

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT

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



Why We Must Win

Newspapers in Wartime

An Ex-City Editor

Productivity and Reconstruction

Ordway Tead

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

March 16, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

UPTON SINCLAIR'S

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE: FOR A CLEAN PEACE AND THE INTERNATION

Price 10 cents a copy \$1 a year 10 yearly subscriptions for \$5

¶ Because this is the greatest crisis in human history, and because I have something of importance to say about it, I have begun the publication of a magazine.

¶ If in the past anything that I have written has brought pleasure or enlightenment to you, I ask you now to read what I have to say in this magazine.

LOUIS F. POST WRITES AS FOLLOWS:

"If you were never to write another sentence worth the reading, your articles on a "Clean Peace" and "Internation" would justify your life work. They are an inspiration at a vital moment, to use a familiar but in this case a wholly inadequate expression, they alone are worth a year's subscription. They point out the right road to the true goal. As a slight earnest of my sympathy with the spirit and tenor of those articles and of my confidence that you will make your paper's policy vital with their vitality, I am enclosing check and list of subscriptions."

CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. BAER TELEGRAPHS:

"Congratulations on your new endeavor. Your interpretations of democracy expressed with rhetorical genius are torpedoes, which will make the political and economic seas unsafe for autocracy."

REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES WRITES:

"Now, as so often in the past, I stand immeasurably your debtor for high thought and noble spirit."

¶ If you can't risk a subscription (only \$1.00), drop me a card for a sample copy free.

UPTON SINCLAIR, 1503 Sunset Avenue, Pasadena, Cal.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI

New York, N. Y., March 16, 1918

Number 1041

Contents

Editorial Notes.....	323
Why We Must Win.....	325
For a More Liberal Harvard.....	327
The Packer's Basic Facts.....	327
The Average Business Man.....	328
Queensland's Example.....	329
Manning Our Ships.....	329
Destroying Class Lines.....	330
Productivity and Reconstruction, Ordway Tead..	332
Newspapers in Wartime, by an ex-City Editor...	334
The Kaiser's Ecclesiastical Steam Roller, Louis Wallis	337
Correspondence	340
Books	343
The Khaki Shroud, Carroll Peabody.....	344
Prayer, Zoe Hartman.....	344
News	345

Once more a crisis in the working of the Great Alliance against Germany has been met, and while it has by no means passed, the key-word has been spoken, and the avenue to a solution opened. Japanese intervention in Siberia, its intention and its method, were freighted with consequences for the future of democracy in the world. President Wilson's action in sending his message of sympathy and promise of support to the Congress of Soviets at Moscow, is beyond praise as a piece of statesmanship. But it is at the same time a simple expression of what the American people desire, with one accord, to say to Russia. Perhaps this is what makes it effective as statesmanship. It must now be evident that only one thing has stood, and at present stands in the way of speedily crushing the military power of Germany, and that is the inability of the Allies to take their stand one and all, cleanly and clearly, upon the non-imperialist platform. Without its high moral purpose actuating the French people, British labor, and the American nation, resistance to Germany would have broken down long before now. It is strange that

the one asset and effective instrument for securing a righteous and permanent peace has to encounter so much resistance among the Allies themselves. Is it not time for mean, little, nationalist ambitions, to cease determining Allied plans? How many more disasters will be necessary to burn away this abomination? When the American people entered the war, it was to put an end to the system that has so long cursed the world. Apparently, there are classes in England, France, and Italy, as well as Russia, that do not comprehend the fact that this intention is real, and that it can admit of no compromise in future arrangements. We are in this thing to destroy German imperialism. But our efforts shall not be used for the upbuilding of this unholy thing, labeled with the name of another nation.

* * *

When Germany forced upon Russia terms of peace that detached the Caucasian provinces, Europe reverted in a moment to the old basis of international policy. Panic-stricken imperialists saw the new road to the East open for Germany, the rails laid, and Teutonic armies on their triumphal tour to India and China. To the imperialist view no nation has significance except to help or hinder. Nations are merely to be played off against each other. If Russia is not a secure barrier to German advance upon India, then put Japan in Russia's place; and when the time comes for Japan to menace India, find something else to block the path. This is the game of high politics.

After all, there need be no problem in connection with Japanese intervention. The principle to govern the matter is a simple one: If the Japanese enter Russian territory, let them go to fight Germans and not Russians. There is

nothing to prevent their co-operation with the Russian people to drive out the invaders. There is nothing shameful in declaring their purpose. The American people have intervened in France and did not consider it inconsistent with their dignity to say why they went. If the call for help is not unanimous, wait a little. It will be unanimous before three months have passed. Above all, there must be no intervention with a Bourbon restoration even remotely in view. It is too simple to collect a few ex-bureaucrats and disaffected landlords to attend a march into Russia. The world has passed the stage for the use of such tricks.

* * *

The All-Russian Congress of Soviets is to ratify or repudiate the treaty of peace. Obviously, ratification means no more than acceptance under duress. No Russian can fail to understand that he will be called upon to liberate his country. Even Lenine urges ratification only on the basis that it is the Russian Peace of Tilsit, that would give a chance to gather strength for the war of liberation. He does not understand that that war must come six months and not six years hence; and that the chief step that Russia must take in preparation for it is to rid herself of him and his kind. The mere fact that a Congress of Soviets is to meet is significant as closing the regime of "dictatorship of the proletariat."

In all the apparent follies through which Russia has blundered in the past year, there has run one motive—the destruction of the old regime. It was a fear of counter-revolution that destroyed the first provisional government and wrecked Kerensky, and threw Russia into the hands of the Bolsheviki who were at least the uncompromising opponents of reaction. It was this haunting fear that led to the "democratization" of the army and the paralysis of civil administration. The field was not cleared by removing a Czar. The only national government that Russia possessed was a bureaucracy, backed by police and military force. It was not sufficient to exchange Nicholas for Kerensky or Lenine. The thing itself had to be destroyed. Now is the moment that marks the turn of the tide. We may look henceforth for rapid reintegration, and the emergence of those important social forces of communal government and eco-

nomic cooperation that distinguish Russia from other nations. That she will continue to fight is a necessity of the situation. That she lies at the mercy of Germany is pure nonsense. The people of Russia, no more than the people of France, can stop fighting because they are tired of war and desire peace. No nation can now base its action on a sense of sacrifice already made. It must see what sacrifice it is capable of making in a fight to the bitter end. Russia is still a nation of trained soldiers, and their help is needed to win this war and secure their chance of liberty. Their Allies, American and Japanese, can provide military supplies. One other factor, and one only is needed, and that is a great and compelling idea. It is the hope of every democrat in the world that that idea will be born at Moscow this week.

* * *

At the bottom of a column on the fourth page of New York's greatest morning paper, is to be found the interview at Philadelphia by Rear-Admiral Francis T. Bowles, assistant-manager of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The interview needs no comment.

"Taking into account all the conditions," he said, "the Philadelphia district is not doing all that it ought in the vitally important work of producing cargo ships for the new merchant fleet. However, my criticism is general. I could place my finger upon the weak spots, but I don't think that it would be best to tell where they are. In the matter of lagging behind, the Philadelphia district is not different from all Eastern shipyards. Not one of them is showing the proper productive power that their equipment, personnel, etc., ought to show."

"In your opinion, Admiral, what shipyard is making the best showing?" he was asked.

"My feeling is," replied the Admiral, "that the shipyard of the Baltimore Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company at Baltimore is making the best showing, considering the equipment and opportunities of that concern."

"Which one of the others is making the best showing?"

"There is not any best," replied the Admiral, "and it would be hard to say which is the worst—they are all bad."

* * *

Collier's prints this week a leading article demolishing President Wilson and his closest advisers as dreamers and bunglers,—men who hate efficiency and those who are efficient. It could have been better written by any good reporter who had spent an evening listening to the talk at the Union League club or in those Wash-

ington circles where Penrose and Lodge talk things over with disgruntled financiers. One of the most glorious things about the Wilson Administration is its extreme unpopularity with that part of the periodical press which apparently exists chiefly to tickle the vanity of that part of the population whose only complaint against the existing order is that labor is still fractious and unwilling to play its part in a world ruled by time-studies, efficiency charts, and the type of mind that wants everybody conscripted except the geniuses of Wall Street, who, of course, must be left free to exercise their great talents. Smashing covers, good art work, and clever features will sell this sort of periodical. But big circulations do not measure influence. In New York City last week, four Congressional districts, two of which were considered safely Republican, sent Wilson men to Congress by big majorities, the women doing their part.

* * *

Mr. Gompers has discovered a new argument against prohibition: it leads to revolution. In his speech before the New York Legislature opposing ratification, as reported in the *Baltimore Labor Leader*, Mr. Gompers said: "Aren't we asking about enough of our German, Austrian and Italian fellow citizens who come from countries where the use of light beverages and wines is general, to be loyal and give their support to the Government, without interjecting at this time a question of regulating or prohibiting their moral habits? I won't attempt to suggest the thought that the condition in Russia today is primarily due to prohibition, but the situation is as it is." Mr. Gompers' theory may not be so wide of the mark. Investigators of the I. W. W. situation in the Northwest have reported that prohibition in Washington State has increased the independence and intelligence of the workmen. They no longer wake up Monday mornings penniless and at the mercy of the boss. They spend their idle time reading and thinking and seriously discussing their common interests. Union officials in Seattle and Denver have written in enthusiastic praise of the good effects of prohibition in increasing the strength and improving the morale of organized labor. A growing number of labor leaders are coming to feel that the old political partnership between labor and booze should be dissolved.

Unlucky is the industrial corporation today that cannot show net earnings for 1917 of \$40 or \$50 on each \$100 share of common stock. After the war there will be huge melons to cut, of a size never dreamed of before. Profits distributed now to the shareholders come under the excess profits tax and the income tax. Far better to put them securely away as "surplus" or "reserve" or "depreciation" or some of the other phrases known to Wall Street book-keeping. Republic Iron & Steel reports profits for 1917 of \$14,007,197, equal to \$53 a share on the stock. And this after setting aside \$9,878,657 to cover excess profit taxes "and other contingent charges," and writing off nearly \$1,000,000 more for depreciation and plant renewal. Industrial Alcohol on the same day reports earnings for 1917 of \$56.67 a share, after deducting 42 per cent of earnings for taxes. It is to be hoped that the Federal Trade Commission or a Congressional Committee will spare the time to look into corporation book-keeping methods now that war taxes are operative. Even so, reports of distributed earnings for 1917 for those corporations engaged in war industries are a national scandal. In the face of them, it is difficult to understand how Mr. McAdoo can find the heart to appeal for the pennies of the poor.

Why We Must Win

President Wilson's emphatic disapproval of action by the present Congress tending to fasten universal compulsory military service on the country as a permanent institution probably removes for the time all danger of the success of the propaganda carried on by the National Security League, the American Defense Society, Sen. Chamberlain, Col. Roosevelt, and that large part of the daily and periodical press that has been regimented and brought into a state of perfect discipline by our masters of business enterprise. Proponents of the Chamberlain bill and similar measures never claimed any advantage for their schemes during the present war. Their propaganda showed frankly enough that they want universal service as an antidote or smotherer of social ferment, as a means of inculcating respect for things as they are, of teaching our young men to obey without question the orders of their superiors. Their program, how-

ever, has its affirmative side. The latest annual report of the American International Corporation shows its amazing progress in the acquisition of holdings and privileges in South America and in Asia. This group represents a coming together of our most powerful monopolists for economic aggression in the foreign field. Their leader, Mr. Vanderlip, delivered a speech in New Orleans two years ago in which he spoke with scorn of a Government that would not protect the property rights of its citizens in Mexico. The American International has given more than one indication that it is more interested in opportunities for profitable underwriting, for the capitalization of contracts and concessions, than in mere tasks of construction or the actual exchange of products in foreign trade. It probably would repudiate the suggestion that more is expected from the Government than a friendly interest to be exhibited by agents of the State Department in countries where concessions or contracts are at stake. But it apparently believes that such expressions would be more potent if they came from a power that was armed to the teeth. So much for the preliminaries of doing business abroad. Later, when American interests are developed and become "vested," they will expect protection against revolutions or "unreasonable" foreign governments.

England's slums have shown us just how much the common man has to expect from the sort of national greatness involved in the dreams of these men. Their dreams fall short of the Prussian standard in only one respect: they have not yet made the State their own. They still prefer to act independently of the State, using it merely as a servant useful in getting and maintaining privileges. If they were wise even in their own unwisdom, they would adopt the Bismarckian program. Instead of opposing all schemes of social insurance and similar enterprises in governmental welfare work, they would get behind them, supplementing military service with a program of scientific housing and rationing that would tend to keep the masses not only subservient, but well fed and contented. And the next step would be to take over the State as the super-corporation. We have such a tendency to keep in mind in connection with state socialism. There is nothing in our form of government to prevent it, except our policy, inadequately carried out, of universal compulsory education. And

that is in some danger from the influence of agencies like the Rockefeller Foundation, whose huge subsidies subtly influence the decisions of the bodies that govern our universities and our educational associations.

