

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1915.

No. 899.

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE THACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.
STOUGHTON COOLEY, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, }
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia	LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York
HENRY F. RING, Texas	HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio	FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia	GRACE ISABEL COLBORN, New York
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio	W. G. EGGLESTON, California
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio	C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois	R. F. PETTIBREW, South Dakota
LLEWELLYN JONES, Illinois	J. W. S. CALLIE, England
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Calif.	JOHN PAUL, England
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island	ERNEST BRAY, Australia
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota	GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri	

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago,
Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Misrepresenting Through Silence.....	609
Another Field for Investigation.....	609
Suppressing Academic Freedom.....	609
Even Plutocrats Teach Economic Truth.....	611
Another Free Speech Flight.....	611
Governor Slaton's Courage.....	611
Another Injustice to Be Remedied.....	611
A Mad Act.....	611
A Federal Bureau Self-Vindicated.....	612
Trade As a Moral Agent.....	612
Public Money and Private Enterprise.....	613
Injuring Chicago's Credit.....	613
An Ambitious Mayor.....	613
Taxpayers and Citizenship.....	614
The Canal Zone District Attorneyship.....	614
Hans Van Nes.....	614
Military Fallacies.....	614
Short Cut Logic.....	615
The Laws of War—Jackson H. Raiston.....	615

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Swiss Sentiment Regarding the War—G. Buscher..	617
------------------------------------------------	-----

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

Wilson and Bryan—W. J. Spaulding.....	618
---------------------------------------	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

"Grandfather" Clause Unconstitutional.....	619
Progressive Professor Dismissed.....	619
Full Crew Law Sustained.....	620
Free Trade League Meeting.....	620
Victory for the Jitney.....	620
To Promote Public Health.....	620
Proportional Representation in New Danish Con- stitution.....	620
Mexico.....	620
European War.....	621
News Notes.....	621
Press Opinion.....	622

RELATED THINGS:

Wilson—Charles H. Winke.....	622
Responsibility for War—Frederic C. Howe.....	622
To An Enemy's Mother—Carol Ring.....	624

BOOKS:

"An Atom Thrown From Eternity".....	624
Economic Ethics.....	625
Books Received.....	625
Periodicals.....	625

EDITORIAL

Misrepresenting Through Silence.

When on April 29 of last year a dissatisfied lessee of the Fairhope Singletax Corporation brought suit to dissolve the corporation the Associated Press sent the news broadcast. Many reactionary papers put the item in a conspicuous place under such misleading headings as "Singletax Is Failure in Colony at Fairhope," or "Singletax Experiment Collapses." But no paper apparently has been notified by the Associated Press that on June 10 the Supreme Court of Alabama dismissed the suit and upheld the corporation. At any rate the New York, Chicago and other papers that made the matter so prominent before have given their readers no information concerning this latest happening. Tainting the news does not consist alone in distorting accounts of what happens. In this case silence is misrepresentation.

S. D.



Another Field for Investigation.

It is to be hoped that the act creating the Commission on Industrial Relations is of sufficient scope to permit an inquiry of that body into the discontent of the employes of universities. The forcing of Dr. Scott Nearing out of the Wharton school of the University of Pennsylvania for his refusal to suppress economic truth calls public attention once more to the unhealthy conditions in many seats of learning, where old fogies are trying to suppress new ideas. It would be a spectacle for the gods to see the Wharton school trustees on the stand, answering questions put by Frank Walsh.

S. C.



Suppressing Academic Freedom.

Professor Scott Nearing has been dismissed from the University of Pennsylvania. He had been imprudent enough to teach truth, concealing no part of it from his students that he could himself see. Truth is not welcome in the eco-

conomic department of every university. It is not particularly desired where representatives of privileged interests sit among the trustees. With growing concern the trustees of the University noted that the most popular professor in the department, known as the Wharton School of Finance, was delivering lectures and writing books and articles showing clearly the wrongs of existing conditions. The facts regarding child labor, underpayment of adult labor, increasing cost of living and other evils, were discussed. What was worse, effective remedies were advocated; and worst of all, the taxation of land values was advocated as "the most pressing of all reforms for the reduction of monopoly power." How could students, who listened to Nearing or read his books, retain faith in the justice or expediency of protectionism, of private appropriation of social values, or of any of the other measures needed to uphold predatory business? The University must not be allowed to turn out graduates informed on economic truth. Hence Nearing's dismissal.



The greatest injury inflicted is not upon Nearing, but on the University, its students and faculty. Nearing could not be coerced into silence. But it is clear that for every professor who can not be coerced, there are many who can be. The Nearing case gives students cause to question whether their teachers may not, through fear of dismissal, be withholding from them instruction to which they are entitled. This suspicion may fall upon professors undeserving of it. So students and the faculty have been wronged even more than Scott Nearing. An institution, where truth may not safely be taught, is not a desirable one to select by a person in search of an education. So the University must suffer.



It is pleasing to note that from a trustee of the Wharton estate came a protest against suppression of academic freedom. The protesting trustee was Mr. Harrison S. Morris. He was not awed by the presence on the University board of such eminently respectable trustees as Edward T. Stotesbury of J. P. Morgan and Company, Randall Morgan of the United Gas Improvement Company, Effingham B. Morris of the Pennsylvania railroad and Girard Trust Company, and other representatives of special interests. Mr. Morris has started a protest movement to save the University. He has not minced words in showing that the institution is not a free agent, but "is supported by great sums appropriated by our

corrupt legislatures, and it must obey their wishes, which is equivalent to the desires of the great corporations."



A fine comment on the affair is offered by one of the University's graduates, Henry J. Gibbons, a prominent attorney and a city solicitor of Philadelphia. His statement follows:

In celebration of the 700th anniversary of Magna Charta on June 15th, the reactionary members of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania decided to degrade the institution in the eyes of the public by dismissing from the public service as teacher of economics the most popular and helpful instructor who came into contact with the students.

Perfectly in harmony with the tactics of Privilege, no announcement was made until after Commencement, when students and professors had scattered and demonstrations would be impossible. Conscious of the fact that college faculties are usually arranged for by the first of May and hopeful that thus Dr. Nearing might not secure a position at any other point, the announcement was made six weeks later and without any reason whatever being given therefor.

But he who runs may read the reason from the history of the controversy over the question of freedom of speech for teachers at this monopoly-controlled university. The victim's statements regarding the distribution of wealth had a tendency to reduce the incomes of some of the trustees. So they fired him. Some of their children who had imbibed the "strange doctrines" of truth and justice that fell from the lips of Nearing, baited their elders at the breakfast and dinner table. Annoying questions were asked concerning the source of family income. Conditions had become intolerable. Something had to break.

A year ago it seemed that a crisis had been reached; but, on the surface, calm was preserved. Undue publicity over the freedom of speech question broke the nerve of those who wanted at that time "to put it over for once and all." But the "hushers" and the "gum-shoers" were unable to prevent Privilege from openly declaring that the University of Pennsylvania is a "kept institution." Now everyone knows what many of us have known for years.

As a graduate of 14 years standing and for that same period secretary of the Class of 1901 College, I do not speak as an outsider or one without interest or knowledge. I am ashamed of my alma mater and publicly declare it because the Trustees by publicly declaring that it is controlled by the public service corporations, who will henceforth exact from its teachers a quid pro quo, have made this necessary. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

From the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the governor of which is ex-officio president of the Board of Trustees, this university receives each year out of the public treasury a larger sum than any other institution in the State. Occupying several blocks of valuable land within two miles of the business center of the city of Philadelphia, it pays no taxes.

Yet the public, the alumni, the students, the instructors have nothing whatever to say as to the selection of a small coterie constituting the Trustees, who fill vacancies among their number and dictate the policy of the institution.

More and more frequently as death caused vacancies have the recruits been directors and heavy stockholders of public service and other corporations dependent for successful operation upon monopoly. All of these trustees live in and about Philadelphia; they are absolutely out of sympathy with the aspirations of the age; they are gluttonous for gold; their corporations have secured valuable franchises for nothing from officials faithless to their trust (and contemptuous of the crooked donors of these increasingly valuable public treasures, they are blind to obliquity on the part of the donees). "By their fruits ye shall know them." What, then, can we expect in the future from the University of Pennsylvania? The fiat has gone forth that the teachers there must "deliver the goods" or "walk the plank."

Scott Nearing has awakened the social conscience of his pupils; that is his crime, for they are not supposed to have such a thing; its presence stirs up trouble, it HURTS BUSINESS. "Aye, there's the rub."

