

The Public

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

Vol. XVIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1915.

No. 895.

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	ROBERT BAKER, New York
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio	GRACE ISABEL COLERON, New York
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio	W. G. EGGLESTON, California
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois	C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
LLEWELYN JONES, Illinois	R. F. FETTERBREW, South Dakota
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Calif.	J. W. S. CALLIE, England
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island	JOHN PAUL, England
S. A. STOCHEWELL, Minnesota	ERNEST BRAY, Australia
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri	GEORGE FOWLER, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Ellsworth Building, 527 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:

Peace and Honor.....	513
More Victims for Slaughter.....	513
Price of Peace.....	513
Moral Forces.....	514
Treason to the Common Good.....	514
Reconstructing the British Cabinet.....	515
Pupils of Plaza-Torro.....	515
A Straw.....	515
The Meaning of the Barnes-Roosevelt Verdict.....	515
Tricky Tax Reform.....	516
Betrayal of a Trust.....	516
Chicago Judges.....	516
Denver's Tribute to Monopoly.....	517

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

A Chapter in the New Internationalism—Alice Thacher Post.....	517
The Denver Fight and Its Lesson—Louis Wallis.....	520
Bad Work of a Gang-Controlled Legislature—R. E. Smith.....	521
Discussing Justice at a Charity Conference—W. D. Mackenzie.....	522

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Commission on Industrial Relations.....	523
Verdict for Roosevelt.....	524
Tax Reform News.....	524
Chicago Telephone War.....	525
Trade Congress.....	525
The Mohonk Arbitration Conference.....	525
Women's Peace Movement.....	525
Mexico.....	525
European War.....	525
Portugal.....	526
News Notes.....	526
Press Opinions.....	526

RELATED THINGS:

The Zone—William Lloyd Garrison, Jr.....	527
Common Ground—Ellis Jones.....	527
Five Hundred Thousand Per Cent Profit—Henry J. Gibbons.....	527
Uncle Sam and Woodrow Wilson—Edmund Vance Cooke.....	529

BOOKS:

Law, Liquor and Love.....	529
For a Durable Peace.....	520
Periodicals.....	530
Pamphlets.....	530

EDITORIAL

Peace and Honor.

It may not always seem possible for a nation to preserve peace with honor, but it always can preserve honor with peace. s. d.



More Victims for Slaughter.

Italy is the latest victim of "preparedness for war." But for "preparedness" she would not have joined in the European struggle. She would have escaped the terrible suffering and losses that are now inevitable, and for which extension of national boundaries will be poor compensation. The unfortunate country seems to have succumbed to a noisy element like that which drove the United States into the Spanish war, tried to drive it to intervene in Mexico, seeks to raise a scare about Japan, and would have war with Germany. Italy now pays the penalty for preparing for a war that her preparedness has brought on. s. d.



Price of Peace.

Dr. John Grier Hibben, President of Princeton University, in his address at Lake Mohonk, on International Arbitration, gave utterance to ideas that may lead to confused thought and understanding. In conceding the desirableness of peace, and a readiness to pay the price in restraint of passion, in sufferance, in sacrifice of material wealth or personal convenience, he warned his hearers that there were some things that could not be surrendered. Continuing, he said:

We dare not trade honor for peace, we dare not betray duty in order that we may bargain for peace. We dare not indulge ourselves in the blessings of peace, while we turn deaf ears to the cry of distress, or to the summons of a righteous cause.

All this is quite true; and few if any peace advocates will attempt to gainsay it, if they be allowed to interpret his words. Both political and military action find expression through government agents, and that expression depends largely

upon the nature of those agents. Their conceptions of honor extend all the way from the punctilious soldier to the broad and tolerant philosopher. Mere readiness to fight, and ability to overcome opponents, has little to do with answering the cry of distress, or responding to the summons of a righteous cause. The great empires of Europe have been armed to the teeth for generations. Yet, during all that time the victims of tyranny and oppression in the Balkans have cried in vain. Their pleas fell upon deaf ears for the very reason that the great nations were armed, and ready for conflict. Their hands were at each others' throats, instead of being extended to the oppressed. Had there been no standing armies in Europe, and no great military establishments, the lovers of freedom and justice in all countries would long ago have volunteered to aid the people of the Balkans to gain the liberty withheld by organized soldiery. A free citizenry will respond to the cry of distress, and to the summons of a righteous cause; but professional soldiers know no duty but to obey the command of their superior officers. They may maintain governments, but they are death to liberty.

s. C.



Moral Forces.

When President Wilson, in his New York speech on the navy, said: "The interesting and inspiring thing about America is that she asks nothing for herself, except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself," he again sounded a high note in international morals; but when he said:

The mission of America is the only thing that a sailor or soldier should think about; he has nothing to do with the formation of her policy; he is to support her policy, whatever it is; but he is to support her policy in the spirit of herself; and the strength of our policy is that we who for the time being administer the affairs of this nation, do not originate her spirit; we attempt to embody it, we attempt to realize it in action; we are dominated by it; we do not dictate it;

he betrayed the difficulty of reconciling force with reason. An armed force, both on land and on the sea is, under present conditions, necessary. But that force may be an agent for evil, as well as for good, depending entirely upon the directing head. Therein lies the danger of a great military establishment. In the hands of a man like Mr. Wilson, or Mr. Taft—both of whom proved by their treatment of the Mexican situation that they could have military power without abusing it—it might be an agent for good; but in the hands of a man like Mr. Roosevelt—granting him equally good intentions—it would be fraught with grave possibilities of evil. And there are men as erratic and

as headstrong as Mr. Roosevelt, who lack his goodness of heart and sincerity of purpose. A great military force in their hands is a menace to civilization.



Consider the Lusitania case. Americans claim the right to move upon the high seas, when and where they please. Germans claim the right to destroy vessels carrying arms and ammunition to their enemies. Neither side questions the other's claim in the abstract. But when the American claims the right to travel on a British ship carrying ammunition, the two rights conflict. How shall they be settled? If America had a great military establishment sufficient to enforce with reasonable ease any demand that this country might make, little attention would be given to the German claims; whereas, if we had a small military establishment, making the appeal to force of doubtful wisdom, much more consideration would be given to opposing claims. Two men, unarmed, may calmly discuss points in dispute. Failing to agree, they may resort to a third party. But if they be armed, recourse is seldom had to arbitration until after the shooting. America has ample naval force to protect her coasts. To increase this force would be, to that extent, to decrease the probabilities of an appeal to reason.

s. C.



Treason to the Common Good.

How the war is leading men to murder each other who ought to be standing shoulder to shoulder as comrades in a fight against a common enemy, is shown in recent casualty reports. Josiah Wedgwood, leader of the fight against land monopoly in England is reported wounded. On the other hand, Bodenreform of Berlin, in the issue of April 20, reports five members of the Land Reform League as recently fallen in battle. No bloody victory can compensate either nation for the loss of such citizens. That men like Wedgwood and these German Bodenreformers should try to kill each other is as illogical as it is wicked. The real enemies of the English people are not the Germans, but the British Tories who obstruct the efforts of those who like Wedgwood would restore to the people of England the right to use of English land. The real enemies of the German people are not the English or French, but German junkers who oppose the efforts of the Bodenreformers to free the land of Germany. The untimely death of these German radicals is a loss to the people of England, France and Russia, as well as to the people of Germany. The loss of

a man like Wedgwood is as great a calamity to the German people as to the English. Soldiers of the Common Good should not fight against one another, even though commanded by their governments to do so. s. d.



Reconstructing the British Cabinet.

Friends of liberty and progress may well look askance at the formation of a coalition cabinet. That a Liberal government, strong enough to take the veto power from the Lords, and put through the Irish Home Rule bill, and still retain the strength to remodel the upper chamber, should be forced to divide power with its opponents, measures again the awful price that must be paid for war. With the exception of depriving the Lords of their veto power, the Liberal program is uncompleted. The return of the Conservatives to power may be the means of undoing all that has been done—even to the extent of restoring the veto to the Lords. It is possible, however, to magnify unduly impending evils, and to underestimate the persistency of good. England is not to be judged by Continental countries. The strength of British institutions does not lie in political parties, nor even in the government. It lies in the individual people. Smile as we may at the English navy or the coal miner, eking out an existence on a pittance, singing, "Britons never will be slaves," there is yet something in that man which, when once aroused, makes of him a resistless force for democracy. Illiterate he may be, and stupid to a degree, a prey to custom, and therefore tolerant of privilege, he still retains the spirit that maintains free speech, a free press, and a trial by jury.



In what other country of Europe would the press be allowed such freedom of criticism of the government during a great war? Where else would strikes for higher wages be tolerated among men working in ammunition factories, and in repairing warships? During the Boer war leaders of the Liberal party stumped the country in opposition to that war. And except for the coalition the Conservatives might have done the same thing in this war. Within a year of the time when a leading member of Parliament raised more than a hundred thousand armed men to resist an act of Parliament, that man is considered for a place in the cabinet with the men who passed the law. These facts should be kept in mind when forecasting England's course. The coalition cabinet will mean a re-casting of the political horoscope. It does not, however, necessarily mean all that might

be inferred from a return of the Conservative party to power. It may be put among the remotest of possibilities that British privileged classes will ever under any circumstances be able to persuade the laboring classes that their course is easiest while carrying the landlords on their backs. If British politics were based wholly upon the opportunism of the politicians, the coalition cabinet would mark a backward step; but if the new ideas have touched the individual citizen—and there is reason to think they have—the seeming triumph of the Conservatives may lead to a quicker overthrow of privilege. s. c.



Pupils of Plaza-Torro.

Militarist and jingo writers on the Chicago Tribune wish to let it be known that they object to going on the firing line in case of war. Cartoonist John B. McCutcheon makes this clear in the issue of May 23 wherein he frantically demands that those opposed to appropriations for military purposes "should be on the firing line if we ever have a war," thus relieving those of that disagreeable duty who demanded preparation. The Tribune clearly belongs to the same militarist school as "that well-connected warrior, the Duke of Plaza-Torro," who "led his regiment from behind. He found it less exciting." s. d.