THE PUBLIC is no ghost-haunted calamity-howler. It has confidence that the tendencies here outlined cannot get far in America. Just one contingency could possibly subvert the progress of American democracy. That would be a peace that left the German Government victorious or at least unregenerate and with unweakened prestige.

We could not then hold out against the maintenance of a huge army and navy. Patriotism and national spirit of the kind useful to our torities would be kept at high intensity. National pugnacity and national prejudice would thrive. Our young men would look forward to "the day," and heterodox elements in the community would lose caste as weakeners of national unity. The price we should pay for an inconclusive peace would be the militarization of America and the weakening of its democratic spirit. Says a writer in the *London Nation*: "It is hard for grown-up people, knowing each other's ignorance and folly, to realize with what respect and attention the young sometimes listen to mere elders, and unconsciously absorb their views. Teach military discipline under compulsion to English schools, and in two generations you will have produced in England all that we have most detested and ridiculed in the German life and character. You will have produced the worship of uniform, the swaggering officer, the bullying official, the petty regulation, the perpetual inquisition, the government by police, the multitude prone in passive submission. . . . The whole country will be pervaded by a stolid and degrading discipline, easy for Germanizing bureaucracy to manipulate, but thwarting initiative, and choking self-reliance. Except where, in the Prayer Book's phrase, service is perfect freedom, obedience may be the easiest and most sluggish of the vices."

How can any democrat evade the conclusion that this war must go on until the institutions and the ideas that are Germany are discredited by decisive failure? How can he imagine that any peace patched up today can be a democratic peace, can be anything but a triumph for the things that pacifists hate?

For a More Liberal Harvard

The forming of Harvard Liberal Clubs in Boston and New York, with the avowed purpose of challenging control of Harvard by a small coterie of Boston bankers, is a long overdue evidence that American university graduates are aware of the disrepute into which university management has fallen. Universities never were, at least in the English-speaking world, centers of radical propaganda. The record of English radicals expelled from Oxford or Cambridge is a long one. But recently English universities have been more friendly to heterodox thinking—at least to that sort represented by the Fabian society. In this country university radicalism has been confined almost entirely to isolated members of faculties, who usually lost caste as a result of their independence, and often more than caste. The character of the student body at more famous American schools has not been encouraging to independent teachers. The chief task of the American college for the past two generations has been to take the sons of men suddenly grown prosperous and teach them how to be gentlemen. It would be hard to find a more intellectually sterile atmosphere than that which pervades American undergraduate life.

The American upper class is not yet sufficiently sure of itself to risk an unbiased examination of the social order which supports it. Serious interest in such things as the labor problem is considered "bad form," and that is the ultimate sin in the eyes of young people not sure of themselves and eager to arrive. All this is truer of the past than it is of the present. There are an increasing number of young men and women in the colleges who think for themselves in spite of the faculties and go forth to become engineers in the work of reconstruction. But the faculties lie under the blight of control by boards of stupiditory business men. Dr. Carleton H. Parker of the University of Washington evoked not a protest when he read a paper before the American Economic Association at Philadelphia in which he scored university teachers in this subject for abject failure as truth-tellers. The influence of such agencies as the Rockefeller Foundation is an important factor. The foundations may not make specific demands on the governing boards of institutions to which they give. But specific demands are not required. A col-

lege executive, with outstretched palm, will take steps in advance to see that the teaching at his school merits the confidence of prospective donors. The state universities offer an opportunity to democrats in this connection that has not been used. State Federations of Labor in many states have the power to place representatives on boards of regents or trustees and to press democratic issues as they arise. The perfect teacher would not wish to be beholden to any element in the community. But THE PUBLIC ventures to assert that organized labor today has more of the true spirit of culture than the average group of banker-trustees.

The Packers' Basic Facts

The Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the packing industry has led Swift & Co. to enter upon an advertising campaign of defense in the course of which is stated: "The feeling against the American packer is based largely on the belief that the income and well-being of the producer and consumer are adversely affected by the packers' operations resulting in unreasonably large profits. Swift & Co.'s net profit is reasonable and represents an insignificant factor in the cost of living." Then figures are presented showing that the net profit would have been entirely wiped out had the concern paid one-eighth of a cent per pound more for cattle, or charged one-quarter of a cent a pound less for dressed beef. This, the advertisement declares, is "putting before the public the basic facts of our business." Nevertheless, it leaves much to be explained.

For a number of years the price of meat has been mounting steadily. The individuals in control of the packing concerns were prosperous before the advance took place. They are prosperous still. The cattle-raisers, as a rule, were not prosperous. They are less prosperous today. The employes of the plants, for the most part, led a miserable hand-to-mouth existence. Recent disclosures show no improvement in that situation. And yet, if dressed beef is being produced at the small margin shown, someone must be gaining what others are losing. That someone is clearly not the cattle-raiser, nor the stockyard employe, nor the consumer. Swift & Co. must show who is profiting by what these lose if it would put before the public the true basic facts of its business.

Until they do so the public may be pardoned for suspecting that some vital facts are being withheld. Is payment for actual and indispensable service rendered included in the entire difference between gross sales of \$875,000,000 for 1917, and net profit of \$34,650,000? Do expenses include payments to the stockyard and terminal railroads or other transportation lines which the packers own or control and is there no tribute to monopoly therein? Is there any basis for the complaint of the cattlemen that they are charged exorbitant prices for feed at the yards? Are any profits covered through payment of unearned salaries to holders of sinecures? If so the net profits reported do not tell the whole tale. If in the answer to these questions does not lie the solution of the problem, then Swift & Co. should be able to show its true location. So far, it has rendered but a very superficial account.

Let it be said, however, that whatever the business methods of the packers may be, there is no occasion or justification for personal denunciation. If Swift & Co. was to ask its critics whether they would not have acted the same way in its place, an honest answer in most cases would show critic and criticized on the same moral plane. The essential question is not whether any business has been conducted in a grossly materialistic way, but whether the prevailing economic system does not offer some business men opportunities to appropriate more than they earn. If it does, then the blame for results rests not upon the individuals who take advantage of such opportunities, but upon society. If it does not, then no one can be getting more than his just due. Let the packers realize that, whatever the unthinking may say, they owe no personal apologies for gains they may have reaped through social wrongs. But they have a plain duty to help lay bare and abolish these wrongs.

“The Average Business Man”

An important position now unoccupied in the liberal movement in America is waiting for that vast number of business men who, falling short of agreement with the more radical as to what is to be done, yet have still less in common with the great buccannering corporations that nevertheless assert their claim to speak for the entire business community. President Wilson appealed successfully to this type of business men

in his campaign of 1912. Everywhere their influence is felt as individuals, to encourage liberal movements and to mitigate resistance to wholesome change. But nowhere are they organized or influential as a class. Yet they have much in common both with disinterested liberals of the so-called “intellectual” variety, and with labor. Pick a corporation notorious for its bad labor record and you will find in nine cases out of ten a corporation with a record of unfair practice toward its smaller competitors. Yet so great is their power either to coerce or dazzle that in almost every community these corporations are able to wield absolute control over the Chamber of Commerce or the Commercial Club or whatever agency exists for expressing the views and advancing the interests of local business men. The consistent torquism and venality of such bodies is a thing to amaze and dishearten the observer. They can be counted upon to oppose every progressive measure from child labor reform and workmen’s compensation to changes in the tax laws designed to relieve enterprise from the extortion of slackers. Invariably their signals are set against progress in any form, and apparently it is just the blind resistance of unlightened selfishness. They opposed railroad rate regulation until it had been enacted and its benefits made apparent. They opposed workmen’s compensation until their defeat and a trial of it convinced them that it was good business. It is the shame of American business men that they are willing to sit back and see their supposedly-representative chambers of commerce controlled by the most reactionary and anti-social elements in the business community. Apparently they either fear the power of “the big fellows” or they are too preoccupied with their personal affairs to give any attention to the things that are said and done in their names. At any rate, they sit back and permit whatever selfish interest happens to be most interested in a specific pending question to use their collective influence in opposition to the thing that is decent and intelligent and, in many instances, in their own best interests.

It is this record of the chambers of commerce and the commercial clubs of the United States that has convinced vast numbers of working men and agitators that all business and all business men are tarred with the same stick. If decent and progressive business men find themselves

subject to the same animosity that exists against unscrupulous predatory groups, they have themselves to blame for it. It is time the average business man gave up the expansive pleasure of saying "we" when he means "big business." If he prefers to remain its tool and jackal, it is he who will suffer most in the end.

If THE PUBLIC has here spoken too sweepingly, we should like to be corrected. We should welcome letters for publication giving the record of Chambers of Commerce or Commercial Clubs in support of progressive measures. But we are not so naive as to imagine that the remedy here is preaching. It is merely another evidence that something is fundamentally wrong with the business game,—that the rules are such as almost always to entangle successful business inextricably with unearned income in one form or another.

Queensland's Example

Congress has so far shown little disposition to heed the recommendation of the Department of Labor for legislation of the type of the Crosser colonization bill. The Department held that "returned soldiers should be placed upon public land and helped to make their living there, but without investing them with absolute tenure rights, useless to them but attractive to speculators." Perhaps Congressmen will be less reluctant to heed the proposal should they learn that something similar has been done elsewhere. If so, they ought to be informed that the Australian State of Queensland has taken action along that line.

Queensland seems to possess legislators of the rare type ready to put in force an idea that seems right, even though no other nation has been wise enough to do the same thing. They have passed an act setting apart large tracts of the public domain for the use of returned soldiers and other settlers, under perpetual lease. The rental terms could undoubtedly be improved, but that can be overlooked just now. For three years no rent is to be paid, and for the next twelve less than the fair rental value is to be taken. After that a rent court will fix the amount. The law has, furthermore, provisions similar to those in the Crosser bill for instruction of settlers in farming, employment of them at current wages during growing of crop, and for Government loans on improvements. Soldiers

are to be charged a lower rate of interest on these loans than civilian settlers.

Although the low rental provision seems to leave a loophole for the speculator, yet this law is so far ahead of anything that has emanated from our own Congress, that we cannot afford to find serious fault on that account. Queensland has taken a step that has more than sentimental consideration for the soldiers to commend it. The law will safeguard the State from an industrial depression, which is sure to afflict commonwealths that refuse to take precautions in time. With at least a part of the State's natural resources open to labor without payment of tribute to speculators, there will be a refuge for the unemployed.

Should Congress persist in refusal to take time by the forelock and guard against the recurrence of a depression, there will be an opportunity to observe how much better Queensland will be faring. When that takes place our own representatives may well be called upon to explain why they failed in their duty.

Manning Our Ships

The Administration is to be congratulated in going slow on the proposal to man all merchant ships with officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve. It is true that more than 60 per cent of skilled seamen in the American merchant marine are not citizens of this country. But they have proved their courage and fidelity by risking the submarine menace through more than a year of unrestricted undersea warfare. They are highly skilled. And they are loyal to this country through gratitude for the passage of the Seamen's Act. There is grave injustice in scrapping a skilled seaman who has stuck at his post throughout the past twelve months, and filling his place with a young landsman whose only qualifications are patriotism and a few months' training at some shore station. Some merchant ships have already been taken over by the Naval Reserve, and experience has proved that the transfer involves the doubling or trebling of the crew, and even then a distinct loss in efficiency. Behind the demand for the navalization of the merchant marine is clearly enough the desire of ship owners to create a large class of ship labor accustomed to working for meager wages, and to absolute power in the hands of the employers'

agents. Mr. Lewis Nixon, a shipbuilder and owner, disclosed this purpose clearly enough in a recent speech before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. He said: "The men of our merchant marine are recruited largely through the Seamen's Union and not through the United States Government. Instead of being faithful and willing they have sometimes refused to obey orders. Even when an ordinary drill was ordered on Sunday they demanded an increase in wages. . . . We have got to have our ships handled autocratically. In 1913 I opposed the Seamen's bill. Since its passage you have seen the American flag driven off the Pacific Ocean."

This has a familiar ring. The only American ships that have left the Pacific were sold or chartered at enormous rates for the more profitable Atlantic trade. Ask any grizzled skipper of the merchant marine whether, in a pinch, he would prefer his present crew or twice the number of youngsters from Pelham Park Training Station, and his answer would not be in doubt. But the skipper is not thinking of after-the-war payrolls.