Mr. Gibbons undoubtedly expresses the feelings of all loyal sons of the University. s. d.



Even Plutocrats Teach Economic Truth.

Whoever Scott Nearing's successor may be, he has warning of his fate should he fail to withhold from his classes instruction concerning certain economic truths. Does not that fact alone constitute an indictment of economic conditions, which the plutocratic trustees of the University are endeavoring to defend? s. d.



Another Free Speech Fight.

There is such a thing as constitutional right of free speech. But that is one of many facts which reactionaries find it hard to remember. And when these reactionaries happen to occupy executive positions in a city, their ignorance is likely to prove harmful. The city of Cincinnati is unfortunate enough just now to have two such reactionaries as Mayor and Director of Public Safety. They have refused to permit Herbert S. Bigelow to hold public open air meetings with the result that Mr. Bigelow has asked the courts to give these officials needed instruction regarding the rights of citizens. Mr. Bigelow has much to tell that will not be at all helpful to the interest of the local street railway monopoly, which must next year take chances on revision of its fares. He has other facts to present that the lighting monopoly does not relish. He has facts which will make clear the desirability of a tax system that will put

an end to land monopoly and will encourage industry. Mayor Spiegel and Director Holmes seem to have more respect for the interests, which Mr. Bigelow may effectively attack, than for the constitutional rights of citizens. In this respect they unfortunately resemble officials in charge of many other cities. s. d.



Governor Slaton's Courage.

Credit for courage belongs to Governor John M. Slaton of Georgia. He was called upon to decide the question of whether a man, under sentence of death, had had a fair trial. This question had been evaded by State and Federal courts and by a majority of the State Prison Commission. - These officials either were unable to understand that the question of legal technicalities had nothing whatever to do with the merits of the case, or they feared to run counter to popular feeling. So responsibility was passed on from one to another until finally it reached Governor Slaton. He, too, could have passed it on. He could have allowed the prisoner a few days' reprieve and shoved responsibility upon his successor. Instead he manfully faced the issue and put humanity before political expediency. Let credit and honor be given where it is due. s. d.



Another Injustice to be Remedied.

Now let those who protested against the conviction of Leo Frank without a fair trial turn toward Colorado, where John R. Lawson has been convicted of a murder he was not even charged with committing. An unjust conviction to please powerful privileged interests is no less outrageous than one to conciliate a disorderly mob. s. d.



A Mad Act.

The evil men do lies not so much in the act itself, as in the influence it will have upon other minds in arousing distrust of their fellows. The German disregard of its treaty with Belgium made all treaties potential "scraps of paper." The sinking of the Lusitania made all non-combatants subject to the horrors of war. And so the murder by a "trustee" of Warden Allen's wife in the Joliet penitentiary will bring under suspicion all "honor" convicts.



Edmund Allen is a man of ideals. He saw in the criminals placed in his care latent manhood and womanhood, and he set himself the task of

quicken it into life. It was in pursuit of this idea that the harsh rules of prison life were relaxed. Stripes were taken from all save the few incorrigibles, and recreation was allowed; but best of all, the honor system was evolved. Prisoners were permitted more and more freedom, until many were held only by their word of honor. Honor men were placed on farms and at road building, where the men grew healthy morally as well as physically. Other opportunities of manhood culture were opening up; and this great hearted man saw unlimited possibilities for good.



In all this work the warden had the fullest sympathy and co-operation of his wife. Mrs. Allen added the feminine touch; and the response among "my boys," as she insisted upon calling the prisoners, was what always comes to the sympathetic smile of a good woman. The Joliet penitentiary took on a new air. A spirit of hope animated the prisoners, and the whole country eagerly watched the experiment. But the confidence that has required years to build may be destroyed in a moment. Mrs. Allen was murdered by one of the trusties whom she had befriended. Warden Allen is prostrated with grief and disappointment. And the cause of prison reform has received a severe blow.



But this terrible calamity must not be allowed to overthrow a great principle. A mad man's act must not turn aside the noble work of regenerating the moral weaklings. Warden Allen and his wife were right. Liberty, sympathy, and confidence are the things to rekindle human souls. Provision must be made for preventing a repetition of this deed, without taking from the prisoners their new-found hope.

s. c.



A Federal Bureau Self-Vindicated.

The Federal Children's Bureau has issued a report on "Mental Defectives in the District of Columbia." The District has at present no institution for the care of such cases; and the study made by the Bureau was for the purpose of securing a complete enumeration, as far as possible, of the mental defectives of the District who may be assumed to need the protection of an institution. Only those cases were included concerning which information could be obtained from the public and private agencies, teachers, physicians, and others dealing with defectives. The Bureau's investigators found 798 individuals so defective mentally as to need institutional care. Only 12

per cent are reported as having proper attention. Thirty-four per cent are in institutions not equipped for their care, or boarded out. Fifty-four per cent are at large in the community under varying conditions of helplessness and neglect. Two hundred and seventy-two cases are those of children under fifteen years of age. The report describes a large number of individual cases illustrating the various types for whom institutional care is desired. These cases include mental defects transmitted from one generation to another. Feeble-minded mothers of from one to six illegitimate children are reported. The children are cared for at public expense, but no provision has been made for protecting the mothers. Twenty-six per cent of the defectives found are women between the ages of 15 and 45. The report furnishes evidence of individual suffering and degeneration, the burden to families, the handicap to the school system, and the danger to the whole community resulting from the lack of proper provision for the feeble-minded. Data is furnished also of the newer state institutions where defectives are taken care of on the colony or village plan. Rough, uncleared land is found to serve for this purpose, giving healthy and useful work to the inmates, clearing the timber off and constructing the necessary buildings, and preparing the land for agricultural purposes. The report urges that the best modern care of the feeble-minded should be found in the capital city of the nation. Aside from the direct financial considerations, the Bureau report says: "The social economy that must result from the prevention of transmission of defect cannot be estimated in figures, but it is hardly to be questioned that the investment would result in savings compounded with each generation." How would it do to put one per cent of that \$500,000,000 that the militarists propose to spend on the new army, into the care of these mental defectives? It will be recalled that an effort was made by certain members of the last Congress to strangle the Children's Bureau by cutting off its appropriation. They must have had a premonition that the Bureau would make a report on "Mental defectives in the District of Columbia," and were afraid it might include those of the Capitol.

s. c.



Trade as a Moral Agent.

The old adage, "let the buyer beware," has been changed by the mail order houses to "let the seller beware." And so thoroughly has this thought permeated the commercial world that the national convention of advertisers in Chicago this

week have adopted as their motto the word "truth." Truth and honesty make up the theme of their discourse; and even though their primary motives be not of the highest, necessity compels obedience to the higher law. As the complicated industrial system demands sobriety, so the labyrinths of trade require honesty. Advertising is a legitimate function of trade, but it is overladen with useless and wasteful extravagances, and has failed of its full purpose. To the extent that the advertising agents eliminate the unnecessary and the dishonest, they will enlarge its legitimate field.

S. C.



Public Money and Private Enterprises.

Reactionaries, especially when they happen to be Protectionists, find it difficult, in arguing against a progressive idea, to avoid arguing against one of their own reactionary notions. Thus ex-President Taft, trying to strike at municipal ownership, while delivering an address before the Pennsylvania legislature, said:

The People's money should not be put into private business where private enterprise can do the work better.

These will be awkward words to recall when Mr. Taft again argues for a protective tariff. For what is protection but a method of empowering private interests to take the people's money for private purposes? And protectionists declare the object to be to shut out other private enterprises whose services are more satisfactory and desirable. Furthermore, though Mr. Taft's argument applies perfectly to Protection, for which he did not intend it, it does not apply at all to Municipal Ownership. When a business is monopolistic in its nature, private enterprise always seeks to get all that the traffic will bear, and in order to get it constantly exercises, or attempts to exercise, a corrupting influence over government. Public money put into such enterprises is not put where private enterprise can do the work better.

S. D.



Injuring Chicago's Credit.

The argument is used that, should Chicago insist on forfeiture of the automatic telephone plant, the city's credit would be injured. That argument can only be explained on the ground that, when the city accepts a promise from a corporation in return for a concession, it is not expected to hold the corporation to the terms of its agreement. In other words, Chicago is now credited with being an "easy mark," which credit will be lost or injured should its conduct in the telephone

case show it to be otherwise. It will not hurt the city much to lose that kind of credit.

S. D.



An Ambitious Mayor.

