

# The Public

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

Vol. XVIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1915.

No. 917.

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

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

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio  
JOHN E. WHITE, Illinois  
LLEWELLYN JONES, Illinois  
MRS. LONA INGRAM ROBINSON, Calif.  
L. F. O. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
S. A. STOKESWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM F. MELL, Missouri  
LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York  
HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York  
GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York  
W. G. EGLESTON, California  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOHN PAUL, England  
ERNEST BRAY, Australia  
GEORGE FOWLES, 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:

An Appropriation That Should Not Be Omitted.....	1041
Japanese Preparedness.....	1041
Making Soldiers and Destroying Manhood—Grace Isabel Colbron.....	1042
He Talks Too Much.....	1042
The Preparationist Fairy Tale Industry.....	1042
Soldiers Prosper While Workers Starve.....	1042
Militarist Fruit.....	1043
The Land for the People.....	1043
Inheritance and Income Taxes.....	1043
Needlessly Worried About the Farmer.....	1044
Morals and Revenue.....	1045
Queer Science From a Professional Scientist.....	1045
Taxation and Population.....	1046
Putting Public Property to Use.....	1046
Ella Flagg Young's Retirement.....	1046
A Typical Reactionary School Trustee.....	1047
When Should An Oath Be Kept?.....	1047
Peter Witt's Candidacy.....	1047
Constitutions Written and Unwritten.....	1047
Had Better Beware.....	1048
Representative Government—Albert H. Jackson....	1048

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

A Meeting of the Security League—Alfred W. Klie- foth.....	1050
---------------------------------------------------------------	------

### INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

True National Defense—R. T. Snediker.....	1051
Concerning Proposed Constitution—Lawson Purdy In Defense of the Proposed Constitution—George T. Keyes.....	1051
Perkins' Absurd Alarm—J. H. Sawtell.....	1051

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

European War.....	1052
Mexico.....	1053
Urges Justice to Weaker Nations.....	1053
Peace Prize Contest.....	1053
Tax Reform News.....	1054
Chicago School Affairs.....	1054
News Notes.....	1054
Press Opinions.....	1055

### RELATED THINGS:

Could They But Meet—Joseph Dana Miller.....	1056
England's True Greatness—John Bright.....	1056
Webster Up To Date.....	1057
Poor Lords of Creation—J. W. H. Brown.....	1057

### BOOKS:

The Voice of the World.....	1057
Principles of Trade.....	1058

## EDITORIAL

### One Appropriation That Should Not Be Omit- ted.

The answer, furnished by Superintendent Josiah H. Brinker of the Federal Bureau of Public Documents, to the many requests for copies of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations is that no more are on hand and "our only hope now for copies of their report for sale to the public is that Congress may order a document print and provide for a sales edition." This hope should be made a certainty. An appropriation for this purpose would be a far greater public benefit than the squandering of money on the army and navy. Congressmen and Senators should hear at once from constituents.

S. D.



### Japanese Preparedness.

Certain Americans pretend to be very much afraid of an attack upon us by Japan, and to that end are urging the building of a great navy to resist the dreaded assault. But let us look at the matter from the Japanese point of view. America is larger, wealthier, and a more powerful nation in every way than Japan. It belongs to the Occident, and the Occidental peoples have ever shown small respect for the rights of Oriental peoples. Europe has never hesitated to encroach upon Asia; and America is the child of Europe. She already has possession of the Hawaiian Islands, she is in Samoa, and she has the Philippines. What reason is there for supposing that the great nation that has grown out of the thirteen colonies on the Atlantic seaboard by absorbing territory from France, from Spain, from Mexico and from Russia will stop with the present status? By all the logic of history she will not tolerate Japan's position in the Pacific, and will at the first opportunity destroy her power.



With such a thought in mind—and there is no reason to doubt that some Japanese may harbor such thoughts—what will be the effect upon them

when they see us doubling our navy? Will they not be confirmed in their conviction that we intend mischief? Will not those who are now suspicious be quickly convinced, and set about persuading those who have hitherto thought well of us? And will they not rally to the defense of their own country by doubling their own navy? Is not this the teaching of modern statesmanship? Is it not the very essence of preparedness? And if the Japanese double their navy, what will be the effect upon our timorous ones? Will not those who now seek to have our navy doubled want it redoubled? And then what? It is possible that Japan and China may come to terms, and by combining their powers be able to command a wealth equal to our own. Is such wealth to be squandered in mad armament rivalry? Yet is not this the logic of the argument for a large navy? Every additional ship that we place in the Pacific is a threat to Japan; and every answering ship that Japan launches is a challenge to America. Is this statesmanship? Is it Christianity? Is it civilization? Is it plain common sense?

S. C.



### Making Soldiers and Destroying Manhood.

Save us from our friends! Major General John F. O'Ryan of the New York National Guard remarked recently in public that

The greatest value of a trained soldiery came from the process that made them mere automatons, trained to do the bidding of their officers. The first thing that must be done is to destroy all initiative, and that with the training, fits men to be soldiers.

The General is quite right, but—we have always thought that initiative was the most characteristic and best American quality, the trait most responsible for the building up of this great country and all the things this nation is most proud of. General O'Ryan's remarks are not calculated to help the advocated army increase in this country. They deserve the widest circulation, for they are likely to do just the thing he does not want them to do—they are likely to make many Americans stop and think before they join the National Defense Leagues and the various other organizations formed to boost "war stocks." Is there any really good and valid reason why we should enter on a course of training for our young men that *must*, if it be effective, rob them of the quality that is their proudest boast? Is there any reason at all?—except the desire to see Bethlehem Steel reach the proud pinnacle of \$1,000 a share?

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.



### He Talks Too Much.

Preparationists should urge General O'Ryan to

refrain from after-dinner addresses. He lets out too much for the good of the cause. In the same address on October 20, wherein he showed how soldiers should be made automatons, he bewailed the fact that existing law forbids the sending of the National Guard out of the country unless the members volunteer for such service. Then in an effort to show how harmful a similar rule has been to other countries he said:

That defect is not peculiar to the United States, however. The German Emperor has not the power to send troops outside of Europe. A Japanese officer told me recently that it was practically impossible for his country to send troops to Europe. The men must first volunteer, and they have not enough interest in European affairs individually to cause them to give up their homes and families and go abroad.

So it seems that Germany and Japan, the two countries against which we are urged to prepare, could not send any invading armies across the ocean unless the soldiers themselves saw fit to go. And it further appears that Japanese soldiers don't care to go to another part of the world to take part in a war that does not interest them. It is safe to say that German soldiers are equally sensible. Then what becomes of these awful bogeys?

S. D.



### The Preparationist Fairy Tale Industry.

The latest fairy tale issued by the preparationists is that Germany will demand compensation from the United States at the end of the war for the sale of munitions to the Allies. The concoctors of this story have forgotten that, though a protest against such sales was made by Austria, Germany did not join in it. They further forget that Germany is even now endeavoring to float a loan in this country through popular subscriptions and offering the unprecedented premium of twelve and a half per cent on five per cent bonds. American citizens who buy these bonds will be giving to Germany practically the same help that munition factories are giving to the Allies. And they forget that Germany has offered to submit to arbitration matters in dispute that have come up. This continuous manufacture of one ridiculous scare after another by the preparationists is itself enough to show the unworthy nature of their demands.

S. D.



### Soldiers Prosper While Workers Starve.

The Chicago Tribune of October 16 quotes a colonel of the United States army as describing the advantages of an enlisted man's career as follows:

The enlisted man is immediately given board,

clothing, housing, medical insurance, \$15 per month, and put under the care of a trained officer whose duty and ambition it is to keep his soldiers in tip-top fighting shape. After a few months his shoulders begin to broaden and to square out, his chest to deepen, and his arms and legs to fit into the "military bearing." He learns, probably for the first time in his life, that cleanliness, neatness and moderation are not luxuries and, what is better, the fundamental reasons underlying law. . . . A soldier has the privilege of depositing his savings with the government at 4 per cent interest. After thirty years' service he goes on the retired list, which at the very least, granting that he does not save a penny, is equal in value to a paid up insurance policy of from \$10,000 to \$20,000, nonforfeitable and guaranteed by the government. But if the soldier remains a normal man he will save. Considering all possibilities, the man who served thirty years as a private and deposited one-half his pay and the amounts due him upon re-enlistment would quit the service with \$9,000, which at 4 per cent would yield over \$30 per month, and, added to his retired pay, would give him a monthly income of nearly \$65 for the remainder of his life, to go wherever he pleases and do whatever he pleases. If he became a sergeant, which the average man could hardly escape being promoted to, he would have \$15,000, with a monthly income of \$100; if first sergeant, \$16,000 and \$120, and a noncommissioned officer, \$18,000 and \$130. If he cared to study in the army school to become a master electrician, chief musician, a baker or cook he would be worth \$24,000 and would have an income of \$170 per month.

