

estate speculator's) efforts to defeat the exemption on improvement legislation being fought for so stubbornly for three years now? If so, how very careless of the Sun to let the real conditions be known.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.



PLUTOCRACY'S BLINDNESS.

• Boston, August 17.

In its distortion of fact, perversion of history and stagnant misconception of social forces, the widely circulated Newark address of Mr. Vanderlip, President of the City Bank at New York, was a notable illustration of the argument by Mr. Brooks Adams in "The Theory of Social Revolution"—from which Mr. Vanderlip ventures quotations, misleading by vital omissions—that, "unless capital sets its house in order and submits to [not creates] law, it will suffer a cataclysmic disaster."

The banker asserts that his class, "business men of the whole nation, should see the need of such organization [as that of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce]. There is necessity for the association of these business organizations into effective forums for the discussion of current affairs." "Effective" forums, let it be noted—not fair and free forums—which would imply the "muck-raking" so vigorously howled down by "big business."

Mr. Vanderlip has actually discovered that "the foundations of the present order are threatened," but he is blind to the fact that they are so threatened that they must be relaid. He can only recommend that they be still farther weakened by more of that rubble which has been substituted for the solid stones able to bear the structure, concerning which alone it may be said: "The floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

Mr. Vanderlip can not reckon upon such incredible ignorance among his readers as to seriously anticipate the acceptance of his assertion that business men in the past have failed in the most practical manner to exhibit their full appreciation of "the effects of political tendencies upon business, upon property and upon property rights,"—and the inverse effects; by every form of corruption known to the lobby in what he calls "comparatively rare examples of greed, of blindness to social obligations, of unfairness, and even of dishonesty." Have they been rare? Have they not been so frequent, so flagrant and so disastrous that the community dreads even the advisory employment of business and financial "experts"? The suggested remedy for the pernicious influence which partially has been unearthed, with so much difficulty and with such a paralyzing effect, is more influence! The spokesman for his group exhorts its members to "band themselves together, first in small associations, and then to see that these associations are united in a common effort to impress upon the country those views which are the best results of your [their] experience, judgment and righteousness." Not by the use of money, he says. Oh, no! When he demands a ninety days' submission of purposed remedial legislation for attack by these associations, it is to be made by giving [without cost?] correct "infor-

mation" to the people throughout the United States, especially to the constituents of Congressmen! As to the regular organs of information, this precious advice is given: "If a newspaper is ill-informed, see to it first that it has every facility for correct information, and then, if it is still unfair, publish its unfairness in a way which will make unfairness unprofitable, and you will have no more of it." No use of money is suggested in thus stifling the press!

The patriotic course is to imply we are told a temporary "submergence of self-interest"—later to "bob up serenely"—for the sake of powerful teamwork by the body which Mr. Vanderlip represents, concerning whose attitude he is forced to acknowledge that "the opinions which come to me may be highly colored by prejudice; they may come from a single class, and they may fall entirely to represent the true situation."

Mr. Vanderlip condescends to a silly verbal fling at the new forces which he dreads with so little comprehension as "Cubists" and "Futurists." His most audacious misapprehension of historical authority is his appeal to the example of Patrick Henry, James Otis, Samuel Adams and the Revolutionary committees of correspondence for consolidation of the movement among the states for freedom and equality as a logical precedent for the enslaving propaganda of his financial quasi conspiracy! It is not forgotten that the City Bank not long since issued a circular in the interest of the investor, vigorously protesting against the acquisition of those rights by a subjugated people, for which the fathers pledged their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

It is not to the working of law, however, the often delayed and inadequate expression of the popular will, that we refer the Vanderlips, but to that unmistakably settled will itself which can achieve and will achieve the elimination of the opportunity, intrinsically fatal, for capitalistic control, even if it involve the destruction of the present régime. Cooperation in brotherhood is the demand of the time. To the old order the word has gone forth:

"Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting."

"God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it."

ERVING WINSLOW.



THE HOUSEHOLD SERVICE PROBLEM

Further consideration must, it seems to me, convince the writer in *The Public* of May 29 at page 521 that no single remedy, even the Singletax, will cure so complicated a disease as the household problem. All hail the power of Singletax! but household service will continue a vexed and vexing question until some way is found to make housework a reputable business, just as the carpenter's, the banker's, the laundryman's, is a reputable business.