A Straw.

Light upon the question of why Latin America distrusts the United States broke when Secretary Bryan, in an address before the delegates to the Pan-American Trade Congress, repeated President Wilson's statement at Mobile that the United States did not want a foot of territory from any other country. The words were greeted with such enthusiasm by the delegates that they interrupted the speaker. Latin America has had good reason to distrust the United States. It is for us to remove the foundation of that distrust by making good President Wilson's Mobile declaration. s. c.



The Meaning of the Barnes-Roosevelt Verdict.

In finding for the defendant, the jury in the Barnes-Roosevelt case declared in effect that Mr. Roosevelt told the truth in saying that a corrupt ring controlled the government of New York State from 1898 to 1910, and perhaps even longer. It was impossible to render the verdict without implying that Roosevelt's statement applies to others than Barnes. It applies to all who took orders from him or the interests back of

him. That Roosevelt has cause to believe that Barnes' influence over government is not at an end, was shown in the reasons he gave for taking a change of venue from Albany county when the case first came to trial. Barnes' influence is strong in that county and Roosevelt feared its effect on the courts. The testimony in the case, together with other testimony, excluded an account of the narrowness of the issue, shows the need of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, if Bossism is to be destroyed.

S. D.



Tricky Tax Reform.

The City Club of Chicago's Committee on Taxation has made clear the tricky nature of the so-called revenue reform amendment submitted by the Illinois Legislature in obedience to the demand of special interests. These interests have pushed this amendment authorizing classification of personal property only, on the alleged ground that it had received popular endorsement through the public policy vote of 1912. As a matter of fact, what the people endorsed that year was an entirely different measure, one that demanded classification of all kinds of property. Yet in contemptuous disregard of this expression of public opinion the legislature has submitted a measure which will not permit classification of real estate, and is falsely represented by its sponsors as in accordance with the demand made at the polls. The City Club's committee did well in exposing this trick. If the Legislature felt that it must give tax reform preference over other propositions it should at least have submitted a measure approved by the voters. It substituted instead an inferior imitation. What it has done constitutes betrayal of a trust. What the voters will be called on to consider, therefore, aside from the merits of the measure submitted, is whether it is good public policy to encourage such methods as special interest have used to influence the Legislature into disregard of the popular will.

S. D.



Betrayal of a Trust.

Those ultra conservatives who are so bound by the traditions of the past that they will not admit the Initiative and Referendum to a place in their political creed, may consider with profit the career of the Illinois Legislature. Fortified by an iron-clad Constitution that permits only one amendment at an election, it has been able so far to resist all attempts to bring the State laws into harmony with modern political science. Not only has it betrayed the people by refusing to submit

a call for a constitutional convention, or an amendment to the amending clause of the present Constitution, either of which would have given the people relief from antiquated restrictions, and both of which had been overwhelmingly endorsed by the voters; but in submitting an amendment permitting the classification of personal property for purposes of taxation, it has flouted the people while pretending to serve them.



The question of submitting an amendment to the people empowering the Legislature to "classify property for purposes of taxation" was put to a popular vote on the Public Policy ballot in 1912. It was carried by a vote of 541,189 to 187,467. The Legislature elected at that time failed to do anything toward carrying out the wishes of the people; but the agitation having continued, the present Legislature has responded by submitting to the people an amendment empowering the Legislature to "classify *personal* property for purposes of taxation." One of the most potent arguments urged in behalf of this measure while it was before the Legislature was the fact that it had been endorsed so emphatically by the voters; but to submit an amendment to classify personal property, when the people had asked for an amendment to classify all property, was like giving them a horse chestnut in response to a request for a chestnut horse. The only effective way to compel a representative to recognize the will of the people after he has been elected is to place in their hands the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall.

S. C.



Chicago Judges.

Among the sins to be laid at the door of the Illinois Legislature was its failure to make available the judicial primary law for the nomination of candidates for the Circuit and Superior Courts of Cook County. As a consequence of this inaction the central committees of the several parties were unable to agree upon a non-partizan ticket, and returned to the old party ticket system, the Republican and Democratic committees naming each twenty candidates, and the Socialists, three. The sitting judges, who had been elected on a non-partizan ticket, were renominated by the parties to which they belonged, together with enough new names to complete the lists. The judicial ticket, therefore, requires extra attention on the part of the voters. It would be the height of absurdity for a voter claiming to be intelligent to vote a straight party ticket. Nor would it entirely remedy the matter to pick out all the names of sitting

judges. As there are men among the candidates who offer little promise of judicial efficiency, so there are men now on the bench who have proven themselves unworthy of their position. The Public does not pretend to be able to name the best twenty candidates, but it believes that any intelligent voter can, with the assistance of a lawyer friend, or well-posted citizen select a list of worthy candidates.



There is one candidate in the list, however, for whom The Public would bespeak the consideration of all its readers in the County, because of his proven fitness for the bench. A judicial candidate should be honest above suspicion; he should have a breadth of mind that can grasp both sides of a question; and he should understand enough law to avoid its technical entanglements; but above all, he should understand the question of human rights. Judges are law-makers. They make more law than do the legislatures. In fact the legislators themselves never know whether they have made a law until the judges have passed upon it. And so controversial are these decisions that make and unmake laws that the voice of a single judge may determine the law. As with the supreme courts of the States and Nation, so the courts all the way down are molding the law toward the personal bent of the sitting judge—not necessarily from dishonest motives, but according to his philosophy of life. The beneficiaries of Privilege understand this, and do all in their power to put men of their frame of mind on the bench. The friends of the rights of man should exercise the same diligence, and do all in their power to elevate to the bench men of their kind. Such a man is Judge Edward Osgood Brown, who has proven himself both on the bench and as a citizen, a lover of liberty and a friend of man. Put his name first on your list, and use it as a touchstone to prove those who are to sit with him.

S. C.



Denver's Tribute to Monopoly.

The principal objection urged in Denver against the proposed single-tax amendment to the city charter by the organized opposition was, in effect, that it would relieve the people of paying about \$8,000,000 in tribute to landed interests. This was implied in the statement that adoption of the Singletax would destroy \$160,000,000 of land value. It was not denied that there would have been as much land in Denver after adoption of the amendment as there was before. It could not be

successfully disputed that the land would have been as desirable for use as before. There would have been as many labor products as before and these would have been just as valuable. There would have been in every respect the same amount of wealth, the same demand for its use, the same supply of men willing to engage in productive work, and the same amount of capital available. But \$160,000,000 of marketable value, according to the anti-singletax organization, would have disappeared. Although the banks would have had as much money on deposit, although no merchant or manufacturer would have had less in stock or machinery or buildings than on the day before, although there would have been no reduction in supply of anything that labor has produced or that human beings need, we are told that \$160,000,000 would have gone. Would it be unreasonable to conclude that the alleged loss in prospect must have been \$160,000,000 worth of nothing? That the imperilled sum represents the capitalized value of \$8,000,000 paid annually by Denver citizens for no return whatever? If so, would it not have been a boon to the people of the city to have been relieved of this burden? It may be said that the anti-singletaxers misrepresented the case, that the measure before the people provided for only a partial application which would have done no more than place on land values \$1,000,000 a year in taxation that would have been taken off of labor and its products. But the fact remains that anti-singletaxers unconsciously admit the needless burden put by land monopoly on the people of Denver. And this admission will help to reverse at a future election the mistake made by Denver voters this year who voted against relieving themselves of this unjust burden.

S. D.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

A CHAPTER IN THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM*

Rotterdam, Holland, May 8, 1915.

The first great organic expression of international feeling—that perhaps summarizes the International Congress of Women held at The Hague from April 28 to May 1. But this Congress not only made articulate the sense of the women of warring and neutral nations at this period of pre-eminent warfare, that war is a madness and a horror; it also threw up against the screen of hideous smoke and reek

*The correspondence published in The Public of May 21, page 494, under the title "A Pacifist Journey in War Time," was prepared from private letters written by Mrs. Post. This present article on the recent International Congress of Women was written by Mrs. Post for The Public.—Editors of The Public.

which veils the battlefields of Europe, a vision of many of the elemental things which must go into the making of the longed-for peace, if that peace is to be something more than a pause of exhaustion, something more than a rehabilitation of military slavery—a clear vision of such elemental things as respect for nationalities, small as well as great; popular control of questions of war and peace; the freedom of the seas and great trade routes; the recognition of the citizenship of women; simple justice, and yet again justice.

That the Congress should have been a powerful expression of emotion was to have been expected. That it succeeded in formulating an intelligent and logical constructive program, is matter for profound satisfaction, for this leads us just so much farther along the road to the certain internationalism of the future—the world solidarity based upon a federation of self-governing nations, the logical historical consequent of federations of self-governing states.

The American delegates arrived in two or more groups. A few reached The Hague by way of Scandinavia a day or two before the Congress opened. With this group came Mme. Rosika Schwimmer, the eloquent Hungarian who had done much in America to make known the call to this Congress.

Forty American delegates, including Miss Jane Addams, chairman of the Woman's Peace Party of America, arrived at The Hague at the last moment, having been held on the Noordam off Dover for four days.* With them came Mr. and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence of England. Mrs. Lawrence had also been speaking in America with great effect for the cause of peace. We drifted late into the hall of assembly where a meeting of welcome was being held on the evening of Tuesday, April 27. The hall, the same in which all subsequent meetings of the Congress were held, was the Dierentuin, a fine concert hall in the Zoölogical Gardens, and the largest auditorium in The Hague. Its capacity of 2,000 was required, especially for the evening meetings. It may be noted here that for the day-time meetings we were obliged to take off our hats.