Which raises the question; does the soldier earn all this? Does he give service equal in value to what he gets? Does the money received by him during service, and that goes to him at the end of his term, represent wealth which, but for what he has done, would not be in existence? If so, then how is it that the ordinary laborer, who produces as much, or more than the soldier, has no chance to get such a reward after thirty years of service? Why must an electrician, musician, baker or cook join the army to be sure of \$24,000 in 30 years? If the soldier does not earn what he gets, then does he not get what others earn? In either case is there not gross injustice done the great mass of laborers? And is not the remedying of this injustice a far more important matter than any question relating to the army or navy?

S. D.

### Militarist Fruit.

The brutal execution of an English woman in Belgium has shocked even many who have been hardened, during the past fifteen months, to constantly recurring acts of barbarity. The German official who insisted upon the murder of this woman was a victim of a military education, that taught him more about military efficiency than common humanity. He would probably have scoffed at the suggestion that his country

could far better afford to take chances on suffering whatever might follow an act of mercy, than to become responsible for so brutal a crime. He had been taught that he must not allow his conscience to overrule the military code. And, being a trained soldier, he cast humanity aside when it seemed to him that military necessity so required. He is an example of what a militarist policy must breed everywhere. To be prepared for war requires development of such characters. Without them there can be no efficiency in military affairs, and without efficiency the whole policy of preparedness must be in vain. To be consistent, American preparationists must applaud the rejection by this German official of Brand Whitlock's powerful and pathetic appeal in behalf of the condemned woman. For, whether they know it or not, they are insisting on adoption here of a course that must create and encourage the same slavish obedience to dictates of military necessity, and the same brutal indifference to dictates of humanity. Do we want American citizens to be trained that way?

S. D.



### The Land for the People.

In issuing his call for men, why should not King George have included an offer similar to what was made by the Allies to Greece? Greece was offered the Island of Cyprus. Why should not Britons be offered the Island of Great Britain? Morally the island is theirs. Withholding it from them for the benefit of a few thousand dukes and other lords is as great a wrong as any foreign enemy could inflict. Why should not Britons, when asked to fight, be offered its immediate restoration? Is it possible that the noble lords in possession are so unpatriotic that they would resist so just a concession?

S. D.



### Inheritance and Income Taxes.

A correspondent submits for consideration the following:

A tax should be for benefits received or in prospect. The land or Singletax is certainly and cheaply collectable, and equitable up to a certain point; but would a Singletax, exempting incomes and inheritances, be just? Except in cases of extreme national need every man who is a producer is entitled to an untaxed wage sufficient to support himself and reproduce his line; but above this living level, should not an income be taxed to support the State? Is there any income, is there any inheritance, any large fortune earned or accumulated except as the direct result of the benefits of government? Then why not draw on such income or inheritance in support of the government whose benefits are enjoyed?

Why not the income or inheritance tax, supplementing the Singletax?

This inquiry is due apparently to an incomplete understanding of the Singletax on land values. All citizens are served by the government with police protection, with streets and highways, and the various public functions, and all citizens should pay for this service, each according to the service received. It so happens, however, that while the government extends police protection, and the various services, to all citizens and property holders, the holders of certain kinds of property are able to collect the value of that service from the users of the property. For example, the first settler on the remote frontier, where there is no government, may rent or sell his plow to the second settler who comes; and he may continue to rent or sell plows to incoming settlers; but always at a price that will pay only for the reproduction of the plow. When, however, the increasing number of settlers leads to the formation of government, that government protects and serves not only the owners of plows, but the holders of land; and the original settler may rent or sell his land as well as his plow, though with this difference: the increasing population and the additional services rendered by the government have no effect upon the price of plows—unless it be to cheapen them—but the same increase in population and better government service does increase the value of land. Hence, although the government protects alike the owner of plows and the owner of land, the owner of the plow can never get out of it any more, on the average, than the labor put into it; whereas the owner of the land can get an ever-increasing amount, according as the population grows and the service of the government increases. Justice, therefore, requires that to establish equality between the two citizens the government should take annually the amount of this financial benefit conferred upon one citizen that is not enjoyed by the other citizen. By expending for common services to society the annual value thus created by society justice will be done to all. This revenue, though it has the form of a tax, is in reality not a tax at all, but rent. It is an annual sum collected from those who have in their possession communal values, which they may use themselves or rent to others.



If for any reason the government should find itself in need of more revenue than the annual value of the land a tax might be levied upon all the people, and the inheritance or income tax might be considered on the ground of expediency; but so long as the land value, or communal value, suffices

to pay for all the legitimate expenses of government there is no occasion for applying either the inheritance or the income tax. The thought that troubles some minds is that the enormous fortunes already accumulated might, under the Singletax, perpetuate themselves, and so keep alive a dead-head class; and they demand a means of reaching them. There is some reason in this feeling. The great fortunes, however, are due to some form of legal privilege; and the same moral principle that justifies the taking of a legal privilege from the present holder would justify the taking of the fortune that had been accumulated by that privilege. To that degree an inheritance and an income tax would be justifiable. But as the Singletax falls only upon values unearned by the owner, so an income tax to be moral should fall only upon unearned incomes; and if it should seem to be worth while to distribute fiscal justice with such minuteness, an income or an inheritance tax could accompany the Singletax until the accumulated unearned fortunes had disappeared. There is every reason for believing, however, that when legal privilege has been destroyed these great fortunes will not be self-perpetuating, but will quickly melt away into the general wealth of mankind. The Singletax is more than a mere fiscal measure. It is based upon a fundamental principle of political economy, and its adoption would quickly lead to an entirely different economic system from what we now have. By opening up the resources of the earth to all—and this is the big feature of the Singletax—the advantages of science and co-operation would be enjoyed by all. Each would have all that he produces, and none would be rich enough to oppress his fellows. The inheritance and income taxes, therefore, might be used temporarily for the purpose of restoring normal conditions; but, those conditions once restored, there would be no occasion for either tax. So long as the government has values of its own to pay its way it should not encroach upon the private incomes of its citizens.

S. C.



### Needlessly Worried About the Farmer.

A writer in the Dallas News who conducts a column called "The State Press" asserts in the issue of October 13, in the course of a criticism of the Singletax:

Even with low taxes there are at this moment millions of acres of arable land which nobody wants to work. How would loading it with taxes increase its attractiveness to farmers? Also, why the continued reiteration of the arbitrary dictum that an increase of taxes on agriculture would result in an increased production of food? The tendency would be directly the opposite, for it is human nature to wish to avoid

the tax collector, and with all trade and commerce and manufacture and finance relieved of taxation, there would be a rush to engage in those activities and a corresponding disinclination to stay on the farm and pay taxes.

Land which "nobody wants to work" is valueless land, and valueless land under the Singletax would be entirely exempt. Land commences to be valuable when somebody wants to use it. To allow such land to be withheld from use is to keep some one unemployed who wants to work. As long as it costs little or nothing to hold it out of use the owner is tempted to withhold it on speculation, especially when State laws require that the more he improves the more taxes he must pay. As to a tax on land values increasing production, "State Press" himself says "all farmers' taxes have to come out of the products of the farms." Consequently a man who holds land idle will have no products from which to pay taxes. So if his land should be properly taxed he must either put it to use or let others do so. In that way all valuable land now unused or partially used will be forced into use and production of food and all other forms of wealth will be increased. Taxes on properly used land would be decreased to the extent that taxes on unused lands would be increased.



When "State Press" says that the Singletax would increase farmers' taxes, he must be under the impression that farm land values are as high as city values, or that city values are as low as farm values. -Is this the result of observation in Dallas? Is land in Dallas' business center selling for \$100 or so an acre, like farm land? The question seems absurd, but if "State Press" is right such must be the conditions prevailing in Dallas. Under no other circumstances could it be true that the Singletax would add to the farmers' taxes. But "State Press" gives an apparently better explanation of his assertion. He says that he has heretofore confessed that "maybe" he doesn't understand the Singletax. The word "maybe" seems the only error in an entirely superfluous confession.

S. D.



### Morals and Revenue.

Whatever may be the advantages and disadvantages of the use of alcoholic drinks, the question of the revenue derived from the liquor business should be the least of the items determining its treatment. That men should weigh such a far-reaching question of morals by its revenue-producing power shows the handicap under which the government labors, through its neglect to collect

its own peculiar revenue. If government collected for the common use of the people the annual value conferred by the people upon the land, there would be no necessity for its going outside for revenue. And the question of whether or not the use of alcoholic drinks should be permitted could be settled upon its own merits. In view of the vast sums of money that will be required to carry out the contemplated program of preparedness, the friends of the liquor interests are urging a continuance of the business, in order that the Government may have the revenue.



Is it practical, one writer asks, for the Government to give up \$250,000,000 in internal revenue, at the same time it increases its military expenditures \$250,000,000? Another asks how Chicago is to replace the \$7,000,000 derived from saloon licenses, should the city go "dry." These are pertinent questions, and it will stand the "drys" in good stead to ponder the question of taxation along with the liquor question. There is a good and sufficient answer; and if the "drys" would avail themselves of their full opportunity they will have it ready.

