President have acted, all the agitation and discussion and ultimate decision may be set at naught by the votes of five Justices comprising a majority of the Supreme Court. And this possibility of judicial veto becomes more than a possibility when the act of Congress in question is one that seeks to modify the conditions under which private property shall be held and used. Action to this end by Congress must become more and more frequent in the years ahead, and on the efficacy of legislation of this sort in effecting an orderly reconstruction depends very largely the issue as between orderly progress and some eventual resort to civil conflict. If Congress wishes to foster the I. W. W., the best way to do it will be for Congress to admit that it is impotent to carry out the will of the people, except when that will does not happen to run counter to the preconceptions and prejudices of any five Justices of the Supreme Court.

To admit that Congress is powerless and that we must obtain an amendment to the Constitution whenever the Federal Government wishes to take a forward step or to abate an evil is to surrender to the theory of an impotent democracy. Those in charge of the fight for adequate child-labor regulation should make no such surrender. There could be no better time for the liberal elements of the country to unite in insisting that Congress and the President must be left free to carry out the popular will. Lawyers may disagree as to the authority of the Supreme Court. Intelligent liberals should admit no ground for disagreement. There is a firm legal basis for their contention, and this is their opportunity to insist that it prevail. The courts themselves have shown that they are willing to stretch a point or resolve a doubt when they wish to construe the Constitution in such a way as to protect property. Such instances are conspicuous in the construing of the "due process" amendment,—an amendment designed to protect the rights of the emancipated slaves and used rather to protect the exploiters of industrial slaves from the demands of humanity and justice. Shall liberals, then, hesitate to hold out for a construction of the Constitution that once and for all will remove the veto power now held by five old men, whose legal training is used, conscientiously enough, merely to rationalize their prejudices?

Senator Owen of Oklahoma has reintroduced the Child Labor bill with an amendment providing that it shall "only be questioned hereafter by Congress itself, and by the people of the United States in their sovereign capacity as voters." This is the measure referred to by Chief Justice Walter Clark of the Supreme Court of North

Carolina in an article contributed to this issue of THE PUBLIC. It deserves the active support of every liberal. The Supreme Court might disregard it, although Justice Clark points out that it respected a similar prohibition in the Reconstruction Acts. Congress should in that event continue to assert the popular will in every act that might be questioned. Not even the Supreme Court would long resist the determination of the people, thus expressed through Congress, to make of Congress an effectual agency of popular government.

Justice Clark's article was written at our solicitation to illuminate this vital issue.

A Test of Statesmanship

Liberals in the Government at Washington will undergo in the next year or two a test of their ability to set forward the economic readjustments that now loom on the horizon as the essential task of the statesmen of this and the ensuing generations. It is a task inseparable from the present, and one that must be faced in meeting the problems of the war itself. That this is recognized at Washington we have ample evidence, as we have ample faith in the vision and ability of such men as President Wilson, Secretary Baker, Secretary Daniels, Secretary Wilson, Louis F. Post, William Kent, William Colver and a score of others on whom the President relies. The momentous question is whether they can succeed while they continue to depend for their political support on a Party diversely composed of elements that are far from agreement on what needs to be done. It is not that a majority of American voters are blind to the economic issues and unprepared for political action to effect radical economic readjustments, but that this majority, which we believe exists, has never been brought solidly together in any organization or behind any group of leaders. Even at this time there is little question that in certain States voters who rightly belong in such a majority would vote for Republican candidates, either because they have been offended by the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party or because the liberal wing of that Party has had to keep its purposes somewhat obscured in order to avoid the antagonism of illiberal elements that are necessary to its success in Congress. In order to mobilize the full political strength of those voters who are ready for adequate measures, we need to offer them the warm glow that can only come of joining in a movement that is openly and avowedly committed to the cause of economic reconstruction. The forces set in motion by President Wilson's leadership come nearer to constituting such a movement than any political development of our times. Organized labor is more politically alert than ever before, and Mr. Gompers' support of the President expresses the sentiment of the rank and file as well as Mr. Gompers' own predilections and political strategy. We believe that what might be called the Wilson Democracy can make itself politically irresistible by developing its present policies to the point where there would be no room in the Party for reactionaries and therefore no longer any need for withholding such a frank avowal of purpose as would enlist the support of every forward-looking voter. Someone may say that there is now no excuse for any such withholding his support. The fact is that very many do, and that many of those who do not, yet feel their enthusiasm dampened just enough to reduce their political value as enthusiasts in the task of rallying their fellows.

The growing demand within organized labor for a more comprehensive and a more deeply cutting political program will serve a good purpose if it impresses on Mr. Gompers and his friends in office the necessity of more fully justifying his present policy, which is to serve labor's political interests as a member of the group that advises President Wilson and influences the policies of his Administration. It seems fairly certain that Mr. Gompers, that is, must go to the next Convention with an assurance that the Wilson Administration is to face the problems of reconstruction with a far-reaching and radical program, or else he must meet an irresistible demand that labor strike out for itself in the broader political field. THE PUBLIC'S conviction that labor should take such a step has at no time involved the belief that it could or should displace the remarkable group of able and far-seeing men whom President Wilson has called into counsel and action. And if the obstructing elements within the Democratic Party can be so far overcome as to give us what the times demand without independent political action by labor, well and good. It seems likely, however, that such action would

merely smooth the path for those within the Democratic Party who see the road and the goal. This would be particularly true if labor's political action took the form of formulating and presenting a program, without attempting at this time to nominate candidates and embark on the vast and hazardous task of building up a political machine.

When it comes to the concrete steps to be taken in working out an economic reconstruction, the land question naturally takes first place. And it is in this field that President Wilson is particularly strong in clear vision and able counselors. Secretary Wilson, Mr. Post, Justice Brandeis, Mr. Kent, Mr. Colver—these are a few of the men immediately about him who are available for a survey of the problem and the working out of an adequate program. Such a program must have for its object the socializing of our natural resources by whatever means seem most practicable and in closest harmony with American habits and traditions. Fee simple title to land that is to be made available to returning soldiers and discharged munition workers either cannot exist, or must be stripped of its abuses by the adoption of a system of taxing land values. Prof. Elwood Mead of California is conducting valuable experiments and working out a practical basis for such a program. For land that is to be reclaimed and made available for agriculture by the use of public funds by the Nation and States, it is possible that a leasing system, with tenure well protected, will be best. For such land as cannot be acquired by the State or Nation, there is no way other than the taxation of land values. It is not for us to formulate a program here, but rather to point out the fact that such a program must be formulated by any group of leaders that expect to take their place in history as men who proved equal to the demands of their times. The danger is not that we shall have no program of reconstruction. That is a vague phrase about to gain general adoption. Mr. Roosevelt will have a program, and so will every other candidate and party that enters the next political arena. The thing to avoid is a program promising much and giving little—a program of half-hearted palliatives. No program that does not substantially alter the present system of property rights will be worth the paper it is written on as a contribution to that readjustment on which the salvation of society depends. We must have a program drafted by men who realize that industrialism and land monopoly have combined to create a condition that will destroy the health and happiness of the race unless by courageous, purposeful effort we can bring our economic regime once more into harmony with human needs.

Conscientious Objectors

For THE PUBLIC to undertake to dispose of conscientious objectors in one exasperated paragraph was obviously a mistake, and our mails have reminded us of it ever since. We are sincerely sorry that we did not discriminate between those young men whose conscientious objections spring from reverence, and those who are merely noisy objectors on any and all occasions, because the distinction of being in a conspicuous minority feeds their vanity and satisfies some thwarted craving for superiority. It is they who have been most numerous and most vociferous, and we were thinking entirely of them. The distinction is difficult to put on paper, but it can be drawn easily enough when an objector of this type appears before us in the flesh. It was such an appearance that took us off our guard. We cannot withhold our respect from the Quaker or the Tolstoyan, the convinced non-resistant, who goes through life endeavoring to exemplify his ideals of brotherly love and understanding. But when we see pugnacious, assertive, cocksure, egotistical youngsters setting themselves up as conscientious objectors and claiming sanctuary, we feel neither sympathy nor respect. There is a third class so engrossed in what the Socialist calls " the class struggle " that they find it impossible to join with their enemies in resistance to what the rest of us see as even a greater menace than domestic economic oppression, which it would foster and perpetuate. Some of our I. W. W. belong in this class. Their preoccupation is so great that their perspective is shortened, and not even the war has been able to lengthen the angles from which they see things. These men also we can understand and respect, although we cannot follow them. Between them and the convinced non-resistant we see no ground on which the conscientious objector can respectably stand. The convictions of a young man who would justify his refusal to serve in the army must be passionately held, they must be convictions that grip and pos-

sess his soul, if they are to claim respect. Glib mouthings of Socialist catchwords and easy conversion to the doctrines of Russell or Roland will not suffice. We feel that unless a young man is impelled by all the passion of his being to refuse service, he must be set down as a presumptuous egotist and a slacker if he takes that course. Many a young man must have gone into the army hating it all, loathing it with his soul, because his brothers are traveling today the way of the cross, and he sees it as self-indulgence to escape the travail when his turn arrives.

All of which is a lame attempt to rationalize an antipathy, a failure in understanding, toward men who disagree with us on an issue that arouses deep feeling. It is simply that we are incapable of patience with men who advocate physical non-resistance to German brutality and tyranny.