Chicago's Rooseveltian mayor spiced his campaign with the usual pre-election promises. But, although he has not driven the crooks, courtesans, and undesirables from the city, nor brought in the prosperity that the wicked Democrats frightened away, he has given a demonstration of his ability and good intentions in settling the street car strike. His efforts in settling the building trades strike have not, as yet, been successful; but he is still trying. The prediction was made when Mayor Thompson took office that he would give the city what is known as a clean administration. That is to say, it would be efficient in executive departments, free from vulgar scandals, and reasonably responsive to the so-called better classes. But that it would at the same time play into the hands of the financial interests seeking privileges of the mayor and city council.



The first part of the prediction bids fair to come true. The administration is, as administrations go, reasonably efficient in the executive field. What is to be the outcome of the second part of the prediction? The Mayor has not as yet made himself conspicuous as a champion of the people in insisting upon the carrying out of the contract between the city and the automatic telephone. It is so seldom that a contract ever runs in favor of the city, and so rare that any attempt is ever made to enforce it when it does, that the people's representatives seem to be helpless. The present indications are that public rights will be made subservient to private interests, regardless of the law. Another test of the mayor's good faith will come when the question comes up of building the subways. Will an honest effort be made to levy the cost of these subways on the lands benefited? Or will they be constructed at the expense of the people and made a free gift to the holders of the land benefited? It is important that the executive department of the city government be clean and efficient; but it is much more important to the men and women out of jobs, and those underpaid, that they see an increased demand for labor. If Mayor Thompson seriously means to bring prosperity to Chicago, he has a golden opportunity for making a start by insisting that the cost of the subways be paid for by the owners of the land that is enhanced in value. More than half the cost of the "boule-

ward link" is to be assessed upon the lands benefited. The whole assessment of the subways should be so levied. Here is an opportunity for an ambitious mayor to make a place in history, similar to that of Tom Johnson.

S. C.



Taxpaying and Citizenship.

The point has been made by some of those who are working for a higher civic consciousness, that citizens would take a greater interest in the government if each paid taxes direct to the government. No matter how small the amount might be, it would constitute a financial tie between the citizen and his country. Possibly this point is well taken. Unless a man feels that his government can aid or hinder him he is not likely to take it seriously. Since, therefore there is so much difficulty in collecting taxes, income taxes, and taxes on intangible property, the whole matter might be simplified by raising all revenue by a per capita tax. Dividing the total revenue required by the government by the total population will give the tax to be laid upon each man, woman, and child. There should, however, be this qualification attached. No government is justified in collecting a tax until it has assured the citizens in the receipt of their full earnings. And since land values are due entirely to the activities of the people as a whole, they belong of right, not to the person who holds the title to the land, but to all the members of the community. When, therefore, the government, which has been instituted to protect life and guard property rights, has collected annually the land value of the country, and distributed it equally among all the people, it would be justified in collecting a per capita tax from all the people. There could be no objection made to such a system on the ground of equity; but as a practical measure it might be urged that to collect annually all the ground rent and divide it among the people on a per capita basis, and then to levy a per capita tax to defray the expenses of the government, would involve a lot of useless labor and bookkeeping; and that better results would follow if the government collected the annual land value from those enjoying the exclusive use of the land, and distributed it to all the people in the form of government service.

S. C.



The Canal Zone District Attorneyship.

Among those mentioned for the place of District Attorney of the Canal Zone is Frederick G. Swanson of Balboa. Should the final selection fall upon him the Zone will be assured the services

of not only a competent lawyer but of one who is a fundamental democrat—a doubly important qualification in a locality where popular government does not exist.

S. D.



Hans Van Nes.

An old soldier of the Common Good passed away at Charlevoix, Michigan, on June 18. He was Hans Van Nes of Cincinnati. Back in the early 90s, when Cincinnati seemed hopelessly enslaved to the Cox-Bernard machine, Hans Van Nes published and edited the only paper in the city that dared make a vigorous fight, not only against the superficial evil of boss rule, but against the fundamental evils underlying it. His paper was a weekly, the Cincinnati South-West. Though its circulation could not be compared with that of the great dailies, none of these could compare with it in fair and intelligent discussion of current issues. Its influence was accordingly out of proportion to its circulation, and did much to stimulate and encourage the little band of progressives that later, when Herbert S. Bigelow begun his work, were ready to support the work of that leader. Although finally compelled to let the South-West go into hands less able, and less interested in fundamental truths, Mr. Van Nes continued to work for and support the principles for which his paper had stood. Almost until the day of his death he remained an active fighter. And who, realizing how much of today's progress is due to seed that he planted, can successfully hold that his work has stopped?

S. D.



Military Fallacies.

Mr. Bryan put his finger on the weak spot in the militarist argument that preparation for war is the best guarantee of peace, when he said:

It is impossible to coerce the people into bearing the burdens incident to continuous and increasing preparation without cultivating hatred as if it were a natural virtue. There must be some one to fear, some other preparing nation that must be represented as plotting for war.

The verification of this is seen in every argument in favor of increased armament. The protection sought is not against imaginary foes, or foes in general, but against some specific foe, as, for instance, Germany, or Japan. And, in order to induce the people to submit to these unnecessary burdens, other countries must be held up to our execration. The same amount of effort devoted to a better understanding with those countries, and

an appreciation of their ideals and aspirations, would remove the necessity for mutual armament.

s. c.



Short Cut Logic.

Julian Street, in an admirable article in Collier's designed to scare the American people into preparations for their next war, quotes General Stockton's reference to the 17,000 Federal troops at the breaking out of the Civil War, and the 800 regular and 28,000 militia and volunteers at the first battle of Bull Run. The General adds:

Had the United States had a trained army on the field instead of an untrained mass of civilians, Bull Run would have been the end of the Civil War—not the beginning.

Very likely; but which end? The end of the Union, or the end of the Confederacy? It has been a common charge that sympathising Federal officials in Washington just prior to the breaking out of the war moved large quantities of arms and supplies into the Southern States. Had there been a big army at that time it would have had a large number of Southern officers, who would have seen to it that as many as possible of the troops were stationed at Southern posts, and made friendly to the Southern cause. The small army was disregarded; a large one would have had to be won over. It is quite possible as General Stockton says that a large regular army would have decided the war at the first battle of Bull Run; but which way?

s. c.



THE LAWS OF WAR.

"Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in Heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care and the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

Accepting the spirit of these lines, written by Bishop Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, some three centuries ago, we may believe that when men first discussed the "laws of war," Mars chuckled, and since that time High Olympus has resounded with his guffaws. Laws of war, what are they? What are the laws of arson? The laws of mayhem? The laws of murder? Can there be laws of lawlessness? If so, where do we find their sanction? Who created them? Who will enforce them? Are their roots found deep in moral

principle? Are they of philosophic origin, or the result of natural perception and logical development? Who welcomed them as "the mother of their peace and joy?"

When we accept these laws we bow to the rule of orderly disorder, moral immorality, justly and equitably planned disregard of human right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

After all, these laws strangely mystify us. We find that they may be disobeyed without penalty or punishment. We discover that under their rule, it is righteous for an army to explode mines under the feet of an unsuspecting man—it is unrighteous to use false flags. It is proper for a submarine, like a midnight assassin, to blow up a vessel of war—it is improper that a peaceful merchantman to escape destruction, should fly the flag of a foreign nation. One series of acts is condemned under the laws of war, and another may be sustained, and when we seek for a rule of reason we find we are, as it were, on a shoreless sea, without a rudder, with no compass to guide us, and no sail to carry us to a port of safety.

Perchance there may be some deep fundamental error in our attitude toward the subject. It may be that somewhere we have missed our bearings, for we are continually calling for aid from the laws of war and are getting only Delphic response.

What is the error of which we are guilty and at which Mars laughs? We have treated war as a legitimate thing, with regard to which consistent laws might be laid down which would enforce themselves. Nationally, we have laws against mayhem, arson, murder. Internationally we accept these things as just. We have no laws *against* them. We have so-called laws *of* them. When we have met in Hague Peace Conferences, as in 1907, we have passed six times as many conventions concerning the warlike relations of States as we have concerning their peaceful relations, so legitimate is war. We never proscribe it, limit it, punish it.