S. C.



### Queer Science from a Professional Scientist.

In view of the fight being made in New York City by landed interests against extension of any relief from unjust taxation to labor and enterprise, the following from the Pittsburgh Press of October 19 is pertinent:

The same sort of blindness and selfishness that fought at Harrisburg last winter to secure the repeal of Pittsburgh's graded tax on buildings are now at work in New York to prevent that State from adopting the progressive principle that the Pittsburgh plan embodies. It is a plan which puts the burden of taxation on unimproved land instead of on building. By making the tax on the land relatively twice as heavy as the tax on buildings it stimulates improvements, but of course it displeases the landowner who holds idle land until its value has been multiplied many times by the labor and capital of others. It is a law which will always be unpopular with land unimprovers and speculators.

It is to be hoped the principle will be incorporated in the New York statutes. The question of whether the tax rate on buildings shall be halved, which has made its appearance very regularly before the Legislature at Albany, is to be taken up again next month. The New York Mayor's committee on taxation has announced a series of public hearings, and in the meanwhile Prof. Robert Murray Haig of Columbia University has prepared a report on the subject in which he endeavors to show that the system would be of doubtful benefit in New York City because it is "so different." The professor is obliged to concede, however, that the system in its most radical form—namely, the Singletax—has worked well in

Western Canada, where it has been in operation extensively for many years. (Pittsburgh has had it for four years.) Prof. Haig makes the significant statement that the exemption of improvements stimulates building, but Dr. Haig states that its having that effect in Canada is no certain evidence that it will have that effect in New York City. With regard to a decrease in rents, there was little experience of value to offer in Western Canada as to the effect of this policy, although rents are lower now than they have been in previous years, owing to the fact that they had been exorbitant.

Professor Haig seems to have peculiar views for a scientist. He holds that an economic principle will not necessarily work the same way in New York as in Canada. He might with equal reason say that though the law of gravity operates in New York, it may not be doing so in Canada. If that is the way political economy and other sciences are taught at Columbia University, then the students are entitled to sympathy. S. D.



### Taxation and Population.

Professor Joseph F. Johnson, dean of the New York University's School of Finance, advocates an income tax on married men in order to discourage too rapid increase in population. His views have been largely treated as a joke, but they should not be. The professor, as well as most of his critics, does not seem to realize that the Federal tariff is in effect such a tax as he advocates. It falls most lightly on single persons with no responsibilities, and most heavily on large families. According to Professor Johnson it must be an ideal tax. Protectionists should put the professor on the stump. S. D.



### Putting Public Property to Use.

When Chicago closed the Sunday saloon the fact was brought out that that peculiar institution filled a large place in the social life of the community; and its sudden and arbitrary closing made clear the necessity of providing some other means to take its place. A large number of men spent a long, dreary, monotonous day, unable to entertain themselves, and calling down imprecations upon the heads of those who had deprived them of their former entertainers. A proposition has been made by a social worker to use the public school buildings for meetings and such diversions as would be appropriate to the time and place. The idea has been well received in many quarters and steps are being taken to put it into practice.



Lack of initiative is one of the pronounced limitations of American political life; and a conspicuous example is the failure of the governing bodies

to derive the full use of public property. Until very recent times it has been the practice throughout the country to confine the use of public school property almost entirely to the day sessions, which amounted to thirty to forty hours a week, four to ten months in the year. During the remaining time this immense property—the most extensive and valuable in the community—remained idle. The idea of using public school buildings for the social service of the community seemed to most people on a par with putting churches to mercantile use. Now that the movement has taken hold of the popular mind in various parts of the country, however, there is little doubt that this valuable and extensive property will be put to its natural uses. The Gary experiment of making full use of the plant shows how twice the number of children can be served with the same equipment. The use of the buildings Saturdays, Sundays and evenings will still further add to their public service.



The objection will be raised by some that this is entering into competition with private business. Yet to put the school rooms to the use of public halls is no more an entrance into private business than is the education of the children. To insist upon keeping this valuable property idle is of a piece with the philosophy that prisoners should not be employed at productive labor. The same objection would apply to the employment of United States army officers in such civil engineering work as the construction of the Panama Canal. The school property is there; it belongs to the whole people; it represents an enormous investment; and by all the dictates of reason that property should be put to its fullest use. S. C.



### Ella Flagg Young's Retirement.

Two years ago public sentiment in Chicago forced an unwilling School Board to continue Ella Flagg Young as superintendent. But that did not end the fight. Mrs. Young was subjected to constant nagging, and her work was interfered with so seriously in underhanded ways as to force from her an announcement of withdrawal on completion of her present term. The parents of school children have good cause to regret this. Their own observation must be showing them that under Mrs. Young's management educational methods in Chicago schools have splendid results. If the children's interests had first consideration, every possible inducement would be offered Mrs. Young to reconsider.

S. D.

### A Typical Reactionary School Trustee.

The assertion that Chicago's business district would be an unused swamp today, had the city retained title to all of its school land, was made by Trustee Holpuch of the Chicago Board of Education. It seems from this remark that Mr. Holpuch does not know, although the duties of his position require that he should, that every lot is fairly well improved to which the Board still holds title in the square mile which it once entirely owned. On the other hand, many of the lots that were sold are by no means so well used. There are some which have but one or two-story buildings where conditions require higher ones, and some have no other improvement than unsightly billboards.



But this is not the first instance where Trustee Holpuch has displayed ignorance and misinformation on matters relating to the schools. To a committee of the State Senate, at a hearing during the month of August, he repeated one of the many anonymous stories set in motion by hidden enemies of efficiency in the schools. Unexpectedly asked to give the name of the teacher alleged to be concerned, he confessed that he did not know. Asked to give the name of the principal and of the school, he was again obliged to confess ignorance, and has not to the present time produced this information. He must have based his views on the land question on similar lack of knowledge. There may easily be the same explanation for his opposition to the Teachers' Federation and to progressive policies generally. S. D.



### When Should an Oath Be Kept?

True to his oath, Mayor Thompson of Chicago once more enforced the Sunday closing law on October 24, and forgetful of his oath allowed policemen, who had taken a similar oath, to break up a public meeting and arrest eight speakers for exercising their constitutional right of free speech.

S. D.



### Peter Witt's Candidacy.

The voters of Cleveland will have an opportunity on November 2 to elect as successor to Newton Baker, another Mayor who, like Baker, is inspired by the same vision as Tom L. Johnson. Peter Witt, who was one of Tom Johnson's active supporters, has made a campaign on Tom Johnson lines and can be depended upon to administer his office in the same way. There are three other candidates, and the choice will be by preferential vote, but the selection of Peter Witt is the one which the good of the city most emphatically requires. S. D.

### Constitutions: Written and Unwritten.

Progressive, forward-looking men and women in this country, finding their efforts thwarted apparently by constitutional limitations, sigh for an unwritten constitution, such as that of England, and bend their efforts to making our own more easily amendable. It may be questioned, however, if too much is not made of these obstacles. Though the British Parliament is subject to no restraint whatever, while our own Congress is most carefully hedged about with written limitations, it may be doubted if during the past fifty years as many fundamental changes in public policy have been made in England as in America. Though the Federal Constitution carefully limits the powers of Congress, and with equal care prescribes the rights of the States, yet State powers have passed into national control with a rapidity that would have made the early fathers of the Republic gasp in amazement.



Under the simple provision of the Constitution empowering Congress to regulate commerce between the States, that body has presumed to meddle with all sorts of matters that formerly were considered purely State matters. Whether it be a censorship, public health, lotteries, liquor traffic, railroad rate making, conservation or white slavery, the Federal Government does not hesitate to exercise jurisdiction; and there is every reason to suppose this tendency will continue. Two facts are patent. First, it is more and more apparent that the States are not natural political units. Second, it is evident that a written constitution does not prevent the people from adopting policies they have determined upon. State boundaries lost their main reason for being when the States ceased to be independent political units. When the Union was established State boundaries lost their former significance. The natural divisions of political power are local and general. The State rights advocate, when he extended local interests to the State boundaries, and limited national interests to the same point, fixed an arbitrary and unnatural line of demarkation that had to be abandoned. The division between local and general interests apparently embraces a much smaller unit than State lines. It would seem to correspond more nearly to present city boundaries. Experience will ultimately determine its location. For there is such a line, and within it are found the local interests that fall logically under what has come to be known as home rule. This is the natural local political unit, and the people within it should have the right of home rule. The gen-



eral interests of these political units may be served best by State governments or by the National Government, according as experience dictates.



In this effort to adjust political rights action would be made easier if the constitutions were in accord; but experience has shown that this is by no means indispensable. Whatever the people en masse determine upon, political agents, whether legislative, executive or judicial, or all combined, will find a way of carrying out. We have a tariff because most people believe in a tariff. We tax industry and exempt monopoly because most people do not realize that this is the situation. Whether or not the Constitution permits the one and protects the other matters little. When the mass of the people make up their minds to change our fiscal policies the change will be made. To advocate constitutional amendments furnishes a rallying point for propaganda work; but in many cases the amendments proposed are by no means indispensable to political action. The disingenuous "what's the Constitution between friends," becomes the policy of state when the mass of the people are in that frame of mind. No constitution long stands in the way of a majority of the people.