On the 28th and 29th we held five-hour morning sessions, with afternoon teas, and evening meetings for speeches. On the 30th we sat morning and afternoon, and in the evening had speeches or readings from over twenty members, including a great speech on internationalism from Miss Addams. On May 1st we held a morning session to the time limit for which we could have the hall. Certainly the Congress worked hard.

At the opening of the business sessions Miss Addams was elected President of the Congress by acclamation. This was of course a natural thing to do, as Miss Addams came from the largest neutral nation represented in the Congress. And experience proved it a popular and most satisfactory thing to have done, as Miss Addams' tact drew us safely through the many pitfalls of a "strife of tongues" and the variations in our historic sense of things.

For we were there from many lands and we spoke many languages. We had but few delegates from Great Britain. One hundred and eighty were prevented from coming by a temporary cessation of passenger traffic between England and Holland. The French women, who had originally expected to come,

did not succeed in getting through. According to the roll, which was, however, difficult to make up, and may not have been quite correct, there were, besides the two or three members from Great Britain and the fifty members from the United States, 28 members from Germany, 18 from Hungary, 15 from Sweden, 12 from Norway, 8 from Denmark, 6 from Austria, 5 from Belgium, and one each from Armenia, Brazil, Poland, Italy, South Africa and Canada, and roughly 1,000 from Holland.

English, German and French were the official languages, and in the evening Dutch also was used. The evening speeches were not translated, but during the business sessions official translators gave versions of everything, usually condensing more or less. This business of translating took time, of course. It may be readily seen that even with condensation, translations would cause the normal work of one day to take at least two days' time, and, besides, there were misunderstandings and unintentional errors of translation to be straightened out. Still, the confusion did not create a babel. And a great number of delegates who could speak only in their own languages, could nevertheless understand one or two more. The first, though not the only delegate to speak in all three of the official languages, was our own Emily Greene Balch, professor of economics and sociology at Wellesley College. The Scandinavian women all had to speak in other than their own tongues. Some of them used German, but many spoke in English. The Dutch women also used either English or German. The eloquent Italian delegate, Mme. Genoni of Milan, spoke in French, as did also the Belgians.

The five Belgian delegates did not arrive until late on Thursday. They had come with the permission of the German governor, by automobile from Brussels to a little frequented part of the frontier, and had then walked to the nearest railway line. On Friday morning they were given an enthusiastic welcome by the Congress, and all five were asked to take seats on the platform, since, unlike the other nations, they had not been able to have two of their number on the platform the preceding days. The speech with which they were welcomed came eloquently from the lips of Dr. Anita Augspurg, an able German delegate from Munich.

By the general rules of debate of the Congress, discussions on the relative national responsibility for or conduct of the present war were outside of the scope of the Congress. Also, resolutions dealing with the rules under which war shall in future be carried on, were barred from the scope of the Congress.

It must be noted that this body was not called together as a peace congress, and it is to be further noted that the Congress did not, as was at first contemplated, even call for a truce or armistice to be declared in this war for the discussion of peace. Perhaps it may be said that this body of women was too practical to ask for what they surely would not get. Moreover, the thought of armistice brought a sense of fear to some who believed that the status quo at the moment of an armistice would become a permanency in the peace to be developed; and, somehow, at least to the pacifists of the neutral nations of Scandinavia, and to the Dutch, the status quo of the present did not seem to be tolerable as a permanency. So a substitute motion calling upon the

*See The Public of May 21, page 494.

governments of the world to put an end to this bloodshed and to begin peace negotiations was offered in place of the original truce motion by Mme. Schwimmer in an enormously powerful speech, in the course of which, upon her call, the members of the Congress rose and stood, in sympathy with the countless women who mourn their dead, for a long minute with bowed heads, in a tense silence broken only by weeping.

In connection with this armistice question, we learned in conversation with some of the Belgians that they hope for an arrangement by which Germany will withdraw from their territory, and will not be driven out by force, for in the latter case, they say, not one stone will be left on another by the retreating troops.

For the settlement of the war the Congress asked for a Conference of Neutral Nations which shall offer continuous mediation without armistice, a proposition based on a plan developed last winter by Miss Julia Grace Wales of the University of Wisconsin, and embodied by the Wisconsin Legislature in a memorial to President Wilson early this spring.

The Congress also asked that representatives of the people, including women, should take part in the conference that will frame the peace settlement after the war.

The democratic spirit of the Congress, alluded to previously, expressed itself in such principles as the following, which were laid down as essential to the permanence of peace: "No transference of territory without the consent of the men and women residing therein"; "that autonomy and a democratic parliament should not be refused to any people"; that "future international disputes" should be referred "to arbitration and conciliation"; that the nations should agree "to unite in bringing social, moral and economic pressure to bear upon any country which resorts to arms instead of referring its case to arbitration or conciliation"; "that foreign policies shall be subject to democratic control"; and, finally, the "political enfranchisement" of women.

It was natural that feminism should assert itself strongly at a Congress called especially to express the feminine voice at a time when there seemed to be sore need for it. And so we find demands for suffrage for women over and over in the resolutions of this Congress, but always in appropriate connection, and uttered as a cry for something the need for which had become absolute for existence itself.

It was in connection with the discussions in regard to no transference of territory without plebiscite, that the greatest group emotion found expression. Some Finnish women had even written to the Congress to ask, not only that this demand should be made, but that retroactive effect should be asked for it. Passionate appeals for the resolution were made by the Poles and the Belgians. Mme. Genoni of Italy wanted the principle got into immediate operation, even before the war should be over; territories now in danger needed it at this very moment. A Dutch member foresaw difficulties if the principle were to be applied to colonies. Protest was finally made to these speeches on the ground that they were not germane. The chair recognized the point of order, but condoned the speeches on the ground that they expressed genuine group needs.

The constructive power of the women showed itself

strongly in their plans for international coöperation. The calling of the third Hague Conference immediately after the war was asked for. There were also urged, as a development of the Hague Court of Arbitration, a permanent International Court of Justice; and as a development of the Hague Conferences, a permanent International Conference to further coöperation among nations, to enforce justice for subject communities, and to safeguard the interests and rights, not only of the great Powers, but also of weaker countries and primitive peoples; also, the establishment of a permanent Council of Conciliation and Investigation for the settlement of international differences arising from economic competition, expanding commerce, increasing population, and changes in social and political standards.

Universal disarmament was advocated, and nationalization of the manufacture of arms and the munitions of war, and national control of international traffic in arms.

The American delegates stood especially for the democratic principles and for the international court and conferences outlined above, and for nationalization of the manufacture of armament, and much of the phraseology in which the resolutions upon these subjects is expressed was derived from the American forms of presentation.

The Americans also advocated the abolition of all preferential tariffs, and the neutralization of the seas and of such maritime trade routes as the Panama Canal, the English Channel, the Dardanelles, the Suez and the Kiel Canals, the Straits of Gibraltar, etc. Miss Grace Abbott of Chicago made one of the most impressive speeches of the Congress to these propositions. They finally got into the resolutions in the following form: "That in all countries there shall be liberty of commerce, that the seas shall be free and the trade routes open on equal terms to the shipping of all nations."

The Americans further brought in a resolution which passed in almost their precise language as follows: "Inasmuch as the investment by capitalists of one country in the resources of another, and the claims arising therefrom, are a fertile source of international complications, this International Congress of Women urges the widest possible acceptance of the principle that such investments shall be made at the risk of the investor, without claim to the official protection of his government."

Action to be taken by the Congress directly resolved itself into the creation of an International Committee for the calling together of another Congress in the same place and at the same time as the Conference of the Powers which will frame the peace settlement after the war, for the purpose of presenting practical proposals to that conference. This International Committee consists of the following members: Miss Jane Addams, President, Mrs. Fanny Fern Andrews, United States of America; Dr. Anita Augspurg, Lida Gustave Heymann, Germany; Miss Chrystal Macmillan, Miss Kathleen Courtney, Great Britain; Fräulein Vilma Glöcklich, Frau Rosika Schwimmer, Hungary; Frau Leopoldine Kulka, Frau Olga Misar, Austria; Frau Anna Kleman, Fröken Hansson, Sweden; Fröken Thora Daugaard, Frau Clara Tybjerg, Denmark; Mme. Rose Genoni, Italy; Frau Keilhau, Dr. Emily Arnesen, Norway; Dr. Aletta

Jacobs, Mevr. van Biema Hymans, Dr. Mia Boissevain, Netherlands.

The Congress also voted, as a matter of direct action, to send envoys, appointed by its International Committee, with the message expressed in the resolutions of the Congress, to the rulers of the belligerent and neutral nations of Europe, and to the President of the United States. These envoys are now entering upon the fulfillment of their tasks. Miss Addams and Miss Balch, and perhaps Mrs. French and Miss Wales, of the United States, Dr. Jacobs of Holland, Mme. Schwimmer of Hungary, Mme. Genoni of Italy, Miss Macmillan of Great Britain, and others, are proceeding by twos and threes to the principal European capitals.

As we leave Holland we hear of the loss of the Lusitania, with shock and sorrow. The Hollanders appear to be greatly moved by the event. I have been spoken to about it, simply and democratically, and apparently out of full hearts—by a waiter in a restaurant, a man on a pier, a steward, and so on. The waiter got me his Dutch newspaper and helped me to get at the facts. The relations of service were past; we were two human beings speaking together in quiet awe of a sad tragedy.

Holland—beautiful, clean, gorgeous with the spring blossoming of tulips and narcissi and jonquills—is gravely and kindly and bravely going about its work. This little country is caring for 800,000 Belgian refugees, and nearly 200,000 interned soldiers. It has its own problems of ruined businesses and thousands of unemployed, and the burden of mobilization taxes. The people who walk the streets are serious and silent and self-contained. They live as in an atmosphere of austere sympathy, and they stand under the shadow of a Great Fear.

Alice Thacher Post.



THE DENVER FIGHT AND ITS LESSONS.

Denver, May 19.