If we could imagine a country in which the inhabitants expected sooner or later to indulge in marauding against one another and seizing each other's property for their several uses, then we could further imagine these same people getting together in solemn conclave, as our nations do, and piously resolving that as individuals they would not raid one another, save when they personally felt that they had been insulted by their fellows, or save when their important vital interests, as they individually determined them to

be, demanded that they possess themselves of the property of each other, and then only under fixed rules, as for instance, that while they might kill the head of the family, they would not kill children under the age of six; that they would not make slaves of the survivors, but only take away their property, or mortgage their labor for future years; that they would endeavor to nurse back to health those of their neighbors whom they failed to kill at the first shot. These laws would be reasonable, as reasonable as the laws of war, and yet perhaps we would all admit that there might be circumstances of convenience and advantage, and perhaps of humanity or even morality which would prevent the entry by individuals into such contracts.

Turning, however, to the law of nations, we say in Hague conventions that States may themselves judge when they are insulted, or when their vital interests demand that they should be their own executioners. Having so declared, we next lay down rules of action to apply when they are at war, but without reserving power to enforce such rules. In themselves the rules may be very excellent, as excellent as was the rule of action governing Robin Hood, when he stole from the rich to give to the poor. England frowned down upon his exercise of this praiseworthy principle, but other nations and England as well have never dissented from the idea that it was entirely proper to blow the blessings of civilization over far countries under cover of cannon smoke, or that the rich and powerful nations should take from the poor and weak.

Our laws of war have utterly failed because they have started from the premise above indicated, that war was natural, inevitable, even laudable and righteous. We can never meet the difficulty until we approach the problem from an entirely different standpoint. We must, as a nation, treat war as abhorrent and to be stamped out. We must never again send a representative to a peace conference to write the laws of war. In the place of such burlesque upon peace, we must write real declarations of principle by nations which intend not to enter into war, but propose to render it unnecessary and impossible, and undertake to punish as far as practicable nations indulging in it. At least we must do this and accept the consequences of such new rules of action if, indeed, we believe war to be an evil and a nuisance, though in our minds it may fall short of being a crime.

It makes a great difference whether the laws of burglary are framed by burglars, even by those who, recognizing the frailty of human nature,

expect that some time or other they will be compelled to resort to burglary, or on the other hand by citizens who are not burglars, do not expect to indulge in burglary, and do propose to treat it as an objectionable occupation.

To give slight concrete illustrations of the idea we have in mind, we may call attention to the fact that one of the latest Hague conventions undertook to regulate the use of submarine mines in war. This recognized the legitimacy of their employment. Again, according to the accepted practice among nations, a city may be bombarded and the property of neutrals destroyed, and such neutrals are without recourse. Approaching these topics from a saner point of view, we would agree that a nation which by planting mines or through any other act of war, inflicted injury upon the property of the individuals of a neutral nation, should be responsible for the injury inflicted.

To illustrate: If gun in hand, and endeavoring to kill my enemy, by mischance I slay an innocent bystander, I am punished for the act. The fact that my aim was bad will not excuse me. Even civilly I may be compelled to pay heavy damages to his wife and family. If I set a trap for an enemy and by accident kill a friend, our municipal laws hold me deserving of punishment. The nation committing like acts should receive corresponding punishment.

We should not allow any nation to gain material advantage or assume material advantage as the result of war with another nation. If in a dispute I am overcome by another man, he gains no right to hold me down until I yield to him my purse, or deed him my property. Yet we are told that by the laws of war similar acts may occur between nations and be fully justified. We say there are no such laws of war, that in such things are lacking all the elements of law, whether measured by the criterion so eloquently stated by Hooker, or by any criterion recognized among men who claim a speaking acquaintance with the Ten Commandments or with the properties recognized as existing among gentlemen. If a thousand times men have been overcome by their enemies and despoiled of their pocketbooks, there is not thereby created a law of robbery. A thousand like instances as between nations cannot create a law of war sanctioning such conduct. The fact that under given circumstances men or nations have taken advantage of one another does not create a law of wrong doing, but only indicates a tendency on their part, their passions being excited, to ignore the laws of decency.

We will further add to our national laws.

Within our borders we will prohibit the flotation of bonds to carry on war, just as we punish a man as accessory to a crime who loans money to another to buy a gun to kill his fellow. Likewise we will prohibit the selling of arms and ammunition by our citizens to another nation to carry on war, for in so doing we make ourselves accessories to the ensuing slaughter. We must have our own rules of righteousness and right living.

We will make it more difficult for ourselves to enter into war. Today our Congress and our President may declare war without real knowledge of popular sentiment, influenced by the excitement of the moment, and we are compelled to follow in their train. We will prevent declarations of war before a reference of the whole question to the entire people on a direct vote, and if this be had, we may be assured that we will never enter into it. War has ever been a game for kings to play at, and Presidents and Congresses should not succeed to their role.

But if our thesis be wrong, if we must continue to have laws of war, instead of laws against war, let us address ourselves to the problem in a sportsmanlike way, and let war be a game, sanctioned as such, and carried out under enforceable rules. Let us be systematic, forming a circle around the combatants, and allowing no nation to trade with them while the game proceeds. Let the prize be determined in advance of the conflict, so that each nation may know exactly the penalty of defeat or the reward of victory. Let strict rules be established with an umpire furnished with power to call the game off, enforce forfeitures or declare the victory which should be awarded to the side winning the most points or indulging in the fewest fouls. The burning of a town should have a fixed value, the killing of a thousand soldiers, the slaughter of civilians and the bombardment of unfortified ports, the sinking of an enemy's ship—vessel of war or merchantman—should be rewarded, and a proper number of points allowed. So many points should be deducted for the destruction of the vessel of a neutral nation or the killing of neutrals. Of course official tally keepers should be appointed.

In this or some similar way it will be possible to systematize war, as we do a baseball contest or a game of parlor bridge, and thereby add to its sanctity and glory. JACKSON H. RALSTON.



To my mind the trouble with the nations of the earth is that they spend less money in getting ready to help people than they spend in getting ready to kill people.—Henry Ford.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SWISS SENTIMENT REGARDING THE WAR.

Zurich, Switzerland, June 3.

It will be interesting to Americans how the little Swiss republic looks upon the war. Opinions are as sharply divided here, as is the population in their language and origin. The French and Italian-speaking Swiss are in sympathy with the Allies, the German-speaking people in sympathy with the Germans and most of them go even so far as to approve of the sinking of the "Lusitania." But there is a marked difference in the attitude of the press in the German and in the other parts of Switzerland. Most of the German papers are tolerant enough to allow the friends of the Allies to express their opinions freely, whilst I have not yet found a single article in defense of Germany in an Italian or French paper in Switzerland.

The judgment of nearly all the world is led astray by sympathies and antipathies often in a way astonishing on account of its contradictions. German papers are complaining that Great Britain betrayed the white race by her alliance with Japan, and do not think of themselves being allied with the Turks, who are of a race related to the Japanese. The British are complaining about the brutality of German warfare, and do not remember that shrapnels and torpedoes, Maxim guns and dum-dum bullets are British inventions. All the Allies have denounced the violation of Belgium neutrality as a breach of faith unheard of in history, but the breach of faith committed by Italy finds their warm approval. And is there no contradiction in the attitude of the United States praying for peace and making money out of the war? It is much to be feared that this will revive and strengthen the old reproach that the Anglo-Saxons are a race of hypocrites.

It may seem strange to Americans that the violation of Belgian neutrality has not aroused strong protests in all the neutral states in Europe. The reason is probably that it was expected by all military authorities. The military authorities are also convinced that a French army would have marched through Belgium as soon as this would offer a considerable advantage, and this might easily happen, since Belgium has been the favorite battleground between the French and the Germans for centuries. If it was not right for the Germans to march through Belgium there was at least a strong temptation to do so. The same holds true of the sinking of the "Lusitania." The ship carried a lot of ammunition sufficient for a great battle, the sinking of the ship meant practically a battle won to the Germans, and this temptation has proved too strong to withstand. It is not true, as English papers have said, that the sinking of the vessel has caused exultation in Germany. The German papers have justified the act, but it was clear that most of them justified it with pain and sorrow. Some of them even expressed a veiled disapproval. "We rejoice over every loss that is inflicted by our navy on the British battle fleet, but it is impossible to conceal that the sink-

ing of the 'Lusitania' aroused other feelings," wrote a big Socialist daily in Munich. There are certainly many Germans sharing this opinion, and if this opinion is not strong enough to force the government to abandon its policy the reason is to be found in the bitter feelings aroused in Germany by the American exportation of war material to the Allies. The United States are practically considered as an enemy by the Germans, and it is to be feared that many of them would prefer open war with the United States to the neutrality of today. They hold themselves entitled to a strict neutrality on the part of the United States because they have always tried to live in peace with them, and because Germany has given a number of useful citizens to the United States whose feelings are hurt by the support given to the Allies. If they are reminded that they could buy freely in the American market as well as the Allies, and that it is not the fault of the Americans that they have no means of supplying Germany with war material, it sounds like mockery to them, and in their present mood they are not inclined to take such mockery lightly. Since all the neutral European states have forbidden the exportation of war material, they conclude that the United States could do the same.