S. C.



### Had Better Beware.

Some New York democrats are inclined to favor the proposed new Constitution, in spite of its objectionable features, because a few concessions to progressivism are said to have been made. Their position is in effect that "half a loaf is better than no bread." Unfortunately not half a loaf, but merely a few adulterated crumbs, is all that has been offered. And there is good cause to fear that these crumbs are not free concessions but bait to lure unwary voters to acceptance of dangerous measures. It would be wiser to reject the bait.

S. D.



## REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

In his closing speech before the Constitutional Convention, the Hon. Elihu Root said:

One other thing I wish to say, and that is, that similar evils to those that we have found in our state government have been found in the governments of many other states. People of those states have had recourse to an abandonment, or a partial abandonment, of representative government. They have had recourse to the initiative and referendum and the recall, the recall of officers and the recall of decisions. In this convention we have offered the most irrefutable, concrete argument against those nostrums and patent medicines in government and in favor of the preservation of that representative

government, which is the chief gift of our race to freedom by undertaking to reform representative government, instead of abandoning it, and to make it worthy of its great function for the preservation of liberty.

In a similar strain the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge informs us in his literary tirades against the initiative and referendum, that representative government is the great contribution of English speaking peoples to the science of government, and that it has preserved political freedom, while the democracies of Greece and Rome and the Italian city republics lost it.

What is representative government, and how do Mr. Root and his convention propose to preserve it? Unquestionably its highest development in modern times has been reached in its prototype, the English House of Commons, and in the legislatures of the British self-governing colonies, which are patterned after the "mother of parliaments." A cabinet composed of a few leaders of the predominant party, being members of Parliament, is chosen to direct the legislative and executive policies of the government. These men are responsible to Parliament for their acts, and that body in turn is responsible to the people. When the cabinet loses the confidence of the House of Commons, it resigns, and when that branch of the legislature becomes doubtful about the support of the country, it dissolves. By this system public opinion in Great Britain and her colonies has been faithfully represented and carried out, unhindered by constitutional checks and limitations. If there are lingering remnants of feudalism in these countries, the fault is due to the conservatism of the people and not to the form of government.

But, as Mr. Bryce wrote, while the Englishman puts the fullest trust in his legislature, because it had been his bulwark against the oppression of the king, in America the keenest suspicion and jealousy were felt of the government to be established. "It was feared that Congress might become an illiberal oligarchy and the President a new George the Third." It might be added that our constitution-makers equally distrusted the people. Hence it was deemed a wise expedient to separate the government into three parts, the legislative, executive and judicial, each to be a check upon the other, and thus secure liberty by preventing usurpation of power. In addition, the constitutions were loaded with directions and restrictions, bills of rights being considered especially necessary. The plan has worked badly. The powers never were completely separated, for if they had been they could not have checked each other. The governor, besides his executive functions, controls



legislation through the veto and his power of appointment. The legislature controls the executive through the power of impeachment, through its power to make and abolish administrative offices and to determine the method of nomination, through the control of salaries and appropriations, and by bartering legislation for appointments. The judiciary, itself, controlled by the other branches of government in various ways, controls the acts of administrative officers through the injunction, and the writs of habeas corpus, certiorari and mandamus, and controls legislation, in a limited measure, through its power to declare statutes unconstitutional. This is not a separation, but a confusion of powers, with resultant irresponsibility. Under this system the courts wield the ultimate political power. But the courts are not, and never were intended to be, the people's representatives. They are not the proper medium through which the political hopes and aspirations of the people can be expressed, nor can they be adapted to such a purpose, even with the recall of judges or of judicial decisions. If representative government is to be restored in this country, the first step must be to deprive the courts entirely of their legislative power; and this can only be done by abolishing constitutional restrictions so that there will be no constitutional law for the courts to enforce. The irresponsibility for the enactment and enforcement of laws and the conflict between the executive and the legislature can be ended only by the complete union of these two branches of government. It is a significant fact that no civilized country, except our own, attempts to separate the powers of government, those which tried it having abandoned it.

Now Mr. Root's idea of reforming representative government, as expressed in the work of his convention, is to confer greatly increased power upon the governor, to confer certain administrative, legislative and quasi-judicial powers upon more or less irresponsible appointive officers and commissions, and by adding largely to the power of the courts through an increase in the number of constitutional provisions which they will have to interpret, and all this at the expense of the legislature. This increase in the legislative power of the courts is a distinct loss to representative government, as is the power conferred upon the commissions, who can be removed only upon charges or by impeachment. But it is urged that the governor is the people's representative, and that by increasing his power over appropriations and appointments, the responsibility can be squarely placed upon him. "It is to destroy autocracy and restore power, so far as may be, to the men elected

by the people, accountable to the people, removable by the people," said Mr. Root, when denouncing invisible government. But the governors of this state heretofore have had broad powers and responsibilities, and yet, according to Mr. Root's own testimony, they have been as susceptible as any other public officers to the influence of the invisible government. His method of destroying that evil influence is far from convincing, especially in view of the fact that the beneficiaries of that system are working desperately to have this constitution adopted.

It is an advantage to be able to place responsibility, but it is doubtful whether one man, with legislative power equal to two-thirds of the legislature, with practical control over all the appropriations, and with such great power of appointing administrative officers, can fairly represent ten million people. Every man has his limitations, his prejudices, and is influenced to a great degree by his environment. A representative government should consist of many minds and the many diverse interests of the community. The growing demand for proportional representation is due to the belief that every class, no matter how radical or reactionary, should be represented, for all wisdom does not reside even in majorities. Under the English system any measure inaugurated by the cabinet is usually worked over and threshed out by the members and represents a compromise between varying opinions. Then as it goes through Parliament it is often amended and battered beyond recognition. When finally enacted, the measure reflects the average sentiments of the people. Such a result cannot be secured in a one man government, no matter how wise and beneficent he may be. The tendency, therefore, to make the governor all-powerful and the legislature correspondingly powerless, seems to me to be decidedly reactionary, and a denial rather than a restoration of representative government. It is exactly the reverse of the course pursued by our English ancestors, who wrested arbitrary power from the king and vested it in Parliament.

Efficiency may be gained by the budget, the short ballot, the consolidation of the one hundred and fifty-two state departments into seventeen, and in the serial bond provision.

But all these and many more could be obtained by legislative action, if the existing constitutional restrictions were removed. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that this constitution represents the prevailing opinion in New York today, who can say what the opinion of tomorrow will be? Can such a vast mass of statutory matter and directions and prohibitions, petrified into a rigid

constitutional system, possibly secure representative government? Is it not of the very essence of representative government that it shall be capable of giving expression to the changing needs and opinions of the people? Society is an organism which should be allowed to develop freely and naturally and not be confined and repressed by any such cast-iron instrument.

The fact that this constitution will practically prevent the state ownership of public utilities, is alone a sufficient reason for rejecting it. The iniquitous tax clause will be voted on separately and should be defeated. But it is important to consider the broad general objections to the whole instrument, in view of the great claims which its proponents are making for it.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

### A MEETING OF THE SECURITY LEAGUE.

Chicago, October 23, 1915.

With militiamen in gaily colored uniforms, with bugles resounding every few minutes, and three grizzled old soldiers, the remnant of a fife and drum corps that had done service in the Civil War, the stage was set for the opening meeting of the Security League in Orchestra Hall. This was also the enticement offered to several hundred men casually passing the building to enter the hall where a small assemblage had come to discuss the military needs of the United States. The size of the audience fell below expectation, and it took a great deal of solicitation on the part of the uniformed militiamen to induce the crowd attracted by the bugle calls and the beating of drums to enter upon an invitation of "free seats, good music and splendid talks." Nevertheless, there remained large gaps in the audience and many empty seats on the stage, but the emptiness in space was filled with the music of a fifteen-piece orchestra playing patriotic airs and supplying applause for the speakers. Yet the splendid setting of the surroundings failed to move the audience, and the outburst of patriotism did not come until the three grizzled old soldiers, tramping to the tune of "Marching Through Georgia," crossed the stage accompanied by the buglers of the State Militia. At this "psychological" moment a large flag, which had been hidden away from sight, fluttered down about the heads of the gray haired veterans. It was then that the artificial stimulant became effective, and the audience, speaking through the presiding officer, a colonel, realized the military needs of our country!

The first speaker of the evening, Judge Jacob M. Dickinson, a former Secretary of War, quoted and misquoted great men, from Christ to Wilson, who had glorified the military deeds of nations. "The immutable law of self-preservation," said he, "is the law of nations as well as of individuals. Our country cannot shirk the responsibility of a first-class power." To the psychologized audience it could only mean arm and fight. Our country's richness, he ex-

plained, is an invitation to all foreign powers. Our interests in Porto Rico, Panama, the Hawaiians and the Philippines attract selfish nations. But not a word did he say that it was our selfishness which made us seize Panama. He did not speak of the modern way, moreover, of avoiding friction by neutralizing the Canal or opening isolated islands as coaling stations on equal terms to all nations. He advised leaving these matters to experts, military experts, for they alone understand how to handle these problems, as is so remarkably illustrated by the military experts of Europe. For the furtherance of this expert European method he advocated the development of military science in this country. He urged military training to instill obedience, discipline, respect for law and uprightness. "Mob law," said the Judge, "cannot live under military law." And I thought of the Lusitania, of Louvain, of Poland, of Armenia, of South Africa, and Sherman's march to the sea. These achievements, history relates, were executed under military authority. The audience was also informed that during the Civil War while the Judge was then on the "other side," the war would have been less bloody had there been military training. And I said to myself, "Well, Judge, you are on the 'other side' of this question too." But the patriotism of the speaker was not without exemplification, for with dramatic ability he uttered at the close of his address the famous saying of Decatur: "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

From the next speaker, Harry Pratt Judson, President of the University of Chicago, I had anticipated some hope, for here, I thought, is an educator, a moralist, and a famous scholar; no doubt, he would lead the way to an unselfish and ideal conclusion. He spoke of his experience in China. "Can America," he said, "afford to be a helpless China?" But he startled his audience with the information that the Atlantic ocean had been annihilated by science, and that it was but a question of strategy for a European army to see the sights of New York and Washington. "Did it not happen in 1812?" he asked. The learned scholar also quoted from experts, from teachers and philosophers, his greatest authority being he who said: "When a man guardeth his palace his goods are in peace." Here a stranger whispered to me, "Is that the president of the University of Chicago?" "Well," he remarked, "he has less ideals than I, and I am merely an uneducated workingman."

Judge Cutting, the closing speaker of the evening, was awarded a ripple of applause when he uttered "We want peace"; but a thunder of applause greeted him when he quoted Kipling: "The time is coming when someone will plunder your rich country. Will you permit it to be plundered?" He then read a splendid dissertation on "The animal in us can only be met by animal force."

This, in short, is the idealism of a former cabinet member, a great university president and a distinguished judge. And as the crowd was slowly winding its way out to the tune of "Dixie," I wondered what the appeal to this tribal patriotism and fighting instinct, the curse of international suspicion and the coincidence of war scares and armed prepa-

ration would lead us to. Will patriotism give justice or will it demand justice?

ALFRED W. KLIEFOTH.

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

### TRUE NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Kansas City, Mo., Oct. 15, 1915.

If civilized (?) nations believed in the Christian religion, in its teaching of "Peace on Earth and Good Will to Men," there would be no wars nor need of armies and navies. If we would use the 250 million dollars now annually appropriated for our army and navy for internal improvements, we could build seven rock roads each year 24 feet wide and a foot deep from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, or a double track steam railroad with modern stations and the latest improved rolling stock from ocean to ocean and operate it for 50 million dollars a year, that now costs the people 250 million dollars for freight and passenger rates.

Turning human effort in this direction and changing our tax system so as to make it possible for our 15 million landless and homeless men to get homes of their own would make for a stronger National Defense than if we were to double our navy and increase our standing army to a 1,000,000 soldiers from landless, homeless men. Who would dare to attack 22 millions of home owners? To be sure, there are fools who would fight for a boarding house, but better soldiers are they who fight in defense of their own homes.

Thirty-three thousand people own the land of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Is it any wonder that men have to be forced by conscription to fight for the landlords? How long will it take governments to learn that they are no stronger than their weakest link? When two-thirds to nine-tenths of the people are landless and homeless, how are we to expect very much patriotism? What have such men to fight and die for?

R. T. SNEDIKER.



### CONCERNING THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION.

New York, Oct. 23, 1915.

The present New York constitution does not contain the prohibition [referred to on page 1019] against the exercise of jurisdiction by military tribunals "while the civil courts are open." The constitution is unchanged in this respect. I am informed that the phrase mentioned is in the constitution of West Virginia.

In certain important features the tax amendment enlarges the powers of the legislature. It prevents the power of taxation from being contracted away, but whether it otherwise restricts the power to exempt classes of property is at least improbable.

LAWSON PURDY.



### IN DEFENSE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION.

New York, October 23, 1915.

I venture to comment upon your article on the New York Constitution, published in your issue of

October 22. I believe that you are in error when you state that the Governor "cannot remove a member" of the Public Service Commission, and that "the people will be helpless against corporation-controlled commissions, even should they elect a Progressive Governor."

Article 6, section 15, of the new Constitution provides for a department of public utilities, consisting of two public service commissions. "The Governor may remove any commissioner for cause after service upon him of a written statement of the alleged cause and an opportunity to be heard thereon." The Governor's action in this case is final and the provision merely protects a competent public service commissioner from a bad Governor.

In the same article you refer to "the elimination from the bill of rights of the clause prohibiting military tribunals from exercising jurisdiction over civilians 'while the civil courts are open.'" I believe that you must have been misinformed in regard to this section, as there has been no omission. The New York Constitution for one hundred and twenty-nine years has contained no clause prohibiting the suspension of trial by jury within the jurisdiction of a military tribunal. I, for one, am in favor of such a prohibition, but I do not believe that the history of this State points to any grave necessity for such a clause.

I am for the Constitution because it improves administration in this State and gives the public a chance to place responsibility for such administration.

The Initiative and Referendum have done much for civil service reform in Colorado and New Jersey, and, yet, I would not be willing to defeat a Constitution which failed to contain these principles. Is it not wise to leave those for a future time when the sentiment of the State will permit their adoption?

GEORGE T. KEYES.



### PERKINS' ABSURD ALARM.

Manhattan, Kans., Oct. 12, 1915.

I notice by the press dispatches of today that Mr. George Perkins of New York in his address before the Indiana bankers in Indianapolis has sounded a word of alarm, and in stentorian tones proclaimed from the house tops, is calling on the United States to get ready for the great industrial war that is to follow the European struggle. The fear that seemed to pervade his righteous soul was to the effect that Europe, in order to get back the gold she has been compelled to send to the United States, would flood this country with low-priced commodities.

I wonder if any sane man could crowd into one sentence more idiotic nonsense than that. To think, for instance, how the laboring man lies awake at night dreading the time to come when Europe will flood his back yard with low-priced commodities! How utterly unspeakable it will be for the housewife, when she comes to pay her monthly bills to find that, because of this heartless influx of cheap European goods, she has to pay about half as much as formerly!

I suppose that it never occurred to Mr. Perkins that it would be the greatest boon to this country that could possibly happen to have it flooded just

now with low-priced commodities. What would happen if all of us, even including Mr. Perkins, should have to spend but half the labor and time necessary to procure the necessities of life because of cheap European goods? We should have money to purchase more comforts and luxuries, we could educate our children better, we could have a little time for recreation, and in a thousand ways we could better our condition. As a nation we could, in a very short time, save enough to corner all the gold in Christendom and lay a mortgage on the Eternal City, whose streets are said to be paved with gold.

I suppose, too, that it never occurred to Mr. Perkins that Europe, in her necessarily impoverished condition at the close of the present titanic struggle, would be in no condition to play the part of a benevolent benefactor to the United States by donating to her goods at even half price. The only fear this country will have will be, not the fear of cheap goods, but the much more reasonable fear that Europe will be in no shape to purchase of us because of her impoverished condition. Then, too, I don't suppose Mr. Perkins thought of the labor side to this great influx of cheap goods. It just occurs to me that labor might be a little scarce in Europe after this war is over and thereby a little dearer because of this scarcity, and for this reason Europe would be in no position to rush cheap goods to our shores.

In whichever way we look at Mr. Perkins' argument we at once come upon the grossest absurdities. I very much fear that the extreme solicitation of Mr. Perkins is not for the great masses of humanity who consume goods, but for the smaller number who are engaged in the making of goods, and who have been in the habit of securing special bounties at the hands of a willing Congress.

J. H. SAWTELL.

---

## 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, October 26, 1915.

---

### European War.

Activities on the western and eastern fronts are still overshadowed by the Balkan campaign. The German forces have renewed their attacks south of Riga, and have succeeded in finding further lodgment east of the Dvina River, but have as yet brought about no decisive action. The Russians continue to hold Dvinsk, and to check the German advance. To the south, in the neighborhood of Pinsk, and in Galacia, the Russians maintain a vigorous offensive. [See current volume, page 1028.]

Vigorous fighting continues along the western front, but the only changes of moment in the lines have been made by the French in the Champagne

district, where they have succeeded in taking German trenches. Near Tahure the French made important gains; but as compared with what remains to be done, if they would win, such gains seem trifling.

In the Balkans the reports of military operations are so indefinite, and so contradictory, that the real situation is not known outside of military circles. The Teutonic forces have established themselves within Serbian territory, and have advanced up the Morava Valley nearly thirty miles. At other points their forces are only ten or twelve miles from the frontier. They have cleared the banks of the Danube of Serbian troops, and are reported to have joined with Bulgarian forces at Orsova. Steamers and lighters can thus place the invaders within Bulgarian territory, but the lack of railroads across Bulgaria prevents the use of that route to Turkey. Meanwhile, the Bulgarian forces are invading Serbia from the east. They hold the Nish-Saloniki railroad at Vrania, and at Uskub, an important railway junction midway between Nish and Saloniki. The Allies, with the French in the lead, advancing from the south, have defeated the Bulgarians south of Ishtip, and effected a junction with the Serbians at Krivolak. southwest of Ishtip. Strumnitza, the fortified Bulgarian town was not taken by the French, as at first reported. The Allies are pushing on past the town, with a view apparently to turning the flank of the Bulgarians, who have advanced to Uskub. Troops are still landing at Saloniki, and hurrying northward.

Italy continues her vigorous campaign along the Isonzo, but without decisive results. Aeroplane attacks on Venice resulted in injury to three persons, and the destruction of the sculptured ceiling of a church, but no military damage was done. Italy has declared war on Bulgaria, and sent a fleet to aid the Allies. No news is given of the Dardanelles campaign. News from the Caucasian front is to the effect that the Grand Duke Nicholas has his army in shape for action, and is advancing against the Turks. Successful engagements are reported in the neighborhood of Lake Van.

British submarine activities continue in the Baltic, where German commerce is seriously interrupted. The sinking of eight vessels is credited to one submarine. Berlin admits the cruiser Prinz Adalbert was sunk in the Baltic off Libau, with heavy loss of life. A change in rules made by the British will hit German commerce. Article 57 of the Declaration of London, which declares that the neutral or belligerent character of a vessel is determined by the flag it is entitled to fly will no longer be recognized. The ownership of the vessel is to

be the test of its nationality. This was the rule of England and the United States before the declaration. The resort to the old rule is had for the purpose of preventing Germany from operating ships acquired from neutral countries.



The Russian Minister of Finance has been authorized to seek foreign credit to the amount of \$2,750,000,000. A large part of this will be English credit to be expended in England, similar to the Anglo-French loan negotiated in the United States.



#### Mexico.

Recognition of Mexico became an accomplished fact on the 19th, when Secretary of State Lansing notified Elizeo Arredondo, General Carranza's Washington representative that the United States Government had decided to recognize the Carranza government, and was ready to exchange diplomatic representatives. Similar letters were received by Arredondo from the ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil and Chile, and the ministers of Bolivia, Uruguay and Guatemala. The embargo on arms shipped from the United States to Mexico went into effect on the 20th, but President Wilson suspended it as to arms intended for the Carranza government. On the same day the Villa agency in Washington closed its doors. It was announced that the recognition of General Carranza made it useless to maintain the agency. General Carranza, when asked by press correspondents if he would be a candidate for the presidency said:

I have not had the character of the presidency. I have never been president. I have been only Governor of Coahuila and First Chief of the Constitutionalist Army in charge of the executive power of the cause. Anyone may be a candidate. There is no law that prohibits me from being a candidate.

[See current volume, page 1028.]



Ten Mexicans were hanged or shot for alleged complicity in wrecking a St. Louis, Brownsville and Mexico passenger train on the outskirts of Brownsville, in which three Americans were killed and four were wounded. General Villa continues in the field, but detachments of his men and officers continue to desert to the Carranza authorities. Secretary Lansing reports improvement in Mexican conditions since recognition.



#### Urges Justice to Weaker Nations.

Under date of October 22 the Anti-Imperialist League has issued from its Boston headquarters the following:

The Anti-Imperialist League maintains with faith and courage its special work of obtaining, by the establishment of Philippine independence, relief from the anomalous and dangerous responsibility of holding and defending remote "possessions." But the situation calls for the application to affairs in the

Western Hemisphere of the doctrines which the League upholds, and demands a protest against a drift which menaces the peace and safety of the Republic. No spheres of influence, protectorates, or trusteeships should be undertaken here by the United States acting alone, promoting, as they must, jealousy, distrust, and disorder.

For the maintenance of honorable international relations the Anti-Imperialist League looks with fervent hope to the development of the Pan-American Union, which under one or another name has had for a quarter of a century the unquestioned support of our leading statesmen, and which should secure joint action by the great nations of America on all questions of international importance arising in the Western Hemisphere. This co-operation with other American nations has been resorted to during the past year in dealing with the lamentable difficulties of Mexico and the League earnestly urges the adoption of a similar course in the critical situations which exist in other American countries, as San Domingo, Nicaragua, Haiti, and Panama.

The League urges the early adoption of some proper treaty with Colombia to settle the bitter controversy which has embarrassed so long her relations with the United States. In the interest of justice and amity the League urges careful scrutiny of any treaty like that between the United States and Honduras, which has for several years been under consideration. The League urges a prompt granting of citizenship to the unfortunate inhabitants of Porto Rico as repeatedly recommended by all parties in successive official reports.

That the withdrawal of the United States from the Philippine Islands entails the duty of negotiating their neutralization, is the policy adhered to by the League, this neutralization to be negotiated in advance by combination with other nations interested—a policy analogous to that recommended for dealing with American questions as above mentioned; which solution of the Philippine problem may be expected to receive world-wide approbation like the withdrawal heretofore of the United States from Cuba.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

(Signed) Erving Winslow, Secretary.

(Signed) Moorfield Storey, President.



#### Peace Prize Contest.

The American School Peace League has offered prizes, known as "The Seabury Prizes," open to pupils in senior classes of normal and secondary schools of all countries. Open to seniors of normal schools is a contest for the best essay on the subject:

The Opportunity and Duty of the Schools in the International Peace Movement.

Open to seniors of secondary schools is a contest on the following subject:

The Influence of the United States in Advancing the Cause of International Peace.

Three prizes of \$75, \$50 and \$25 will be given for essays in each set. Essays must not exceed 5,000 words, must be on paper 8 by 10 inches, written on one side only, with a margin of at least 1¼ inches. The contest closes on March 1, 1916. The award will be made at the annual meeting of

the League in the following July. The writer's name must not appear on essay but should be sent in a letter with school and home address to Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary American School Peace League, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston, to whom all requests for information should be addressed.



#### Tax Reform News.

The Committee on Taxation, headed by Alfred E. Marling, appointed by Mayor Mitchel of New York, will hold a series of hearings in November. The hearings will be based on a report prepared by Professor Robert M. Haig of Columbia. This deals with the proposition to reduce by one-half the tax rate on buildings in New York City and is summarized by the New York Herald as follows:

He maintains that the tax burden in Manhattan would be increased by the adoption of the proposed scheme to untax buildings. Under partial reduction methods the tax rate on land would increase to 2.20 and under the full system to 2.86. There would be a decrease in taxes on the skyscrapers below Chambers street and uptown tenements. Downtown tenements would pay higher taxes, while single family houses would probably be required to bear a heavy increase. The presence of a large quantity of vacant land in the Bronx would prevent a very large decrease of taxes in this borough under the proposed system. If this vacant land were to be disregarded, Dr. Haig states, there would be a considerable decrease in the taxes on the remaining real estate. The tendency would be to force much of this vacant land in the Bronx to immediate use. Vacant land in Brooklyn is not a factor of sufficient importance to affect the situation to the degree that it would be affected in the Bronx. In seven sections of Brooklyn Dr. Haig believes there would be an actual increase in the total tax on real estate. In Queens there would be a slight increase in the total taxes, while in spite of the presence of a large quantity of vacant land in Richmond the report states that there would probably be a reduction in the taxes there. However, in final conclusion, it is not evident that the tenants will receive any considerable benefit from the reduction in the tax on buildings because of several factors which might interfere, while if any benefit whatsoever should result the cost would be charged to the owner of the land. Dr. Haig concedes that this cost would be considerable, and has set forth in detail this amount, as well as the modifying factors, in the appendix of his report.

[See current volume, pages 158, 597, 1005.]



At a hearing on taxation at New York City on Oct. 21, by the legislative committee headed by Senator Ogden L. Mills, Professor Joseph F. Johnson of the New York University Finance School opposed any exemption of married men in imposing an income tax. He held that such taxation should be resorted to to stimulate the prudential check on increase in population.



At the eleventh hour an initiative petition was

filed in Pueblo, Colorado, submitting at the election on November 2 a proposition to repeal the Singletax amendment to the city charter. [See current volume, page 955.]



#### Chicago School Affairs.

A letter from Superintendent Ella Flagg Young of the Chicago schools was made public on October 21 in which she announced her decision to retire on conclusion of her term on December 8. She had desired to take this action a year ago, and had only remained because at the time there was a deficit in the educational fund. She could now turn over the system to her successor free from anything that would cause embarrassing difficulties. Her work had been hampered and made difficult by hostile trustees which necessarily interfered with her efforts. [See current volume, page 1025.]



Miss Margaret Haley, representing the Teachers' Federation at the Illinois Federation of Labor convention at Alton on October 20, attributed the adoption of the rule against the Federation by the Chicago School Board to corporation influence, as follows:

We have made a fight on tax dodgers for thirteen years and have caused many big corporations to pay taxes. Another reason the board is fighting is because we oppose the sale of school lands. In the past land was sold for \$50,000 which today would yield a huge income.



Mayor Thompson sent the following appointments of members of the Board of Education to the City Council for confirmation on October 25: Reverend John P. Brushingham, Mrs. F. E. Thornton, William N. Selig, Max Loeb, A. Sheldon Clark, Harris W. Huehl and Charles S. Peterson. The last named is a reappointment. He is hostile to the Teachers' Federation. The others are to displace Trustees Sonstebly, Rothmann, Roulston, Metz, Pietrowicz and Schlake. Three of the displaced trustees, Rothmann, Roulston and Schlake are hostile. The others are friendly. At Mayor Thompson's request confirmation of the appointments was delayed one week.

## NEWS NOTES

—President Wilson issued his Thanksgiving proclamation on October 21 setting aside November 25 as the day.

—After the price of butter in Brandenburg had reached 80 cents a pound the military authorities fixed the maximum price at 70 cents a pound.

—Five guards and deputy wardens were discharged from the Georgia state prison at Milledgeville on October 22 as a result of the lynching of Leo Frank. [See current volume, pages 886, 952.]

—Dr. Wellington Koo, Chinese minister to Mexico, Peru and Cuba, has been appointed Chinese minister to the United States, to succeed Kai Fu Shah, who is recalled to Peking. [See current volume, page 1005.]

—The first national convention of secretaries of state met at Cincinnati on October 21. The meeting was called by Stuart F. Reed, secretary of state of West Virginia. Nineteen states were represented on the first day.

—The American Defense Society was reported on October 18 to be preparing petitions with which to flood members of Congress at the opening of the session in behalf of the \$500,000,000 army and navy appropriation.

—Early reports of the Union of South African election indicate the representation in Parliament to be: Unionists, 31; Botha followers, 11; Laborites, 3; Dutch Nationalists, 1; Independents, 4. [See current volume, page 813.]

—Up to Oct. 23, 10,000 persons had registered at Minot, Bismarck and Plaza, N. D., in the hope of drawing one of the 700 homesteads in the Fort Berthold reservation to be raffled off by the Federal government. [See current volume, page 1029.]

—Fear lest Democrats dissatisfied with the nomination of Theodore Bilbo for Governor of Mississippi vote the Socialist ticket and defeat him at the general election on November 2, has caused a warning to Democratic voters to be issued by the state chairman of the party.

—Complete returns from New Jersey put the majority against the woman suffrage amendment at 56,707. Two other amendments submitted were also defeated. One would have made easier any further change in the constitution. The other provided for excess condemnation of land in making improvements. The ballots at this election were not numbered, thus rendering fraud easy. [See current volume, page 1025.]

—The first suit under the Clayton Act was brought at St. Louis on October 18 by Attorney-General Gregory against the United States Shoe Machinery Co. No request for dissolution is made, but the court is asked to enjoin the company from alleged unlawful practices. It is charged with making leases of its machinery conditional on the lessee's agreement to refrain from buying any supplies from competitors. Another suit brought under the original Sherman law is now pending on appeal before the Supreme Court. [See current volume, page 311.]

—After a discussion of the new British budget by the Land Values Group of members of the British Parliament, the following motion was unanimously adopted:

The Executive of the Land Values Group in the House of Commons profoundly regret the action of the Government in including in the Budget various import duties which contravene the principle of Free Trade and increase the taxation of food, while wholly neglecting the fundamental principle that those who hold the land ought to make a special contribution to its defence; and they urge the Government to impose, without delay, a National Tax on land values throughout the United Kingdom.

—A call for the Third Conference on Marketing and Farm Credits has been issued to meet at Chi-

cago on November 29. The call has been issued by the National Council of Farmers Co-operative Associations. Delegates will attend from the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, the American Society of Equity and other organizations. The committee issuing the call includes Frank P. Holland of Dallas, Texas, Gifford Pinchot, Herbert Quick, editor of Farm and Fireside, Clarence Poe of the Progressive Farmer, H. L. Hughes of Farm, Stock and Home, Henry Wallace of Wallace's Farmer, E. T. Meredith of Successful Farming, L. S. Herron of the Nebraska Farmer, and others. Information may be had from the secretary, C. W. Holman, 903 Gaff Building, 230 South La Salle street, Chicago.

## PRESS OPINIONS

### Is He Too Democratic for the Democratic Party?

Harper's Weekly, October 23.—Some men in public life have breadth of vision. One such is a Democratic Senator from a southwestern state. An independent citizen recently conversed with this Democratic Senator as follows:

Citizen: Why wouldn't Congressman Kent be a good man for the Democrats to nominate for the Vice-Presidency?

Senator: There couldn't be a better.

Citizen: Some say he is not enough of a Democrat.

Senator: There is not a better Democrat in the United States.

Citizen: He calls himself an independent.

Senator: How do you judge a man, by labels or by deeds?

Citizen: I judge a man by deeds, but I am not so sure how those who will steer the next Democratic convention will judge.



### Homage to Keir Hardie.

Labor Leader (Manchester), October 7.—Our newspapers have no space for anything but war news at this time and they are thus neglecting to record events which time will prove to be of no less significance than the fortunes of battle. Keir Hardie is dead, but the dead Keir Hardie is a living power. The meetings which have been held this week to commemorate his life work have proved a marvellous tribute not only to the affection borne for him but to the influence of the principles for which he stood. Too readily we imagined those principles to be buried in the devastation of war. The wonderful gatherings held in Glasgow, Bradford, London, and other centers prove that there are great masses of men and women in whose hearts Hardie's ideal of working-class solidarity and human brotherhood the world o'er lives undimmed as ever. There must have been 5,000 people present in the St. Andrew's Hall in Glasgow on Sunday evening. Hundreds were turned away. The meeting was a memorial service to Hardie, but it was also, as he would have wished it to be, a demonstration of Socialism and Internationalism of profound significance. When Mr. Robert Smillie declared this war to be a Capitalist war the vast audience rose en masse and cheered. When Mr. MacDonald, at whom the press has never ceased hurling the epithets



"pro-German" and "traitor" because he has maintained the Internationalism of our faith, was called upon to speak, again the audience rose and cheered with a fervour the meaning of which no one could mistake.



### An Expensive Luxury.

Youth's Companion, Sept. 23.—Already we begin to get a glimpse of what the conditions will be in Europe after the war. Vorwärts of Berlin figures that the entire income of Germany before the war will be only a little more than enough to pay pensions and the interest on the national debt. All the ordinary costs of government—and they will be greatly increased, of course—will have to be raised by new taxation.



### Wherein the Swiss Army Lacks Democracy.

Appeal To Reason, Oct. 23.—We oppose militarism in every form and look on a so-called democratic army as a delusion and a snare. The Swiss system is not as desirable as politicians of the Roosevelt type would have it appear. The Swiss system provides for no standing army; instead, every able-bodied man is a member of the national militia. At barracks, each citizen has a gun, ammunition and a uniform. Several weeks each half year are spent at drill. But it is not a democratic army when the Swiss cabinet, . . . may direct and command the men, ordering them to fight. An army cannot be democratic until it has the right to choose its own enemies. But this the Swiss cabinet will not permit. The worker must be willing to fight, and he must, at all times, be ready to look upon any person as his enemy if the men higher up so decide. Wherein is this a democratic army?



### Not as Long as It Seems.

Christian Science Monitor, October 20.—Single-taxers see through it all so clearly that they are in a constant state of wonderment because it is not equally clear to others. Touching upon New York's stupendous revenue problem a citizen of Brooklyn writes: "Why not get right down to bottom facts and place the entire tax burden upon land values—that is, take for community use the values created by the community?" Nothing could be simpler. And nothing could be more rational. But it looks as if it might require many years more of education along this line before the majority can be induced to listen to reason, let alone be convinced of the soundness of the reasoning.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

### COULD THEY BUT MEET.

Joseph Dana Miller in New York Globe.

If they could meet and calmly talk the thing—Leon with Hans, and both with Ivan—then, I'm thinking, what a change such talk would bring. Were they to meet thus face to face like men. Perhaps the truth would dawn upon their ken

That the real "enemies" are those who hold  
From all and each the means of life; that they,  
Their rulers, in whose names their lives are sold—  
Kaiser or king—that they alone should pay  
The cost who thus deceive and thus betray.

And then, I fancy, all these armed "foes,"  
Casting their rifles from them with a shout  
Of wild acclaim, would straightway turn about  
And each of them, knowing, as now he knows,  
Leon and Hans and Ivan, marching straight  
To throne and parliament and palace gate,  
Would call upon his rulers—in that day,  
As fit reprisals for those age-old wrongs—  
The worker's tears, the peasant's sorrowing moans—  
Hearken, amid a risen people's songs,  
The crash of falling palaces and thrones!



## ENGLAND'S TRUE GREATNESS.

From One of John Bright's Speeches.

I believe there is no permanent greatness to a nation except it be based upon morality. I do not care for military greatness or military renown. I care for the conditions of the people among whom I live. Palaces, baronial castles, great halls, stately mansions, do not make a nation. The nation in every country dwells in the cottage; and unless the light of your constitution can shine there, unless the beauty of your legislation and the excellence of your statesmanship are impressed there on the feelings and the condition of the people, rely upon it you have yet to learn the duties of government.