Two huge, flaring red signs, "ANTI SINGLE TAX LEAGUE" AND "SINGLE TAX LEAGUE," confronting each other on opposite sides of a main business thoroughfare; great political advertisements occupying whole pages of space in the daily newspapers; rival orators addressing densely packed crowds on the street corners; frank admission by a hostile press that Singletax overshadowed all other issues; the city flooded from center to circumference with campaign literature; the people aroused as in a presidential year, with feelings mounting higher and higher; these facts, chronicled in plain type, give the outsider a few inadequate glimpses of the Denver Singletax campaign.

The charter amendment which the voters of this western metropolis rejected at the polls May 18 provided for what is called "municipal singletax," shifting about one million dollars tax from labor products over onto land values and franchises. For state and national purposes, the citizens of Denver would still be subject to the older methods of taxation; so that the charter amendment did not mean full singletax. Yet the measure was generally recognized as an "entering wedge," leading to the complete reorganization of public finance along the lines of land value

taxation. The vote resulted 7,988 in favor and 27,125 against.

The Denver fight is the culmination of a series of Singletax campaigns in all the western states. It has aroused the "interests" to fury in a state which has been torn wide open by one of the most terrible mine strikes in history, and it has enforced certain lessons which will inevitably result in changing somewhat the evolution of the Singletax movement in the immediate future.

To begin with, a difference arose among the Denver Singletaxers themselves as to the wisdom of starting a campaign at the present time. While some felt that conditions were not ripe, others went ahead and secured the signatures necessary to "initiate" the question. This difference of opinion, however, is not simply a matter of local significance. It applies to all the recent Singletax campaigns in the west. It comes down to the general question, "What are the proper circumstances under which to make a political fight for land value taxation?"

Another important difference also arose between the Singletaxers with reference to this campaign. The tendency which has recently divided the Socialists into the "red" left and the "yellow" right made its appearance in the Singletax movement in a way which will presently engage the attention of all followers of Henry George. Let it be said at once, however, that this difference is inconsistent with the ultimate logic of the Singletax, and that it has practically overcome and lost sight of before the end of the campaign. The split in the Socialist party is logical and therefore permanent; the factional division among Singletaxers is illogical and therefore transitory. The stress of the Denver fight closed our ranks and forced us to campaign in practical harmony.

On the one hand, the "right" wing insisted that a partial application of the Singletax principle, by relieving business from one million dollars annual tax burden, would stimulate industry, increase the demand for land, and thus boost the price of land sufficiently to overcome the normal tendency of Singletax to cut down its market price. This claim seems to be borne out by the experience of Vancouver and other cities that have tried "municipal" Singletax. In view of this consideration, the right wing urged that the Denver campaign be waged, not on the "moral" issue, but along fiscal and economic lines, with the appeal chiefly to the "business element." In this behalf it was said that since the amendment provided only for partial Singletax, the full theory of Henry George was not in question, and that we should seek to disarm prejudice by confining the campaign to the amendment itself.

On the other hand, the "left" wing took the view that, in the nature of the case, the full Singletax gospel could not be ignored in the campaign. We were in the fight in the first place because we were Singletaxers, and we looked upon the pending measure as an "entering wedge" to make way for a larger dose of Singletax in the future. On this view, while it was perfectly proper to explain the amendment, it would not do to keep the Singletax gospel in the background, else the enemy himself would interpose questions and objections with the object of showing our ultimate and fundamental purpose. In brief, the Singletax propaganda has already gone so far, and

become so widespread, that no local fight could be managed independently of the larger issue, and the movement everywhere must remain true to the logic of its origin.

The argument might have continued indefinitely if the pressure of the opposition had not forced the Singletaxers into fighting trim. By pushing the attack along two distinct lines of approach, the enemy made it impossible for us to play up the "fiscal" issue alone. In the first place, they loudly proclaimed that the amendment was "unjust," and in this way they raised the "moral" issue themselves at the very start. In the second place, they tried to stampede the voters by the cry that Singletax means confiscation and common ownership. Thus, the whole program of Henry George was brought into discussion, and the Denver amendment was obscured by the larger issue. The practical result was, that in our campaign speeches we had to explain the amendment from the point of view of the full Singletax gospel.

The progress of the campaign demonstrated that the great mass of the people of Denver knew little about Singletax, and that the opposition could play on the ignorance and fears of the voters. Wherever we could actually reach the people with facts and arguments, we had sympathetic attention and were able to make many converts; but the odds were too great. All kinds of absurd notions, misrepresentations and lies were set afloat. The novelty of the Singletax idea, and the preponderant money barrel of the opposition, combined to defeat the amendment, so that, for the time being, special privilege is victorious in the Colorado capital.

The Denver fight has raised in acute form the question as to the relative spheres of "political action" and "propaganda" in the Singletax movement. Long ago, when Henry George was running for mayor of New York, somebody said to him, "You cannot be elected, and you will only succeed in raising a disturbance," to which the Singletax leader replied, "I don't expect to be elected, and I do expect to raise a disturbance." Since that time, the attitude of Singletaxers relative to politics has been expressed by the formula: "Political fights give the best opportunity for propaganda because the question is before the voters in concrete form, and they feel compelled to discuss it and to decide one way or the other."

So far as those who have taken part in the Denver fight are concerned, the Singletax movement has entered a new phase. While in favor of "political action" as much as Henry George ever was, we feel that in every locality where a political fight is to be staged, there must be a deliberate, intensive and extensive propaganda and organization before the campaign itself takes place. We are sure that all Singletaxers will recognize the justice of this conclusion as soon as they become acquainted with the circumstances of the Colorado situation. Every movement has to go forward gradually, accumulating wisdom by experience.

Everywhere throughout the country there is a spirit of inquiry and friendliness which makes it easier for us to talk Singletax than it was fifteen or twenty years ago. But this new spirit cannot be suddenly forced into the channels of political action. We seem, at length, to have reached a period in which the general public is ready for the presentation of

economic democracy. But there is nothing in the merely "fiscal" Singletax to stir the soul and kindle the imagination. What we need everywhere is the full, fundamental gospel of Henry George, as pointing the way to the next great step in social evolution.

But we have not learned the greatest lesson of the Denver fight when we conclude that more propaganda should precede these electoral contests. The term "propaganda" itself is a problem and not a solution. What do we mean by this familiar word? The Singletax agitation grows out of a book which was not only a treatise in political economy but a manual of theology; and the first great impulse of the movement was moral, spiritual, and religious. But in recent years, the Singletax propaganda has been more and more secularized and materialized, until the original force that impelled the idea onward has been temporarily obscured and lost to view.

In the meanwhile, during the generation that has elapsed since the appearance of "Progress and Poverty," a great democratic, radical movement has been silently transforming the religious life of modern civilization, carrying the churches away from conservatism toward a new liberalism harmonious with the message of the Singletax. The tragedy of the situation is, that the majority of Singletaxers do not as yet realize the nature of the spiritual revolution which affects the organized religious thought of more than half the people of the United States. The Singletaxers who assert that the spiritual life of the world contains no possibilities for fundamental democracy is turning away from the road pointed out by the founder of our movement, and is unconsciously playing the game for special privilege. In the new era of Singletax propaganda upon which we are now entering, economic liberalism will be linked with religious liberalism, and the great moral and spiritual impulses to which Henry George appealed so successfully will carry the movement onward with irresistible power.

LOUIS WALLIS.



BAD WORK OF A GANG CONTROLLED LEGISLATURE.

Pittsburgh, Pa., May 24, 1915.

Just before it finally adjourned the State Senate passed a bill to repeal the graded tax law for Pittsburgh and Scranton. This was done under orders issued by the State leaders of the Republican organization in response to an insistent appeal from Mayor Joseph G. Armstrong of Pittsburgh. It now goes to Governor Brumbaugh for approval or disapproval.

The graded tax law (under which buildings are taxed at a less rate than land) during its short life has made many friends in Pittsburgh. Its enactment in 1913 was made possible through the assistance given by William A. Magee, who was then Mayor. Several pronounced opponents of the law, prominent in political and business organizations, took advantage of a shortage of revenue in the year 1914 to arouse the city administration to opposition to the law. They were shrewd in their method and found it easy to accomplish their purpose, for the newspapers in their criticism of the Council and Mayor had laid emphasis on the increase in millage. Now

it happens that the graded tax law will promote an increase in the maximum millage (that assessed against the land) even though it lessens the millage assessed against the buildings. This was a sufficient argument for these gentlemen of narrow vision. They immediately joined forces with the repeal advocates. Quite a campaign has been carried on, every civic body was brought into the discussion, and the newspapers devoted a very generous amount of space to it. The result was that the law was approved by the Pittsburgh Board of Trade, Pittsburgh Civic Commission, North Side Chamber of Commerce, North Side Board of Trade, Allied Boards of Trade, Pittsburgh Real Estate Board, and many other organizations, and by every newspaper in Pittsburgh, while the opponents of the law were supported only by the Chamber of Commerce, whose endorsement was secured at a meeting loaded with orators, who were in turn loaded with misinformation. At a hand-picked meeting called by Mayor Armstrong the same tactics were attempted, but information was furnished by friends of the law to such purpose that his resolution had so narrow a majority that the meeting was never referred to.

At Harrisburg Mayor Armstrong controlled the Pittsburgh delegation in the House, and the repeal bill passed by that body by courtesy. In the Senate Charles J. Magee, a brother of William A. Magee, led the opposition to the repealer. He was supported by Senators McKee and Moore. The bill was in the hands of Senator Kline, a Pittsburgh member, who was President pro tem of the Senate. Senator Magee made a strenuous fight and would have been successful had not the State organization demanded the passage of the repealing bill as a proper recognition of Mayor Armstrong as the party leader in Pittsburgh. Some Pittsburgh newspapers factionally opposed to ex-Mayor W. A. Magee announced that a trade had been made by which Magee had sacrificed the graded tax law in order to secure the passage of canal legislation in which he was interested. Such was, of course, not the case, and the misstatement was greatly regretted by all the friends of the graded tax law, for rational taxation has not anywhere in the United States an abler or a stancher advocate. We are not yet defeated. Governor Brumbaugh is intelligent, fearless and honest. We expect him to veto the repealer.