The New Socialist Executive

The Socialist Party's appeal for popular support will not be strengthened by the personnel of the new National Executive Committee, just elected under a new plan by which the Committee is increased from seven to fifteen members, with three members elected by each of five geographical districts. The new committee comprises Messrs. Morris Hillquit, James Oneal and Abraham Shiplacoff of New York; George H. Goebel and Frederick Krafft of New Jersey, Alfred Wagenknecht of Ohio, Victor Berger of Wisconsin, Seymour Stedman and John M. Work of Illinois, Stanley J. Clark of Texas, Dan Hogan and Fred Holt of Arkansas, Walter Thomas Mills of California, and Emil Herman and L. E. Katterfeld of Washington. Krafft, Wagenknecht and Herman are serving sentences under the Espionage Act, and Berger and Clark are under indictment. The Committee will hold its first meeting in Chicago on August 10. The prospect does not seem good that the Party directed by the majority of this committee will abandon a pacifism that in effect is pro-German and pro-militarism, and range itself on the side of those who see Germany's defeat as an essential of democratic progress. Max S. Hayes, editor of the Cleveland *Citizen* and himself a Socialist, has stated the case for the vast majority of American radicals in a recent editorial. Writing from St. Paul, where he was attending the convention of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Hayes says: "If there were those in previous conventions who deplored the lapse to barbarous warfare to establish free, democratic conditions on earth, their ideals have been shattered, for the time being at least, by brutal Prussianism that has thrown off its hypocritical mask of 'defense' by subjecting Russia, Finland, Ukrainia and the Baltic Provinces as vassal states, and which seeks to rear a world power that will be a standing menace to every other form of government on earth. If kaiserism should prove victorious, which is unthinkable now that its real purpose is revealed by its junkers in eastern Europe, it would mean that America would have to switch from its century-old policy of non-militarism to an out-and-out system of militarism that probably would endure for several generations, and finally precipitate another great war, greater by far than even the present world horror. The triumph of Prussianism would mean that ten years hence military uniforms would be as conspicuous on the streets of Cleveland as they were in Berlin or Bremen before the war; it would mean that our independent citizens would be compelled to salute every swashbuckler who undertook his daily dress parades, that your lowly policeman would cut no more figure than a dirty deuce when it came to the exemplification of disgusting snobbery and privileged arrogance; it would mean the slavery of an immense debt on top of our colossal war expenditures in order to support armies and navies to guard our shores against invasion on the Atlantic and perhaps the Pacific Coast as well. How could Liberty live in such an accursed atmosphere?" Mr. Hayes may somewhat exaggerate the subversive effect on American democracy of the military preparations and the bellicose nationalism that would be forced on this country if this war ends in a truce or a German victory. But we think not. Of course, these things do not worry those infatuated optimists who see a world-wide cooperative commonwealth just around the corner. Let them read history for instances when as promising movements in human society were turned back and utterly abated for centuries by some such catastrophe as a German victory would be today. Let them realize that a victory for Germany means a victory for reaction everywhere, a victory here as in Germany for militarism and narrow nationalism.

Judicial Supremacy Unwarranted by the Constitution

By Chief Justice Walter Clark
Of the Supreme Court of North Carolina.

The jurisdiction conferred on the Supreme Court by the Constitution, Art. III, is small, and then follows: "In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, *with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make.*"

The Inferior Courts are "ordained and established" by Congress, which must prescribe the limits of their jurisdiction. The claim of supremacy by the Judiciary over its creator is therefore not authorized. It is asserted that it is "necessary to the independence" of the Judiciary. In fact, it is the assumption by it of supreme, irresponsible and autocratic power.

Of course every department of the government takes an oath to support the Constitution. But the supreme power to review whether they do or not is reserved to the *people,* and is nowhere given to the Judiciary.

If Congress disobeys the Constitution the members of both the House and Senate are chosen by the people and can be reviewed at the next election.

If the President disobeys the Constitution, he is chosen by the people, and his acts can be reviewed at the next election.

If the Judiciary do an unconstitutional act they are not chosen by the people, and cannot be reviewed at the next election. That they have acted unconstitutionally has been held by themselves in reversing the Legal Tender decision; in the Income Tax decision; in the 10-hour case (Lochner case), virtually reversed in the Adamson Law case, and in other cases.

In the Income Tax case the last decision was wrong, and it required 18 years to get the evil corrected by Constitutional Amendment, and in the meantime that one vote of one Judge transferred 3,000 millions of dollars taxation from the predatory rich, and placed it upon the producing classes of the country.

Is it not worth while to prevent other abuses by an irresponsible court, a bare majority of whom may again, as so often in the past, mistake their own economic views for the Constitution?

An Act similar to that now proposed by Senator Owen, depriving the Court of jurisdiction over the Reconstruction Acts, was admitted by the Court itself as depriving them of power in McCardle ex parte 6 Wallace 324.

The first usurpation, in "Marbury v. Madison," during the incumbency of Chief Justice Marshall, was made by an *obiter dictum* and was not repeated as to an Act of Congress for 54 years, in the Dred Scott case, and this brings me to the purport of this article, which is to call attention to the motive for the *obiter dictum* in the Marbury case, as follows:

In laying the foundation of the Constitution there began the trouble between the free and slavery system of labor, which was a continuous struggle down to 1861. It was compromised by the Constitution giving three-fifths of a vote to slave owners as representatives of their slaves. It was recognized that by the increase of the white vote at the North, as well as by immigration, the South would soon lose control of the House and that it would ultimately lose the control of the Senate, though for a long time the parity was kept up by always admitting a slave state and a free state at the same time. On the admission of Missouri in 1820 we came near a dissolution of the Union. The Mexican War was largely caused by an effort to maintain the political equality of the slave states in the Senate.

For a long time the South held the Presidency by nominating a "Northern man with Southern principles," but when Lincoln was elected it was seen that that could not be relied on.

The Marbury v. Madison decision was simply "throwing an anchor to windward" by giving to the Supreme Court power to invalidate any action of Congress, though approved by the President, which should jeopardize slavery, and which would thus make the court a third line of defense that would last the lifetime of the Judges. This was shattered by the hostile recep-

tion given the Dred Scott case, and the results of the Civil War. The contest for slavery made the South "A section apart," and the waves have not yet entirely subsided. They have a proverb in wind-swept Spain, a land of wind mills, "Though the mills are down, the winds are blowing there still."

Marbury v. Madison having been thrown up as a bulwark for the Slavery Trust, when the 14th Amendment was passed with a provision intended for the protection of the emancipated negro, (which it did not affect), the Interests created by the War through the new appointees from time to time on the Supreme Bench secured for themselves the construction by the Court of a newer and deadlier theory than Marbury v. Madison, which was outworn. As to the Reconstruction acts, Congress made the Court stand off. But as the court is appointive, and for life, the people have no hand in choosing them, and no power to review them, and if their assumption of the supreme and ultimate power of review of the action of Congress shall continue to be substituted for that of the people, then aggregated wealth, following the example of the Slavery dealers down to 1861, have the irreviewable power to control the government and set at naught the will of the people on all public questions.

In Haines' "Judicial Supremacy," pp. 234 and 282, it is stated that twice before—in 1825 and 1867—bills like Senator Owen's present bill were introduced. That in 1867 passed, but applied only to the Reconstruction Act, and was obeyed by the Court in the McArdle case.

When the Marbury v. Madison decision was rendered it was at once denounced by President Thomas Jefferson as an usurpation unwarranted in the Constitution, and when it was repeated 54 years later in the Dred Scott case it was as vigorously denounced by Abraham Lincoln, and these men were, respectively, the very chiefest of the apostles of the two great parties now before the country.

In passing the Keating Child Labor Bill, the House and Senate declared the public policy of the people, by whom they were elected, and whose will they represented. The President not only approved, but requested the passage of the Act. The odd man on the Court, imbued with the ideas of Judicial Supremacy, and the rights of Capital over Labor, handed down from John Marshall, and a Court impressed with the necessity of protecting slavery, set the act aside. Where does the governing power reside?

Senator Owen's bill, re-enacting the Child Labor Law and prohibiting the Supreme Court from invalidating it, can be more speedily adopted than a Constitutional amendment, and will be as effective.

Josephus Daniels

By William E. Dodd

II

Mr. Daniels was now (at the time of Mr. Wilson's election) fifty years old. He had become the most powerful political and social figure in North Carolina, social in the larger sense, and what he advocated was apt to become law and what he opposed, even if it were already law, was apt to fail. His paper was an institution as much as Greeley's *Tribune* was ever an institution in his section. The *News and Observer* was read by country people far and near. Its place on the family table was seldom vacant. Men counted themselves as failing in their duty if they did not read what "Joe Daniels" had to say every morning. They sometimes swore at him, but they were later apt to repent; they more often rejoiced at his support of every good cause, and especially his courageous and inveterate opposition to corporation attempts to dominate the state. For twenty-five years there was war between Daniels and the Southern Railway, whose representatives lobbied in the legislatures against him, set up rival papers sold at lower prices, and even set one United States judge upon him with indictments for contempt of court. Nor was it different with the American Tobacco Company, whose headquarters were at Durham. In neither case did the editor of the *News and Observer* suffer any serious harm, although men did bear such grudges against him that at times he was thought to be in danger of losing his life.

Such a figure was not to be overlooked by the

new President in 1913 when the first Democratic cabinet since 1893 was made up. Wilson had made up his mind that Daniels should be among his group of advisers. But why should the North Carolinian be made Secretary of the Navy? was asked again and again. There are two reasons: First, Mr. Daniels was connected with a family which had had representatives in the Navy for many years. Mrs. Daniels' brother, Worth Bagley, had brought him into close touch with naval affairs; and the death of Worth Bagley at the beginning of the Spanish War had attached the family to that branch of the service. And Worth's brother David, recently commander of the *Jacob Jones,* was also an officer in the Navy. Mr. Daniels had written a short biography of Worth Bagley and had some acquaintance with naval affairs. There was, therefore, one good reason for Daniels to take that portfolio.

Another was the fact that North Carolina never had a cabinet officer except in this very department. It is a strange thing. The state has no large seaport, no great shipping interest; yet it has furnished four Secretaries of the Navy: John Branch, of Jackson's cabinet; George E. Badger, of William Henry Harrison's; James C. Dobbin, of Pierce's; and Josephus Daniels of the present Administration. It would have violated a tradition in North Carolina if any other position had been accepted from President Wilson.

What gave the tradition its start was the fact that John Paul Jones, the great Admiral of the early Navy, was appointed from North Carolina. The state has ever been proud of John Paul, the lonely young sailor, friendless and penniless, who stopped one day at the house of Willie Jones, one of her greatest leaders, and asked shelter. That friendless sailor took the name of his benefactor Jones, and he made the whole world ring with the valor of his exploits. From Revolutionary times, therefore, North Carolina has taken special interest in naval affairs. That is the second reason Josephus Daniels is to-day Secretary of the Navy. Both are good reasons; and, I believe it will be acknowledged on all sides that we have a great Secretary, devoted to his work and to service. Let us see what he has done for the Navy in his five years of leadership.

In 1913 many of the best officers of the Navy had made up their minds that the drink habit was one of the drawbacks to the highest efficiency. In the country the liquor interests were already on a desperate defensive. And the privates of the Navy had been forbidden to drink while in the service. Only the officers enjoyed the privilege of the wine mess. To the new Secretary what was good for the country was good for the Navy; and what was good for the men was good for the officers. The famous wine mess order was promptly given. A noise out of all proportion to the importance of the move was made and Mr. Daniels was denounced far and near by people who really believed in special privileges for certain classes of men. Of course all the pro-liquor journals joined the cry. But the President sustained his Secretary and after a year of fruitless faultfinding the noise subsided. Now hardly a voice is raised anywhere against the wine-mess ruling. The efficiency of the service is greatly increased.