Early last year the Seamen's Union concluded an arrangement with the United States Shipping Board providing for the dilution of skilled ship labor with apprentice seamen, and the Shipping Board has established a competent school at Boston for supplying young men to the merchant marine. Graduates of this school can be put to work with older and thoroughly-skilled men, and the number can be increased to meet all needs. Is there any more reason that we should scrap the personnel of our merchant marine and militarize the service than there is that we should man our munition factories with soldiers, on the ground that a large percentage of the present employes are aliens? Before such action is taken we shall want a clear statement that meets the objections and that will convince us that the proposal does not get its chief support from those who are still fighting the emancipation of the seamen. There is no doubt that the shipowners have refused to carry out in good faith the terms of the agreement entered into at Washington between their representatives, the Shipping Board and the Seamen's Union, looking to the building up of an adequate civilian personnel for the merchant marine. They fear that apprentices thus inducted into the merchant service would become members of the Union. If they can induce the Government to man the ships now building with

enlisted men of the Navy, then after the war there would be no union. And they could draw on the Chinese or enlist the support of the British Government for an attack on the Seamen's Act.

Destroying Class Lines

The Archbishop of York, speaking in New York of the changes wrought by the war said that class distinction has practically been wiped out, and adds: "It would be futile to destroy the autocratic menace and then return to the old conditions." There is truth in the Primate's statement, and it is prophetic of what is to be. Class distinction is less marked today in Great Britain than at any time in her history. But the change is not all on the part of a nobility that in the stress of war has come to recognize the worth of the fighting man. The more important part of the change is in the mind of the fighting man. He too has felt the spirit of comradeship, but his thought has gone farther.

The privileged classes, touched by the magnificent devotion to country by men who have received so little from their country, are making tardy efforts at atonement. They now feel some of the shame that is due to a toleration of deplorable economic conditions in which these men have been forced to live. The health-destroying hovels called cottages, the rookeries known as tenements, and the inmates, the stunted men and women and undeveloped children dignified by the term citizens, are all included in plans for correction during and after the war.

Some of this work that comes under the term housing is well set forth by Richard S. Childs in "The Outlook" for March. "Garden Cities" is the term applied to these ventures of the British Government in housing the munition workers. Five hundred million dollars has already been spent on them, and so much have they added to labor efficiency that the work is to be continued. The ablest city planners in Great Britain have undertaken to make them convenient, economical, healthful and beautiful. And these housing accommodations, surpassing anything ever dreamed of by persons of small means, may be had at an astonishingly low rental.

"If private landlordism had supplied these homes," says Mr. Childs, "we should have seen the following sequence of events: (1) Munition

plant located; (2) influx of population, local land values boom; (3) munition plant cries for labor and offers high wages; (4) builders try to buy land to put up houses for labor, pay inflated prices for land and charge for it in the rent; (5) labor finds high wages nullified by high rent and fades away; (6) munition plants offer higher wages, and (7) landlords levy higher rents and owners of empty land announce higher prices. Net result: high cost of munitions, incessant labor turnover, disorganization, labor troubles, landowners and speculators making fortunes. That is the American method."

And is it not so? Does not this describe the situation at the site of each of the war industries? Mr. Childs' citation of the farmer at du Ponts' new town of Hopewell, Virginia, who sold part of his \$10,000 farm for \$250,000, causes no shock, nor does his reference to Gary, Indiana, where the United States Steel Corporation created a city in 1906, and sold off lots at cost that brought \$22,000,000 in land values to those who bought early. This is the custom. People expect it. It is also the custom and people expect to see hovels and tenements in these rich communities. They have not yet seen the connection between the land values going into private pockets, and the high rents and poor accommodation for the workers.

"English labor," says Mr. Childs, "has grasped the principle and sees the vision of a slumless and tenementless age. It is demanding that when the great armies flood back across the Channel, and the period of unemployment and readjustment sets in, the Government shall spend billions for no less than a million new dwellings to rehouse the working class of England." The British Government in attempting to meet the housing demands of labor took the lands by Parliamentary authority, "not at the boom value that followed the creation of the munitions plants, but at pre-war valuation. And it reserves the further right to take as much more adjacent land as it sees fit at the pre-war valuation without regard to the owners' idea of the new value given it by the coming of thousands of people to the neighborhood."

This is the first step in what the Archbishop calls the wiping out of class distinctions. It is only a step, however, and will require many more strides to reach the goal. Britain's heroic efforts to mend the disgraceful housing conditions show

a good spirit on the part of the ruling classes, but the real work of wiping out class distinctions will be done by the serving classes. It is not so important what the landed aristocracy does with the men who return from the trenches, as what the men from the trenches do with the landed aristocracy. The British Tommy will, no doubt, appreciate a good house for the former price of a very poor one. An opportunity to acquire a farming plot on very long terms at low interest may interest a few. But with the great mass of the men in the trenches who have had a chance to think and exchange ideas the dominant thought is not so much of the terms on which they can get a piece of land, as the terms upon which the present owners hold the land. It is quite easy to see what the owner of the cottage or the truck patch gives for his holding, but the thing that is not so easy to see, and the thing that must be made clear, is what the owners of the great landed estates, the mineral lands, the city sites, and the various rights of way, render to society in return for their holdings.

To supply labor with comfortable homes no more solves the social problem than giving lunches to school children meets the question of poverty. This efficient housing is defended on the grounds of sound finance. As Mr. Childs says, "Tory business men agree, for it will make English labor so efficient that England can conquer the commercial world." That is to say, this decent treatment of labor will make it so productive that mineral lands will be worth much more than before. The same will be true of farm lands and city lots. But if lands are worth more, it merely means that the people of England who use the lands of the country will have to pay more for that privilege to the owners. Thus social conditions will drift inevitably into the condition before the war. Such a course will never wipe out class lines. "The spirit of humanity, of cooperation, of brotherhood," spoken of by the Primate, will do much to ameliorate unpleasant conditions. But nothing short of justice will remove the cause. No amount of sympathy, brotherhood or fellowship will wipe out class lines, as long as some men live by taking toll of others for the mere privilege of using the earth.

Class lines, nevertheless, will be wiped out. The very necessities of civilization demand a re-arrangement of the processes of production and distribution of wealth on the basis of service.

When all serve in the commercial world as they do in the trench world, there will develop that brotherhood of which the Archbishop speaks. It cannot come through the owners of estates giving a part of their income to relieve the condition of labor, but only by rendering full service for what

they retain. And what is true of conditions in England is equally true of America. The curbing of autocracy is no more necessary for the political freedom of the world than the destruction of landlordism is necessary for social and economic freedom of the nations.

Productivity and Reconstruction

By Ordway Tead

The problem of economic reconstruction after the war will be twofold. We shall need goods in unprecedented quantity and in securing them we shall have to be on our guard against the dangers which unregulated production has always brought. Uncritically to accept output as the sole criterion of successful reorganization is to neglect three important lessons taught by nineteenth-century industrialism: first, that labor, for reasons that it has deemed sufficient, has been indifferent to the claims of efficiency and to demands for quantity of product; second, that unrestricted production has with astonishing regularity glutted the world's markets and brought unemployment and depression in its wake; and third, that surplus product and surplus wealth at home seek profitable foreign markets and investment areas, thus sowing the seeds of national expansion and imperial ambition in industrially undeveloped regions. If reconstruction proposals are to be soundly conceived, they must recognize not only the stupidities and sufferings attributable to the capitalist system before the war, but the failure of that system to meet the present demands in which national and broadly human rather than selfish individual purposes are to be served. We must reconstruct our economic arrangements at the central point of weakness. If we leave untouched the underlying element of anarchy in industry, we shall advance little towards internal prosperity and international stability.

Without question the world after the war will require goods in unprecedented quantity. Our manufacturers must help in restoring to normal condition the devastated portions of Belgium, France and Russia. Our own depleted stocks of food, machinery, clothing, and other goods must be replenished; in addition, the extraordinary wear and tear on all present equipment must be compensated; our railroads alone will require

billions of dollars of new capital outlay. There will be a rush to carry out all sorts of construction plans interrupted or postponed by the war. The demands of new markets in South America, Africa and Asia must be satisfied. War debts must be paid—both principal and interest. With increasing insistence, labor will demand a larger share of the product, not only relatively, but absolutely. Even before the war our national income, minus requisite deductions for reserve, depreciation and new capital outlay, was insufficient to provide a comfortable living for our population. And after the war this situation will be yet more pressing. We cannot divide wealth which we do not have. We cannot sell goods which are not made. We cannot pay bills with supplies which do not exist.

Yet further, we shall have to meet in competition new and scientific methods of manufacture and marketing on the part of Great Britain and Germany. America should not and will not try to build up a self-sufficient national economy, but should seek whatever trade comes from legitimate superiorities of our goods. To do business in direct competition with the merchants of Europe, we must have low unit costs of production. Such rivalry is on the whole to be desired; for the more widely and intricately interwoven the network of international trading relations becomes, the more firmly will the world become rooted in that economic interdependence which is an essential basis—even if not an infallible guarantee—of world peace.

The case for high productivity after the war is thus impregnable. What, then, are its dangers, and how are they to be overcome? The answer depends on the probable trend of industrial events after the war. In the absence of conscious and deliberate effort to control productive life for social ends, one of two developments seems inevitable; and both lead finally to the same in-

ternational economic *impasse*. A reasonably full measure of control may remain with the private owners of capital; or the Government and labor may each exert a considerable check upon the whole productive enterprise.

If the employing classes retain unimpaired their ascendancy in our country, they will keep wages as low as the supply of unemployed workers may warrant. Labor will exercise no control over the introduction of labor-saving devices, scientific management, and "speeding up" methods; and failing such control, the tendency towards instability of employment will be increased, while monotony, absence of self-direction, and demand for unskilled machine feeders will be even more characteristic of industry than it is today. The natural corollary of these conditions will be high profits, which in turn will result in the restriction of high consuming power to the small group of profiteers who have money to spend. The workers will be mulcted—as wage-earners through low wages and as consumers through high prices. In this situation (which was incipiently present before the war) the rapidly increasing supply of free capital will be devoted either to the purchase of luxuries or to new investments in the most profitable channels; and where home demand is artificially limited by a low purchasing power among the great working class the most profitable field for investment and for marketing will be in foreign lands.

If, on the other hand, American labor promises to exert a substantial measure of control over industrial affairs, and the Government increasingly intervenes to control profits and prices, free capital will be driven equally into foreign loans. As the profitableness of unrestricted enterprise in Africa or Asia in comparison with home ventures hedged about with restrictions will be beyond question, capital will flow abroad, regardless of domestic needs. The extensiveness of American investments abroad will then give rise to a demand for military protection and for the appropriations necessary to provide such defence for "American interests." These expenditures, forming a considerable fraction of the national budget, will contribute not a little to the increase of taxation and the further burdening of the taxpayer.

In other words, any course of action which leaves uncontrolled the use of credit and the flow

of capital results in production's taking place in response not to actual human needs, but to more or less artificially created demands. The old reasons for imperialism stand unchanged; the familiar demands for a narrowly construed, aggressive nationalism remain; and political leaders join hands with captains of industry in obstructing any popular effort to develop the world's material resources for social purposes. Lacking democratic control of the credit system upon which industry depends, our nation—and the civilized world—lacks the essential conditions of a rational system of production.

Logically, the first question for an intelligent community to ask itself is: What do we want made and how much of it? So long as this question is answered not by consumers in their own interest, but by controllers of credit in theirs, no fundamental reconstruction can take place. Social control over the initial direction of human energy in industry is obviously at the heart of wise industrial statecraft. Production must, in other words, be carried on in direct, avowed and measured relation to a demand dictated primarily by considerations of national and international welfare. The first principle of reconstruction is that no production can be intelligently initiated in the absence of organized effort to know the total demand of local and foreign markets. Organization and anticipation of the existing effective demand is the first elementary step towards producing only what is needed. The present unregulated competitive struggle on the part of each producer to supply as much of the market as possible is now completely discredited. If America refuses to see this fact, she will find her cost of production rising to a figure which will prevent successful competition in foreign markets.

Competent organization of demand and production, as already suggested, entails public regulation of investments in home and foreign enterprises. Dictation as to the direction and extent of outlay on new manufacturing ventures must come from the consumer, not from the credit-seller, if the dangers of productivity are to be held in check and if temptations to exploitation are to be removed. Agreement is already widespread that short of international oversight and supervision of the industrial undertakings of Western investors in undeveloped countries, permanently amicable relations cannot be maintained among the creditor nations, nor can approximate

justice be done the peoples among whom the enterprises are established.

We are not without clues as to practical ways in which our country can begin to make the control of credit effective. Our Federal farm loan law runs distinctly in the direction of more popular and less privately centralized management of credit instruments, while Secretary McAdoo's bill for a "war finance corporation" with governmentally owned stock looks directly towards public credit control. The purpose of this corporation would be to provide capital for enterprises needed for national purposes and to discourage undertakings not so required. After the war such an organization should certainly be retained; its management should become representative of diverse industrial interests; and its powers should gradually be extended to include public oversight of all considerable extensions of credit.