The policy of the United States may be right or wrong, but it is certain that it will lead them into trouble in every armed conflict in Europe. If England would be at war with the French and would be supplied by the United States with war material the French would naturally be just as much embittered against the Americans as are the Germans today. The many German soldiers killed and mutilated by American shells speak a language that cannot arouse friendly feelings in Germany. The most deplorable fact of this war is that it has created a gulf of hatred between the Germans and the Anglo-Saxons, and this gulf must be broadened and deepened by the policy of the United States.

It is not my opinion that the Germans are faultless and blameless. I believe that they have committed big blunders in politics and probably also some unnecessary hardships and cruelties in the war. I say "probably," because all the stories being told here in Switzerland about cruelties of German and Austrian soldiers, when investigated by impartial observers, have turned out to be untrustworthy without a single exception. Case after case of German cruelties told in the French and Italian papers in Switzerland, and often published by people of high standing, has been found to be purely invented or to be based on hearsay, which nobody could verify. And there are not only hardships and cruelties committed by the Germans. There was an outbreak of indignation when German battleships bombarded the British coast and caused the death of British women and children, but there was no indignation when the British navy bombarded the Belgian coast and caused the death of Belgian women and children. The French artillery is destroying day after day life and property of Frenchmen not by mere accident but in order to destroy lodging and shelter of the German soldiers. Is there morally a difference between these acts and the sinking of the "Lusitania?" In both cases the lives of civilians are sacrificed to a military advantage.

It is the avowed intention of the British Gov-

ernment to starve the German people into surrender. Does this not mean making war not only against the armed forces, but also against civilians in Germany? If it does not, I do not know what meaning attaches to these words. If it does, what right has the British Government to complain that Germany does the same? Great Britain assumes the right to treat the highways of the seas in wartime as its private property. This assumption is intolerable today, even more to the little nations than to Germany, because the little nations are more dependent upon the freedom of their oversea commerce than a big one. For months the industries in Switzerland have been in a bad plight because Great Britain would not allow raw materials to be imported into Switzerland. The pride of the Swiss is hurt by the fact that Great Britain is supervising Switzerland as if Switzerland were an unreliable servant, and many a Swiss has asked himself the question, what is our independence worth if Great Britain can starve us into surrender? "British navalism is more dangerous to us than German militarism," is a general feeling here, and therefore the German submarine war is looked upon with indifference or with approval. If the United States are taking another attitude and are supporting the British Government, they may do what they believe to be right, but they will lose the great opportunity of working for a durable peace based on mutual consent and sincere reconciliation of the European nations.

G. BUSCHER.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

WILSON AND BRYAN.

Springfield, Ill., June 9, 1915.

It is perhaps very fortunate that Bryan has resigned, considered from the standpoint of humanity in general. No person in the world has perhaps been so prominent in advocating peace and devising ways and means to promote it has Bryan, and to have the country adopt a war policy or negotiate in terms looking toward it while Bryan is in a position of such direct responsibility would not only be a stultification of himself, but would tend to discredit all the work he has done in the past. It would give it the appearance of mere sentiment and ideality that has no place in practical administration and would be a blow and discouragement to the peace movement which it would require years of diplomacy and education to recover from. The tenor of the note of resignation and also of acceptance are presented in a fine spirit of brotherhood and patriotism. Surely, there never were two more sincere men in Washington than Wilson and Bryan. While it seems to me that Bryan did the consistent thing, and undoubtedly promoted the larger good by his resignation, at the same time I believe it might be consistently said that Wilson's policy is the wise and practical one for him to pursue.

W. J. SPAULDING.



Respect of law is a good thing only so far as the law respects the rights of those it is supposed to govern.—Appeal to Reason.

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, June 22, 1915.

"Grandfather" Clause Unconstitutional.

The United States Supreme Court on June 21 declared unconstitutional the "grandfather" clause of the Oklahoma and Maryland election laws. This clause was designed to evade the Fifteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution. It restricted the right to vote to persons entitled to vote on January 1, 1866 or prior thereto, or to the lineal descendants of such persons or to persons who had they become naturalized at that time would have been eligible to become voters. Chief Justice White in rendering the decision declared the "grandfather" clause a subterfuge to evade the constitutional provision forbidding denial of suffrage on account of "race, color or previous condition of servitude." [See vol. xiii, p. 948; xiv, p. 493; xvi, p. 780.]



Progressive Professor Dismissed.

Provost Edgar F. Smith of the University of Pennsylvania sent on June 17 the following notice to Professor Scott Nearing:

My dear Mr. Nearing: As the term of your appointment as assistant professor of economics for 1914-15 is about to expire, I am directed by the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania to inform you that it will not be renewed.

This is the culmination of a fight that has been going on for some time at the university. Two years ago a report that the trustees were about to discipline progressive teachers of the Wharton School of Finance, the economic section of the university, brought a storm of protests, and the idea was abandoned for the time. The trustees moreover disavowed any intention to interfere with free speech and advanced Nearing and others from the position of instructors to assistant professorships. Another effort to discipline Nearing and others a few months ago was abandoned after the students protested. Then the trustees waited until the end of the term and without formally dismissing Nearing have got rid of him by refraining from renewing his contract. The university trustees are nearly all men closely connected with great business interests. Among them are Edward T. Stotesbury, Effingham B. Morris, J. B. Lippincott, Wharton Barker, George Wharton Pepper, J. Levering Jones and Randall Morgan. Stirred by the affair, Harrison Morris, son-in-law of Joseph Wharton, the founder of the

Wharton School, issued a public protest against the trustees' action. He said:

As one of the executors of Joseph Wharton, founder of the Wharton School of the Pennsylvania University, I stand for freedom of speech. Assistant Professor Scott Nearing, of the Wharton School, one of the best loved and one of the best teachers of the University, has been dropped by the standpatters in the board of directors for expressing views opposite to those held by great trusts and by public service corporations which depend on corrupt politics for their profits.

Scott Nearing is a noble fellow, who had seen the oppression by entrenched monopoly and has spoken of it. He was the most readily punished of the group of useful young scholars of the Wharton School who have given it universal fame and drawn students from almost every country of the globe, because he was assistant professor and could be dropped without a trial by his peers as a full professor could not.

His associates have been equally guilty of trying to better social and business conditions, but they are harder to get. They have been of vast use to the present mayor and his directors in showing up the wrongs done the city by corporations whose most powerful directors sit on the board of trustees of the University. They have checked the United Gas Improvement Company in its aggression against the citizens; the Reading Railway was brought to its knees in its excessive freight charges on coal by the service of one of these professors, and the talent and efficiency of the Wharton School have been used wherever possible by the present administration.

The limitation of the University has been that it has had too little touch with the life and business of the city. These younger men have been bridging the chasm, and for doing so they have been under suspicion, and at last one of their number has fallen as a sacrifice on the city's altar. The Pennsylvania University is not a free agent. It is supported by great sums appropriated by our corrupt legislatures, and it must obey their wishes, which are equivalent to the desires of the great corporations.

My belief is that all the right-minded citizens of the State would rally to the support of the University if it would free itself from an alliance with Penrose, Vare and McNichol, which controls its judgment in a crisis like the present, when freedom of speech is at stake.

The trustees have refused to offer any explanation of their action. One of them, J. Levering Jones, a corporation attorney, is quoted in the Philadelphia North American of June 19 as saying: "We don't feel we owe the public any explanation; what has the public to do with it? Private men gave \$18,000,000 to the University before the State gave a dollar." [See current volume, page 371.]



The Legislature has appropriated \$1,000,000 for the university, but when the news of Professor Nearing's dismissal was published many telegrams were sent to Governor Brumbaugh urging

him to veto the appropriation unless the trustees satisfactorily explain their action.



Full Crew Law Sustained.

Governor Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania vetoed on June 20 the bill to repeal the full crew law. The repealer was passed by the legislature after a long fight in which the railroads had placed half-page advertisements in papers throughout the state arguing against the full crew law. Labor organizations opposed repeal. In his veto message the Governor said that members of the legislature had been subjected to the pleadings of a "large and persistent lobby." Since the present law has been in operation the Governor said loss of life among passengers has been substantially reduced. The extra man required by the law, while not always engaged in emergency, and his presence may save life or property. The railroads, the Governor said further, deserve the same consideration "that is guaranteed to the humblest citizens, and no more."