Of even greater importance was the next step of the new Secretary—the appointment of officers from the ranks of the Navy. It is a well recognized rule of efficient organization that every man in a given business should feel that he may rise to its most responsible positions. Mr. Daniels, a democrat of the Jefferson school, held firmly the belief that caste works injury. He would put a bridge across the social chasm which separated officers from men. Consequently his order for the opening of training schools on the ships and his appointment of privates of fine record to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. There was a loud outcry. Men who had been brought up under the old rule and others who opposed democracy on principle declared that discipline in the Navy was being undermined.

But once again the results proved the wisdom of the rule, the wisdom of giving all men a chance to rise as high as their abilities would warrant. The apprentice schools have been enlarged and now scores and even hundreds of officers are being picked from among the seamen of the Navy. Perhaps the Academy does not like it and possibly there is as yet a little quiet hazing of the " common herd " when they enter the famous school; but no future Secretary of the Navy will go back to the old rigid caste system. Once again the Navy and the country are the gainers. If the Secretary sympathizes with the underdog in the service and tries to give him a chance, he but expresses the sense of fair play which all good Americans entertain.

Another great enemy to the morale of the

Navy, the scarlet woman, demanded attention at the hands of the Secretary. From time immemorial the young men of the Navy were allowed to play havoc with their own health and endanger that of others with whom they came into contact. In 1916 the men of the Navy lost 141,378 days because of venereal diseases, to say nothing of the cost of maintaining hospitals and physicians to take care of these young men. It was a shame, a shame upon the men themselves in the first place, and in the second place it was a shame to the Nation which allowed hordes of scarlet women to hang about the places where ships and men were compelled to go.

Mr. Daniels has always opposed the double standard of morals so frequently defended in this country as between men and women. In Raleigh his paper had always been an inveterate enemy of the brothel, and he had done much to keep the city measurably clean. He secured the passage of a law by Congress in October, 1917, whereby the sale of liquor and the maintenance of houses of ill-fame near the places of training for the Navy or stations where the national ships must anchor was made subject to orders of the Secretary. He therefore intervened wherever the case demanded to protect the men from temptation. While the evil has not been eradicated, the way to its eradication has been pointed out and the number of young men subject to treatment for venereal diseases has been decreasing. Few enemies of democracy in this country have had the temerity to attack the Secretary on this score.

But improving the morale of the Navy is not all that we have to thank Mr. Daniels for. When the Wilson régime came to office certain great manufacturers had been accustomed to drive shameful bargains with the country. Protected by a high tariff against competition from abroad, these men charged the country exorbitant prices for armor plate and other materials. No Secretary had made an issue of the matter. Daniels declared to the manufacturers that he would get a law authorizing the making of such materials by the Government itself if prices were not reasonable. He would also buy from England at lower prices. An outcry was made that this editor of a "country newspaper" should talk of such socialistic measures or think of going abroad for materials which our own laborers stood ready to make.

One of the greatest companies sent circulars all over the country denouncing this attempt of the Secretary to injure business; it published shrieking advertisements in the leading papers of the country denouncing the new proposals; it even entered politics prior to the last Presidential election in behalf of a certain distinguished candidate. All to no purpose. The President stood by his Secretary. Congress authorized the Navy Department to commandeer plants, in time of war or national emergency, if their owners demanded unjust and unfair prices. Before the country entered upon the great war the struggle was over and Mr. Daniels was free to make contracts in the interest of the country and the service, rather than simply in that of the great corporations that furnished materials and supplies. This is one of the fundamental reasons for the success of the Navy since hostilities began.

But on this issue the Secretary was attacked more bitterly than on any other; rather, all the other subjects and scores of trifling things were reviewed and rehashed in the hope of driving him from office. The great reason behind most of the attacks in the press, which continued uninterruptedly for nearly four years, was just this one: he took control of all the contracts and allowed only reasonable profits.

On another score Daniels was made the object of attack which was really aimed at the President: the notion that he was a pacifist—that is, a man who hopes and believes that mankind may yet escape the curse of war. At the beginning of the present Administration, Mr. Daniels proposed to the European powers a naval holiday, thus falling in with the British Government in its plan of reduction of armaments. And recently the Secretary has emphasized the need of forming a world navy to keep the peace of the world against any would-be maurauder. "Pacifist" was the immediate response, as if this were not the very purpose of our entering the war—to start a new era for the world if possible. But the opposition and fun making and personalities did not go so well. Mr. Daniels has shown that criticism does not scare him, that the interests of the Navy and of the country are his interests. It was not so easy to make an issue on this last score, when the great war is proving every day that the world can not stand the old system of reckless armaments.

Now when the country finally entered the great

combat for democracy what was the contribution of the Secretary of the Navy? The story of our work upon the ocean tells the tale. Within six weeks there were American war vessels alongside those of Great Britain in Europe; within two months our navy was doing its part and receiving the praise of British veterans. In a year the number of men in the navy rose from 82,000 to 350,000, and nearly a thousand war vessels were set to the grim task of beating Germany. There are more American destroyers upon the ocean now than there were in the world when the war began; and submarine chasers are being put upon the water in ever-increasing numbers. Energy, promptness, decision, are the watchwords of the whole service. And there is a joyous cooperation and a hearty loyalty in every branch of the navy that gives promise of that victory which is the only promise of peace. Not a complaint, it is said in Washington, has come from any private or officer. That is the efficiency and the service which the country wishes its navy to show. Because Secretary Daniels believes and hopes that this is to be the last great war, he throws every ounce of his strength and energy into the present conflict. No man in the present Administration has rendered the country better service; no one has kept the main object more clearly in view; that we fight now in order that we may never have to fight again. Secretary Daniels has, therefore, the confidence of the people as few public men have it. He has stood the sharpest tests; he shows that he knows what he is about and that he can not be frightened into doing wrong.

Now what sort of man is this who has stood the brunt of the attacks upon the present Administration from the beginning till recently, when Secretary Baker was chosen as the better target? A plain man who lives the wholesome life of the average citizen of the Republic; one of the few prominent public men in either of the greater political parties who believes in the ideals for which our government was founded and who is bold enough to try those ideals out in practice. If you talk with the Secretary a little while you are apt to hear in most unconscious manner something like this: "Mr. Jefferson says that no public man should appoint his own kinsman to office," or "Mr. Jefferson thinks that one generation should not bind another generation to pay huge debts."

In this frequent reference to the great democrat of 1800 one gets the spirit of Daniels. He speaks and thinks of Jefferson as if he were still living and a next door neighbor to any of us. But he does not say things shall not be done, only they ought not to be done; but then he goes on in every day practice acting as though *shall* and not *will* were the word. He understands the power of suggestion and persuasion; he is not a dogmatist in word, but an exceedingly resolute man in deeds. And there one has the spirit of the Wilson Administration. Its leaders know what is their aim; they would make both this country and Europe safe for democracy and they set themselves wisely but resolutely to the task.

Now if the country did not want the Government to be democratic it should have chosen other agents of administration and leadership. Having committed itself to these men of democratic ideals and vision, they feel called on to live up to their professions. That is Josephus Daniels. He is, as I said in the beginning, a democrat and a Christian; if you do not like democrats and Christians say so.

Collapse of the German Social Democracy

By George S. Bryan

We are probably agreed that in all this German business the most disheartening thing is the utter collapse of the German nation. Some of my learned friends have been fond of repeating Burke's dictum to the effect that he knew no way of drawing an indictment against an entire people. Burke fortunately had not our sad knowledge—our hideous disillusion. That way has been found. For four years the German people has busily been furnishing data for humanity's bill of particulars against it.

The savants have done nothing but mouth official lies, commending anew to the common tribe the worship of that stale, sour materialism that already has wrought such pitiable harm. The clergy have seemed priests of some diabolic

cult, as they justified every horror and snuggled closer to their dreadful Gott. The men-of-letters have failed. What has become of such a humanitarian spirit as that of Hauptmann, who once defied official ostracism and spoke so movingly for the inarticulate and the wretched? Instead of the brooding sympathy that inspired "Die Weber" and "Fuhrmann Henschel" and "Hannele," we have the silly paranoiac bombast of Lissauer's "Hymn of Hate."

And the Social Democracy, built up through years of state oppression and militaristic aggrandizement—built in spite of the combined opposition of thick-skulled Agrarians and oily National Liberals and uniformed barbarians—with its control of the Reichstag prevented by only autocratic gerrymandering—this Social Democracy, confronted with its historic opportunity, crumbled like the baseless fabric of a dream.

It must have been an unpleasant, thwarted life, that of an intelligent young man with a vision, in modern Germany. We have a suggestion of this in the portrait of the young lieutenant, Bernd von Inster, in that notable book "Christine." All vision seems wholly to have gone now, and the people have morally perished.

The complete disintegration of the Social Democracy is one of the outstanding phenomena of Germany's course in the war; and it must of necessity be left to future historians to explain. Certain it is that Karl Liebknecht seems to have been the only member of that party to keep the faith. In May, 1916, he was sentenced by the autocracy to penal servitude for four years and one month. But before that, in January, 1916, he had already been expelled from the Social Democracy because of his steadfast refusal to vote with the majority members in support of military credits. His denunciation of the German Government in a surreptitious pamphlet dated May 3, 1916, has been reprinted in this country and is doubtless familiar to students.

Not long since, however, in searching the files of "Die neue Zeit," the weekly official organ of the Social Democracy, I came upon an article, by one Heinrich Stroebel and entitled "Krieg und Kultur," that seems to be little known and yet that helps us, I think, as evidence for measuring the enormity of Social Democracy's treason to the common weal. I have here translated the more important paragraphs. Two things are to be noted at the outset: first, that the article appears in the issue for September 11, 1914, or more than a month after Germany had declared war against Belgium, France and Russia; second, that Stroebel evidently uses the word "Kultur" in its generic sense and not with the highly specialized meaning borne by it in the jargon of the Pan-Germanists.

Says Stroebel: "It has burst upon Europe, this monstrous Fatality—and in a night. How many educated Europeans were there who two or three months ago thought seriously of the possibility of a world war? Of great civilized nations tearing each other in pieces; of the complete suspension of international trade, so that a ligature has been bound around the main artery of our entire economic life; of the cessation, in workroom and studio, of all work save that directed toward the bare maintenance of existence, and toward the devising of ways and means for destroying property and human life! And although Socialism has continually been pointing with emphasis at the irresistible growth of militarism and imperialism as a danger that every day threatened more intensely the peace of nations and the spread of civilization—in spite of this, there have undoubtedly been many, even among the Social Democrats, who optimistically regarded such warnings as idle theorizing.