Supplementing credit control we shall need the passage of standard labor and factory laws to protect the workers of each country equally, laws whose enactment has already been demanded by the organized workers of England and the United States. The second principle of reconstruction is, therefore, that the investing function should be subject to public control on an international scale, and that the opportunity to produce be safeguarded by universally enforced standards of safe and wholesome practices in factories, mines and common carriers.

Labor's historic opposition to large output has already been noted, as well as the probable increase of labor's influence in industry. The indifference of the workers to large production has arisen neither from laziness nor from stupidity. It has been occasioned by a feeling that production motivated by the gain of private owners of capital serves ends which are not labor's own—and which cannot be made labor's, short of a

change from purely private to more largely social dictation as to the use of credit and of the technique of production. Such a change involves the creation of a whole new structure of control, wisely distributed between actual head and hand producers and consumers. A third principle to be observed, therefore, is that in order to secure maximum production labor's voice must become increasingly dominant where chiefly its interests are affected.

Finally, indispensable in the permanent reconstruction of the world's economic life is adherence to the third of President's Wilson's peace terms, which demands "the removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

Liberal English opinion has not been blind to the importance of understanding and finding acceptance for these principles and of translating them into proposals for specific reforms. All sorts of reconstruction programmes—maximum and minimum—are being discussed in the meetings of trade-union locals—and of the House of Lords. We confront the same need for productivity as England, and we may learn not a little from a consideration of her after-war programmes. Indeed the principles here discussed have already been clearly enunciated there. Our own formulation of policy can derive from British experience the benefit of a graphic presentation of the central issues. In a word, reconstruction must assure goods for a world facing an actual deficit of supplies; but it must also guarantee freedom and fulness of life to our whole population. Unless both objects are kept in equal view, reorganization will be on no firm foundation. It is high time to develop American reconstruction programmes—in the interest of productivity and personality.

Newspapers in Wartime

By An Ex-City Editor

Signs multiply that the newspapers are recovering from the breakdown which threatened to be their chief contribution to the war. "Those changes necessary to win the war" which editors discuss largely for others, may yet be adopted by the newspapers themselves.

Those who were in newspaper offices last April see excuses for their failure. The onset of war suddenly made editors' duties very important. They were to mold public opinion, to maintain morale. Modern wars, they were reminded, were fought with printing presses no less than with

artillery. It was no time for them to be humble and introspective. They must be stalwart and looked up to. The Government, failing of a censorship law, increased their self-importance by making them the judges of what to print. Every line of type became matter of life and death. Editors, exalted to find themselves in the first line of defense, struck the very human pose of "Close up the ranks. No dissensions. Don't start anything new. Three cheers for the flag." Doubts, dissensions and innovations came thick, but it never occurred to editors that their slogan lacked efficiency. Their despatches from abroad warned that the war was changing everything. American newspapers exempted themselves.

With most of them it is still a case of "business as usual." They look the same as a year ago. They carry the same advertisements, largely of sales non-essential to the war. Deeper, they have not changed their traditional attitudes except that now what they do not like is "pro-German" instead of "Socialistic." Their attitude toward labor is the same. They are just as respectful to big business. They display the patriotism of their ancient standbys, "spokesmen prominent in law and finance." They are more ignorant than ever of such things as strikes. They still view with alarm drastic methods threatening privilege, though these promise to win the war.

The disregard into which they have fallen is indicated by the people's increased refusal to take their politics from the papers. In the recent election in New York every metropolitan morning daily except one, campaigned for Mayor Mitchel. Hylan's name never appeared on the first page except as the butt of some "exposé." Judging by the papers there could be little question of the merits of the election. The vote, as the result on suffrage proved, was not entirely unintelligent, unconsidered or perverse. A great many decent, thinking, independent voters believed the choice was Tammany or Tory and they preferred to put up with Tammany. They did not get this definition from the newspapers.

Will the people quit taking their war from the papers? This is quite the most important question before editors these days. Things will begin to totter indeed if the masses want the war won in ways different from the prescription of the newspapers, of the newspaper owning classes.

Newspapers which ran Petrograd despatches headed "Bolsheviki Rule Can Last But Few Hours More," for two months, convicted themselves of not getting the truth. But the showing up of the papers was largely the work of President Wilson and other war forces. The President's message warmly commending the Russian leaders' handling of peace offers, printed on the first page, caught most of the papers with their insides full of editorials damning the Bolsheviki for pro-German crooks. Before this, the papers' own despatches from Brest-Litovsk had aroused suspicion that the American editorial writers were concerned not so much by the Bolshevik peace policy as by their confiscatory social program. At present these editorials are performing for the President the same service which they charged to Bryan in the Dumba affair, assuring Revolutionary Russia that Mr. Wilson's sympathetic words mean nothing.

Are the papers any more preoccupied with winning the war when they damn the I. W. W.? Suppose the great I. W. W. trial in Chicago next month shows not a scintilla of evidence against the 166 defendants, what will become of these columns of stories of a "gigantic I. W. W. anti-war conspiracy?" The country, especially the West, would not be surprised by an acquittal. What will the country think of the newspapers?

When President Wilson condemns the Bisbee deportations and editors go on applauding them, do newspapers really think they have the country with them? When Secretary Baker flays the perpetrators of the Bigelow flogging and half the papers fail to print his rebuke, isn't the attitude of these papers obvious? When newspapers bury little items of the Government's settling war strikes by granting union demands, while editorials go on calling strikers "traitors," the newspapers are simply publishing their own breakdown.

Those familiar with editors' offices know why, for example, not a paper in the East printed an elaborate communication to Congress from a lawyer, Amos Pinchot, who had collated big concerns' reports of war profits. He was called a pro-German pacifist and his researches suppressed. At least one paper in the East printed the Federal Income Tax Report showing an increase of 7,000 millionaires in the past fiscal year, but no person looked for editorial comment, least of all those who hold the theory that drastic

limitations of profits would do more than anything else to unite the country behind the war.

Here is what an experienced news editor said in admitting that he was glad to be doing his war service somewhere else than in his old office:

"I believed the war was of all times the hour for printing the facts. I printed the first stories of what American Socialists wanted to do at Stockholm simply as information. I nearly lost my job. I printed the first stories in any Eastern daily of the Mooney case, and it would have gone hard with me if the Petrograd riots over 'Muni' hadn't followed quick to justify my news judgment. When Trotzky was in America I was the first to send to get his story, but what was the use trying to print it?"

"Why aren't your American papers more taken up with the war?" was the astounding question put by the Ministry of Munitions Mission recently in this country. Nor did they seem to be satisfied when shown our best papers,—the entire front pages and half the insides monopolized by war news. The Britishers seemed to expect a change in the papers, an attitude of complete concern over but one thing, winning the war, no matter whose ideas went by the board. They seemed to expect the editors to be preoccupied with the search for the winning way, not a winning way which would save somebody's privileges.

These Munitions' officials—Kent, Garrod, Bailey and Asquith, were exceedingly interesting and important visitors. They spent ten weeks touring the country, yet hardly anything was published about them. This was partly through their preference for meeting audiences face to face, privately, without publicity, but more through their, and American officials', distrust of the American newspaper. Headed by Sir Stephenson Kent, a wealthy coal-operator, they came to talk to employers. They confined themselves to a recital of their experiences, sedulously avoiding to advise. Theirs was the employers' viewpoint and while they did talk to labor men their main concern was to be questioned by employers. To the last they refused absolutely to voice criticism of America, but it is no secret that the British Mission went home appalled at conditions in industry here. "Appalled" is the right word—their own. The appalling thing is the attitude of the American employer. The one concern of these men is to win the war.

To them it is mainly a question of man-power and its utilization. To them, as employers, the way out is to recognize organized labor and then reach agreements with the Unions. To them the attitude of their brother employers here is simply flabbergasting. They see we have the men, we have the plants, we have able directing heads. The difficulty? Faced with their silence a questioner rapped his brow inquiringly with his knuckles. The dignified Briton nodded emphatically.

"There are three sacrifices in war" said one of the Commissioners in a speech, "the sacrifice of men, the sacrifice of capital" ("which is nothing," Sir Stephenson interpolated, sotto voce), "and the sacrifice of prejudice."

American employers' prejudices bulked large to the Commissioners. They wouldn't say so. The farthest they went in comparisons was this from Garrod: "If one-eighth of the labor disturbances we have personally observed in two months in this country had happened in England in the past three years, England would now be suing for a disgraceful peace."

Now it is significant that while the Mission dared to recite its experience, so shocking to the American employers' idea, in private, neither the Mission nor its Washington sponsors dreamed of daring to attempt to utilize the American newspaper for publication of facts.

And yet inquiry among business men who heard the British recital might show them not so deaf to the visitors' "win-the-war" labor policy. The chiefs of big business may be adamant against such ideas, but the bulk of employers are less impervious. "I'd do it," said one, and another: "I'd give up practically all my little profit, but meanwhile the Government helps the big fellows pile up everything in sight. And if anyone starts to agitate conscription of wealth, or even real limitation of profits, just watch the newspapers jump him for a pro-German."

The American newspaper, like American industry, entered the war with its house not in order. Back in peace times editors were notorious for being too responsive to special interests and deaf to masses' wants. That newspapers are awaking to their responsibility is evident when one sends a trained investigator to get at the truth of the I. W. W. and the war, at the same time that another prints Trotzky's book on a

Bolshevik peace. People may cease to tolerate our present papers, veracious though their accounts may be of battle lines in France and accurate as may be their spellings in the long casualty lists. People will look to see in their papers a burning search to win this war, not just the way so far favored by the newspaper-owning classes. And the first big paper to limit the word "pro-German" to not over thirty repetitions in one edition and to agitate determinedly for winning, no matter whose fortunes or prejudices are sacrificed, will, for one thing, be rewarded by a jump in circulation, the like of which has never startled newspaperdom.

RELATED THINGS

The Kaiser's Ecclesiastical Steam Roller*

II

In the preceding article we saw that one of the important supports of junker power in Germany has been the strangle-hold of the aristocracy on the Church. Systematic efforts have been made to clamp the lid on theological professors whose investigations have undermined the psychology of religious authority. But the German government, being unable completely to steam-roll and crush thought, has given its divinity professors freedom of discussion and research within academic limits; while, at the same time, the liberty of the classroom and the lecture hall is denied to the pulpit.

In the meanwhile, religious life in Great Britain and America has been profoundly disturbed by the importation of the mysterious Higher Criticism of the radical German professors. The leading results and methods of the higher critics are now fully accepted and constantly used at such institutions as Oxford and Cambridge universities; the Free Church College of Glasgow; Harvard, Yale, and Chicago universities; the Union Theological Seminary of New York City; together with a host of other divinity schools and colleges in the leading denominations of America.

The religious and ecclesiastical situation of Christendom as a whole is vastly unsettled and

subject to cross currents of influence which confuse and obscure the spiritual life of the world. Nevertheless, a few outstanding facts are clear: (1) The old, aristocratic orthodoxy has been dynamited by German radicals. (2) These radicals have been steam-rolled and repressed by the conservative, junker authorities, who have prevented liberalism from functioning normally in the thoughts of the German masses, thus divorcing scholarship from life. (3) German biblical criticism has been destructive rather than constructive; minutely analytic rather than broadly synthetic; while one of its concomitants has been the rapid growth of atheism in the German socialistic working classes. (4) The alliance of organized religion with special privilege has been characteristic not only of Germany, but of Christendom as a whole. The external conditions of this alliance have not been uniform; but the underlying principle has been the same everywhere.

Bearing these facts in mind, we are prepared to realize that in spite of much progress at educational centers, the ecclesiastical systems of Great Britain and America remain pretty much as they were under the old "Church and State" regime, when the upper classes ruled with an iron hand. The acceptance of German criticism by our leading universities and divinity schools is merely an intellectual fact, having thus far no large and vital connection with our moral and spiritual life. Sixty per cent of our people no longer stand connected with organized religion. Most of us have religious instincts; but most of us are bored by the religion of ecclesiasticism. We were once a church-going nation. Our ancestors, even among the humbler classes, were interested in theological discussion. But God is no longer good form in ordinary conversation. The destruction of aristocratic orthodoxy in Great Britain and America has done little more than clear the ground for the future. Listen to Professor Vedder, of the Crozer Theological Seminary, a Baptist institution:

"For a generation now the Church has made no appreciable numerical advance, though it has poured out money like water, and spent effort more freely than in any previous generation of its history. The Church is just holding its own. It is marking time, not marching to conquest. It makes no successful appeal to the people at large. It must change its policy radically or lose

* The subject here briefly considered is taken up somewhat more fully by Mr. Wallis in a booklet entitled "The Struggle for Justice," and in systematic form in a larger work, "Sociological Study of the Bible."—Ed.

even more in the coming decades. The Church has been trying to ride two horses, and as democracy and aristocracy get farther apart every day, pretty soon something is going to drop."*

Professor Vedder's chair is that of Church History. He is thoroughly familiar with the movement of organized religion, from the times of the New Testament to the present day. If what he says is true, something radical is before us in the near future. His views are shared by such religious leaders as Bishop Charles D. Williams, of Michigan; Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, of the Rochester Theological Seminary; Professor Harry Ward, of the Boston University School of Theology; and a growing host of clergymen who are not hesitating to speak their minds clearly. The democracy of these men finds expression to a large degree through the results attained by the steam-rolled professors of Germany.