Free Trade League Meeting.

Louis F. Post was the principal speaker at the dinner of the American Free Trade League at Boston on June 14. He was introduced by President William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., as an "Editor, learned in the law, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor, lucid thinker, penetrating philosopher, unselfish citizen, evangelist of social justice, teacher of Christian ethics, optimist." In his address Mr. Post pointed out that the idea of free trade involved the largest idea of human brotherhood, and is identified with the great Peace movement.



Victory for the Jitney.

Judge A. B. Pittman of Memphis rendered a decision on June 17 declaring unconstitutional an act of the Legislature requiring operators of public motor busses to give bond. The decision declares the act to be class legislation. The Legislature passed the bill on account of a complaint made by the street railway companies of Memphis that jitney competition reduces their profits about \$45,000 a month.



To Promote Public Health.

The Civic Association of South Orange, N. J., of which C. H. Ingersoll is president, passed on June 15 the following resolutions:

Whereas, Many of the vacant land areas of the Village constitute a nuisance and menace to health.

Resolved, That the Association through its appropriate committee formulate a plan and promote the use of such for gardening purposes.

Resolved, That the Village Board be urged to pass

ordinances, if not now existing, to abate such nuisances as weed growing, mosquito breeding, dumping, etc.

Resolved, That the co-operation of the Board of Health be sought to this same end. And, finally, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Assessors be urged to tax all vacant areas to the full amount permitted by law, so that their owners may be influenced to put them to productive use.



Proportional Representation in the New Danish Constitution.

Under the new constitution of Denmark, which was signed by the King and became operative on June 5th, the use of the proportional system of election is extended considerably. Hitherto the system has been used only for the election, by an "Electoral College," of the Danish Senate. Under the new constitution, it is to be used also for the election of the "College" which elects the Senate and for some members of the Lower House, which is elected by popular vote. [See current volume, page 572.]



Mexico.

Unofficial press dispatches from Washington announce that the Administration's new Mexican policy contemplates nothing beyond moral support of some Mexican who appears to command the backing of his own countrymen, and an embargo on arms to other factions. Three names spoken of as likely candidates for the Administration's favor are Eduardo Iturbide, who is now in Washington; Vasquez Tagle, minister of the interior in Madero's cabinet, and Pedro Lascarain, Madero's minister of foreign affairs. It is the hope of the Administration to choose a man with the consent of Carranza, Villa, and the other leaders. The new government is to be recognized by the United States and by the governments of Europe and South America. American banking interests will lend it support, and withhold support from rival factions. An embargo will be placed upon arms and ammunition for opposing forces. [See current volume, page 596.]



Four members of General Carranza's cabinet have resigned, and General Obregon is reported to be at outs with his chief. General Filipe Angeles, Villa's right hand man, is in the United States, on his way to visit his family at Boston. It is rumored that his visit also has political significance. The newest convention provisional president, Francisco Lagos Chazaro, set up by the Villa-Zapata forces in Mexico City, expresses a desire to unite for peace with the other factions. General Carranza is looked upon as the chief

obstacle to the restoration of order. He has not accepted Villa's offer for a conference.



Continued activity of the Yaquis Indians in attacking Americans led to the dispatch of Rear Admiral Howard with the Colorado to Guaymas, bearing marines to protect the Americans menaced by the Indians. Governor Maytorena of Sonora has protested against the landing of the American forces, declaring he will himself suppress the Yaquis. Admiral Howard is holding his men on board for the present, until it has been determined whether the Mexican authorities can restore order.



European War.

Galicia continues to be the chief center of interest. The Austro-German advance, which seemed to pause a week ago, has been renewed with redoubled energy, and the Russians have retired along the whole Galician front. The victors have advanced as far as Rawa Ruska, to the northwest of Lemberg, and are within less than eighteen miles of that important city, which is now the direct objective of the German forces. The Russian line continues to retire, but it has nowhere been broken. No activities of moment have been reported in Poland. The fighting in the Baltic provinces is indecisive, but the Germans seem to maintain their positions. Fierce fighting has occurred at various points in the western field from Alsace to Ypres. The French claim gains in the valley of the Fecht River in Alsace, and are reported to be bombarding Munster. Fighting is almost continuous in the Arras region, particularly at Souchez, where the French claim gains. But all gains and losses are measured by trenches, and all are attended by great sacrifices of life. The Italians continue their advance on Trieste, but are at present chiefly concerned with their attempt to reduce the fortifications of Goritz, on the Isonzo River, from which the Austrians threaten their advance on Trieste. The campaign in the Adige valley has resulted in no definite action as yet. The Dardanelles campaign appears to be lagging. German submarines forced the temporary withdrawal of the warships from the Gulf of Saros, where they have been supporting the troops in the land advance on the Gallipoli peninsula; but the later dispatches announce a renewal of the bombardment of the Turkish forts by the fleet. No naval actions of moment have occurred. A duel occurred between an Austrian and an Italian submarine, resulting in the destruction of the latter. This is the first battle between two submarines. [See current volume, page 596.]



Rumors persist that Roumania has come to terms with Russia and the Allies, as to the terri-

tory she is to have for participation. Bulgaria also is more persistently announced as having been placated by the Allies; but no official announcement has been made. Greece, although giving her war party an emphatic majority in the election, cannot take action before the 20th of July, when her parliament will convene. The king, who has been dangerously sick for some time, is now reported to be recovering.



Last week the British Parliament granted the government \$1,250,000,000 for war purposes. On the 21st, the House of Commons unanimously passed through first reading a measure extending the credit of the government to \$5,000,000,000 if that sum be found necessary for the prosecution of the war. This loan of indefinite amount is to be issued at par, bear interest at the rate of 4½ per cent, and be redeemable at the option of the government between 1925 and 1945. The terms are such that one dollar can be invested as easily as a million.



General Christian De Wet, the Boer general who headed an uprising against the Union of South Africa in October, and was captured on a farm at Waterburg, British Buchuanaland, has been found guilty of treason and sentenced to six years' imprisonment, and a fine of \$10,000. No other opposition to the government is announced in South Africa. [See vol. xvii, p. 1190.]

NEWS NOTES

—The order that government employes on the Canal Zone be required to pay rent for their houses has been revoked on order of President Wilson. [See current volume, page 233.]

—San Francisco's Municipal Street Railway has so far earned \$766,000 in profits to be applied to the \$2,000,000 bond issue voted in August, 1913, for municipal railway purposes. [See vol. xvi, pp. 848, 850, vol. xvii, p. 348.]

—As a result of the visit to this country of the Chinese Merchants' Commission, a movement is on foot to establish a commercial museum in China where American materials and manufactured products can be exhibited.

—Governor John M. Slaton of Georgia on June 21 commuted the sentence of Leo M. Frank to life imprisonment. Frank was immediately removed from the Atlanta jail to the State farm at Milledgeville. [See current volume, pages 502, 590.]

—Appraisal completed on June 16 of the personal estate of Mrs. Frank Leslie indicates that the bequest entrusted to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt for the woman suffrage cause will be no less than \$1,300,000. The appraisal made is of the personal estate only, which amounts to \$1,737,477. [See current volume, page 254.]

—A chain of American hospitals spread over China, managed by American surgeons, with a view to improving medical and hospital conditions in the republic, is the ambition of the Rockefeller Foundation. As an initial step the Union Medical College at Peking has been purchased.

—A bulletin from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shows railroad and agricultural pursuits to be most hazardous, each having about 4,200 fatalities a year. Coal mining contributes 2,600, building and construction 1,900, general manufacturing 1,800. But metal mining has a rate of 4.00 per 1,000 fatalities, manufacturing has 0.25.

—The central labor organization of France, Confederation General du Travail, has officially approved of a proposal from the American Federation of Labor for a world conference of labor representatives to be held at the same place and at the same time as the peace conference. The purpose of this labor conference is to facilitate permanent peace by: First, the suppression of secret treaties; second, absolute respect for nationalities; third, the immediate limitation and the eventual suppression of armaments; and, fourth, obligatory arbitration.

PRESS OPINIONS

No Support for National Wrong Doing.