"So war has taken by surprise the peoples of Europe, and in the violence of its onslaught it has swept away what men but yesterday looked upon as ethical and spiritual achievements that civilization had established forever. Just as the war has torn up railway tracks, so too it seems to have broken asunder that common interchange of ideas which united civilized peoples in their science, their literature, their technology, their industry. Race-hatred and national arrogance, gradually thrust into the background by serious investigating and by the civilizing effect of international competition, have again broken forth with unbridled violence. In the place of that highly developed mode of thinking and feeling that characterizes modern civilized man, appear the sombre and gloomy instincts that, thousands of years ago, ruled the men of primitive antiquity. The world had been broken, as it were, into a thousand rays by the prism of modern knowledge; but now it has once more assumed the rude and uncouth aspect that it had when the cave-man beheld it.

"In each of the contending nations, so we are told, none has wished war; all have honorably sought to avert it. How much truth there is in these assertions, can be determined by historical investigation only, when peace has restored an honest self-consciousness. To-day national passions have so distorted facts that they are quite unrecognizable. But whatever we may think of all the twistings and turnings of statesmen, all the arts and tricks of diplomats; even if we be willing to grant that imperialism and the rivalry of armament outgrew the power of those responsible to cope with them, and in their disastrous selfishness upset all calculations; if, in short, war was suddenly upon us, and if it was a dreadful necessity, from which none of the nations involved could longer escape—even then, we must protest that it was far from an inspiring sight to see the war explained in terms adapted to the most rudimentary intelligence, after the style of a child's story-book. It might perhaps have sufficed to describe war as unavoidable—as a brazen necessity, bitter though it was. But no; the war must be presented as 'justified'—not, forsooth, in the loftier historical sense, but in the most banal sense of the most thoroughly ugly Philistine code. And the intellectual gentlemen who at other times could not turn up their noses contemptuously enough at the common herd, now at once fell to raving over the charmingly primitive quality of the popular conception of history. The proper attitude was that of the child's fairy-story, and more recently of the *Berliner Tageblatt:* Germans are upright and honorable. but Russians are brutal and tricky, Serbians are insolent, Englishmen are treacherous. The stupid scribbler who wrote for the *Tageblatt* actually found it delightful and inspiring that the masses, in their judgment of national character and historical right or wrong, were so refreshingly child-like! O land of poets and philosophers!

"The feeling for those things that appeal to a finer sensibility is indeed lacking in many persons. For example, on August 4th the *Militär-Wochenblatt* said: 'If there is a just God in Heaven—and there *is*—we may expect victory will fall to the righteous cause of our German arms.' Positive as one may be about the victory of German arms, it is somewhat bold, from a religious point-of-view, to postulate the existence of a just God upon certain arbitrary conditions. Napoleon more prudently preferred to omit the heavenly powers from consideration, expressing it as his opinion that God was usually on the side of the strongest battalions. And not so long ago the *Christliche Welt* said: 'It is unconscious hypocrisy to suppose that war and Christianity can be reconciled. It is hypocrisy to speak of a God of love, and then ask him to help us kill our enemies.'

"But the most amazing spectacle was that of a number of more or less well known German writers, men who were fond of having themselves viewed as not only the elite of German intellectual life but the loftiest expression of modern culture, making the sudden discovery that all the labor of peace had been a long stupor, an enervating hasheesh dream, and that only with war did mankind awake to fresh and splendid life. After such statements one might actually have supposed that war is not a catastrophe, a paroxysm, but of the utmost benefit to mankind, which, alas, engages in it far too infrequently. . . .

"Well, we can test the thing now. We are experiencing the heroic manifestations of war—and all its awfulness."

Naturally enough rises the query: How could a party, one of whose official organs could print, as late as September 11, 1914, anything so penetrative and so caustic as these utterances of Stroebel's, shortly stultify itself and bow meekly to the most brutal military oligarchy that the world has ever known?

RELATED THINGS

Clarifying Property Rights

The district judge of a Kansas court who appointed a receiver for 160 acres of idle land went at once to the bottom of the question of property rights. The land was fertile, there was demand for the potential product, and the judge assumed that the owner was either incapable of managing his property, or negligent. It was, in effect, a case of public service. The public was in need of food, the food could be grown only on land, and the land was idle; hence the right of the public to command its use. Whether or not this is good law, in the sense of winning the approval of five members of the Supreme Court, remains to be seen; but it certainly is good morals.

This action of the Kansas judge in putting idle land to use despite the will of the owner is in keeping with that of the State Defense Council of North Dakota in forcing slacker acres into use. It is in accordance with the practice of the courts of California and other Western States in respect to water power and irrigation. And it will meet with a cordial response from the people at large who wish to see the whole might of the nation thrown into the war. But that the principle is not yet generally recognized is evident from such incidents as that of Cleveland, Ohio, where 71 acres are announced for subdivision into lots. This is not because there are no more vacant lots in Cleveland, far from it; there are more than will be used in many years; but the land speculators in that city feel that the market will absorb more lots, and they proceed to satisfy the demand by cutting up farm land into unnecessary building sites. Had Ohio judges the Kansas sense of obligation to the people they would have named a receiver for the 71-acre tract and put it to raising food.

Still, we are making progress. When Mayor Pingree sought to relieve the poor in Detroit in 1894 by devoting vacant lots to potato raising it was looked upon as spectacular demagogy. But vacant lot cultivation came to be recognized as a legitimate factor in social benefit work, and has been the means of spreading and popularizing the idea of rural settlements. But it was not until the stress of war conditions came upon us that law abiding people were moved to question the right of the land owner to do with his land as he willed. He can no longer say with impunity, "This is my land; I shall do with it as I please." The people are coming to think, "No, it is our land; if you would use it, do so; if not, surrender it to those who will."

Nor is the application of this principle limited to raising food on vacant land. Manifestly it would be poor economy to raise potatoes on land worth a thousand dollars a lot when there was land available for potato raising worth but a hundred dollars an acre. Building lots that are vacant because the owner asks more for them than a builder can pay are subject to the same treatment as the 160-acre Kansas farm. This right of the community to compel an owner to use his land is not new. It was exercised in New York, then New Amsterdam, 260 years ago. An ordinance of New Amsterdam, adopted January 15, 1658—to be found in "Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland, 1638-1674, by E. B. O'Callaghan, Albany: 1868," page 325—says:

The Director-General and Council daily see that their former well-meant orders and proclamations are not obeyed, but that, notwithstanding their repeated renewals, many fine and large lots in the best and most convenient parts of this City remain unimproved and are kept vacant by their owners, either for a profitable advance in price or for pleasure, preventing others from building and thereby increasing the population of the City, from promoting our trade and from beautifying this place, which to many newcomers might be induced, if they could buy a convenient lot for a reasonable price, conform to the above mentioned ordinances. The neglect, if not villification thereof, principally leads to the keeping back these large and fine lots for profit or pleasure, and this is done because the former ordinances do not carry a fine; for the owners who have held such lots for years without expenses are keeping them for an advance in price or using them for pleasure as orchards or gardens, thereby preventing the erection of houses and the increase of the population, hence also the advancement of trade and injuring the well-being of the City, contrary to the good intention of the Lords Directors of the West India Company, the Master and Patroons of this Province, as first givers and dispensers of the lots, to be used for the adornment, population, increase of inhabitants, trade and welfare of the City by houses, as the patents given expressly stipulate under such taxes, as said Lords or their deputies may impose. In obedience to their orders the said Director-General and Council have lately caused their sworn surveyor, in the presence of the Burgomasters, to survey and measure the vacant lots for regulating the streets, and they find several hundred lots within the City walls vacant and not built on. In order that, agreeably to the good intentions of the said Lord Director and in conformity with the former ordinances, these may the sooner be built upon, any way, that the doubts about the ownership of such large lots for profit or pleasure without taxation may be settled and the persons wishing to build on lots acquired at a reasonable price may be accommodated, the Director-General and Council amplifying the former ordinances ordain that all vacant lots lately measured and laid out by the Surveyor of the Director-General and Council shall immediately after publication hereof be appraised and taxed, first by the owners themselves, that they may not complain hereafter over the valuation by others, which appraisal shall stand as long as the owner keeps the lot or lots unimproved, he paying his yearly tax of the fifteenth penny in two installments, namely, one-half on May-day, the other before the Fair-day of this City; this revenue is to be applied to the fortifications of this City and their repairs. The Burgomasters are directed and authorized to summon after the publication of these presents before them in the City Hall the owners of the lots in person, without regard to their position, and have them make the appraisal, which their secretary is properly to record, and the

Treasurer is to receive the revenue. In case of opposition or refusal they are civilly to reprove the refractory person and tax his lot according to value and circumstances, under condition that the owner shall have the choice of keeping the lot, taxed by the Burgomasters, if he will pay as aforesaid the fifteenth penny, or if surrendering it to them for the behoof of the City at the price put on it by the Burgomasters; while, on the other side, it is left to the device of the Burgomasters, either to take the lot at the owner's price for account of the City and sell it at this price to any one who desires and is ready to build conformably to the ordinance, or else to leave it to the owner until it is built upon by him or others, when this burden, for good reasons laid upon unimproved lots, shall be taken off.

This quaint old ordinance may serve to reassure some of the present holders of New York lots, who delight to trace their genealogy back to the simple burghers of New Amsterdam days, that the Kansas judge is following a good precedent. It may also cause the reflection in the minds of present New Yorkers, as they view the city's vast area of vacant land, that had the principle underlying this ordinance been continued and amplified to meet modern needs we should now have fewer crowded tenements and less idle land. Those hard-headed burghers saw clearly the responsibility of the lot owner. The Lords Directors of the West India Company had laid out the lots " for the adornment, population, increase of inhabitants, trade and welfare of the city by houses, as the patents given expressly state." If the owners would not fulfil their part of the agreement they were to be fined. A special tax was laid upon the lots as long as they were vacant. Have the intervening years disclosed a better method? The burghers fined the owners of the idle land and devoted the money to the fortifications. What better course can municipal councils, state legislatures, and the national Congress take today than fine the owners of idle lands and devote the money to the defense of the country?

We are coming to see property rights in a new light; but we are still timid; and we hesitate. We need more of the spirit of Kansas. We need a public opinion that will demand that all the natural elements be put to use, whether they be idle farm lands, mineral lands, water power, or town lots; and there is no better way known than to levy a tax large enough to absorb the value conferred upon the land by the community. It is just and practicable, and it establishes property rights on a sound basis.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chambers of Commerce

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Your editorial in the March 16 number headed " The Average Business Man," makes me feel that you have been a little unfortunate in your experience with some one or two Chambers of Commerce or Commercial Clubs, and that you have become rather skeptical of all of them.