The most ancient of profane historians has told us that the Scythians of his time were a very warlike people, and that they elevated an old scimeter upon a platform as a symbol of Mars. To this scimeter they offered more costly sacrifices than to all the rest of their Gods. I often ask myself whether we are at all advanced in one respect beyond the Scythians. What are our contributions to charity, to education, to morality, to religion, to justice, and to civil government, when compared with the wealth we expend in sacrifices to the old scimeter?

We are assured, however, that Rome pursued a policy similar to ours for a period of eight centuries, and that for those eight centuries she remained great. But what is Rome now? The great city is dead. A poet has described her as "the lone mother of dead empires." Her language even is dead. Her very tombs are empty; the ashes of her most illustrious citizens are dispersed. "The Scipios' tomb contains no ashes now." Yet, I am asked, I who am one of the legislators of a Christian country, to measure my policy by the policy of ancient and pagan Rome! May I ask you to believe, as I do most devoutly believe, that the moral law was not written for men alone in their individual character, but that it was written as well for nations, and for nations great as this, of which we are citizens. If nations reject and deride

the moral law, there is a penalty that will inevitably follow. It may not come at once; it may not come in our life time, but rely upon it, the great Italian is not a poet only, but a prophet, when he says: "The sword of heaven is not in haste to smite, nor doth it linger." We have experience, we have beacons, we have landmarks enough. It is true, we have not, as an ancient people had, Urim and Thummin, those oracular gems on Aaron's breast, from which to take counsel, but we have the unchangeable and eternal principles of the moral law to guide us, and only so far as we walk by that guidance can we be permanently a great nation, or our people a happy people.



### WEBSTER'S UP-TO-DATE.

From *The Common Herd* (Dallas)

**CRANK:** One who tells you something which you have not the sense to understand or appreciate.

**SUFFRAGIST:** A woman who has confidence in her sex, and believes she is human, and who is not afraid of her husband.

**ANTI-SUFFRAGIST:** A rich woman with a boss husband, who cannot appreciate freedom and liberty.

**FOREIGNER:** A fellow who came to this country after you came.

**AMERICAN:** A Red Indian, or a foreigner who has forgotten who his ancestors were.

**WAR:** Organized murder, robbery and rapine.



### POOR LORDS OF CREATION.

For The Public.

The foxes have homes in the caverns,  
The wild birds live in their nests,  
And only the child of the Human Kind  
Has no place of his own to rest;  
The rabbits are hale and hearty,  
The chipmunks are all well fed,  
And the image of God is the only chump  
That is missing his daily bread.

The grasshopper goes where he pleases,  
With never a worry or a sob,  
And only the civilized working man  
Must beg the Boss for a job.  
The hills are a garden of Eden,  
The prairies a harvest of song;  
Only the hordes that are ruled by "Lords"  
Must suffer the whole day long.

It's a sight to make Angels shudder  
To see how this earth is run;  
It's enough to wring tears from a wooden man  
The way that things are done.  
This earth wasn't meant for a poor farm,  
With poverty-stricken galoots  
To be ridden to death by a batch of snobs  
With golden spurs on their boots.

J. W. H. BROWN.



Every new truth which has ever been propounded has for a time caused mischief.—Buckle's *History of Civilization*.

## BOOKS

### THE VOICE OF THE WORLD.

"He Shall Speak Peace." Compiled by Dignus Non Sum. Published by William F. Butler, Milwaukee. 1915. Price postpaid to all parts of the world, \$1.50.

As one is sometimes in doubt whether to give the honor to the man who first expresses a thought, or to him who expresses it best, so one may hesitate as between an author who gives other persons' thoughts in his own language, and a compiler who presents others' thoughts in their own words.

The unnamed compiler of this book has undertaken to gather into a single volume the most striking world utterances of all time on peace. The method is unique. Upon the right-hand pages throughout the book, as though to serve as a standard to measure all other thought, run quotations from the Bible; and upon the left-hand pages, facing these words of antiquity, are gathered the thoughts and expressions that have been deemed worthy to be associated with them, beginning with an abridgment of Milton's *Paradise Lost* and closing with *Paradise Regained*. Of it the compiler says:

This book distinguishes not "church," "sect," nor "creed." It knows neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free." It does not presuppose the ignorance of any of its readers concerning the fundamental truth it echoes; it aims, rather, to recite that widely known truth to those of us who may seem, at times, to have forgotten or cast it aside: namely, that there can be no abiding peace between nations, between individuals, or in any heart, except through a living demonstration of the eternal oneness of the Creator with His creation.

With this thought in mind the compiler has ransacked the literature of all ages, culling from poets, seers and philosophers the words addressed to mankind by way of counsel, hope and admonition, making of the whole a carefully edited symposium, in which is to be found the choicest thoughts on peace and concord.

At a time when half the world professing a belief in the teachings of the Prince of Peace is engaged in the greatest war of history, and the remainder of the Christian-professing world is arming in the hope of escaping subjugation or annihilation, it is well that distraught minds be clarified by wisdom. It is not enough to cry "Peace" once, or thrice, nor yet seven times; it must be cried as long as strife shall last. And when men finally tire of war they will set about laying the foundation of peace, which is justice.

S. C.



Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it.—Bernard Shaw.

## PRINCIPLES OF TRADE.

**International Trade and Exchange.** A Study of the Mechanism and Advantages of Commerce. By Harry Gunnison Brown. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York. Price, \$1.50 net.

"Heaven," said Bronson Alcott, "is a place where one may have a little quiet conversation irrespective of the limitations of Time." One hopes that the Orphic Philosopher was correct and that Henry George and his old-time opponent, Benj. R. Tucker, together with Herbert Spencer, Prof. Sumner and Joseph Chamberlain, may sit together and discuss Harry Gunnison Brown's book. For it is a thought-stimulating work; an honest examination of many problems and a writing that every Singletaxer would do well to have on his shelves. And as Prof. Brown is instructor in political economy in Yale University, the enthusiastic arguer can cheerfully quote the work, using the author's name club-wise for the felling of those who worship authority. As collateral reading to George's Protection or Free Trade the book is especially valuable.

The work is in two parts; the first, handling in the main Foreign Exchange, opens a way to discuss, in the second part, International Trade, Protective Tariff, the Value and Effect of Bounties, Ship Subsidies and the like, and the reader is drawn irresistibly to the conclusion that, given a protective tariff, we gain an inevitable rise of prices, affecting unprotected as well as protected goods and money incomes, which latter, while compensating in some measure for the secondary rise of general prices, fails to compensate for the original rise of prices of the protected goods, and therefore decreases average prosperity.

Clear and incisive in both thought and expression, the author points his moral in brief periods. Thus, on the subject of subsidies favoring native ships: "There is no economic gain in having our commerce carried in American ships if foreign ships are able to carry it more cheaply." "Shipping subsidies . . . are without economic justification." "Since a bounty system tends to burden the taxpayers, with no corresponding gain to the general public, it tends to lower real wages." "The effort of interested parties to get protection for their industries is usually wrong." And this: "There is no reasonable doubt that free trade within the borders of the United States adds greatly to our national prosperity, and adds also to the prosperity of each separate State. To widen this, our free trade area, so far as lies within our power, would still further increase our economic welfare."

Inasmuch as this book goes so far, one awaits with some interest the publication of Part III that Prof. Brown promises us, for that he has read Henry George closely is very evident in Chapter IV.

CHAS. J. FINGER.

## THE NEARING CASE

By LIGHTNER WITMER, Ph. D.

Head of the Department of Psychology  
University of Pennsylvania

The whole world is discussing the dismissal of Dr. Scott Nearing from his position as Assistant Professor of Economics, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. A great fight for free speech will revolve around this incident. Few persons are fully informed as to the facts. This 140-page book contains a complete statement, the charges, the evidence, the arguments and many documents that may become historic. These include Dr. Nearing's famous letter to Billy Sunday.

## THE NEARING CASE

At booksellers, 50c. net. If by mail add postage for 1 lb. Published by

B. W. Huebsch

225 Fifth avenue

New York

## Objections to the Singletax Answered

In the early nineties, Louis F. Post made three lecturing trips across the continent and up and down through the States and into Canada, speaking on the Singletax, Free trade, etc. After each lecture questions were called for and answered.

The same questions that were put to Mr. Post are asked now. Every Henry George man has them fired at him, but not every good singletaxer has had the time to work up brief, conclusive answers.

In "The Taxation of Land Values," the fifth edition of which is just out, Mr. Post has devoted nearly a fourth of the book to answering representative questions. They are classified under the heads: "Elementary," "Revenue Problems," "Special Instances," "Economic Effects," "Labor Questions," "Business Questions," "Money Questions" and "Miscellaneous Problems."

"The Taxation of Land Values" is illustrated with colored charts, which illuminate the argument. Part I explains the various Taxation Methods; Part II discusses Land Value Taxation as a Tax Reform; Part III shows how Industrial Reform will come from the reform of our taxation methods; and in Part IV, as we have indicated, expert attention is given to questions.

Cloth \$1, postpaid; paper 50c.

Other books by Louis F. Post:

"The Ethics of Democracy," \$1.25 postpaid.

"Social Service," cloth 75c, postpaid, 40c.

"Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce," 75c postpaid.

Book Department

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, CHICAGO