R. E. SMITH.



DISCUSSING JUSTICE AT A CHARITY CONFERENCE.

Washington, D. C., May 19.

In view of the mental terrorism under which many professional charity workers live, it is a most significant and encouraging fact that a discussion of the land question formed a prominent feature of the forty-second annual conference of charities and corrections, held this year in Baltimore between May 12 and 19. On Saturday, May 15, two well-attended meetings were devoted to the land question. All necessary arrangements for these meetings were made by that efficient and tireless worker for lower rents and the reduction of taxes on homes, Benjamin C. Marsh of New York City.

At the morning meeting in the Sunday school room of the First Presbyterian Church, Frederick C.

Leubuscher of New York read a well-prepared paper, bristling with facts and statistics, on the "shifting of taxation to land values as a means of relieving congestion and poverty." He was followed by Prof. Seligman of Columbia University, who is a member of Mayor Mitchel's commission on taxation in New York City. The learned professor is a handsome, suave, and urbane gentleman, who has always been associated with people who are financially prosperous, and is quite incapable of looking at any public question from the view-point of the plain American citizen. He criticized the Singletax on philosophical, social, and fiscal grounds. His most startling statement, which met with very prompt denial, was that all economists of note are opposed to the Singletax. When questioned from the floor, he denied the existence of land monopoly, but rather inconsistently admitted that he favored a progressively heavier tax on land values. It was generally agreed that the professor's "bark is worse than his bite."

At the afternoon meeting, in the Emerson Hotel, the chairman was H. Martin Williams of Washington, D. C., and the other speakers were Representative Warren Worth Bailey, Charles H. Ingersoll of New Jersey, Dr. Royal Meeker of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mrs. Joseph Fels, Herbert J. Browne of Washington, D. C., State Senator Ogden of Maryland, and Prof. Scott Nearing of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bailey's paper was a masterly appeal for economic justice and equality of opportunity. Mr. Ingersoll handled the question of taxation with the keen logic and practical ideas of a successful business man. Dr. Meeker was humorous and entertaining. He is evidently a sound economic thinker of democratic sympathies. Mrs. Fels never fails to touch the heart strings of sympathy and devotion to the great cause of land reform to which she and Joseph Fels have given so generously. Her remarks on this occasion were thoughtful and inspiring. Mr. Browne, who has recently returned from a trip to Mexico, gave a graphic sketch showing how the revolutionary struggle in that war-swept country is freeing the peons from the grip of landlordism. Senator Ogden explained how and why the Singletax may sometimes increase land values.

Scott Nearing, professor of economics in the University of Pennsylvania, and the author of a recent book on "Reducing the Cost of Living," gave a logical and forceful address on the relation between rising land values and rising prices. There are many others, but in himself Scott Nearing is a living, pulsing refutation of Prof. Seligman's curious assertion that an economist can not be a Singletaxer. He showed by official census figures that while meat has risen in price 90 per cent, dairy products 60 per cent, cereals 40 per cent, and wholesale timber products 60 per cent, the prices of clothing have advanced only 20 per cent, and those of metals and instruments have actually declined 20 per cent; in other words, that products derived directly from the soil have advanced in price to a much greater degree than those involving considerable labor in the process of manufacture. These conditions, he explained by the fact that since 1900 the cost of land has risen more than one hundred per cent.

The social gospel of Henry George was never more forcefully presented than by the speakers at these

two meetings, which were attended by not less than 600 persons, to many of whom the Singletax was a revelation. Judging by the close attention paid to the speakers, the social workers and others who packed the two halls were deeply impressed. It was a field day for the Singletax. It is not too much to say these meetings were of great historic importance in bringing the land question into the practical field of social helpfulness and reconstruction.

W. D. MACKENZIE.

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, May 25, 1915.

Commission on Industrial Relations.

Clarence Darrow and James A. Emery of the National Association of Manufacturers appeared before the Commission on Industrial Relations on May 18. Darrow said in defense of the McNamara that they were criminals in the same sense that John Brown was a criminal. Regarding the act of J. B. McNamara in blowing up the Los Angeles Times building he said:

What did he do it for? If he succeeded it meant neither fame nor money, for he could never tell any one about it. If he failed, it meant prison and possibly death. He did it thinking it was for the welfare of his class. He saw the great masses in poverty and the few with great riches. He saw the fight of the structural iron workers. In his mind it was for the welfare of his class. Some time people will not judge anybody who does things from an unselfish motive. He was risking his life in a cause that he believed in. I wouldn't have done it; I wouldn't have advised any one to do it. From his standpoint he was a martyr.

Darrow said further that all punishment is barbarous and that some day hospitals will be substituted for prisons, and that the people of England have more liberty than those of America. James Emery denied this latter statement, saying that if he were a laborer he would prefer the industrial laws of America. He defended government by injunction, saying that it had done much good. Commissioner O'Connell read into the record a letter from Secretary of Labor Wilson denying a statement of Walter Drew of the National Erectors' Association that the Department of Labor was used in the interest of the closed shop. Secretary Wilson made clear that the Department handled cases in the interest of labor, regardless of closed or open shop conditions and regardless of whether any question of organization was involved. [See current volume, page 498.]



Reverend Eugene S. Gaddis, formerly in charge

of the sociological department of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Company, appeared before the Commission on May 19. He had been discharged by Rockefeller last February because he had insisted that a report for the government on camp conditions should be truthfully made. He justified resistance of Colorado miners to constituted authority on the ground that the operators had been allowed to ignore laws for betterment of the miners' condition, and forcible resistance was the only remedy left. Though technically the southern Colorado strike was lost, it has succeeded, he said, in forcing the operators to be very careful in the future. Today, he said, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Company dominates politics as much as "it dares, but not to such an extent as before the strike." Asked by Commissioner Weinstock why the miners could not use their political rights to obtain reform peacefully, Mr. Gaddis answered by citing the case of John Murray and John Marians, who had started a petition for recall of a judge and were thrown into jail in consequence for "contempt of court." Their appeal from this is still pending, but they are out on bail. Speaking concerning the case of John R. Lawson, Mr. Gaddis said that one member of the jury that convicted him, named W. W. Wilson, was a biscuit salesman, who had secured a monopoly in his line in territory controlled by Rockefeller officials. He told of how the editor of the Pueblo, Colo., Chieftain had once been disciplined for publishing an account of a defalcation in the Pueblo Steel Works. He had gone into Colorado, he said, a conservative, but after seeing how plutocracy grinds had come out a radical. Chairman Frank Walsh read into the record a letter dated May 13, 1913, from L. M. Bowers of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Company to Charles O. Heydt, an associate of Rockefeller in New York, regarding a request for financial aid for the Pueblo Star-Journal, sent to John D. Rockefeller from the owner, Frank S. Hoag. The letter referred to former activity and expenditures on the part of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Company in politics and also to the profit it derived from saloons, gambling houses and houses of prostitution. It referred to Sheriff Jeff Farr, elected by the votes of company employes, as largely interested in the saloons. The letter stated further that Jesse Welborn and the writer had devoted much time to do away with these evils. Further on it said:

We have secured, the past winter, a mining law almost entirely written by our own superintendent, E. H. Weitzel, with four other men appointed by the Senate Committee, including representatives of labor, a capable engineer and two representatives of the operators. It is just and fair to all concerned and meets every requirement of the labor organizations, excepting that there are no special privileges granted to labor unions.

Mr. Walsh asked Mr. Gaddis to state whether Jeff Farr was not still sheriff, kept in office by the

Colorado Fuel & Iron Company and is not still a partner in the liquor business. Mr. Gaddis answered affirmatively. Reverend Daniel C. McCorkle of Sunrise, Wyo., said that when he went to that town he was informed by the church authorities that the Colorado company maintained the church, but the fact had to be kept secret. On account of his development of "socialistic tendencies" efforts had been made by the company to get him out of the church, but the people have stood by him. He said that the company owns everything in Sunrise, including the churches and schools.



John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was on the stand from May 20 to 22. Chairman Walsh put in the record a long series of letters between Rockefeller and L. M. Bowers, in which considerable feeling was expressed against Secretary of Labor Wilson and officials of his Department, and also against independent newspapers. In some of the letters President Wilson was spoken of contemptuously. Mr. Rockefeller was questioned by Chairman Walsh, who repeated Gaddis' disclosure concerning the Lawson jury, whether he would not do something to secure a new trial for Lawson before an impartial jury. He received an evasive reply. Chairman Walsh read a letter dated November 18, 1913, from Bowers to Rockefeller, in which the following statement was made:

We have been able to secure the co-operation of all the bankers of the city, who have had three or four interviews with our little cowboy governor, agreeing to back the state and lend it all the funds necessary to maintain the militia and afford ample protection so that our miners could return to work, or give protection to men who are anxious to come up here from Texas, New Mexico and Kansas, together with some from states farther east.

In a letter dated December 22, Mr. Bowers said:

If the governor had acted Sept. 23 as he has been forced to act during the last few weeks this strike never would have existed ten days. We used every possible weapon to drive him into action, but he was glove in hand with the labor leaders and is today, but the big men of affairs have helped the operators in whipping the agitators, including the governor.

Mr. Rockefeller at first pleaded ignorance of the matters referred to in these letters, and when Mr. Walsh reminded him that he had written that he would back up Bowers, Rockefeller explained that the letters had reference to disorder in Colorado and the inclination of every citizen to get officers of the law to do their duty. Another letter from Bowers referring to "Mother" Jones said: "The Governor has ordered her taken to the State line and told not to return." Walsh then asked whether he had remonstrated with his subordinates for condoning and sympathizing with such violation of constitutional rights. Mr. Rockefeller answered that he had no reason to suppose they had ap-

proved. Asked if he would punish officers guilty of condoning such violation, Mr. Rockefeller said he would "take such steps as he considered necessary." To all other questions regarding action toward evils or wrongs shown in previous testimony, Rockefeller returned the same reply.