This is perhaps natural, because a goodly portion of your comments have in the past been more or less true of a percentage of these organizations; but I believe if you will investigate a dozen or two of them, you will find that your criticisms are decidedly less applicable today than they would have been five or ten years ago, and in the majority of them they never have been applicable.

Your charge that corporations, " notorious for bad labor record, are able to wield absolute control over the Chamber of Commerce " is easy enough to say, and sounds trite in a publication, but, except in a few possible cases you might be able to point out, I do not believe you are justified in making this statement.

Speaking for St. Louis only, I desire to inform you that the statement does not apply at all. This Chamber of Commerce has 3,100 members. Its officers and directors are all elected by the entire membership by secret ballot. Nominations are made by a Special Nominating Committee, each member of which is elected by the Board of Directors, which is itself elected by the entire membership. The president and officers have nothing to say about the matter at all.

Furthermore, any ten members can by petition have any name included in the nominations. Still further, if after these nominations are posted, it is thought that the right man has not been nominated, any fifty members can add another name for any position.

The president can make no nominations or have anything to do with the appointment of the Nominating Committee.

The final authority in any matter is vested in the membership at large, and any five members of the Board may compel a referendum, or any fifty members of the Chamber may do the same thing; and, when such referendum is sent out, arguments must be prepared on both sides of the question, not exceeding 500 words, so that the members voting may understand the different viewpoints.

In voting for officers and directors the preferential system is used. Now that applies to the machinery of organization, but no matter what machinery you have, if the kind of men that you seem to have in mind are elected, they naturally would not be as valuable to their city as if men are selected who have a broad viewpoint, and who realize that a successful Chamber of Commerce must be *of, for,* and *by* the city that supports it.

If you were personally acquainted with the men who were elected president of this Chamber in 1916, 1917, and this year, I think you would realize that there

is no higher type of individual in any community.

In 1916 it was Clarence H. Howard, president of the Commonwealth Steel Company, and a member of the Board of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Last year it was J. Lionberger Davis, vice-president of the St. Louis Union Trust Company, who has recently been made managing director for the Alien Property Custodian at Washington. Both of these gentlemen are men with the highest ideals, and no one would ever connect either of them with the "scheming and planning" which you had in mind in writing your editorial.

This year the president is Jackson Johnson, chairman of the Board of the International Shoe Company, one of the largest industries in this part of the country. Mr. Johnson was induced to accept the nomination by appealing to his sense of duty to the city in which he has lived and prospered. He is a man of powerful personality, and when he decides what is the right thing to do he goes ahead and does it, regardless of any possible "business effect" that it may have either in his own affairs or those of his friends.

Personally, I might mention that my own viewpoint on this question is a little different from what it might have been if I had been a Chamber of Commerce secretary all my life. I have been in this work less than two years, and prior to that was a "common garden variety" of business man. During that period there were times when I thought about as you do on this general subject, but in the past year I have had my eyes opened to the wonderful possibilities for good that a Chamber of Commerce possesses, and I have seen how it can take up big projects of a general nature and handle them for the good of a city, when it would be impossible for any individual to even think of taking them up.

I am enclosing herewith a little leaflet which mentions just a few of the principal items on which we are working at this time. This was really gotten up for the benefit of the Membership Committee, but it will give you the idea quickly.

But the main point is, that you are wrong in assuming, at least so far as St. Louis is concerned, that the Chamber of Commerce is in any way under the control of any clique of men, notorious or otherwise, or that any one could put over a movement for his own personal good. If that ever could have been said of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, it certainly cannot be said today.

P. V. Bunn,
General Secretary, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

The Prohibition Amendment

To the Editor of The Public:

Mr. W. J. Coleman wants to know why The Public doesn't favor the scheme for forcing prohibition upon the states that do not want it, by the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution. It is hard to see how anyone who really understands the singletax can believe in prohibition, least of all, in national prohibition which if once put into the Constitution cannot be abandoned so long as thirteen states, with less than 6,000,000 population, favor its retention.

The singletax is a philosophy of freedom; free land, free trade, free men. It is the negation of socialism; it denies the theory that protective tariffs are necessary, and it is absolutely inconsistent with the notion that men can be made temperate by law. Henry George did not believe in prohibition as a remedy for intemperance, and no prominent advocate of the singletax favors that essentially socialistic scheme. In "Social Problems" Mr. George wrote: "The protection of fools against the consequences of their own folly is not a proper function of government." He denied that the use of alcoholic beverages is, as asserted by the prohibitionists, the principal cause of poverty, and held with Frances Willard that poverty is one of the chief causes of intemperance. Prohibition is based on the unsound theory that one set of men have a right to enact laws interfering with the personal tastes and habits of their fellow men. I cannot understand how anyone professing to believe in the philosophy of the Natural Order of Society taught by Henry George, can approve this paternalistic and undemocratic proposition.

Whidden Graham.

New York.

The German Language in Our Schools

To the Editor of The Public:

Following the example of several less august legislative bodies, the United States Senate, which, at an expense truly vast, acts as the upper branch of the common council of the District of Columbia, much to the delay of national business, and without notable results in the way of good municipal government in our capital city, has voted in favor of discontinuing the study of the German language in the Washington public high schools. If the lower branch of our common council (the national House of Representatives) concurs in this action, "German" passes from the curriculum of our public schools; and this as the result of action taken by a legislative body representing every Congressional district in the United States, but *excluding the District of Columbia!*

In thus proscribing "German," are we not supplying the world a notable example of "cutting off one's nose to spite his face"? Such a course as a war measure appears of dubious value, while, on the other hand, much of the world's best thought upon a wide range of subjects finds expression, and the results of a great amount of valuable scientific research appear, in the German language. In so far, therefore, as we make this language unavailable to the coming generation, we deny them a key to a vast depositary of useful knowledge. How is this going to help the Germans? How will this contribute to the winning of our war for civilization? Incidentally, may it not be suggested that any harm done to students of the German language in the past by imbibing a trace of *Kultur*, is now beyond remedy by anything we may do concerning the language.

If the intent back of this "movement" is the dis-

crediting of things German because they are German, should we not, in the interest of consistency, go much farther? Music, like language, is a mode of expression; therefore, should German music be heard in our land? When marriages are celebrated, should we tolerate the Wedding March from "Lohengrin" or that from Mendelssohn's "Midsummer Night's Dream"? When Christmas hymns are sung, is Haydn's "Holy Night" to be omitted? Are the fairy tales of the Grimm Brothers henceforth to be taboo? By the way, was not printing itself the invention of the German Gutenberg? If we break our bones, shall we decline the use of Roentgen's Xray? Shall we throw away our Fahrenheit thermometers? And so on, down an almost interminable line.

If "German" has been the vehicle of ideas and ideals that in the last analysis are barbarous and antisocial, is it not also the vehicle of ideas and ideals the opposite of these? If there is bane, is there not also antidote? We have the "Hymn of Hate," but there is also "Koerner's Hymn." Against the poems laudatory of the divine right of force and autocracy, we may set the poems of Schiller. Lessing's "Nathan the Wise" is a noble plea for toleration, religious, political and racial. Literature would be distinctly poorer by the sacrifice of Goethe's "Faust." Against the political doctrines of the Kaiser and his school, we have the teachings of Karl Marx, Engels, Lassalle and the social-democratic school—teachings we are borrowing from extensively these days, with the General Government, in the interest of the people, entering into so many varieties of industry heretofore left to private initiative, and with the "police powers of government" acknowledged to be a factor in almost the entire range of contract. We should, of course, see to it that the text books employed in our public schools, supported as they are by public taxation, should not be permitted to contain ideals the opposite of American. But this is an easy task. Some slight modicum of error may possibly creep in through inadvertence, but, if so, we may take heart from the words of our own Thomas Jefferson: "Error may be tolerated where truth is left free to combat it."

Finally, although it tries us sorely to see the German people follow the Kaiser and his class blindly, and assist in the riveting of their own chains, let us adopt the attitude of President Wilson, and hold, with him, that this is a crusade, whose object is to save the world for democracy, and that autocracy's worst victims are the German people themselves.

GEORGE A. WARREN.

Washington, D. C., June 18, 1918.

BOOKS

Our Racial Decline

Mankind. Racial Values and the Racial Prospect. By Seth K. Humphrey. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price $1.50.

We are indebted to the author of this book for a lucid presentation of a situation the gravity of which has troubled the minds of many thoughtful sociologists. A tendency that has been traceable in all past civilizations may be observed in operation today. The growth of luxury and culture that accompanies material prosperity unquestionably produces a condition in which the perpetuation of the race is left mainly to the classes guilty of that unforgivable sin of not having got on in the world. If this "unfitness" or failure to succeed in the struggle for a living is a sure index of deficient hereditary qualities or what Mr. Humphrey calls "genetic values," then the fear of racial degeneration which is the dominant note in the book, is well founded. This, however, is just the point on which an amateur in biological science, while lacking the courage to differ boldly with a student of the subject, may yet require more proof than is offered. The author assumes throughout that our racial qualities must be degenerating because the rich and successful, the people "who bring things to pass" fail of their duty to "multiply and replenish," while the poor and unsuccessful fulfil that duty for them. And while this process of breeding from the worse instead of from the better stock has invariably led to racial degeneration in the centers of culture, the situation in the past has always been saved by the "human values in reserve" which were found in those isolated portions of the earth where natural selection had had free play, and the genetic or inborn qualities had been maintained at their highest level. But, our author argues, with the emergence of a *universal* civilization and the removal of the impediments of inaccessibility, those unexploited reserves of genetic values are rapidly disappearing. From what source then, is the twentieth century civilization to replenish its extravagant waste of effective human material? To this question Mr. Humphrey offers no cheering reply, and the burden of the book is consequently set in a minor key. A note of deep pessimism indeed, pervades it from beginning to end, and the warning he utters to the world is, he admits, likely to be a "futile" one.