Ohio State Journal (Columbus), June 18.—The Chicago Tribune keeps at the head of its columns Decatur's saying, "Our country right or wrong." It would be better to drop Decatur and change the phrase to "Our country, always right." That would eliminate the justification of a possible wrong. It is a wicked vanity to boast of standing by a wrong. A national wrong is as bad as other wrongs. And thus it is wretched doctrine, for don't we know a wrong will bring sorrow whether the perpetrator is the people or just one man. It is really treason to advocate that our country should do wrong under any circumstances. The idea that we are liable to get into a fix when we must take the wrong side of a matter to save the country is a very foolish doctrine, arising from just such stuff as Decatur preached a century ago. Times have changed since then. It might have been right to do wrong in those primitive days, but it isn't so any more. We have clearer views than Stephen had.



Bryan at His Greatest.

Herbert Quick in Cincinnati Post, June 16.—Mr. Bryan never had anything to gain by accepting a place in the Cabinet. It was a step downward. He was greater as the Great Commoner than as Secretary of State. Financially, the taking of a place in the Cabinet involved a great sacrifice. Within a day or so after the news had been made public that he had accepted the portfolio, the writer had a talk with him. "Yes," said he, "I'm going into the Cabinet. Mr. Wilson has asked me to do so, and I can find no valid reason for refusing." It was plain, however, that he was quite conscious of the problems he might be facing. It was plain that he had sought for good reasons for asking to be excused, and had

found none. . . . Today he should stand higher in the respect of his countrymen than ever before. Those rancorous pens which are writing "Good riddance of bad rubbish!" are wielded by men who fail to realize that the act of giving up a great office for the sake of a belief is an admirable thing. It is not so common a thing in this country that we can afford to deny ourselves the privilege of appreciating it. Bryan is too old a politician not to have known that his action would make him the target for every unthinking and rancorous tongue and pen in the nation. He knew it would divide his friends, and for once his enemies would speak with one tongue. Was he right in his difference of opinion with Wilson? I do not think so. . . . I believe the judgment of Wilson and the rest of the Cabinet is best. . . . But Bryan was true to his principles, as he has always been. He is again the Great Commoner. Whether his greatness shall grow or decline depends on how he uses his newly regained freedom. The people are with Wilson; but the claims of arbitration and the pacifist position generally should have a spokesman. They will have one in Mr. Bryan. God grant him wisdom in what he shall say!

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

WILSON.

For The Public.

For Peace this calm, far-visioned man contends,
Daring to face the calumny and blame
Of those who, passion-blinded, would inflame
The Nation's thought for false and selfish ends;
He sees, dark-imagined, what vast ill attends
Woe-breeding War, yet does not slight the claim
Of honor that is more than form or name;
Above the moment's harm his thought ascends.

Time holds but few such crises for a land,
And few wise leaders meet such fateful hour!
Though the whole world is frenzied with alarms,
No hasty word profanes this Chief's command;
And Kings shall learn Forbearance, too, is power,
That Peace is braver than the clash of arms.

CHARLES H. WINKE.



RESPONSIBILITY FOR WAR.

From a Letter to the New York Times of June 11,
by Frederic C. Howe, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The present European war is not a peoples' war. The people were not consulted. Germany is ruled by the Junker class. The people have no voice in the Government. Russia and Austria are ruled by the same feudal caste. In England, too, however democratic her institutions may appear, it is the old aristocracy that really rules. It rules through the House of Lords, and the Tory Party in the House of Commons, through Lombard Street, the press and the large investing class in

the Liberal Party. England's Foreign Ministers have almost always come from the aristocracy.

And the class that rules these warring countries is the class that owns railroads, mining, oil and landed concessions all over the world. They own billions of bonds in foreign countries and weak dependencies. The foreign investments of England alone are estimated at twenty thousand million dollars. And it is the bondholders and concessionaires in the Orient, in Africa, in Egypt, in South America, and in Mexico that mold the foreign policy, that urge armaments, and that have kept Europe on the verge of war from the time when England acquired the shares of the Suez Canal, which was the beginning of her aggressive commercial foreign policy. . . . It is not the American people who urge armed intervention in Mexico. It is those who own railroads, mines, and great haciendas, which, according to a statement in the New York Times, are valued at twice the amount of the property owned by the Mexican people themselves. . . . The killing of men never settled anything either in private or public disputes. National dignity cannot be elevated or national honor vindicated by war, no matter if the offended nation should kill a great many more men than the offender. I believe it is literally true that a nation can be "too proud to fight," too secure in its own position to accept the blood feud as a means for settling disputes. At some time or other some man was courageous enough to decline to fight a duel. Some time some nation will take the same position and insist that the killing of thousands of men and the wasting of hundreds of millions of dollars is too mediaeval an arbitrament for it to accept, even though private property or individuals may suffer at the hands of some offending nation. We do not permit a drunken bully or an uncivilized savage to establish the rules of personal dealings; and a nation as big and as strong as our own should have the courage to say that it will not permit some other nation with the standards of an earlier age to force upon us its ideas of international controversy. . . . I stated that there "should be no profit in war" or suspicion that some men were making money while other men were giving up their lives, and that the Government should take control of all munition works and the manufacture of all war supplies. It would be a horrible travesty for one group of men to swell their fortunes while another group gave up their lives for the safety of the State. Especially is this true when those at the front sacrifice not only themselves but their wives and children they have left at home. War should call for universal sacrifice. . . . The public records of England, Germany, and France are filled with proof of "accelerated public opinion" for armaments. . . . The German Arms and Munition Factory wrote to its agents in Paris a year or two ago:

Get an article into one of the most widely read French newspapers, the Figaro, if possible, to the following effect:

"The French Minister of War has decided to accelerate considerably the provision of new pattern machine guns, and to order double the quantity at first intended."

This was designed to stimulate war sentiment in Germany. The German arms industry employed special agents to corrupt military and naval officers, and Government documents of the most confidential character were passed into the hands of one of the managers of the Krupp works. The scandal reached the Reichstag, where these agencies for the promotion of militarism were exposed. The Congressional Record at Washington contains twenty pages of closely printed documentary and other proof of this character, and America herself did not escape in the indictment. . . . They justify the suspicion that the agitation for further armament is not wholly disinterested.

I would collect war taxes from incomes, inheritances, land values, and from monopoly, and not shift the cost of war onto the back of the poor, where our Federal taxes now fall. I believe that war is only possible because Governments collect their revenues by indirect taxes which are not seen by the people, and which are paid most largely by the poor. For fifty years the poor of America have been paying for the direct and indirect costs of the civil war. Up to the recently imposed income tax, wealth and property were practically immune. In that time the Government collected probably \$20,000,000,000 in taxes upon the people's necessities. The same is true in Europe today. It is the ability of Governments to "pluck the goose without making it cry out" that makes war possible, and frees the privileged and propertied classes from its financial costs. Only since the recent Liberal Ministry has been in power in England has an attempt been made to tax the lands and privileges of the ruling aristocracy.

Wealth should not complain if the sacrifice demanded for the nation's safety is made to fall on all alike. . . . And it is because I believe that wars are made by classes and privileged interests that I insist that in a democracy, at least, people should vote whether they want war or not. And it is because the women suffer along with the men that I insist that they, too, should vote upon it. It is because my patriotism is affronted at the thought of human sacrifice being a cause of private profit that I urge Government ownership of munition factories and the taxation of property rather than the necessities of the poor. And if a recognition of the facts, which are a matter of record, that wars have been made by the privileged classes, and not by the people themselves; that the privileged classes are so often interested in

foreign investments to be protected by war, and in the making of munitions at home; if these are "pestiferous preachments," if these involve "the setting up of class distinction," then I must plead guilty to the indictment of having presented these facts. War seems to me too monstrous a thing to be identified with secrecy, with any suggestion of "dollar diplomacy," or the commitment of a whole people to its ravages by any group of people, whoever they may be, who may be accidentally intrusted with power.



TO AN ENEMY'S MOTHER.

Carol Ring in Labor Leader (England).

And did my son kill thine? Alas! Alas!
But I have my boy safe at home again,
His wound is healed. God! if there could but pass
From my soul's vision sight of thy son, slain!

Nothing can heal thy wound, thy bitter smart;
No prayer of mine can bring thee back thy boy.
Yet, my son thrust the sword-blade in thy heart,
And trampled out the flame of all thy joy.

Dear God of Pity, how can such things be?
My gentle, chivalrous, and high-souled son!
Oh, that we could together, I and he,
Make reparation for this deep wrong done!

Oh, broken-hearted mother! Could I press
Thy bowed head close against my aching breast
And bring thee some faint comfort, none the less
Would my despair and anguish find no rest.

For when my dear boy puts his hand in mine
I feel it wet with this warm crimson stain,
The life-blood welling from the heart of thine,
And all my soul goes out to meet thy pain.

BOOKS

"AN ATOM THROWN OUT FROM ETERNITY."

The Poet in the Desert. By Charles Erskine Scott Wood, 419 Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Portland, Oregon. 1915. Price, \$1.00.

The Poet has "come out from the haunts of men; from the struggle of wolves upon a carcass"—and has entered into the desert to meet his soul—"Face to face, naked as the Desert is naked, Bare as the great silence is bare."

And putting his hand in the hand of the Eternal he loses the little self that toils in the world's treadmill, and alone between two immensities he sings his song of meditation and chants his dirge unto civilization:

I have come into the primal solitude to seek Truth;
To lie at ease upon the breast of my Mother
And to be athirst amid the primal conditions.
Nothing will I sing of quaint conceit or purring
softness

Wresting my thought unto a rhyming word;
But I will sing a dirge unto Civilization.
It is a brazen mirror wherein all is distorted;
A chattering of monkeys who are foolish proud
Because they have put on clothes.
They imitate each other in the follies of their ignorance;

And all is falsity. They mould all to a false pattern,
The blind correcting the blind—
The more ignorant compelling the less ignorant—
The dumb sheep ordered not with a shepherd's
Crook but with a Sword.

And here in the desert—"empty, vague, vast and terrifying" the poet makes his appeal to "Truth—dweller in the starry places," and Truth with shining wings responds to the passionate summons: "Ask and I will answer." The conference between Truth and the Poet constitutes the substance of a poem that soars beyond the vision of the dustman into a region where "the clock of the heavens is set for eternity" and one sees with eyes that are not blinded by the deceiving hands of Time.

It is an infinite work that Truth marks for the Poet to perform, but he only is the true poet who bravely and boldly announces his own mission and flings down his challenge to a civilization drunken and bloated with the insidious poison of greed and selfishness. That the builders and defenders of the state would protest against the charges brought by the Poet goes without saying. None the less, it is only as Authority is summoned to face itself and study the effects of its own mandates that any reform—slow as it may be—can possibly come to pass. The Poet of the Desert with the Sword of Truth is making some magnificent strokes at the arch enemy of Justice and Freedom, and all lovers of humanity will find inspiration in a book issued in unpretentious gray covers by the author himself, though any leading book company might have found honor in its publication.

Have we no criticisms to offer? Surely. But they are mainly covered by the poetic license which embellishes Truth with brilliant figures and symbols that startle the imagination and fasten thought on matters heretofore regarded with indifference or with merely conventional approval. It would be a pleasure to quote some of these awakening touches at ancient evils; but nothing less than an entire reading of the book from Prologue to Finis would give an adequate conception of its real character.

"Freedom is the air of the soul" for its writer. Yet we might question what it would be for the brute man who is ground through the mills of the gods in countless lives—"running about in a lost circle, cheated by things which seem to be but are not"—before he can reach the limitless state of the Poet of the Desert.

A. L. M.



"The good author is he who contemplates without marked joy or excessive sorrow the adventures of his soul among criticisms."—Joseph Conrad.

ECONOMIC ETHICS.

Social Justice Without Socialism. By John Bates Clark. Published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston. 1914. Price, 50 cents net.

The University of California is issuing in separate books as a series, its Barbara Weinstock Foundation lectures "dealing with the various phases of the moral law in its bearing on business life under the new economic order." John Bates Clark, Professor of Political Economy at Columbia University, seeks in the first essay of the series "a golden mean between letting the State do nothing and asking it to do everything"—between the *laissez-faire* policy and Socialism.

As a "preliminary reform," "a condition of securing most of the others," he mentions with approval direct legislation, the recall, the short ballot, direct primaries and proportional representation. Through this people's machinery he would get among other reforms a shorter working day, emergency employment, conservation of natural resources, "telephone and telegraph systems that can be universally used," and a freer governmental use of the principle of eminent domain. "Regulation of monopoly is nearly the greatest of possible reforms," in his opinion, but "perhaps the greatest is a change in the mode of adjusting wages." The fundamental law "if it could work entirely without hindrances, would actually give to every laborer substantially what he produces." "In the midst of all prevalent abuses this basic law asserts itself like a law of gravitation, and so long as monopoly is excluded and competition is free—so long as both labor and capital can move without hindrance to the points at which they can create the largest products and get the largest rewards, its action can not be stopped."

How to exclude monopoly is not within what the author has taken for his province in this essay. But something creates the impression in the Singletaxer's single mind that Mr. Clark is not thinking of land value taxation, but of wage arbitration, or profit sharing or the like. The guesser, however, is left to his guess; and the book gains its significance not from anything unique about it, on the contrary, from its typical character, from its many companions out of the same source, the economic and political science departments of our universities.

The moral law and the science of economics, in these democratic days, are certainly being royally cousined out of their distant old coldness.

A. L. G.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—**Naval Occasions.** By "Bartimeus." Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. 1915. Price, \$1.25 net.

—**The Orthocratic State.** By John Sherwin Crosby. Published by Sturgis & Walton, New York. 1915. Price, \$1.00 net.

—**War and the Ideal of Peace.** By Henry Rutgers Marshall. Published by Duffield & Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.25 net.

—**The Japanese Problem in the United States.** By H. A. Millis. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.50 net.

—**The World-Storm and Beyond.** By Edwin Davies Schoonmaker. Published by the Century Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$2.00 net.

—**America and Her Problems.** By Paul H. B. D'Estournelles de Constant. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$2.00 net.

—**World Peace: A Spectacle Drama.** By Frank P. and Kate Richards O'Hare. Published by the National Rip Saw Publishing Co., St. Louis. 1915. Price, postpaid, cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.

—**Population: A Study in Malthusianism.** By Warren S. Thompson. Number 153, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York. 1915. Price, paper, \$1.75 net.

—**Nationalization of Railways in Japan.** By Toshiharu Watarai. Whole Number 152, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York. 1915. Price, paper, \$1.25 net.

PERIODICALS

Taxation in Ohio.

The Quarterly Journal of Economics (Cambridge, Mass.) for May prints an essay by Oliver C. Lockhart on Recent Developments in Taxation in Ohio. The history is given of tax legislation and administration from the Honorary Commission's report in 1908 with its unheeded advice to abolish the general property tax, down to the latest returns under the centralized assessment plan of the Warnes law of 1913. The writer finds the difficulties of the uniform tax insurmountable: "Perhaps in no other State," he concludes, "has the theory of the general property tax been more vigorously defended and the legislation supposed to be alone necessary for the successful operation of the tax been more cheerfully provided; yet the result is at best a partial, and in all probability, a temporary success. . . . In view of the fact that the proposal to classify property for purposes of taxation has been so widely discussed in the State, it seems fairly certain that the first step in reform will be the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for some degree of classification and according a low rate, rather than exemption, to intangible property."

A. L. G.



One day small Sadie was watching the lid of the teakettle rise and fall, emitting at the same time tiny puffs of steam. Finally she said, "Mamma, you'd better call in the doctor. The teakettle's got the asthma."—San Francisco Star.

"Spriggins boasts that he is a self-made man."
 "Then why did he make a fool of himself?"—Sacred Heart Review.



Enthusiastic Aviator (after long explanation of

the principle and workings of his biplane)—"Now, you understand it, don't you?"

Young Lady—"All but one thing."

Aviator—"And that is—?"

Young Lady—"What makes it stay up?"—New York Times.

August 26th, 1915

a sale of

TRANSFERS OF TAX LIENS

will be held by the

CITY OF NEW YORK

affecting lands and tenements in the

BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

How much shall we invest for your account?

The Tax Lien Company of New York

68 William Street, New York, N. Y.

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

SCHILLER BUILDING

June 25—Rev. Thomas E. Cox, Pastor of St. Basil's Church: "Some Reflections on Progress."

Alfred Cook, "The Single Tax."

There will be no regular meetings in July and August.

Otto Cullman,
President.

E. J. Batten,
Business Secretary.

A Live Railroader

made a democrat of Tom L. Johnson. More potentially great men and women than you think are waiting in your locality for you to make democrats of them. 1,000 new yearly subscribers in July.

Advertise in The Public

Be sure to

buy Fels-Naptha the next time you need soap. It will make *all* your work easy and pleasant.

One of the *best* things it will do for you is to get the weekly wash on the line in half the time, with less than half the bother than ever before.

That's the Fels-Naptha way!