These results can be stated very briefly; but we must beg the reader's indulgence for another moment while we recall certain features of the older theology which is now passing away. Everybody remembers the ecclesiastical tradition about the struggle between the prophets of the one, true God and the worshippers of the false gods. Boys and girls in Sunday school have been taught with solemn unction that it is displeasing to God for them to bow down to idols which have no power of life or motion. This philosophical distinction between the real and the unreal was much emphasized by the old theology, according to which the true God undertook to destroy idolatry by passing down written directions from heaven, which, when expanded by inspired writers, became "The Bible," a collection of writings whose interpretation has been for ages the prerogative of the clerical profession, a body of teachers set over the people in aristocratic fashion.

According to modern critical investigators, the Hebrew prophets were not philosophical opponents of imaginary gods. They were primarily the flaming champions of the exploited masses against the evils of ancient junkerism. Their business was not to predict the future, but to preach to their contemporaries. The religion of the Bible, instead of being concerned mainly with "the other world," and with a pallid, pri-

vate morality, is a red-blooded gospel of *revolt* against economic evils that press heavily upon the children of men here and now, in this present life. The identification of the prophets as champions of the common people, however, is only one item in the critical interpretation of Hebrew history.

Another phase of criticism, whose democratic significance is not at first clear, is the destruction of the traditional idea of the Israelite "Conquest of Canaan." This orthodox tradition is embodied in the Book of Joshua, wherein the Israelites kill the Amorites and then divide the land by lot among the twelve tribes. On the contrary, if you turn to the Book of Judges (chapter 1), you find that nothing of the sort happens. The Israelite clans, coming in from the wilderness of Arabia, merely take the Canaanite *highlands*, leaving the earlier inhabitants, the Amorites, in possession of a score of strong, walled cities in the *lowlands*; and then later, the inter-marriage of these two Semitic peoples produces a new race, the "Hebrews," who, like all great nations, emerge from the melting pot. The Hebrews, as a rule, ignored their Amorite ancestry and mistakenly thought of themselves as line-bred descendants of the original Israelite tribes. "And the children of Israel dwelt among the . . . Amorites . . .; and they took their daughters to be their wives and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods [the Baals]." (Judges, chap. 3, vss. 5 and 6).

Hebrew history and religion were vigorously investigated by the scholars of Germany during the generation before the great war. While German professors have done good service in dynamiting the junker, orthodox view of the Bible, their work has not issued in constructively intelligible results. Being kept away from the common people by the ecclesiastical machinery of Kaiserism, German biblical professors have been academic, pedantic, and theoretical. Their effect has been negative; and their scholarship has not played a positive part in the average life of their people. And this is true of higher criticism wherever you follow it over the world; it has not made terms with economics and sociology.

The real meaning of the Hebrew warfare between Jehovah worship and Baal worship was that of a struggle between the aristocratic and democratic tendencies which the Hebrew people

* "The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Modern Democracy" (New York, Macmillan, pp. 17, 44, 45).

inherited from the Amorites and Israelites. Jehovah symbolized originally the customs and ideas prevailing among nomadic tribes, who think of the earth like air and sunshine as a gift of Deity, and who cannot conceive of private land monopoly. We find these ideas among all natural tribes the world over. But on the other hand, the Baal gods of the Amorites represented a settled, commercialistic civilization, and the adding of field to field in a system of private land monopoly which fastened an exploiting master class on the backs of the working people. When the Israelites and Amorites intermarried and produced the Hebrew nation, the ideas and usages and gods of the parent races went along together in the stream of national evolution, with the inevitable result of class conflict. The democratic ideas and customs associated with Jehovah worship antagonized the legal usages of Baalism. The Hebrew prophets came from the highlands, not from the walled cities; and their campaign against the economic and moral evils of Baalism gradually carried their thought of Deity up to a splendid elevation of ethical insight. The war between Jehovah and the Baal gods was an uprising of the common people against Big Business and high living cost; while the overthrow of idolatry was the first great democratic victory in the history of mankind.

No sooner was this brilliant outcome achieved, however, than the worship of the One God was taken in charge by junker ecclesiasticism which, except for short intervals, has maintained its grip on religious machinery from ancient times down to the present day. The prophet Jeremiah's denunciation of the Hebrew church has been more or less true of ecclesiastical organizations ever since: "The priests said not, Where is Jehovah? And they that handle the law knew me not. The rulers also transgressed against me; and the prophets prophesied by Baal" (Jeremiah, chap. 2, vs. 8).

Hebrew religious evolution has never been clearly explained by German investigators. The problem is, of course, extremely complex, being at once historical, sociological, ethical, philosophical, psychological, and spiritual. It stands at the very basis of our civilization, for people are incurably religious. And liberals who avoid the subject are, in reality, playing into the hands of standpatism and special privilege.

The Hebrew prophets found God in the principle of justice which underlies and conditions human society, but which is so largely ignored by human laws. "Clouds and darkness are round about him; but justice and righteousness are the habitation of his throne." The religious life of Christendom is gradually coming back to the logic of its origin. Junkerism fails to crush the human spirit. The steam roller of special privilege collides with powerful ideas which block its path. Religion moves into a new epoch through the flames of world-war.

LOUIS WALLIS.

Across the River

We had crossed the river for an idle Sunday morning excursion to the great army transport docks. We found the water-front street wind-swept and deserted except for three or four sentries with fixed bayonets, patrolling the side nearest the docks or standing guard at the wickets where, in an earlier age, untold thousands had passed through on their way to summer holidays in the Alps or along the Rhine. Over the roofs of the warehouses that hid the water rose just the tops of the three huge funnels of a great ship. That was all we could see, except for row after row of motor trucks in battleship gray just within the iron palings between the sidewalk and the dockyard. It was all lonely and desolate and bitterly cold. We passed on to the ferry slip, just beyond the docks. A warehouse flanked and hid the space where the huge funnels alone betrayed the ship's presence, and we walked onto the upper deck of the homely little ferry boat still regretting that it was an off day and no troops moving. Then we moved out into the river, and rounded the end of the nearest pier. There just before us loomed the stern and port side of the world's greatest ship. She was brilliantly and weirdly camouflaged from the water line to her funnels. And almost at once we saw that all the space above her many decks was a solid mass of khaki brown. There was no movement,—they were packed too closely,—and no sound that reached us. They stood there silently,—ten thousand boys in khaki, strangely dwarfed by the hugeness of the great ship. Smoke came from her forward funnel, and a tug stood by under her stern. That was all. The little knot of passengers on the deck of the ferry

stood and stared. There were no exclamations, there was not even a wave of the hand in greeting and farewell. We stood and stared until the brown khaki lines faded into the huge outline of the ship.

Fifteen minutes later we entered the family hotel where an elderly maiden lady daily complains that the toast is burned.

CORRESPONDENCE

Real Estate Income

To the Editor of **THE PUBLIC**:

THE PUBLIC has been, until recently, a stranger to me but is fast becoming a valued friend; and yet its principal doctrine is not convincing.

Failure to appreciate the value of singletax may be due to ignorance but not to fear of disadvantageous personal consequences, for a liberal-minded person strives to change the present social system that he is fortunately enjoying for the sake of more general prosperity in the future, in spite of the fact that almost all reforms may reduce the comforts of those who are privileged even if only in a moderate degree.

You criticize Mr. McGuire for arguing in a circle about taxes and substitute theories of your own; but real estate refuses to follow theories. Something unforeseen often interferes. In New York City, real estate followed the rules almost continuously until 1907, when the excessive burdens put upon it and the speculation to which it was subjected upset all theories and started this usually dependable commodity upon a wild and unprecedented career. As taxes increased, rents decreased; as new buildings were erected, land value decreased; well established neighborhoods were deserted and the market for real estate disappeared; certain sections of the city enjoyed an unearned increment of minus thirty per cent in ten years.

The predicted boom along the subway and near the Pennsylvania terminal did not materialize; the steady increase changed into a decline. The total assessed value of Manhattan real estate in 1917, including all new buildings, was less than in the previous year—the first instance on record.

One of the unforeseen causes of this upheaval was the unhealthy practice of buying real estate solely for the purpose of resale regardless of its income producing ability.

On Long Island, taxes on a certain farm have increased 700 per cent in the past thirty years, while the rent remains the same. It is now in the market, 400 acres of cleared land for \$250 a year, or less than half the taxes. You may say that it is not properly improved. Well, the owners of the adjoining 8,000 acres have developed their land, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, but, after ten years, are unable to obtain enough to pay one-fifth of the taxes. Other

land, covered with scrub oak, within thirty miles of Manhattan is for sale at \$5 a lot and back taxes.

You may say that these are exceptional instances and that the general experience over a number of years must be considered. True, but hundreds of owners of New York City real estate would welcome municipal ownership of their property with compensation based upon the cost to them twenty-five years ago, and their number would probably include the well-known operator who asserted in about 1906 that New York realty netted twenty-seven per cent.

You remark: "Mr. McGuire is right in saying the heavy tax on improvements discourages the erection of needed buildings." As a practical matter, the amount of the tax is a trivial deterrent compared to the excessive cost of material and labor, the fear of departmental orders, the difficulty and cost of financing the operation and inability to market the completed structure.

All these difficulties may be explained by your concluding paragraphs which show the distinction between the interests of the land owners and the people in general. "If he is guided by expediency, he will favor or oppose the tax on buildings according as he does or does not own land." In other words, you admit that the land owner is better off without singletax. That is of slight consequence provided the community is benefited, but are you sure that such will be the result of shifting all the tax upon land only?

Is it not true that land must produce a reasonable income to make it attractive to private owners, and if it does not, the demand will fall off and the price drop to such an extent that it cannot afford to pay the needed tax? In what way will singletax be superior to public ownership?

WILLIAM FLOYD.

New York.

Post Office and People

To the Editor of **THE PUBLIC**:

I have found awaiting my return to New York a copy of your issue of February 16th, containing the article signed by Perley Doe, replying to my article of December 21st exposing the absurdities and iniquities of the postal zone law passed by Congress.

Mr. Doe nowhere attempted to argue postal principles and the postal function in relation to this nation, and to which my article was chiefly devoted. In my article, however, I utilized as an illustration of postal guesswork and absurdity the fact that the Wells-Fargo Express Company would collect, ship and deliver at my door farm produce, from any zone, at from 20 to 35 per cent cheaper than the Post Office would charge for a similar quantity of neat, clean, easily-handled periodicals of high educational and economic importance to this nation. This was the only point to which Mr. Doe devoted himself.

Mr. Doe admits that the Express Company will deliver 15 pounds cheaper than the Post Office will, but explains that it is one package and goes to one address,

whereas 15 pounds of periodicals would be split up into many addresses. The point, however, is this: That a private enterprise, frankly adventuring for profit, is able to deliver packages at a lesser rate than that proposed in the second-class postage amendment is admitted by him; and a hair-line distinction drawn between bulk and piece delivery. The Wells-Fargo Express Company will collect from the shipper, give a receipt, make out counter-receipts, way-bills, check and counter-check its package in and out of wagons and express cars at every point of transfer. They must cover in their charge taxes, insurance, payment for shipments strayed or stolen, registry and special delivery—things which the Post Office never undertakes in periodical mail handling. To put it in another form, the Wells-Fargo as merely one portion of its service gives a service comparable to registry and special delivery of a letter by the Post Office, for which the Post Office charges 18 cents over and above any other charge. Moreover, the Wells-Fargo will drive long distances from one delivery to the next, while the Post Office delivery is from door to door—and in the case of small towns the customer goes and takes it from the Post Office himself.

Mr. Doe seems to be further, in his manner of computing costs, under the misapprehension that newspapers and periodicals are handled by the Post Office in exactly the same way that first-class mail is handled, i. e., that the Post Office collects it and handles it from the publisher's door to the reader's door.

This is not the case! Publishers deliver periodicals to the Post Office, already sacked and routed for shipment, and in very many cases *routed, sorted and packed to the car*; and the first act of the Post Office is merely to seal the car. Furthermore, the Wells-Fargo ships by express in express cars; periodicals are shipped in freight cars by the Post Office.

The question of figures which your correspondent raises has nothing at all to do with principles of postal administration or social function; but the figures on which he bases his arguments have already been analyzed and their absurdities exposed. This was done by Congressman Steenerson of Minnesota, last year, who reduced these cost figures to an absurdity insofar as they may be used to apply to current costs. *The only figures of costs of the several classes of mail matter that have been even approximately correct, are those based on the special weighings and counting of pieces in 1907.* The figures reported then were, for first class mail, 50 cents per pound; second-class mail, 9 cents per pound; fourth-class mail, 12 cents per pound; franked mail, 11 cents; penalty mail, 12 cents, and foreign mails, 11 cents per pound.

Applying these figures to the several classes of mail matter carried in the Post Office in 1916, it is found that if the cost figures be correct, the department must have spent \$590,500,000. *As a matter of fact, it spent only \$306,000,000.*

And the Hughes Postal Commission, appointed later, also showed that the second-class cost estimate was too high.

But the principles of postal function in relation to

this nation is the real basis for rates. For example, *if cost of service is all-determinative* in fixing postal charges—as seems to be the idea of the proponents of this 50 to 900 per cent periodical and newspaper postage increase law with its clumsy "zone" scheme—then all other classes of mail matter must be readjusted to coincide with that purpose; unprofitable routes eliminated; rural free delivery abandoned; franking privileges abolished; the charges for local delivery in great cities like New York drastically reduced.

No law more destructive of the basic interests of our national development and progress could be enacted than one which attempts a censorship or limitation of newspaper and periodical circulation.

CHARLES JOHNSON POST.

Insurance or Pensions

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The comments which R. G. Van Nuys makes in your issue of February 23, on "Insurance or Pensions" appear to me to show some misunderstanding. In speaking of tontines he says, "You know there cannot be large profits without proportional losses to the less fortunate," and that the tontine "is purely a lottery and can only result in still further enriching the more fortunate at the expense of the less fortunate." As to losses, he fails to consider that a man can not carry his money with him past the grave. If to leave his money behind him when he dies be a loss to him it is not due to any method of investment, and in this particular case could not be charged to the tontine. A man invests money for one of three purposes; he lays it away temporarily to draw it out later and spend it, he lays it away to use the interest on it alone while he lives and leave the principal to his heirs, or he insures his life for the benefit of a survivor. In the first case he may calculate his length of life erroneously, and either not spend all he has laid by or may live beyond the period when he has spent it. If he lives after having spent his money he becomes a pauper; otherwise he leaves something to his heirs, and his investment falls into one of the other categories named. No further attention need be paid to the first category.

The profits which come to the survivors in a tontine come from a source which meets with no loss, that is, from a fund for which the former owners have no use. Large profits may come to the survivors; no loss to those who created the fund.

The tontine is not in any sense a lottery, any more than life insurance is a lottery. I have paid out for life insurance more than the returns will be to my beneficiary. That might be reckoned as a loss. It may not be presumed that the payment of premiums has prolonged my life, but I have earned in one year what premiums have not cost me in ten years. Therefore I have gained by living, even though it has resulted in costing me more than if I had withheld the premiums and had invested them.

If one think of himself alone, he can get more income out of a tontine investment, provided he live, than out of any other, and with no loss to any one else

who can use money. If he think of his dependents or those whom he would benefit, he can provide for them at less expense for the benefit conferred by the tontine method than by any other. He has no interest in providing them with money after they are dead, so he need not concern himself with the disposition of the funds after that event. Whether for his own use or theirs, the income increases when it is most needed, that is, when earning power of self diminishes.

The tontine was planned originally to raise public money, but as a beneficent institution, to allay poverty and prevent pauperism, there is no system superior to it.

I refer to your editorial in the issue of February 8.

B. PICKMAN MANN.

Washington, D. C.

“Capital”

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The attempt of your correspondent Mr. Kaufman to reconcile the socialist and singletax positions is interesting but not convincing. No socialist would deny that he used the word “capital” in the sense “monopolized means of production.” That is just what he does mean. He differs from the singletaxer in asserting that land is not the only “means of production” capable of monopolization. The same property adheres to buildings, machinery, and other forms of “capital” in the strict sense of the word. The fact arises from the interest which the owner has in limiting production, thereby creating an artificial scarcity, elevating prices on one hand, and depressing wages on the other. In the face of this tendency, competition, legislation, and other cure-alls fail completely. The trust is the logical consequence of private ownership of capital, even when entirely dissociated from land-ownership. Artificial valuation or “water” is its natural accompaniment. It is just as truly “monopoly value” as is land-rental.

In short, land-monopoly, to the socialist, is only one phase of a more general phenomenon. I think if Mr. Kaufman would read Marx more thoroughly, he will find that idea developed.

FREDERICK C. THORN.

Trenton, N. J.

Taxes on Grazing Land

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The perplexity of your correspondent Mr. Earl Black of New Mexico, as expressed in your issue of March 2, seems to turn upon the assumption that the government grazing land he refers to has no value, and that therefore the abolition of taxes on live stock would put the cattle companies who use it at an advantage as compared with the homestead-owners in the State. May I point out that the taxes these cattle companies now pay on their stock represent in reality the advantage of location, otherwise the companies might as profitably graze their cattle on some of the fertile but valueless mountain slopes that lie out of proximity to markets.

Under the system of taxing land-values only, the tax on live stock will certainly be abolished, but the cattle companies, though not owning the land, would be charged for the advantage of location according to the same standard of valuation as that by which the homestead-owners' taxes are measured. In the one case it might be called ground rent, and in the other a tax, but the difference is only verbal. No unfair advantage need accrue to occupiers of Government land under singletax conditions, nor would private land-owners stand at any disadvantage. Both would contribute to the public income proportionally to the value of the position occupied, and both would be held exempt from taxes on the product of their own labor or enterprise.

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

Boston, Mass.

State Bank Currency

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In THE PUBLIC, February 23, 1918, on page 234, second column, I find this statement: “There is no law forbidding the issue of currency by State banks.” The Constitution of the United States specifically states, “Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures.” The Constitution does not even provide for Congress to enact any law providing for the United States Government to issue paper currency nor for any National bank to do so, and where Congress ever got authority to authorize national banks to issue their own currency I have never been able to find out.

The Constitution plainly states “No State shall coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.” So it does not seem that any State bank can be given authority to issue bank notes.

(Senator) S. J. HARPER.

Winnfield, La.

The Law of Human Progress

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Can you not and will you not give me and other subscribers to THE PUBLIC the benefit of your trained analysis in differentiating, from the mass of facts given in The Law of Human Progress, the concrete facts which check and have checked the full operation of that law? Private ownership of transportation facilities, private ownership of the coal mines may be two of such concrete facts but, if I am right thus far, will you not please name definitely and concretely the whole brood of thieves, that they may be seen by the ordinary mind and fully comprehended without the months of boiling down necessary to the fair comprehension of The Law of Human Progress. It seems to me that I want the *obstacles* to human progress gathered and very briefly named, so that eyesight may assist in comprehending them.

The Remedy is easily comprehended, viz.: "Equality in Association." Definitely again what are our *inequalities* in Association? Yours truly, hoping for a very brief statement of the names of our common enemies.

A. P. POTTER.

Syracuse, N. Y.

Seeing the Other Side

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Gerald Stanley Lee in "The Air Line to Liberty" says: "If all the people of America who read the paper they like would suddenly begin to-morrow reading the papers of the people who disagree with them, the country would soon be reeking with thinkers, with mixers, and with men who do things for a nation, and who know how to act together." Unhappily, even like some singletaxers, the moment a man sees anything he disagrees with in "his" paper, he wants to stop his subscription.

The Air Line to Liberty would be a great book—if it were not so big. It has ideas enough for a hundred pages, spread over 370 pages.

BOLTON HALL.

New York.

BOOKS

American Politics

An Introduction to Political Parties and Practical Politics. by P. Orman Ray. Published by Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y. Price \$1.50.

Although intended for use in the college classroom, this book would be useful to every voter or prospective voter. It gives the reader a comprehensive view of political conditions in the United States, and makes possible intelligent participation in political struggles. All branches of its subject are discussed impartially.

Recent platforms of great and minor political parties are reproduced in parallel columns, their differences and agreements made plain, and the student is left to form his own opinion as to which one has made out the best case. Brief accounts are given of the movements for civil service reform, short ballot, initiative, referendum, recall, and other ideas. Arguments pro and con are fairly presented. The practical working of legislative bodies is described as are also prevalent methods in political campaigns. The methods of political bosses and their machines are laid bare. In this particular, one point may not have been made clear. The student is informed that public service corporations find it to their advantage to go into partnership with political rings of the dominant parties. That is true to the extent that any business man may be said to have formed a partnership with an agent he hires. But it would be well for the reader to understand that without these special interests there would be as little pos-

sibility for a political ring to exist as there would be for an insurance agent without an insurance company.

Remedies for legislative evils are discussed, and the work of such organizations as the National Voters League is described. The education of the attentive reader in political science may be considered well advanced upon finishing Professor Ray's volume. If it should be supplemented by as accurate an understanding of economic science, good citizenship will be stimulated to the extent that is possible to knowledge alone.

Outgrowing Legal Restrictions

American City Progress and the Law. By Howard Lee McBain. Published by Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1918. Price \$1.50.

The book contains the substance of a series of lectures delivered upon the Hewitt Foundation at Cooper Union. It deals with certain important rules of law that are involved in some of the forward-looking movements in American cities. For, as the author says: "Under our constitutional system nearly every so-called reform movement must reckon with the law; and municipal reforms are especially liable to be called to this reckoning."

Within the comparatively restricted space of 270 pages Professor McBain has condensed the more vital court findings of the law's bearing upon municipal progress in the several states. It is easy to see, as one follows the story, why the reformer is impatient and indignant at the legal restrictions that prevent him from doing the obviously good; but one sees also in the light of past municipal misgovernment why the conservative clings so tenaciously to the legal restraints. One has only to recall the scandals accompanying the speculative railroad building era when rival cities bonded themselves to subsidize the roads that would come their way, to realize how much mischief can flow from a little liberty.

The abuse of power, however, does not blind the author to its use. For, though conceding that there are instances in which cities have been protected against themselves by state legislatures, he insists "the homely fact is that while in the fluxes of our politics state governments are sometimes superior to city governments in standards of civic righteousness and ability, they are also sometimes grossly inferior in these standards." That the author's opinion is coming to be the prevailing opinion can be inferred from the general tendency toward the principle of home-rule. One-fourth of the States have by constitutional provision already conferred upon some or all of their cities the power to frame and adopt their own charters.

It is when one realizes that democracy is an ideal toward which man aspires, rather than a fixed interpretation of principles, that the advantages of the federal form of government are most apparent. In a country of such extent as the United States, and containing such diverse peoples and conditions, progress would be sorely hampered if dependent upon the conversion of a central legislative body, such as the British Parliament.

But with forty-eight law-making bodies and an equal number of independent courts to interpret their acts, it is possible to try out all human vagaries without in any way interrupting the general tenor of the national way.

The book is timely. The question of what a city may or may not do in controlling social and economic activities is giving way to what must be done. Whether or not cities may abate the smoke nuisance, regulate the height of buildings and lay off the various activities into zones have become commonplace questions. Conservative judges here and there may still hesitate to give the law a liberal interpretation, but the tendency is in that direction. The fact that writers like Professor McBain include in a chapter on city planning an exposition of the question of excess condemnation shows his appreciation of the deeper phases involved. The insistence with which real estate owners have limited municipal governments to acquiring only the land actually used in making improvements, thus preventing the public from sharing in the values created by the improvements, is at last seriously questioned. Professor McBain is quite clear in wishing the city to have the right to condemn sufficient land, in addition to what is immediately needed, to enable it, by subsequent sale, to reap the gain that heretofore has gone only to the neighboring land owners. It will occur to some that adoption of the principle of land value taxation would automatically meet the requirement of condemnation for public improvements and excess condemnation, too.

City progress and the law appear to be a valuable contribution to a very important subject now in the public mind. And the copious references and citations, together with a generous index, should make it a ready aid to those interested in city progress.

Protecting Women and Children

Laws Affecting Women and Children in the Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States. By Annie G. Porritt. Published by the National Woman Suffrage Publishing Co., New York, 1917. Price \$1.50.

A compilation of the laws affecting women and children in the United States for the purpose of showing how much better the suffrage States have done than the non-suffrage may not appeal to others than suffrage enthusiasts; but a compilation of such laws in the several States for the purpose of showing exactly what has been done in this field will prove a valuable reference book. When it is realized that of the 7,678,578 persons at work in manufacturing industries 72,364 are boys and girls under 16 years of age, and 1,290,389 are women and girls over 16, the importance of protective legislation will be appreciated. Graphic indeed is the circular chart in the front of the book showing in condensed form what the various States have done toward safeguarding working women and children. It is in this chart where the eye catches the whole forty-eight States at once that the advance of the suffrage over the non-suffrage States is apparent. There are exceptions, however. Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, and Wisconsin make as credit-

able a showing in this respect as some of the suffrage States.

It is encouraging to note also that States that have been notoriously backward in protecting women and children in industry are now giving close attention to the problem. This indicates that public opinion is so definite that politicians and legislators can no longer ignore the subject. And since the problem is in process of solution, this book will serve as an arsenal of facts for those who are striving to complete the work of safeguarding women and children.

The Khaki Shroud

*(On reading of the burial of the Americans from the
Tuscania)*

For these our sons, our dearest and our best,
By far more fitting was that khaki shroud
Than any robe of state bearing the proud
Insignia of rank or splendid crest
Hard won by kingly deeds. At no behest
Of kings did these go forth; for them no loud
Acclaim of chanting choirs; no royal crowd
With wreaths of bay enhance their final rest.
Beneath our flag, dear gift of Scotland's heart,
Gathered the humble of the earth to mourn;
They wept as mothers weep when last they part
With those who seek the undiscovered bourne.
For these our sons who died that men may live
No burial like this could princes give!

CARROLL PEABODY.

Prayer

Lord God of revolution, hear!
The heavens quake afar,
And earth gives back in trembling fear
The thunders of thy car.
The storm that with thy advent broke
Hath quelled the tyrant's might
And loosed the ancient galling yoke
Of shackled Muscovite.

Long, long, in trackless midnight driv'n,
Thy people struggled on,
And vainly sought, through clouds unriv'n
The first pale star of dawn.
No guiding ray of noontide danced
Athwart their sombre path,
Till from thy wingèd chariot glanced
The lightnings of thy wrath.

Yon vivid bolt that cleaves the gloom,
Turn not against thine Own!
'Twas forged to seal Oppression's doom,
Strike that and that alone!
Oh Lord, transmute those deadly rays,
Enkindled by thine ire,
And let them burn through endless days
As Freedom's beacon fire!

ZOE HARTMAN.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending March 12

Congressional Doings

The House passed by a vote on March 6 the bill declaring as conspiracies strikes obstructing war industries. Imprisonment up to thirty years and fines up to \$10,000 are the penalties. Before passage an amendment was adopted exempting from the penalty strikes "to raise wages or better working conditions." The Senate passed on March 7 the War Finance Bill by a vote of 74 to 3. This creates a corporation of five men to be appointed by the President, who will control a fund of \$500,000,000 for loans to war industries. The three Senators opposed were Harding of Ohio, Hardwick of Georgia and Sherman of Illinois. [See current volume, page 313.]

* *

The House and Senate Conference Committee on the railroad control bill compromised on twenty-one months as the maximum period after the war for return of the railroads to their owners, and gave the President power to initiate rates subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Wage Arbitration Hearing Closed

Hearings in the wage arbitration of the meat packing industry before Judge Alschuler at Chicago came to an end on March 7. Frank P. Walsh, in closing the case for the men, declared that if, after six months' trial, the eight-hour day should prove a failure he would be the first to ask a readjustment. Judge Alschuler has taken the whole matter under advisement. [See current volume, page 314.]

National and Prohibition Parties

The Prohibition Party convention at Chicago on March 5 voted on the question of union with the new National party. The result was 142 in favor to 105 against. Since the proposition required a two-thirds vote for adoption, it failed. Thereupon, the majority bolted and joined the National party convention on the following day. Besides the Prohibitionists this party is composed of Progressive partyites, Socialists and Singletaxers. A permanent platform was agreed upon based on the tentative platform drawn by the first party convention last October. As drawn, the final platform demands national and State prohibition, labor legislation, land value taxation, government ownership, abolition of the postal censorship, government inspection and regulation measures demanded by the farmers, prison reform, protection of Negroes in their rights as citizens and voters, woman suffrage, initiative, referendum, recall, proportional representation and other democratic reforms. Taxation measures relating to land, which are advocated, are these: "The gradual and progressive transfer of taxes from improvements and all products of labor to land values, so as to break up land monopoly and to increase opportunities for production." And, under the classification of assistance to farmers, "Un-

taxing all improvements, crops, stock, and all farm equipment, and progressive taxation of large holdings of farm land, with a minimum exemption for homesteads, so as to render it unprofitable to hold large tracts of arable lands idle, and to force them into productive use."

The Negro plank states, "We demand enforcement of the laws which give the right to vote to American citizens of Negro descent, and, in order that they and others may be fitted to vote intelligently, we advocate federal aid to common school education, to be distributed among sections in proportion to the amount of illiteracy." This was not in the original tentative platform.

* *

A correspondent writes:

The second national conference of the National party at Chicago was more largely and widely attended than the first one, held last October. It was marked by a growing harmony of purpose among its various elements, and by a closer merger with the Prohibition party workers. At the present moment, it stands for two salient things: absolute loyalty to the United States Government in the prosecution of the democratic war aims outlined by the President; and the propaganda of industrial, political and international democracy as the rational basis for war-time psychology and the foundation of social reconstruction after the war. No candidates for public office were named, and up to this time the party is political only by profession and anticipation. In effect thus far, it is a force—and a growing force—for the propaganda of loyal radicalism. It is organizing throughout the country in such fashion as to open a channel for the political operation of those onward moving forces which are obstructed by the machinery of the old parties.

The platform adopted by the convention substantially reaffirms the doctrines of the platform promulgated last October. The various planks were gone over carefully in committee, and then item by item on the floor of the convention. The demands for public ownership of the railroads and all public utilities were made more definite and explicit. The prohibition and woman suffrage planks were again emphasized as an element of advancing democracy. The plank for untaxing improvements and heavily increasing the taxation of land values, which caused a storm in the first conference, was quietly passed without objection, showing the educational effect of the large amount of land value tax matter which has gone out broadcast through National party channels since last October.

Headquarters of the party will be continued at the Masonic Temple, Chicago, in charge of the new chairman and organizer, David Coates, who will probably issue a bulletin. Mr. Coates reports a steadily increasing stream of applications for membership and of requests for printed matter relative to the demands and aims of the new party.

Radical Reforms in North Dakota

Eleven amendments to the Constitution of North Dakota are to be submitted by initiative petition by the Farmers' Nonpartisan League. Four of these make easier future amendments by reducing the number of voters required for the Constitutional initiative to 20,000, and for the referendum to 7,000. A majority of the Legislature is to be empowered to submit amendments also. At present two successive Legislatures must pass thereon. Another proposed amendment empowers the Legislature to exempt personal property from taxation entirely. At present it has the right to tax different classes of property at different rates. Another amendment authorizes a state bail insurance fund through a land tax. Other propositions empower the state to issue bonds for building, acquirement and operation of various kinds of public utilities and industries, or to make internal improvements of any kind.

New York Labor for Land Value Taxation

The Labor League of New York City organized by local leaders to work in harmony with the city administration adopted a program of action on February 8. This urges that the city lay in supplies of fuel, ice and milk for sale to consumers, municipally supported vacation camps for children, a municipal board for conciliation of strikes, eviction of the New York Central railroad from Riverside Drive and Eleventh avenue, and substitution of municipally owned terminals open to all railroads, legislation enabling the city to buy unused land in the city to transform into farms and homes, changing into summer resorts with municipally owned ferries of Blackwells Island and Governors Island, and "a tax on land values not only as a war emergency measure, but also for a permanent means of raising revenue." The American Alliance of Labor and Democracy is endorsed, and an increase in income and inheritance taxes is demanded.

Russia

Leon Trotzky, Bolshevik Foreign Minister, it is reported, has been dismissed by Premier Lenine because of a quarrel over the German peace terms. Trotzky held that a treaty signed under duress was not binding, and insisted that Russia should resist. Lenine contended that the treaty should be ratified for the purpose of delay. No action has been taken to fill the place of Trotzky, who will serve till after the Moscow Conference. Ensign Krylenko, commander-in-chief of the Russian armies, is said to have been removed. Peace has been concluded between Russia and Roumania. The treaty provides that Roumania is to evacuate all Bessarabia, the evacuated places to be occupied permanently by Russian troops. Local authority is to be invested in local self-governing bodies. Russian prisoners and all those arrested for political purposes are to be released.

* *

Much interest centers in the meeting of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, at Moscow, on the 12th, which will pass upon the German peace terms. Presi-

dent Wilson has sent to the Congress the following message:

May I not take advantage of the meeting of the Congress of the Soviets to express the sincere sympathy which the people of the United States feel for the Russian people at this moment when the German power has been thrust in to interrupt and turn back the whole struggle for freedom and substitute the wishes of Germany for the purpose of the people of Russia.

Although the government of the United States is, unhappily, not now in a position to render the direct and effective aid it would wish to render, I beg to assure the people of Russia through the Congress, that it will avail itself of every opportunity to secure for Russia once more complete sovereignty and independence in her own affairs and full restoration to her great role in the life of Europe and the modern world.

The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves forever from autocratic government and become the masters of their own life.

Woodrow Wilson.

[See current volume, page 314.]

Prussian Electoral Reform

Comments of the German papers on the new Prussian franchise proposed by the Franchise Committee of the Diet indicate much disappointment among radicals. Full details of the bill are not yet at hand, but the one feature of plural voting, which is retained in the bill, is sufficient to arouse the indignant protests of those who accepted at its face value the manifesto issued last July by the Kaiser promising universal and equal suffrage. The *Vorwaerts* calls it a mockery, and says:

For decades the Prussian people have been forced to endure the shame of the three-class electoral system. Before the war, and also since the beginning of the war, they have fought untiringly for a free franchise. And not without success. The Crown has solemnly promised the equal, direct and secret ballot. The Government is bound by this promise. And at this stage the enemies of the franchise resort to means which clearly show that not the viewpoint of right, but only that of might concerns them.

European War

Germany continues her military movements in Russia and in Finland. Jamburg, 68 miles from Petrograd, was taken, but afterwards reported reoccupied by the Russian troops. Trench raiding on the western front is increasing in frequency and severity. It has been particularly severe on the American sector, near Toul. Heavy attacks have been made also on the British position along the Menin road, and upon the Belgians, but in all cases the attacking forces were driven off. The British report further advances in Palestine and in Mesopotamia. [See current volume, page 315.]

No decision has been announced regarding the proposal that Japan enter eastern Siberia. The Allied governments favor the move, but the American government does not. It is now reported that China will co-operate if Japan takes action.

* *

Germany has apparently written her own terms into the peace treaties of Russia, Roumania and Ukrania. The terms exacted of Roumania are the cession to the Central Powers of the Province of Dobrudja as far as the Danube. Roumania is to be given a trade route to the Black Sea by the way of Constanza. The Roumanian government undertakes to support with all its strength the transport of troops of the Central Powers through Moldavia and Bessarabia to Odessa.

* *

Lithuania, which was to have been recognized as an independent state, is in confusion over a new turn of affairs. The German Chancellor, in receiving a Lithuanian delegation, expressed the opinion that the people of that country are not ripe for independence. Germany has also aroused distrust among the Scandinavian countries by her conduct in Finland. The manner in which she has occupied the Aaland Islands off the eastern coast of Sweden, and the report that Prince Oscar, the fifth son of the Kaiser, is to be King of Finland, leads Scandinavians to think the Germans were in earnest when they threatened to turn the Baltic Sea into a German lake. The German press is heaping abuse upon Norway, Sweden and Denmark for failure to join the Central Powers. The same organs are boastful of the fact that the peace with Russia and Roumania gives Germany two roads to India without using the Bagdad route. One route lies through southern Russia, Transcaucasia and the Caspian Sea to Afghanistan, and the other crosses the Black Sea and northern Persia.

* *

Eighteen British merchantmen were sunk by mines or submarines during the week. Twelve were vessels of over 1,600 tons and six were under that tonnage. German airplane raids on London and Paris are again frequent, and are made by fleets of fifty to sixty planes. Most of the planes are driven back before reaching their destination; those that break through the defense do little damage.

* *

America's participation in the war is now assuming fuller proportions. No details are given out as to the movement of men, but they are understood to be going forward as fast as the ships can be had. A new call for 800,000 men is to be made this year. Troops and supplies, the War Department announces, are now going forward on time. Seventeen new steel ships were launched in February and twenty-three are expected in March. A constantly increasing number will take the water as the new yards get under way. The making of submarine chasers and "tanks," or armored cars and airplanes by the fabrication process is assuming large proportions, and will soon be able to meet the demand. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of

War, with a staff of seven persons, arrived in a French port on the 10th. His errand is announced as pertaining entirely to military efficiency. He met General Pershing and General Bliss in Paris on the 11th.