In any contest between the spirit of pessimism and that of optimism, the advantage must always seem to lie with the former in that the pessimist may take his stand upon his willingness to look ugly facts squarely in the face, while the optimist may sometimes be accused of a failure to do so. That the replenishment of our racial stock should even to a slight extent proceed from the parentage of the feeble-minded or diseased is certainly one of those distressing facts which we can ignore only at our peril; but it is a long way from the recognition of this, and of society's right to protect itself from such a menace, to the admission that the highest genetic values are to be found among the conspicuously energetic and successful members of the community. To look a fact in the face is not sufficient. Everything depends upon the right interpretation of the fact, and it may be that the strength of the optimist lies in this, that because he is an optimist his interpretation is more likely to be the right one. For example, Mr. Humphrey affirms that "in the physical display which an active nation can make we lose sight of the appalling fact (?) that its constructively effective brains are concentrated in the heads and inheritances of an unbelievably small number," and proceeds to inquire

"what would be left of the United States if the one per cent comprising all who have a vital constructive part in the making of it, were removed; and what would be left of New York if it were denuded of one per cent of its 'best,' its leaders in finance and captains of industry"? The optimist will certainly answer these questions differently from Mr. Humphrey, because he interprets his experience in a different way; and will gently repudiate the dictum that "nothing is more absurd than the notion that ability is apt to come from any condition." When, through a fortuitous concourse of circumstances, certain men find themselves in positions of prominence, abilities emerge which otherwise might have remained undeveloped, and which sometimes surprise none more than the possessors of them. If a score of men of similar native ability should find themselves adrift on a derelict ship, and should draw lots to determine the captain whose command they agree to obey, the selected one *becomes* a more able man by virtue of his position, though by the hypothesis any other among the remaining nineteen would have risen in the same way. If, therefore, New York's captains and officers were to be "removed" tomorrow, the optimist's interpretation of experience assures him that out of the rank and file equally and perhaps more worthy successors would appear.

Mr. Humphrey, like all advanced thinkers along this line, accepts the Weismann doctrine of the continuity of the germ-plasm and the non-transmissibility of acquired characters, but seems to miss some of its remoter implications. It is probably true that we cannot educate the next generation by the simple process of educating this one;—that no amount of culture acquired by parents can be handed on as part of the hereditary endowment of the child, but can only reach him through external domestic influences. But if this seems a depressing conclusion it is more than balanced by the reflection that bad habits acquired by individuals though continued for generations, are equally non-transmissible, and that the racial or genetic qualities of fitness, though suppressed for centuries by unfavorable environments, are transmitted unimpaired and ready to emerge at the first solicitation of favoring circumstance. An eminent British biologist has indeed assured us that among the hereditable or transmissible qualities in animals and in man, the most stubbornly persistent is an instinctive tendency to respond to environment. Leaving aside then the mighty problem of the feeble-minded, or that comparatively small section of society whose germ-plasm has suffered injury through alcoholism or vice, the optimist has reason for his faith that the one per cent group does not contain the total ability administrative or otherwise, of the community, but that in the ninety-nine per cent is concealed a vast untapped reservoir of genetic values awaiting only the opening of the doors of Opportunity.

And here perhaps we touch the secret of the author's pessimism. Nowhere in the book do we discover the slightest conception of a possible time or condition in which Opportunity will offer his forelock to every child born into the world, instead of the ungraspable "bald behind." To realize the misery of the world and to see no way out, is to suffer a state of mind we may well commiserate. To conceive of the human race as caught in a patent rat-trap of nature's devising, can work out to nothing but black despair. But to see that human degeneracy is due to the denial of opportunity through the pressure of privilege and monopoly, is to be filled with a new hope in that these can be removed.

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

Woman's Field

The Sum of Feminine Achievement. By W. A. Newman Dorland. Published by the Stratford Company, Boston, 1917. Price $1.50 net.

Genius as it is manifested, or is not manifested, in women is the subject of this book. But who can define genius? A capacity for taking pains? Banish the idea! Say rather a capacity for doing things without taking pains, but for loving the doing so much that no pains would be grudged. According to Havelock Ellis, it is an ability "that involves a radically abnormal temperament, for it means seeing the world from a different angle from other people and feeling it with a different sensibility. Such a person is necessarily solitary, a rebel at heart, and highly charged with an energy which manifests itself in play, or in work which has the characteristics and the zest of play."

In "The Sum of Feminine Achievement" Dr. Dorland sets out to refute the statement of Dr. Baruch of Columbia University that the genius of women shows itself only in maternity and in the building up of civilization. To do this he takes four hundred women of modern times who have become prominent in various ways, and compares their accomplishment with that of the four hundred great men of whom he made a study in his previous book, "The Age of Mental Virility." Unfortunately in this case his enthusiasm seems to have exceeded his critical faculty, for in order to obtain the requisite number of notable women he lists obscure translators and hymn writers and others of less than mediocre accomplishment, whose inclusion seems to suggest a paucity of material that would be disquieting if numbers were needed to prove his point. In many cases also he greatly exaggerates the value of the work done by the women he cites. When this is discounted, however, enough women of distinction remain to prove that it is as possible for women as for men to show genius along nearly every line of human expression and endeavor, though to the unprejudiced reader Dr. Dorland's study seems to prove also that women show it less frequently and in a less degree. This conclusion is borne out by Havelock Ellis who made an investigation along similar lines and found that among the most eminent British persons from the earliest times to the end of the nineteenth century, only five per cent. were women, and admits that a minor degree of ability sufficed to ensure the inclusion of the women.

How can this apparent inequality be accounted for? By lack of opportunity? But one of the characteristics of genius is its power to attain its end in spite of adverse circumstances. Is it true, as Dr. Dorland

asserts, that the mental and physical planes are entirely distinct? Possibly it is. At any rate it may be a mistake to attribute to the genius the characteristics of a normal personality; his creative work may be largely the product of a certain unusual combination of psychical sexual qualities which exist independently of his bodily manifestation. Was not George Sand a masculine type of genius, and Chopin a feminine one? But, Dr. Dorland notwithstanding, the cause of woman's failure to achieve the same heights as man lies probably in her physiological organization, which leads to her greater emotionality and thus differentiates her psychically from him. Society and social conditions have always been against the genius or innovator, as against any other variant, and with her temperamental need of sympathy, it is more difficult for a woman than for a man to endure social antagonism and to plough a lonely furrow; she suffers more than he does from the solitude that is the fate of the rebel. Again, her emotional nature leads her to put the claims of her personal life before those of her art or of her profession; few women find in artistic or professional success compensation for the loss of intimate social relationships, and as a rule the great woman genius is one who is able to combine the two elements in her life.

Dr. Dorland gives an interesting survey of the work of women in very varied fields, including in his list women warriors, of whom there are more than one would have expected to find, women statesmen, explorers, journalists, scientists, and a large number of emotional and interpretative artists. Genius as expressed in personality also has its place here, and the women who have swayed kings or held salons are rightly included.

On data gathered from the lives of the four hundred women he has selected, Dr. Dorland bases his conclusions as to the age at which women do their most important productive work. He finds that their mental activity begins at twenty-two, while that of men was found to begin at twenty-four. Comparing the average age for the acme of mental power in men and women, he finds it to be forty-five for women, and fifty for men. This varies of course in different groups. Actresses and artists give evidence of their genius very early in life, and do their best work under the age of thirty-five, while women who are distinguished for their intellectual or organizing ability make their most important contribution after the age of forty, and continue it often to extreme old age, especially those who are unmarried. These generalizations are probably correct in the main, in spite of the inclusion of such insignificant women as Mrs. Grant of Laggan, and Eliza Cook, and the omission of a poetess like Mary Coleridge; and of such illustrations of activity carried on into old age as are provided by the lives of Caroline Seymour Severance and Susan Lock Avery, both ardent workers in the cause of suffrage, by that of the financier, Hetty Green, and by that of Susan Elizabeth Blow, the leader of the kindergarten movement in America.

VIOLET B. DISMORR.

Labor's New Consciousness

The Aims of Labor. By Rt. Honorable Arthur Henderson, M.P. Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York. Price 50 cents.

This little booklet is probably the most epoch-marking if not epoch-making document that has ever been given to the world, not excepting the English Magna Charta, or the American Declaration of Independence. Never, indeed, since the greatest labor-leader of all ages issued his manifesto to the rulers of Egypt on behalf of the oppressed Israelites, have the privileged classes been addressed in terms so peremptory and unmistakable and in language so well adapted to their understanding. In the most felicitously chosen words, and in a spirit of reasonableness that has not been conspicuous in former declarations of labor policy, warning is given to British landlordism, British plutocracy, and upper-class rule, that their age-long innings is approaching an end. Have they seen and understood the writing on the wall? Has any Daniel revealed to them the meaning of the uneasy dreams that have troubled their sleep as they "sat at rest in their houses or flourished in their palaces"? No one desires to see the tragedies of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar re-enacted in these latter days. Revolution and violence are, as Mr. Henderson remarks, alien to the spirit of the British people, and it is only in the last resort that they will consent to employ force to attain their ends. "It would be idle, however, to deny that the temper of democracy after the war will not be so placable as it has hitherto been. Whether we like it or fear it, we have to recognize that in the course of the last three and a half years people have become habituated to thoughts of violence."

But the Pharaohs who have held labor in bondage for centuries, are today as subject to the heart-hardening process as in the time of Moses. Already indications are not lacking that the forces of reaction are being mobilized, and that attempts will be made to rivet the shackles of labor more firmly than before. May we hope that words like those quoted will reach the *heads* of the privileged classes and convince them of the futility of resistance to the demand of the workers? The future of civilization hangs upon this issue. Confident though we may be that in the long run justice must prevail, it lies with those who now hold the fortresses of monopoly whether the end is to be reached quickly and peacefully or by prolonged civil strife.

The labor program as outlined by Mr. Henderson may not appeal in its details to believers in fundamental democracy. It goes much further than the removal of those artificial privileges and consequent restrictions upon the liberties of the people, that constitute the root-cause of the economic evils against which Socialism is directed. There is the same old distressing disbelief that natural law when left to itself, and when undeflected by special privilege, will work out toward justice and equity. The demand includes not only the nationalization of the land, but the fixing of a national minimum wage, governmental management of industries and even of the processes of distribution. It inincludes, indeed, so much that the thought of it is

appalling, not only because of its magnitude but because of the difficulty in conceiving it as in successful operation. The question is a staggering one as to where the efficient wisdom and comprehensive vision is to come from that will be required for the administration of an entire country's industry; and in sheer brain-weariness we fall back on the belief that with the abolition of monopoly in natural resources, the business affairs of a nation will manage themselves better for the good of the people, than if controlled by any conceivable group of elected politicians.

Yet in spite of these considerations it may be well that all those whose deepest aspirations are toward a regenerated society undisfigured by ugly heaps of wealth and noisome cesspools of poverty, should sink their theoretic differences and lend their full moral support to the labor movement as it stands both in Britain and America. It ought to modify the dogmatic confidence of the Spencerian individualist or even of the hard-shelled singletaxer, that men of Mr. Henderson's caliber whose soundness of head and heart stands unquestioned, have espoused the doctrines of Socialism. And of this we may feel sure, that whatever in its program for the establishment of liberty really is unnecessary will not be put into operation; and that whatever is unworkable will be dropped after trial. Meanwhile, if we achieve emancipation from the economic slavery that results from the monopoly of land, we may get with it some reforms for which we may have cause to be grateful.