If it is a part of this "business" "to live in a home of refining influences with a comfortable room, etc.," what if the room is "somewhere up the back stairs"? The lady of the house is often thankful for the rescue of the back stairs and the carpenter who built them ate his lunch cheerfully regardless of where the family dined. It is sometimes desirable that maid and family dine together, but

not often. No family is so hospitable as to desire a guest at the table all the time. Here the family comes together for a short time each day for comfortable relaxation, or (Lord have mercy on us, miserable sinners!) sometimes to vent a little family spleen without a damaged reputation. Moreover, serving the table is a part of the business. Why not do it all, without discrimination in the way that brings quickest and best results? That "single instance history records of a servant's receiving her friend in the parlor" might well appeal to you, dear lady. Why leave the maid and her "young man" in the kitchen when that cosy little room off the east porch is unoccupied? Oh, I know all you have done, for I know you well, and how you are trying to make good and help settle the question. Let me see! You are the lady who dressed that pretty little thing that came to you so pitifully shabby, in answer to your call. You put in long hours sewing for her. "Why not," you said, "as well as for the Working Girls' Home"? You patiently taught her how to work efficiently and—well, she left you just when you were planning another way to help her.

Of course there are many instances of maid and mistress standing by each other through the years, but instances, good or bad, settle no problems. Human beings are we all, blundering piteously, when kind as well as when angry. But, friends, let us stop worrying and do something. There is neither time nor space to name all the well-known women at work, each in her own way,

"And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight hard pathway plod."

All these are thinking hard, and—radiant thought—men are thinking, too. Out of it all must evolve some sort of education that will make housework an honorable and desirable business. Perhaps the beginning is with us now. Do they call it Domestic Science?

"CAROLINE CAMP."

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 25, 1914.

The European War.

The German advance upon France, the Russian invasion of East Prussia, and Japan's declaration of war upon Germany have been the outstanding events of the fourth week of the European war. [See current volume, page 802.]

Western Europe.

The two opposing battle-lines on the Franco-German and Franco-Belgian frontiers have been in contact for days with, as first result, announced on the 24th, the forcing backward of the Allies' armies by the Germans, who in the center, Meur-

the et Moselle, captured several French towns. The Allies' advance front stretched from somewhere northwest of Mons, Belgium, where British troops were stationed through Belgian territory to Luxemburg in Belgium, then onward in French territory through the Province of Meurthe et Moselle—opposite the neutral Duchy of Luxemburg, and the German province of Alsace—and crossed into German territory in Lorraine, where the French army had been taking the offensive near its southern border base, Belfort. By August 22 the Germans had begun a general attack all along this line. Battle continued for days with only the most meagre reports until the 24th, when the French Minister of War made it known that the British and French armies had been ordered to withdraw "to their covering positions." The temporary failure of the allies' offensive movements both up in Belgium and down in Lorraine was admitted in this statement by the French minister, and this means that probably the next general conflict will take place largely on French soil. Of terrible carnage on both sides there is no possible doubt.



That part of the German army in Belgium which had swung to the north of Liège had by Tuesday, August 18, marched as far northwest as Diest, thirty miles northeast of Brussels. The military operations of Tuesday and Wednesday, leading up to the retreat of the Belgian army to Antwerp, and the occupation of Brussels by the Germans on Thursday, were described by an Amsterdam correspondent in an Antwerp paper as follows:

Tuesday morning the great advance movement began along a line extending in a broad V from Diest to Tirlemont and St. Trond. The Belgians retired from St. Trond, as the Germans outnumbered the Belgian advance guard. The first Belgian battle line extended along a line of about twenty-five miles and included Diest, Haelen, Geetbetz, Neerlinter and Tirlemont. Tirlemont was guarded by cavalry detachments only, while on the other end of the line the burden of defense at Diest was taken by bicycle sharpshooters.

The battle started at daybreak Tuesday near Geetbetz. At 6 o'clock the Germans opened their attack with large forces of cavalry, supported by infantry and artillery with machine guns. Within a few minutes a fierce battle was raging along the six-mile front. In the north the German right wing attacked Haelen and Loxbergen. In the south it attacked Budingen. The main attack was aimed to break through the Belgian line at Geetbetz, where the dismounted Belgian cavalry poured in a terrific fire, annihilating the German advance columns. Thereupon the German cavalry executed a daring flank movement around the Belgian positions, necessitating the slow retirement of the Belgians on Budingen, where Count Dursel was killed. On the extreme north the Germans stormed Diest, bombard-