

of meanness with the most grasping of the Belgian and French peasants. Unfortunately, too, our land legislation permits and promotes such meanness.

If This is Sociology Give us Tiddledywinks

WE have just received a report of 87 pages of the Sagamore Sociological Conference, which met June 27, 28 and 29, last Summer, at Sagamore Beach, Mass.

The association has an imposing list of "Members and Friends." Its platform is printed in the report. Its most startlingly radical plank is as follows:

"In particular we advocate an expert study of the waste incident to unnecessary fatigue, and the proper and effective correlation of Federal, State and local employment agencies under national supervision, to the end that men and women may easily find opportunities for work."

The platform calls for "government aid in securing co-operation between producer and consumer and the elimination of multiple profits." The removal of obstacles to the more perfect co-operation of producer and consumer is not dwelt upon, and what "multiple profits" are, and how government is to eliminate them, is left to the imagination.

The discussion took a wide range. At times it airily overleapt the bounds of sociology and playfully dallied with such subjects as advertising, standardizing of prices, trade agreements, world politics, school kitchens, suffrage, journalism, woman suffrage, and the Re-Education of Crippled Soldiers through Simultaneous Cycle Motion Charts and Motion Models. This last subject is thrillingly interesting, and we can imagine how its discussion must have enlivened the otherwise dull proceedings of a Sociological Conference. Even the most serious subjects must be relieved by occasional lighter relaxations.

The only purely sociological point which might have given rise to some really vital discussion, was the statement of one of the speakers that this re-education must be done under military regulation and not offered but insisted upon—that is, forced upon the soldiers crippled in their country's service. That these cripples might have some claim upon the country they had defended, some rights which we ought to respect, and maybe some personal preference in the matter, seem never to have occurred to speaker or hearers.

And when the speaker, Frank B. Gilbreth, announced the third and last condition of his pet reform, the necessity of reserving certain jobs for these cripples, and putting them in these jobs on a non-competitive basis so far as uncrippled workers are concerned, he indicated about the first and only sociological fact which had even been so much as hinted at. But it passed harmlessly over the heads of the audience.

Yet here lay the possibilities of really profitable discussion. How comes it that putting men to work to produce wealth threatens the profitable occupations of men similarly engaged elsewhere? Is there indeed too much wealth? Must there be a fixed quantity of things

produced, lest the livings of men, their wage-earning abilities, be diminished? Is the purchasing power of those who buy these goods so exactly fixed that it cannot be increased? And if so, why? These questions, not propounded at this Conference, open up the "undiscovered country" of the sociologist, before the boundaries of which the members of this conference sat down to discuss the insignificant little problems which bear the same relation to sociology as time does to eternity.

Here is a sample of the discussions—it is a fair sample, too. Read, if you have the patience:

MRS. FREDERICK P. BAGLEY: I was going to ask if there has been any large mobilization of women to take the places of men in industry; and if so, what the attitude of the men has been in regard to women taking their places.

MISS NESTOR: No, there has not been yet. It is not necessary yet. But when it comes I think that the one thing we want to all insist upon—and I think the men feel it—is that we want to safeguard them and see that they receive equal pay for equal work.

MISS MARY C. CRAWFORD: Has there ever been any measurement of the effect upon the nerves of women of the noises in the factory?

MISS NESTOR: Not that I know of. You see, there are so many things that contribute to the strain that it is difficult to know which thing is the most injurious.

MRS. JUMP: I was wondering if Miss Nestor had suggestions to make as to popularizing domestic service. MISS NESTOR: If this were a woman's club I know that would have been the first question instead of the last, because that is one of the questions you always expect to have asked. I think that one of the things that has to come is that you have got to standardize the work so that the girl has some time to herself, so that she is not body and soul owned by this house where she is employed. Then I think we have got to get down to a regular hourly basis. I think that people have got to adjust their household affairs to that. When we get to that, we will then begin to meet the problem, and I don't think we will meet it until we get to that.

MR. CHARLES M. COX: Do you think that the strain and rush of our modern business life is accountable in some measure for the decreased attendance and interest in churches on Sunday?

MISS NESTOR: The churches ought to take more of an interest in what is going on in the other world and help us to meet some of the problems. If there could be a closer co-operation in that way, all the way through, it might help in the attendance as well as the interest in the church. There is the feeling among a certain group, not generally, that the church doesn't care much what is going on, and that there are certain things that they are concerned about.

MR. JOHN J. SULLIVAN: Couldn't the restrictions be placed equally on the employer and on the employees, that the employee should not be allowed to work over a certain number of hours?

MISS NESTOR: Well, the object of time and a half for overtime is to so tax the overtime that it will be so expensive as to discourage it. Now, that is the whole reason for charging the extra for overtime. So

far I think that all the union has been able to do is to fix a certain length of day and then say that all over that shall be paid for at this increased rate, so as to put a tax on it and make it expensive and discourage it. Now, I don't want anyone to work more than eight hours even at an increased rate.

What does it profit these men and women to meet year after year for such discussion? Why waste time that might more profitably be given to whist or euchre? Why not resolve the Sagamore Conference into a progressive Pinochle Party, for pinochle is a really noble and intellectual exercise compared with this sort of "sociology."

Let us suggest to members of coming Sagamore Conferences, if they are really interested in discussing anything, the following line of inquiry:

What is labor?

How does it produce wealth?

What does it produce wealth from?

What are the conditions under which it obtains access to the element from which it produces wealth?

Are there conditions of access to the element from which wealth is produced such as must result in low wages and inequitable distribution?

This offers a really profitable line of inquiry. For the world is really a serious world. There are great problems pressing upon us. It ill becomes serious minded men and women to ignore them in a conference calling itself sociological.

An Un-American Attack on the Single Tax

THE *Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide* in its issue of Jan. 26th, delivers an attack of a quite unusual kind against the Single Tax. The article bears the title, "Some Effects of Single Tax on Real Estate." The author is Frederick C. Zobel.

We pass by the time-worn attempts there made to confuse economic values so totally distinct as are those of land and the products of industry. Thirty odd years ago, outside of academic circles, such confusion might have been excusable. To-day when thousands of municipalities and some States recognize the distinction in their official valuations and assessments, making it the basis of their revenue service, ignorance of such an elementary economic fact is unpardonable. In the last issue of this REVIEW we drew attention to the Capital city of Sydney (Australia), where land values, officially recognized as being the ultimate beneficiary of social progress, alone bear the cost of municipal government, while the useful products of industry, such as buildings, commerce and professions, bear no burden at all. In another section of our present issue, we refer to similar progress in taxation recently affected in Johannesburg, (South Africa).

The effort to confuse economic values and to prolong the present unfair fiscal discrimination against the improvement and efficient use of landed property and in favor of its neglect or inefficient use, is fortunately not so successful to-day as it used to be. When the progressive real estate owner, desirous of improving his property, comes across

the prognostication that the suppression of taxes on the improvement, use and development of his property, would be, as Mr. Zobel declares, "a national calamity," he simply smiles incredulously or takes the suggestion as an insult to his intelligence.

Feeling the ineffectiveness of anachronic arguments more or less economic, Mr. Zobel seeks to reinforce these by the altogether extraordinary device of defaming our national character, or what he calls "the psychological composition of our people."

According to this detractor of our national origins, the founders of our Republic were "people eager for the millenium," "in search of the promised land," with "the inherited hunger for the ideal." With such a "psychic infection," as he terms it, "we lack poise and calm judgment;" "it is easy to win the plaudits of the mob." Etc. ad nauseam.

This calamitous psychological morass, according to Mr. Zobel, has been the lot of the American people "from the beginning and up to recent times." Recent importations, it would seem, however, have engrafted upon our deteriorated stock the vigorous growth of a superior kultur. There are hopes that we shall now be less susceptible to the "hypnotic spell of orators, preachers and demagogues." We may even be induced to retrace our steps and recant our democratic heresies. Have we not been solemnly admonished by the President of a great Prussian organization entrenched here, that our abandonment of the monarchical for a republican form of government was an error? All the progress in our history, our steady advance toward personal freedom, toward liberty in religion, education, the Press, will be laid to the charge of atavism, to our original "psychic infection." Our Washingtons, Jeffersons, Lincolns, we shall be told, were unbalanced or degenerate minds; our generous striving for a larger, truer life in our individual, social and political functions, will be derided as but the spasmodic contortions of our collective hysteria.

The article which we are noticing is typical of some of the later psychological ingredients added to our population by a promiscuous immigration. They reveal pronounced regressive instincts and present a grave problem which our native Americanism, now thoroughly aroused and alert, will have to settle once and for all, if we are to save our country for Democracy.

Mr. Zobel having spoken of our "psychic infection" we need not investigate further the source of the *moral* infection, which breathes through the charges, as ignoble as they are untrue and unjust, against the generations of men who have made this country worth living in and fighting for.

In the meantime, such interests as find comfort in this attack upon the American character and upon a great American movement, the spread of which, according to Mr. Zobel himself, is "one of the most astonishing phenomena of our times," may as well make up their minds that the American Democracy will not surrender its ideals, nor be deterred from adjusting its fiscal economic relations in harmony with the supreme law of freedom and equal justice.