ALEX. MACKENDRICK.

Commercialized Drink

Drink. By Vance Thompson. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1918. Price $1.00.

Mr. Thompson once wrote, it will be remembered, a book called "Eat and Grow Thin," which taught the believing reader how to avoid the physical punishments of gluttony while still enjoying the sensual delights of the same. When therefore one reads on the title page that this volume was originally called "Drink and Be Sober," one opens it with great interest, intrigued with the thought of learning how to enjoy one's tipple without paying the usual nauseating penalties. Alas, one is disappointed! Mr. Thompson maintains the old, old thesis that while a man may drink and stay out of the gutter he cannot drink without impairing his efficiency. He says it all very well, but it is, for the most part, the same old story that has been told us ever since the old prophetic fervor of the Prohibition Party, with its ribbons and revivals, gave way to the uninteresting but effective propagandists of the Anti-Saloon League. It is very logical, this book, and reasonable, and calm, and cool, and collected—and stale.

The author does, however, get a little note into the book in one or two places that is not any too common in the utterances of the pro-efficiency enemies of Demon Rum. He recognizes that a very large part of the difficulty with the liquor business is due to the commercializing, the over-capitalization, the profiteering which have taken possession of that business. Here is a little quotation:

"Of old a nation made its drink and drank it. . . . Then began the boom in the manufacture of all things for man's needs and vices—intoxicating beverages like the rest. There was over-production. Creating intoxicating drink in huge quantities, the industrial world had to find means of making the people drink it. It had to find customers. It was not providing drink to satisfy the thirst of the nations. What it supplied was far in advance of the demand. Like every commercialized industry, its one aim was to increase its ouput. . . . Side by side with the making of drink went a crusade of advertisement to force the drink down. Wealth building went on apace, at the mere cost of public health, sanity, morality, safety of the state."

He then proceeds to puncture that argument of the liquor interests which threatens economic disaster to the state with the prohibition of their business with very thoroughness. Would that all the good prohibitionists might perceive that the liquor problem is nine tenths a problem of profits or no profits for brewery and distillery stockholders.

One must admit that it makes interesting reading, too, that passage in this book where the author shows that from the common soil of modern materialism have sprung such commonly abominable things as Huxley, Haeckel, Zola, Anatole France, Bernard Shaw, German Kultur, and the booze business!

Most of this book is simply the usual stuff done over, but you'll enjoy the last chapter, on the economic aspects of drink, a great deal.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

Books Received

Liberty and Democracy. By Hartley Burr Alexander, Professor of Philosophy, University of Nebraska. Published by Marshall Jones Co., Boston, Mass. Price $1.75.
A volume of wartime essays in which are portrayed the ideals of American institutions in the new light which the war casts upon them.

The War and After. By Sir Oliver Lodge. Published by George H. Doran Co., New York. Price $1.50 net.
A study of the philosophy held by the past generation, the trend of the present, and a discussion of the new ideas and ideals emerging for future reconstruction.

The Roots of the War. By William Stearns Davis, in collaboration with William Anderson and Mason W. Tyler. Published by The Century Co., New York. Price $1.50.
This book devotes itself to the political relations between the nations of Europe particularly after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, with a view to arriving at the basic cause of the present war.

The Last of the Romanoffs. By Charles Rivet. Translated by Hardress O'Grady. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Price $3.00 net. Illustrated.
The author is the Petrograd correspondent of the Paris paper, Le Temps. He relates in this volume the story of the whole Russian Revolution up to the point at which Lenine came into power.

America Among the Nations. By H. H. Powers. Published by The Macmillan Co., New York. Price $1.50.
This book is an attempt at an historic interpretation of our national character and of our relation to other nations.

Social Democracy Explained. By John Spargo. Published by Harper & Bros., New York. Price $1.50 net.
This volume is an attempt to state in simple, popular, and untechnical language the essentials of the Socialism of the Marxian school.

Regulation of Railways. By Samuel O. Dunn, Editor of the Railway Age. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. Price $1.75 net.

A survey of comparative results of public and private ownership and management of railways in various leading and typical countries and a discussion of Government ownership versus Government control.

Woman: Past, Present and Future. By August Bebel. Authorized translation by Meta L. Stern. Published by Boni and Liveright, New York. Price $1.50 net.
This is a historic, scientific and economic study of the woman problem.

The Wonders of Instinct. By Jean-Henri Fabre. Translated by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos and Bernard Miall. Published by The Century Co., New York. Price $3.00 net. Sixteen Illustrations.
A philosophic and scientific presentation of life in the insect world.

Militarism and Statecraft. By Munroe Smith, Professor of Jurisprudence, Columbia University. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Price $1.50 net.
A study of the conflicts between the military and the political authorities of Germany in Bismarck's time and in the present war, and an analysis of the military mind as contrasted with the political.

The American Spirit. By Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior. Published by Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York. Price 75 cents.
In this little book the author sets forth the ideals of the American nation, the cause for which we fight, our relation to the Allies, our obligations and oppportunities, and our abiding faith that the struggle shall not be in vain.

The Business of Finance. By Hartley Withers. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Price $1.50 net.
The author has written this book to point out where the strength of the financial system lies and how it can best be used to bring back steadfast and well-ordered social conditions and to meet the great problem of rebuilding civilization.

The Psychology of War. By J. T. MacCurdy, M.D. Published by John W. Luce & Co., Boston.
The theories of Freud, James, Trotter, Jones and others in regard to the Psychology of War are discussed and analyzed by the author in addition to his own.

Hours of France: In Peace and War. By Paul Scott Mowrer. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Price $1.00 net.

A book of little poems about aspects of France from her agony in the fighting line to the calm beauty of a village church in peaceful Brittany.

Sanctuary

The winds of tradition
Blow their deriding sands
Into our faces, into our eyes.
The sweet waters of the springs of Goshen
Drip coolness and content:
But they are charged
With the juice of the lotus,
With sleep and sloth.

Thou white sun,
Beating down on our heads,
Clear is thy light;
But thy truth, how searching,
How full of tortures!

Who will build us a tabernacle
In the wilderness?
For sands do not make us pillars,
Nor flaming skies a canopy.

Though drifting dunes
May lie o'er ancient shrines,
Yet the walls of the temple
Of the Eternal are secure;
For our hearts are strong,
Our souls inviolate,
Where the Most High dwelleth!

RICHARD WARNER BORST.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending June 25

Congress

The House on the 19th voted the permanent increase of the navy personnel from 87,000 to 131,485 men. The Senate set June 27 as the date for a vote on the Federal Suffrage amendment. President Wilson is working for the amendment as an evidence of America's support of democracy. The House on the 24th passed the appropriation bill for fortifications and big guns amounting to $5,435,096,224. The artillery program contemplates three armies of 1,375,000 men, of whom 1,000,000 are combatants and the remainder civilians. Hearings before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the prohibition amendment continue. The Committee by a small vote has eliminated wine on account of the grape industry. The House Ways and Means Committee receives mainly protests against further or proposed taxes on the protestants. The House passed the bill for the exclusion and deportation of anarchists, an anarchist being defined as "one who advocates the overthrow of government by force, the assassination of public officials, and unlawful destruction of property." The Senate passed the annual pension bill carrying a total of $220,000,000.

Rent Profiteering

Rent profiteering in Connecticut factory towns where munitions are being made has gone to such lengths that Governor Holcomb has appointed a Commission, headed by Herbert Knox Smith, former U. S. Commissioner of Corporations, and author of the Government report on timber monoply, to investigate. The Commission reports rent increases in Waterbury averaging 84 per cent during the past two years and two months. In 34 per cent of the cases investigated the rent was doubled or more than doubled. Trades unions are conducting an energetic agitation and appealing to the Government. A large New York real estate corporation, owning many tenements, asserts that its 4 per cent increase in rents during the past year has been ample to meet increased costs.

Second Class Postage

Publishers continue their opposition to the new postal law that imposes higher rates upon second class matter by means of a zoning system. An effort is being made to secure an amendment to the law before it goes into effect, July 1. George McAneny of the New York *Times* and Vice-President of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in behalf of five hundred newspapers belonging to the association. Advertising rates, he said, had been raised 15 to 18 per cent since the war began, while the cost of print paper had advanced 60 to 200 per cent. The more general argument made against the zoning system is that it will restrict newspapers to their immediate neighborhood, and so will tend to provincialize the thought of the country. The American Federation of Labor at its annual convention

at St. Paul adopted a resolution protesting against the zone system for second class postage because it would tend to create zones of thought and promote sectionalism.

Zionists Convene

The twenty-first convention of the Zionist Organization of America met in Pittsburgh on the 23d to continue till the 27th. The purpose of the convention is to outline plans for the development of the national Jewish homeland in Palestine, which has been made possible by the declaration and friendly interest of the Allied nations. The opposition to the Zionist movement has almost entirely ceased, and the organization has grown to enormous proportions. Those participating in the conference of the Provisional Executive Committee for general Zionist affairs were Rabbi Meyer Berlin, New York; Nathan Straus, New York; Rabbi Stephen Wise, New York; United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Louis Lipsky, New York; Jacob Dehaas, New York; Judge Hugo Pam, Chicago; Max Schulman, Chicago; Mrs. Mary Fels, New York and Charles A. Cowden, Philadelphia. Delegates to the number of nearly one thousand were present, representing all parts of the United States and a number of foreign countries.

Socialist Mission to Europe

A committee composed of A. M. Simons, Louis Kopelin, Alexander Howatt, George D. Herron, Frank Bohn, John Spargo and Charles Edward Russell, and representing the American Socialists who are supporting the war policy of the Government, has gone to Europe for the purpose of opposing any movement of the radicals of the Allied countries to talk peace terms with German Socialists. A statement left by the committee, and given out by the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, expressed the purpose of interpreting to European Socialists the American understanding of internationalism. The members are opposed to the Stockholm conference, but see no harm from a meeting of genuine democrats and internationalists when the proper time arrives. "No delegates can be admitted," the Committee declares, "who are not lending their whole power to democracy in its present warfare against plutocracy. All delegations from autocratic countries must consist exclusively of those who are actively engaged in an effort to bring about an immediate revolutionary overthrow of their governments." A member of the executive committee of the Socialist party, whose platform opposes the war says that the men going abroad do not represent American Socialists, and that their mission will be fruitless. There is given out at the same time a statement from fifteen of the forty Socialist members of the French Chamber of Deputies, approving the position taken by the American Federation of Labor in refusing to confer with representatives of labor from enemy countries during the war. "German Social Democrats," they say, "are less worthy than ever of taking part in a general conference." They are accused of conniving at the violation of Belgian neutrality, and the crushing of Russian democracy. They will not, in the opinion of the French Deputies, be worthy of esteem till they have followed the example of Karl Liebknecht and repudiate any connection with the militarism that brought on the war.