NOTES

—The British Commons has unanimously voted a credit of \$3,000,000,000. This raises the total of the credits voted since the war to \$34,210,000,000.

—The Superior Court of Indiana on March 8 held unconstitutional the State-wide Prohibition law enacted at the last session.

—The Texas Legislature ratified the Federal Prohibition amendment on March 4, thus making Texas the eighth State to take such action.

—Beginning with April 1 the National Fuel Administration has ordered a reduction of thirty cents in the price of anthracite, the reduction to remain in force until September 1.

—Geologists commissioned by the Rothschilds and the Queen of Holland have discovered extensive deposits of petroleum in the southeastern portion of the State of Vera Cruz, in the vicinity of Sotavento.

—James Malcolm, one time editor of the *National Single Taxer*, and one of the earliest of the advocates of the taxation of land values, is now editor of *The State Service*, published at Albany, N. Y., and devoted to the interests of the State.

—John E. Redmond, the Irish Nationalist leader, died in London on the 6th at the age of 67. Mr. Redmond, who was elected to Parliament at the age of 30, succeeded Charles S. Parnell as the leader of the Irish cause in 1891.

—Herman Kuehn, secretary and treasurer of the California "Great Adventure" movement, died at Los Angeles on March 6. Mr. Kuehn was well known among the radicals of the United States, especially in Chicago and Minneapolis.

—The number of men now under arms in the American army is given by Secretary Baker as 1,428,650, and the number of officers, 110,856. This is nearly six times the American army in the Spanish-American war, when the forces reached at their highest point, 272,000.

—America's independence of the German potash monopoly is forecast by new processes of producing potash from Chilean nitrates. Means of producing 240,000 tons a year are in sight, and it is expected that improvements in methods will raise this to 720,000 tons. Germany's total annual sales of potash to the world are given as 900,000 tons.

—Scarcity of soap and meagerness of fare in Belgium have caused outbreaks of scurvy in certain districts. Some communal administrations are making preparations to check the scourge by providing medicated baths for the victims. An epidemic of skin diseases is reported to be spreading through many parts of Germany.

—The Chinese Government is attempting to revise its tariff schedule. The present tariff, which was adopted in 1858 by agreement with the United States and certain other nations, fixed the rate at approximately 5 per cent on both imports and exports. Through a change in prices specific rates do not provide the 5 per cent. War conditions have made new demands, and the Allied Ministers in China have endorsed her request for a revision of the rates.

—Four initiative bills have been filed in the State of Washington by the Joint Legislative Committee of labor organizations, the State Grange, Farmers' Union and Direct Legislation League. One is to empower every county, city, town, township or post district to buy and sell farm products, manufacture flour and provide power, transportation and other facilities needed to carry out the work. Another limits the power of the courts in issuing injunctions. The third provides Presidential preference primaries and safeguards the rights of minority parties polling less than three per cent of the vote. The fourth establishes a universal eight hour day for all labor.

—Special elections to fill vacancies for Congress were held in four districts in New York City on March 5. All were won by the Democratic candidates by comparatively large majorities in a light vote. This was the first election in the city at which women voted. The total number of women registered was 35,205. Of these 31,958, or about 90 per cent, voted. The number of men who voted was 46,235, or 34 per cent of the number registered, which was 136,866. But since the men had registered last fall for the mayoralty election, while the women could register but recently for this special election in which there was little interest, the comparison of percentages is not held significant.

—The Mexican Government has issued a decree fixing taxes as follows on petroleum lands: First, on petroleum lands being developed by lessees under contracts made prior to May 1, 1917, 10 per cent of the annual rental up to 5 pesos per hectare [peso, \$0.498; hectare, 2.47 acres], 20 per cent of the annual rental from 5 pesos to 10 pesos per hectare, 50 per cent of

the annual rentals above 10 pesos per hectare, and 5 per cent of all royalties paid by the lessee to the lessor; second, on oil lands being developed by the owners of the land 5 pesos per hectare annually, and 5 per cent of the products annually; third, oil lands for which no rental is being paid are taxed 5 pesos per hectare annually, and oil land on which no royalties are being paid are taxed 5 per cent of the products annually. The American Government has asked for a reconsideration of the question on the ground that these taxes are confiscatory.

The Annual Woman's Number
of THE PUBLIC
will appear early in April

OUR REVOLUTION

Essays on Working-Class and International Revolution (1904-1917)

By LEON TROTZKY

Collected and Translated by

MOISSAYE J. OLGIN

Author of "The Soul of the Russian Revolution"

Just ready. \$1.25 net

THIS volume contains the one English translation of the non-technical portions of Trotzky's book, "Our Revolution," first published, in defiance of censorship, in Russia before the revolution, and immediately suppressed. It is the clearest exposition of Trotzky's views on revolution and re-organization after revolution. In addition there are translations of ten other significant essays, and a biography by Mr. Olgin.

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44 St.
New York

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

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

EDITORS:

MRS. JOSEPH FELLS 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.

BY LAJPAT RAI ENGLAND'S DEBT TO INDIA

An important work on Britain's fiscal policy in India.
Valuable to students of colonial government. \$2.00 net

B. W. HUEBSCH Publisher NEW YORK

THE TIME For Economic Readjustment

is at hand. The people of the United States, not a few private individuals, must draw the bulk of profits from all private monopoly—industrial, utilities, land, etc. This result can be accomplished in a safe and efficient manner—by limiting private fortunes so that the surplus or excess goes back to the nation. Excessive private fortunes are a menace to the nation. Read the facts and the remedy in

Standard Oil or The People AND Bankrupting a Great City

BY
HENRY H. KLEIN

Mr. Klein is First Deputy Commissioner of Accounts, New York City, and was special investigator for several official, state and municipal bodies

	Retail		Wholesale	
	Paper	Cloth	Paper	Cloth
Standard Oil or the People	25c	50c	18c	35c
Bankrupting a Great City	40c	75c	25c	50c

Mailed to any address.

Address: Tribune Building, New York City.

P

ublic Ownership of Public Utilities

The movement for the people to gain control of those activities that are natural monopolies, will be aided by the wide distribution of the best literature on the subject. In addition to the suggestions made below, the student is referred to several books by Frederic C. Howe, to "Social Problems" by Henry George (Chapter XVII), and to Mr. Crosby's "The Orthocratic State," all of which can be ordered from us.

Municipal Ownership.

Debaters' Handbook. Both sides presented. Cloth \$1.

Municipal Ownership.

By Carl D. Thompson. Cloth \$1.

The Telegraph Monopoly.

By Frank Parsons. Paper 25c. (We cannot afford to pay postage on these large paper-bound books—add 1c.)

The Railways, the Trusts and the People.

By Frank Parsons. Vol I, paper, 25c. Vol II, paper, 25c. (Add 15c. postage.)

The Public Book Department
122 E. 37th Street New York

Public Ownership League of America

Organized to secure the public ownership and operation of railroads and other public utilities and natural resources.

THIS League has available for free distribution a pamphlet containing highly interesting information derived from official reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, giving results of investigations concerning the inside finances and management of four great railroad systems under private ownership with a plea for actual government ownership as well as operation.

At no time in the history of the world has legislation of such colossal interest been considered as that now pending in Congress respecting the railroads, upon the just solution of which the future welfare of the American people will largely depend. The question of actual and permanent government ownership may be the issue in the coming campaign. It therefore becomes the duty of all citizens to inform themselves thoroughly on government ownership, and to this end the question should be studied and debated in colleges, schools and associations as well as by individuals.

The Public Ownership League of America has for its object the furthering, by every means in its power, the public ownership of all public utilities, both national and municipal, and solicits the opportunity to disseminate information.

Address **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP LEAGUE OF AMERICA**, ALBERT M. TODD, PRESIDENT, WESTORY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Joseph Fels

His Life Work
By Mary Fels

A story of one who had the true faith; of the brotherhood of man and the worth of man. *The table of contents to a sufficiently eloquent appeal to the liberal-minded: The Making of a Business Man; Social and Personal Life; The Situation in England; Farm Colonies; Why Small Holdings Fail; Political Interests; Home Colonization; The Methods of Monopoly; The Single Tax; The Contest with the Laissez Class; The Fels Fund Commission; Educational Experiments and Suffrage; Later Activities.*

Bound in cloth; price, postpaid, only \$1.00.

The Public Book Department
122 E. 37th Street New York

Commended by Bliss Perry, Wm. Lyon Phelps, Richard Le Gallienne
"A BRIEF GUIDE TO CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE"
by **A. Henry Schaefer**
of The De Witt Clinton High School
Address: 925 Whitehall Ave., N. Y. C. Price, 12c postpaid



OSCAR H. GEIGER

WHOLESALE FURRIER

6 WEST 37TH STREET
NEAR 5TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE
GREENEY 2678

NEW YORK

Bank Checks

*in special individual designs
printed from*

C E R O T Y P E S

in engraved style at lower cost than
by lithographing or other engraving
processes.

Special offer: Your engraved name
elegantly placed on end of your
bank's lithographed check, 500
checks, numbered and bound, for
\$3.00. Write for samples.

*You are invited to investigate
this process for letter heads,
cards, and other stationery forms.*

FRANK McLEES & BROS.

Engravers and Printers of Cerotypes
2 DUANE STREET NEW YORK

Pass It Along

After you have read this copy of
THE PUBLIC, please pass it on. We
will be glad to send you another copy,
if you keep a file.

On the back page there is a sugges-
tion that makes this easy: also, to call
attention to some special article or
editorial.

If half our readers follow this
suggestion, about 10,000 people who
would not see THE PUBLIC this week,
will see it.

DO YOU KNOW

That The Public is read by
19,000 discriminating readers—
enough to go a long way towards
making a success of any product
or book?

It will help your business to ad-
vertise in this or a larger space.

The Public's present low rates
increased April 1st.

Advertising Department
122 East 37th Street, New York

The Truth About The Bolsheviki

By Emma Goldman

A compelling analysis of the historic background and
aspirations of the Bolsheviki. Miss Gold-
man's last contribution before her departure for
Jefferson Prison to serve two years.

Price 10 cents

*Books and pamphlets by the fore-
most writers of all countries.
From the shelf and by mail order.*

MOTHER EARTH BOOK SHOP

4 Jones Street New York
Sixth Avenue off Fourth Street

A Remarkable List of Books

Our latest catalog of Books is just off the press.
Friends say that this little 32-page Book is the
most complete list of Books of its kind pub-
lished. A copy will be cheerfully mailed on request.

The Public Book Department
122 East 37th Street New York

Oratory

By John P. Algard

Authorities consider this book the best short
treatise on the subject. It is instructive and
inspiring. Cloth, postpaid, 50c.

The Public Book Dept. 122 E. 37th St., New York

LEARN Suggestive Therapeutics

A course of essentials which may be com-
pleted at home in 180 hours. Concise,
definite and practical. Well adapted for use of physicians.
For full particulars, address, Dept. M. 16, Weltmer Institute, Nevada, Mo

One of the by-products of the war is that it is playing glorious havoc with mental sterility in both sexes.

So far as woman is concerned, it has put her on the political map; it has lifted her clean out of the useful and interesting domestic-animal class, in which the old-style folk felt so strongly she belonged.

As the result of this new appreciation and realization, universal woman suffrage is coming. Since the war began three belligerent countries (Canada, Russia and Great Britain) and two neutrals (Iceland and Denmark) have given women the vote. This country will follow soon.

Lord Faber, director of the London & North Western Railway, said not long ago, that the railways in England "could not be run if the women had not come forward."

War's reaction on women themselves has necessarily been more marked than on men. More of them will in future discern the larger social problems back of their personal difficulties and will be ready and eager to grapple with them.

In this new deal, which is a square deal, THE PUBLIC can help the women of this country by being for them a weekly interpretive medium, and it wants to do it.

Next month, April, our circulation department will make a campaign to put 5,000 of the leading liberal women of the country on our subscription list. These subscriptions, in clubs of three, will be entered at a rate which does not exceed cost of production: three subscriptions, six months each, for two dollars. Single subscriptions, six months, \$1.

Every women's club should receive THE PUBLIC.

The coupon, used now, will be a coupon still. The thing is to get this April campaign started.

To get THE PUBLIC into the hands of intelligent and right-minded American women is one of the biggest things that can be done at the present moment for the advance of American citizenship and for the development of the international mind on the lines of President Wilson's idealism.

—Alice Thacher Post.

Washington, March 3, 1918

The Public,
122 E. 37th St.
New York

I enclose \$2. Please send THE PUBLIC for six months to the 3 new subscribers herewith.

Name

Address

Single Subscription, six months, \$1.