Mackenzie King, of the Rockefeller Foundation was on the stand on May 24. Mr. King was asked concerning the plan he has in view for settlement of labor disputes. There was nothing to show that there would be any union labor member on any of the boards which Mr. King proposed to have appointed. In explanation he said that there was nothing to bar such members. Asked whether they would be barred in actual practice, Mr. King denounced the Commission as unfair. L. M. Bowers was the next witness. He said that had he controlled the situation he would have met the representatives of the miners, and he denounced the spy system used by the Rockefeller interests. He is on Rockefeller's personal staff, but would like to get off. In regard to the Ludlow massacre he said:

It was a sickening, disgusting, disgraceful piece of work, and I wish I could forget all about it and see justice done to all who were concerned.



Verdict for Roosevelt.

A verdict in Roosevelt's favor was returned on May 22 by the jury in the libel suit at Syracuse of William Barnes. Mr. Roosevelt had said that a corrupt political alliance existed between Barnes and Charles F. Murphy, Tammany leader, in relation to the State government. The jury contained Republicans, Democrats and Progressives. It debated eleven hours before arriving at a verdict. Mr. Barnes' counsel, William M. Ivins, said that an appeal would be taken. [See current volume, page 498.]



Tax Reform News.

The Massachusetts House of Representatives on May 19, by a vote of 202 to nine, passed the resolution already adopted by the Senate to submit the taxation amendment eliminating the word "proportional" from the taxation provision of the constitution. It must be passed again by the next legislature before going to a popular vote. Massachusetts votes on an income tax amendment in November. [See current volume, page 498.]



The Illinois Senate on May 18 and the House on May 20 passed the resolution to submit an amendment allowing the legislature to classify personal property, but not real estate, for purposes of taxation. [See current volume, page 498.]

Denver, Colo., at an election on May 18 rejected a Singletax amendment by a vote of 27,125 to 7,988. [See current volumes 423, 446, 478.]



The Pennsylvania State Senate in the closing hours of the session on May 20 passed the bill which had already passed the House repealing the act of 1913 allowing second class cities to gradually untax buildings. The repeal is now up to Governor Brumbaugh for approval or veto. [See current volume, page 452.]



In obedience to the order of Judge Read to assess all property for taxation, Tax Commissioner Pastoriza of Houston has sent to all owners of law libraries the following letter:

It was our habit under the Houston plan of taxation not to ferret our libraries, but the Houston plan of taxation has been declared unconstitutional. We have been ordered to tax all forms of property, including law libraries. Knowing that we were not trying to ferret out libraries, it became a habit with you not to render your library for taxation; not wanting to tax libraries, it became a habit with us to forget that there was a library in Houston. Of course we will both have to change our habits and get used to the new order of things. To save you the time of coming to the city hall, as well as the embarrassment of an employe of the tax office calling upon you to assess your library, I am sending you a printed postal card herewith, upon which you can fix the value of your library according to the Constitution; that is, "the full and true value in money." I regret very much to have this duty to perform. It looks like penalizing a man who has been sufficiently industrious and economical to provide himself with a library which will enable him to earn his living.

[See current volume, page 427.]



Chicago's Telephone War.

Mayor Thompson of Chicago on May 24 vetoed the Council's ordinance to declare forfeited the Automatic telephone plant. He did this after leading bankers, investment brokers and organizations controlled by them had protested against Council's action, and Corporation Council Folsom had urged a veto. A suggestion of Mr. Folsom that Council should declare the franchise forfeited, before ordering seizure of the property, was promptly heeded by the Council to the extent of unanimously ordering the corporation council to prepare an ordinance to that effect. [See current volume, page 499.]



Trade Congress.

The Pan-American Congress, which met in Washington on the 23d was attended by delegates from 18 Latin-American countries, and by the members of the Cabinet, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, Treasury

officials and over 100 members of the leading banks, corporations and commercial houses of the United States. The Congress is held in the interests of trade and closer relations between the United States and Latin America.



The Mohonk Arbitration Conference.

At the Lake Mohonk, N. Y., conference on international arbitration on May 19 to 21 speeches in behalf of military preparedness were made by John Grier Hibben of Princeton University, Secretary of War Garrison, Major General Leonard Wood and Rear Admiral Chester. These speeches had no effect on the resolutions finally adopted, which endorse President Wilson's stand for neutrality and points to the European war as evidence of the superiority of arbitration over resort to violence. Three plans are presented for settlement of international disagreements. First, a judicial tribunal; second, a council to hear non-justifiable questions and to recommend a solution; third, a conference to formulate and codify rules of international law, which shall govern procedure under the proposed judicial tribunal.



Women's Peace Movement.

The peace embassy appointed by the Peace Conference at The Hague to present the resolutions adopted by the Conference to the various belligerent governments has visited Berlin, where the resolutions were presented to Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg and Foreign Minister von Jagow. From Berlin the peace embassy has gone to Vienna. [See current volume, page 478.]



Mexico.

Telegraphic news from Mexico is meager, and is of minor importance. Letters convey the impression that military forces are exhausting themselves, and that food supplies in parts of the country are running short. Duval West, who investigated Mexican conditions and interviewed Generals Caranza, Villa and Zapata, as the personal representative of President Wilson, has returned to the United States, but his report is confidential. Desultory fighting in central Mexico developed into a battle below Leon, on the Mexican Central railroad between Aguas Calientes and Quedretaro, where a decisive victory is announced of the Villa forces over the Obregon army, Silao, the Carranza base a few miles south of Leon, is reported captured by Villa forces. [See current volume, page 502.]



European War.

Continuous fighting has been kept up on the western front; but no decisive battles have oc-

curred. The Allies appear to have made some progress in the neighborhood of Ypres and Arras, and in Alsace; but most of their claims are denied by the Germans. The Austro-German drive in the East seems to have exhausted itself. The Russians were compelled to withdraw from the western Carpathian passes, and to abandon much of western Galicia. Their front has remained unbroken, however, and they have been able to make a stand between the junction of the River San and the Vistula and Premysl. To break through this line the Germans are reported to have trained upon the Russians the largest number of field guns ever used in an equal area, but without avail. A counter movement by the Russians farther to the east on the Upper Vistula is now in progress. Fighting continues in the Baltic provinces, but without decisive results. Progress in the Dardanelles is reported by the Allies to be slow but steady. The fleet continues to pound the shore batteries, while the land forces fight their way along the Gallipoli Peninsula. [See current volume, page 499.]



Italy, after nearly ten months of vacillating neutrality, declared war against Austria on the 23d. It is understood that Germany will take the part of Austria. The former member of the Triple Alliance thus joins the Triple Entente, which now becomes the Quadruple Entente. The expressed cause of this action is the failure of Austria to cede to Italy territory that belonged to the Italian States in the Middle Ages. The territory in dispute comprises the Trentino, an irregular piece of land projecting southward from the Tyrolean Alps between Lombardy and Venetia, and Istria, which lies on the eastern shore at the head of the Adriatic Sea. The Istrian Peninsula includes Trieste, the chief Austrian sea port, and Pola, her principal naval station. The territory embraces altogether about 8,000 square miles, and about 1,000,000 inhabitants, a large part of whom are Italians. The entrance of Italy increases the forces of the Allies by about 1,000,000 men, and a naval force of 12 battleships and 14 armoured cruisers, together with smaller craft. A vigorous campaign on the part of the Germans against Italy is announced to take place at once.



Little of moment took place on the sea. The German submarines have sunk a few smaller vessels in the war zone. A submarine of the Allies is reported to have made its way into the Sea of Marmora, and sunk several Turkish transports, with a large number of troops. An unconfirmed report says a Russian battleship was sunk in the Black Sea.



A political stir was created by the announcement that England is to have a coalition cabinet.

This has come through nagging criticism of the newspapers under the control of Lord Northcliffe, of which the Times is the leader. Friction has occurred between Lord Fisher, first sea lord of the Admiralty, and Winston Churchill, first lord of the Admiralty. The Northcliffe press has made severe attacks on Lord Kitchener, but this has been resented by the press of the country. No definite announcement has been made of the new cabinet, beyond the statement that Premier Asquith and Earl Grey will retain their places.



Portugal.

Quiet appears to have been restored throughout the country. Premier Joac Chagras, who was shot in a train on his way to Lisbon, is reported to be in a fair way to recovery. His place in the cabinet is taken temporarily by Jose Castro. The new cabinet has announced that it will maintain an absolutely neutral attitude toward all political parties. [See current volume, page 501.]

NEWS NOTES

—By a vote of 47 to 22 the Chicago City Council rejected on May 24 a proposition of Alderman Merriam to restrict saloons to sale of malt liquors and light wines only.

—Speaking at Kansas City on May 22, ex-President Taft declared the Progressive party dead and said Progressives might return to the Republican party, but "they must leave behind their fads, nostrums and issues."

—The Socialist conference of delegates from neutral countries to meet at Zurich, Switzerland, May 30, has been abandoned, according to a dispatch from Berne to the Paris Temps, because of the limited number agreeing to attend.

—By 20,364 for to 17,326 against Denver voted on May 18 in favor of local regulations of saloons. Although Colorado adopted state-wide prohibition last November, the claim is made that the city's home rule charter allows it to decide for itself whether or not to consent to application of the measure locally.

—Lassen Peak, in northern California, burst into another and violet eruption on the 22d. Supervisor Rushing of the forest service reports that the hot lava melted the snow on the slopes of the mountain, which caused the flood of mud that descended on Hat Creek Valley. Heretofore it was thought that the mud came from within the mountain.

PRESS OPINIONS

Preparedness Versus Christianity.

The Call (New York), May 21.—Dr. John Grier Hibben is president of Princeton University, and Princeton University is, as every one knows, a theological seminary. Dr. Hibben is therefore ostensibly

a faithful disciple of the Prince of Peace. Everywhere he leads him, Dr. Hibben will follow on, that is—ahem—with moderation, you know. If he led Dr. John into war, he would line up solidly behind the Prince of Peace. But if he tried to lead Dr. John into peace—his ways are ways of pleasantness, and all his paths are peace, as the hymn says—well, then, you know, really Dr. John might balk. . . . And so Dr. John Hibben wants us to prepare, and begin by getting a slaughtering outfit. What we have now is utterly inefficient. His motto is, "In time of peace, prepare for war," and he adds that the best way to maintain peace is to be always ready to kill the other fellow. . . . Captious critics may say that all the European nations prepared for war to maintain peace, and now they have war no peace; that the Hibben theory has been exploded in Europe. But who cares what the likes of them may say! If the Prince of Peace were here today, he would probably lose all patience with the John Hibbens, the Nick Butlers and the Andy Carnegies. . . . He would characterize both sides equally as hypocrites and shirkers, unwilling either to recognize the causes of war or pay the price of peace, because the price is too great for them and those who own them. . . . Would the Dr. John Hibbens and the Nick Butlers and the others follow him if he insisted on this? They might, perhaps, but they would follow merely to yell "Crucify him!" as their progenitors did nineteen hundred years ago. Dr. John Hibben may be president of Princeton Theological Seminary, but whether he knows it or not he follows, not Christ, but Anti-Christ.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE ZONE.

By William Lloyd Garrison, Jr.

Avert Thy gaze, O God, close tight Thine eyes!
Glance down no longer on the ocean foam,
Lest Thou behold such horrors as can turn
Men's burning hearts to ice, and chill their souls.

Keep Thine heart warm and full of charity
That Thou mayst yet be able to forgive,
And pity feel for those who know not when
To pause in deeds of ruthless sacrifice.

Restrain Thy wrath, and keep Thine hand in check;
Smite not, nor fiercely thrust without the pale
Those who can dare to strew the ocean waste
With fellow creatures, innocent of wrong.

Forget the studied purpose to destroy;
The launching of the missile through the deep;
The shattered hull; the crushed and bleeding forms;
The seething swirl of wreckage, women, men.

Remember that they know not what they do
Who strike in deadly fear and ghastly hate;
Remember that somehow, and at some time,
Each crime exacts its human penalty.

Remember that man's conscience and man's mind
Are agents of Thy purpose and Thy plan,

Which work within a deadlier revenge
Than any sharpnel shot or sabre thrust.

Remember that new generations come
Upon whom fall the burden and the curse,
The anguish of old hatreds and past wrongs,
The crushing debt, the struggle and despair.

Restrain, O God, the sweep of this vast hate;
Recall the nations to their sense of shame;
To those in blinding war, to us at peace,
Reveal anew the message of the Christ.



COMMON GROUND.

For the Public.

Two Extremes met. After arguing for some time without converting either to the other's view, they decided it would be better if they compromised. Accordingly they agreed that next time they met it should be on Common Ground.

"In that case," said the First Extreme, "don't you think it advisable to look around and find some Common Ground on which to meet?"

"To be sure," declared the Second Extreme. So off they started.

They hunted high and they hunted low for Common Ground on which to meet, but they could find none. It was all private ground. In their despair they went to the Court House and consulted the man who kept the records of ground.

"There is no Common Ground," the man told them, "except, of course, the Public Park."

"I guess that will do all right," said the First Extreme, inquiringly.

"Yes, of course. We can meet there," replied the Second Extreme.

Off they went to the Public Park, but when they arrived they found it covered with signs saying: "KEEP OFF THE GRASS."

"It seems to be no use," said the First Extreme with a sigh. "We have good intentions but no way to carry them out."

Thereupon the two Extremes parted, each more extreme than he had been in the first place.

ELLIS O. JONES.



FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND PERCENT PROFIT.

For the Public.

How a block of land in the heart of Philadelphia, the most valuable piece of which has remained for 133 years and six generations in the same family, increased in value from \$1,540 to \$5,500,000, furnishes a good set of facts from which to reason inductively to the general principle that application of a single tax upon land value should work for economic justice. Listen to the tale and draw your own conclusions.

During the war of the American Revolution public credit was in a bad way and the legislature of Pennsylvania provided in 1780 by act of assembly for the public auction of land belonging to the commonwealth in order to raise funds to pay the state militia and meet other current obligations. At that time what is now the heart of the city bounded by Walnut, Race, 12th and 16th Streets, containing the "skyscraper" and "big business" section (worth two or three hundred million dollars) was "away out in the country." The bulk of it through forfeiture had come into the hands of the commonwealth.

In the center of this tract covering seven or eight acres at that time stood Center Square, one of five small squares or parks laid out by William Penn a century previous, the other four lying half a mile equidistant northwest, southwest, southeast and northeast. North and south from this square, now the center of values in Philadelphia and occupied by the public buildings towering over 500 feet and assessed at \$20,000,000, ran Broad street, 113 feet wide and midway between the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, while east and west ran Market (then High) Street, 100 feet wide. Parallel with these streets on a grid-iron system Penn laid out streets 50 feet wide at intervals of 500 feet. Except for slight widenings these streets remain unchanged.

Among others who bought at this public auction was one George Cooper, who for 308 pounds silver money (which on a \$5 basis we shall generously calculate at \$1,540) took title from the supreme executive council of Pennsylvania December 6, 1781, to a tract of ground bounded by four open streets and lying one block south of Market street and one-half block east of Broad. This piece of ground had a frontage of 250 feet on the south side of Chestnut and north side of George (now Sansom) streets and a frontage of 235 feet on the west side of 13th and east side of Juniper street. It contained 58,750 square feet or about $1\frac{1}{3}$ acres. The purchase was therefore at the rate of three cents a square foot or in round figures \$1,000 an acre.

Cooper died in 1798, devising the ground to his children, who in turn died and left various portions to their children. One Thomas Kelly, who seems to have possessed in those early days the "foresight" of the modern land speculator (with such limited opportunities as were afforded when so much free land lay to the westward), married the widow of George Cooper, Jr., who inherited the choicest part of this tract, which was the 13th street or eastern end, nearest to the then center of population. By various conveyances and as a result of partition proceedings, he got possession between 1810 and 1820 of most of the original tract and then laid out a street 25 feet wide called Diamond (now Drury) 109 feet south of and parallel with Chestnut from 13th

to Juniper. Between Juniper and Sansom streets he divided the ground into lots with an alley four feet wide west of the 13th street lots, another east of the Juniper street lots and a third three feet wide between the lots left fronting on Drury and Sansom connecting with the other alleys.

After Kelly's death in 1847, the land was again partitioned among his children, to the families of three of which still belong 1300-02-04-14-16-18 Chestnut street, comprising a group of the most valuable retail store properties in the city assessed for taxation in 1915 at \$1,850,000. Few pieces of real estate in Philadelphia have remained so long in the same family, particularly in the valuable section, for these old store properties are directly opposite John Wanamaker's department store, a massive 16-story granite building on 5 acres of ground (the largest single lot in the central part of Philadelphia), the ground worth \$12,000,000 and the building \$8,000,000.

Now what is the original Cooper tract worth today after the passage of 133 years? First, consider the changed conditions. Chestnut street is our second principal retail thoroughfare, having in the last decade been passed by Market street. This 250 feet is the most valuable frontage on the street because of the short lots, 104 feet in depth since the widening of the street from 50 to 60 feet, during the process of which, by the way, abutting owners in this row were paid \$70,000 damages. The stores pay the highest rents in the city, averaging \$20,000 a year, besides all taxes, water rents, increase of taxes, etc., for an old four-story brick building on a lot 20x104.

The 1915 assessment for the Chestnut street front of the original tract totals \$3,730,000 for 10 stores and a bank covering 26,000 square feet of land or $\frac{3}{5}$ of an acre. Only one is a modern building, built of concrete and eight floors high. The 13th street corner is an old six-story brick structure. The Juniper Street corner is a two story bank building, a "carrier." The others are four story remodelled dwelling houses ranging in age from 50 to 100 years, no one of which adds any market value to the land on which it stands. On the assessment basis therefore, which runs in central Philadelphia 25 to 30 per cent below real value, the ground is worth \$143 a square foot instead of three cents and \$6,250,000 an acre, instead of \$1,000.

But let us be fair and take the entire tract. Eliminating the bed of Drury Street and of the three alleys carved out of the original purchase, we have 47,669 square feet, or one and one-tenth acres, held by twenty-five different individuals and estates, containing twenty-eight buildings (only six at all modern). Of these buildings, two contain six floors, two have five, one has eight, fourteen have four, eight have three, and one has two. For the heart of the city and surrounded by tall buildings it is a decidedly under-improved

piece of land; although every skyscraper is worth less than the lot it is on. In 1915 it is assessed for taxation at \$4,786,000, and worth for ground alone easily \$5,500,000. This is at the rate of \$115 a square foot or \$5,000,000 an acre, all land value due to community growth. This represents, aside from income which has been derived during all these years, a profit on the original investment of 500,000 per cent. And the owners have their capital safely invested there today, for every square foot of the tract is rented to tenants who, on the most valuable fronts at least, pay besides rent all carrying charges.

The owners of this ground live elsewhere; many of them never see the properties from one year's end to the other. The footsteps of the passing millions, most of whom do not own one square foot of ground and a large part of whom live at the margin of subsistence, have created these values. The mere existence in other parts of the city of thousands of men, women and children who have never even seen these properties, add constantly to the values. Every landing immigrant, every newborn child coming to this community, helps to create this public wealth, which our present system permits a few to appropriate.

Here is the chief cause of poverty. A thorough understanding of this situation, which is typical, opens the mind of the honest seeker after truth to the enormity of this injustice. Graphically portray to the average man the facts. Induction will do the rest. Reason from these facts by logical steps to the general principle, that the absorption of economic rent in its entirety by the community (to the activity of which its growth is due) furnishes the only way out of the slough of despond in which we are mired; this is the way for our propaganda to impress the average mind, for all men are interested in the high cost of living.

Philadelphia's teeming, sweated, harried people have here on one acre of God's gift to all, the land, presented to twenty-five persons \$5,000,000. The gift has been at fearful cost. Let us educate the people to cause and effect that we may, as a people, apply the remedy.

HENRY J. GIBBONS.



UNCLE SAM AND WOODROW WILSON.

By Edmund Vance Cooke.

Yes, sir, I was "all het up" and pretty near to boillin';
Seemed as if some thoughts inside of me were close
to spoillin';
They were bad and they were bitter, and if I had
spoken hasty,
I might have mentioned something which was rather
tart than tasty.
There I was a-chewin' pepper-grass and chile sauce
and mustard
And wishin' I could catch some cuss and beat him
to a custard,

And then I looked at Wilson and—he wasn't even
flustered.

Yes, sir, there was Woodrow Wilson going steady as
a clock,
With an eye as soft as heaven and a chin like
Plymouth Rock,
With a calmness all commendable,
And sanity unendable,
So says I, "Well, I'm for Wilson, Woodrow Wilson
the Dependable!"

I don't like women being killed and babies fed to
fishes.
It makes me feel like callin' names and smashin' all
the dishes.
And with all the world gone loony and a-cuttin' crazy
capers,
The Ten Commandments gone to pot, among the
scraps of papers,
I felt like cuttin' loose myself. Yes, sir, I 'most was
ready
To jump into the whirlpool and to flounder in the
eddy,
But there was Wilson speakin'—and his voice was
calm and steady.

Yes, sir, there was Woodrow Wilson, sitting tight and
looking solemn,
As clear-eyed as a prophet and as clean-cut as a
column.
Woodrow Wilson, the dependable,
The candid and commendable,
Yes, sir; today I'd almost say, he's Wilson the God-
sendable!

BOOKS

LAW, LIQUOR AND LOVE.

The Man Who Forgot. By James Hay, Jr. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.25 net.

So entertaining a mystery story as Mr. Hay has written, full of fair love, modern politics and clever dialogue, can greatly aid the cause he has at heart, prohibition. The scene is laid in Washington, a city the author knows well in committee room and corridor, home and street. Except possibly the very admirable hero—whose extreme brilliancy and fervor seem not so much overdone as too constant—the characters are all humanly alive. The whiskey Senator's noble daughter—"one of the two women in Washington who read the Congressional Record every morning"—her keen-eyed kind-hearted widow friend, the Senator himself, the liquor lobbyists and their lackeys, all are real fellow-mortals. But by far the most interesting, distinctively individual and thoroughly life-like person is "Cholliewollie," the reporter-editor, who "knew his Washington" and its politicians' motto, "If you're for liquor, off goes your head; if

you're against it, off it goes," and yet believed in the unknown John Smith, and put his wise journalistic self at that "agitator's" service in the cause of nation-wide prohibition through a Constitutional amendment.

Literary men will call the book melodramatic, or "purposeful"; liquor men will say "fantastic." But those who hate whiskey will welcome Mr. Hay's book as a valuable ally; and everybody else will recommend it to his friends as a "good story, up-to-date, witty and full of a frank and winning idealism."

A. L. G.



FOR A DURABLE PEACE.

The Road Toward Peace. By Charles W. Elliot. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. 1915. Price, \$1.00 net.

A dozen or more of President Eliot's addresses and essays on peace and on the European War have just been gathered into a little volume. The Lake Mohonk Conference address in 1907, extracts from his report to the Carnegie Peace Endowment in 1913, several letters to the New York Times, the correspondence with Jacob H. Schiff, and the Harvard Club address on "National Efficiency," recently printed in the Atlantic Monthly, are included.

President Eliot's emphatic opinion that the Allies are on the side of human liberty in this war, his analysis of the Prussian state of mind, and of the causes of the war, proximate and ultimate, are too well known to call for quotation, and too well spoken to leave unread. His idea of the way toward a durable peace and his hope therefor are perhaps most clearly expressed in two sentences from one address and the closing words of another:

"Horrible as are the murderous and devastating effects of this war, there can be no lasting peace until Europe as a whole is ready to make some serious and far-reaching decisions in regard to governmental structures and powers. . . . There can be no secure peace in Europe until a federation of the European states is established, capable of making public contracts intended to be kept, and backed by an overwhelming international force subject to the orders of an international tribunal.

"The American people believes, as the Pilgrim Church believed, that more truth and light are constantly to be made known to man, and that it is truth that makes men free. More truth—scientific, philosophical, or religious—more freedom for mankind. If this faith can now be implanted in the international mind of Europe as the moral issue of the present cataclysm, the huge sorrow and desolation of that Continent may yet be turned into gladness and hope."

A. L. G.

PERIODICALS

Equity.

"Internationalism, a review of the proposals before Congress looking to a constructive conference of the nations," is the opening article in the April number of *Equity* (1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia). During January and February last, eight resolutions were introduced in Congress, four in the House and four in the Senate, all proposing an international convention. These are briefly discussed and their titles given to enable those interested to send for them, and a plea is made by the writer on behalf of their common purpose. Progress and problems of direct legislation are discussed in a number of shorter articles, one of which includes a table showing the precise "Status of the State-wide Recall" in the ten States that have voted for it. On the back cover is printed the following "World Anthem" of the Robert Browning Settlement, Walworth, London:

God make the World one State!
All nations, small and great,
One civic whole!
Self-ruled each people be!
All peoples linked and free!
Glorious in unity
From pole to pole!

One World, one destiny;
One Race, one family:
One God above!
All States upheld in one,
All laws excelled in one,
All lives impelled by One,—
One Life, One Love.

A. L. G.

PAMPHLETS

Child Labor.

"The National Child Labor Committee. Why? Two million child workers under sixteen years today. What are we going to do about it? Try to protect childhood through mothers' pensions, child labor laws, compulsory education, better homes, health, play, work permits, vocational guidance, inspection, and continuation schools." The Committee's *Exhibit Handbook* (105 E. 22nd street, New York. Price, 10 cents) for the Panama Exposition is a model of persuasion by posters—photographs of children before and after factory work, of machines that can do the work better than children, of "the vicious circle" at this one link, to prove the "High Cost of Child Labor."

A. L. G.



Principles of Heredity.

"Eugenics is the topic of the hour. Yet the foundation principles of heredity are seldom mentioned except in scientific bodies, because so few understand the two difficult phases of biology—Mendelian inheritance and cell structure and activity." This lack of knowledge, which has resulted in all sorts of hasty legislative action and public opinion based on false assumptions, is the reason for the publica-

tion by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, of a pamphlet on "Heredity and Problems in Eugenics," by Effa Funk Muhse (University of Chicago Press, Chicago. Price, 25 cents)—an illustrated essay which actually defines Mendelism and describes cell structure to the ordinary, non-scientific person's understanding. The Eugenics section of the American Genetics Association, Washington, D. C., and the Eugenics Record Office, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, N. Y., in close touch with each other, are the only two Eugenics organizations which, in the author's opinion, represent the true eugenics movement in America.

A. L. G.



Pamphlets Received.

Great Men and How They Are Produced. By Casper L. Redfield, Chicago, 1915.

Stolen Jobs and the Thief. By Moses Franklin, Pueblo, Colo. 1915. Price, 10 cents.

Three-Cent Light in Cleveland. By H. W. Wilson, Published by the Bureau of Public Service Economics, 17 E. 38th street, New York.

What the Government Says about Cotton Mills. By Anna Rochester and Florence Taylor. Pamphlet 243, National Child Labor Committee, 105 E. 22nd street, New York. Price, 5 cents.

High Cost of Child Labor. Exhibit Handbook with photographs by Lewis W. Hine. Published by the National Child Labor Committee, 105 E. 22nd street, New York. 1915. Price, 10 cents.

United States Commission on Industrial Relations: Digest of Testimony on the American Land Question. Taken chiefly at Dallas, Texas, March 16-20, 1915. In

two volumes. Prepared by C. J. Stowell, E. A. Hyde, S. L. Moser.

The First Year and a Look Ahead; What the National Popular Government League Did in 1914; What Should be Done in 1915. By Judson King, Executive Secretary. Published by the National Popular Government League, 1017 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.



Mr. Manley—"My dear, I've had my life insured for \$5,000."

Mrs. Manley—"How very sensible of you! Now I shan't have to keep telling you to be so careful every place you go."—San Francisco Star.



The company marched so poorly and went through their drill so badly that the captain, who was of a somewhat excitable nature, shouted indignantly at the soldiers:

"You knock-kneed, big-footed idiots, you are not worthy of being drilled by a captain. What you want is a rhinoceros to drill you, you wretched lot of donkeys."

Then, sheathing his sword indignantly, he added: "Now, lieutenant, you take charge of them!"—Tit-Bits.



Possible Employer—"H'm! So you want a job, eh? Do you ever tell lies?"

Applicant—"No, sir, but I kin learn."—New York Times.

1015 Hamilton Boulevard,
Peoria, Ill., May 6th, 1915.

The Tax Lien Co. of N. Y.

Gentlemen:—Your check for \$1,014.22 at hand this A. M. and I wish to express my appreciation of your action in this matter in sending me the money at once, and while the certificate was yet in my possession, neither did you require the 60 days' notice as per contract.

I do not know of any way a man can invest his money and have it on call at a moment's notice, except with you, and in addition have it earn 7%. You are at liberty to refer to me at all times.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) Jas. W. Hill.

NEW YORK CITY

Invites You to Invest in Its

TRANSFERS OF TAX LIENS

For information write to Secretary,

The Tax Lien Company of New York

68 William Street

New York, N. Y.