America's War Preparations

General Peyton C. March, Chief of the Army General Staff, stated on the 22d that the number of troops in France or on the way was 900,000. They are now going at the rate of 100,000 a week, which means that General Pershing's army will reach a million men in July. General March spoke in highest terms of the efficiency of men and officers. The present accomplishment, he said, is five months ahead of the program announced in January. The appearance of German U-boats off the American coast so stimulated enlistments that 26,714 men joined the navy in two weeks. The personnel of the United States Navy, including the Marine Corps, now numbers 450,093 men. Shipbuilders now promise for the Fourth of July launching 89 ships of 439,886 tons. Thirty-seven of the vessels will be of steel and fifty-two of wood. Plans of the War Department are based on an army of three million men with corresponding equipment. Provost Marshal General Crowder has amplified his "work or fight" order by additional instructions to draft boards regarding men in non-productive service. President Wilson has approved the action of Congress to permit Jugoslavs, Czecho-Slovenes, and Poles in the United States to take up arms against Austria by becoming autonomous or semi-autonomous units in the American army. It is estimated that this army will number from 300,000 to 500,000 men. Howard Coffin, former head of the Aircraft Production Board, says there are 150,000 men in training in the aviation service.

European War

The Austrian advance on the Piave line ceased on the 19th and 20th. Already the Italians, with the help of the British and French troops, had begun pushing them back at several points. These gains continued to increase till on the 23d the Austrians began to withdraw from their positions west of the Piave. The retreat degenerated into a rout of serious consequences to the invaders. Enormous losses in men and materials are reported. The fighting is still pressed by the victorious Italians, who have crossed to the east side of the Piave at several points. More than 45,000 prisoners have been taken, together with the guns and supplies that had been sent to the west bank of the Piave. The Austrian loss in killed and wounded during the disorderly retreat is reported to be very great. The Germans on the west front attacked Rheims in force, but were driven off. Aside from this the activities have been confined to minor engagements. The American forces, who now hold 38 miles of the western front, have continued their fine record for effectiveness. [See current volume, page 804.]

No further submarine activities have been reported on the American coast. Berlin claims to have sunk 614,000 tons of shipping during the month of May. Air activities continue to grow in importance. Contests take

place whenever an enemy plane appears, and airmen participate in the battles of infantry. According to the official statement of the French Government the Germans have lost 836 airplanes since January 1. The loss for May was, France, 60; Germany, 356.

* *

Reports filtering across the border, as well as the contents of the censored German and Austrian press indicate distress and unrest. Popular criticism of the German Government indicates waning confidence in its management, and the continued shortage of food is weakening the people's morale. In Austria the people have passed from protests to open opposition to the Government. Hunger riots have occurred, and a general strike is threatened to enforce the people's demand for peace. During the budget debate in the Prussian House of Deputies, Socialist member Braun charged that Prussia was in the grip of a crime wave in which "Everybody cheats, steals, grabs, from jail bird to court chamberlain." He denounced the censorship for withholding from the public knowledge of the magnitude of the demand in the army for peace and equal suffrage. The Austrian Cabinet resigned on the 23d. The Emperor reserved his decision, and meantime entrusted Premier von Seidler with the conduct of affairs. The Radoslavoff Ministry of Bulgaria resigned, cause not announced, and M. Malinoff, former Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, has been asked to form a cabinet. Malinoff is credited with being less friendly toward Germany.

* *

American casualties to June 24, as announced by the War Department, are: Killed in action, 1,324; died of disease, 1,270; lost at sea, 291; died of accident, 446; total deaths, 3,331; wounded, 4,859; captured, 119; missing, 248; total casualties, 8,557.

Russia

Reports from Russia are so contradictory and unreliable that it is impossible to form a definite opinion of conditions within the country. Rumors of growing opposition to the Bolshevik Government persist, and there are reports of counter movements. In the midst of it all is the report that the Bolsheviki Central Executive Committee of the Russian Soviets have expelled the members representing the Social Revolutionists and the Mensheviki, on the ground that they are imperialists and counter-revolutionists. It is also reported that the exchange of prisoners is advantageous to Germany and Austria. Nearly all of the Russian prisoners returning that were inspected by the correspondent were seriously ill or crippled, whereas almost all the Germans were well and strong. It was also noticed that there were a large proportion of officers among the Germans returning to their country, and no officers coming back to Russia. Serious revolts of Ukrainians against the Germans are reported. [See current volume, page 804.]

Ireland

The British Cabinet has announced to Parliament that both Irish conscription and Home Rule, which were promised together, have been indefinitely postponed. This abandonment of its declared policy has strengthened the cause of the Sinn Fein. Arthur Griffith, secretary of the Sinn Fein party, and one of the men now held in a British jail charged with being implicated in a plot to cause a rebellion in Ireland, defeated his nationalist opponent for a seat in Parliament from East Cavan by 1214 votes. The Sinn Feiners are still declaring for an Irish Republic. [See current volume, page 805.]

Finland's Constitution

It is announced from Helsingfors that the Finnish Government has proposed to the Landtag a new constitution. It provides that Finland shall be an independent kingdom with heredity in the male line. The king may not at the same time be the ruler of any other state. He shall have an absolute veto in matters affecting the alteration of the constitution and land and sea traffic. In other matters his veto may be overruled by a two-thirds majority of the Landtag elected at a new election. The king is also to be invested with broad powers regarding treaties with foreign states, but he may not begin an offensive war, or sign peace treaties without the consent of the Landtag. The proposed form of government appears to be based on the Swedish constitution of 1809. Two agrarian senators resigned because of opposition to a monarchical form of government.

The Public
A Journal of Democracy

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

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

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

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

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

NOTES

—Governor J. A. A. Burnquist of Minnesota won the Republican nomination for Governor by a vote of 196,110 to 145,832 for Charles A. Lindberg, candidate of the National Non-Partisan League.

—A House resolution providing for a referendum at the election next fall on a state constitutional amendment granting suffrage to women was adopted by the Louisiana State Senate, 39 to 11.

—June 28 has been named as War Thrift Day, by which time it is expected that pledges will have been

made on the part of the American people to buy $2,000,000,000 War Savings Stamps by the end of the year.

—Owing to the scarcity of shipping, and the lack of a local market for bran in Argentina, mills are burning it for fuel. One flour mill burns 100 tons a day, which takes the place of 60 tons of coal. A company is experimenting in making briquets of bran.

—Infant mortality in New York City, owing to greater attention to mothers and children, fell from 102.2 out of a thousand in 1916 to 94 in a thousand in 1917. Omaha, Nebraska, made the best showing, 59.2. The average for all cities over 25,000 was 97.5.

—Frank Stephens, founder of the Arden colony in Delaware, was acquitted of violation of the espionage act by a jury in the Federal court at Wilmington. The complainant was a woman who had tried to sell him Liberty Bonds. He was defended by Gilbert E. Roe of New York.

—The retail merchants of Memphis, Tennessee, responding to the request of the War Industrial Board that they release as many men as possible from truck service, have agreed to have only one delivery a day. They are beginning a campaign of education to secure the co-operation of their customers.

—The present average weekly earnings of New York workers, according to the report of the New York State Industrial Commission, is $19.91, which is $3 more than the average for the same month in 1917, and $7 more than in 1915. The earnings of workers in all branches are placed at 3 per cent higher in May than in April.

—Seven of the eight members of the organizations founded by Charles Taze Russell, whose religious tenets forbid military service, were convicted in the United States District Court of Brooklyn of conspiracy to cause insubordination, disloyalty, and refusal to do military duty in the forces of the United States, and were sentenced to serve twenty years in prison.

—A bill to permit French women to vote at parliamentary and municipal elections has been introduced in the Chamber by Louis Martin, Senator for War. Combating the idea of the supposed indifference of the French women who are satisfied to let their husbands vote for them, Senator Martin is making the point that widows and the mothers of sons fallen in the war should have the right to express themselves.

—The people of Gotenborg, Sweden, have become so interested in raising foodstuffs, according to United States Consul Wallace J. Young, that they have taken 5,000 plots of ground owned by the city, for which a rental approximating 80 cents is paid. Model gardens have been laid out in the parks, and professional gardeners in each of the five districts of the city teach the amateurs who are in need of instruction.

—It is estimated that about one-ninth of the farm loan business of the United States was done by the Federal Farm Loan system during its first year, according to a report issued on the 14th. Since last May 40,451 loans, totaling $91,951,000 were extended. More than 126,000 farmers applied for loans, amounting to $299,948,000. Loans approved and closed amount to $174,858,000. The total agricultural loans made annually in the United States is estimated at $800,000,000.

—One of the specially advertised numbers on the program of the National Education Association, which meets in Pittsburgh, June 29 to July 6, is the address by Dr. Joseph Swain, entitled "Our Profession Shall Not Go Into Bankruptcy." The question of raising salaries to a point more nearly in keeping with the cost of living, in order to prevent the best teachers from leaving the schools is receiving the careful consideration of the Association.

—The Woman's Peace Party of New York State has changed its name to the Woman's International League. The League emphasizes its belief that the only guarantee of lasting security is a democratic league of all nations based on disarmament and the removal of economic barriers. The Woman's International League remains one of the State Branches of the Woman's peace party, which in turn is the American Section of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace, founded at the Hague in 1915.

—Tammany Hall has opened a school for the instruction of women in the duties of election officials. Women are to have one half of Tammany's allotment of places on election boards. There will be 2,805 districts after the September primary, and as each district has twelve election officials, instead of the former eight, the total will be 33,660, divided equally between Democrats and Republicans. Election officials receive $7.50 for primary day, $4 for registration days, and $8 for election days. In addition there are four canvassing inspectors for election night at $6 each, two poll clerks election day at $10 each, and two ballot clerks at $6.

—Following its bulletin on the care of the child's teeth, the Children's Bureau calls attention to the child's eyes. One-fifth of American school children are handicapped by defective vision, and in a considerable number of cases these defects are serious. More than 730,000 men called in the first draft were rejected for physical disqualifications. Of the 10,000 cases examined in detail one-fifth were rejected for defects of the eye. This single cause was responsible for more than twice as many rejections as the next highest cause, the teeth. To aid parents in the care of children's eyes two bulletins, "Prenatal Care" and "Infant Care," will be sent upon request made to Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington.