

FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT

When you have finished reading this copy of The Public place a one-cent stamp on this corner and hand the magazine to any postal employee. The Post Office will send it to some soldier or sailor in our forces at the front. No wrapping—no address.

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

The Public

An International Journal
of
Fundamental Democracy

Coercion or Tolerance

The Russian Land Problem

War Patriotism

LIBRARY
OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY

November 2, 1917

Volume XX
Number 1022

Published Weekly
NEW YORK

Five Cents a Copy
One Dollar a Year



Frederic C. Howe

IS the High Cost of Living a War Product?

Frederic C. Howe in his new book, "The High Cost of Living," says "No." To be sure, the war hastened tendencies. It aggravated conditions. It gave opportunities for speculation and extortion. But the cost of living was rising rapidly before the war, and it will continue to rise when the war is over unless radical steps are taken to prevent it.

In "The High Cost of Living," Mr. Howe aims to present the root causes of the constant shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar. And he applies his examination of the problem to practical questions.

Contents: Agricultural Possibilities and Problems
Gambling in Wheat
The Packers and the Cattlemen
Cold Storage and Food Speculation
The Middlemen and Distributors
The Transportation Embargo
Why There Is Not More Food
Food Control in Germany
The Embargo on Farming
Land for the Landless
Exploiting the Would-be Farmer
The Tenant Farmer
The Farmer and the Banker

This book's value will increase daily as the pressure of the high cost of living forces the people to consider the problem, and the politicians to flounder helplessly in their explanations of it.

Price \$1.50, postpaid.

The Public Book Department 122 East 37th Street New York

CONTENTS—NOVEMBER 2, 1917

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Editorial | 1047 |
| War Patriotism—Louis F. Post..... | 1055 |
| News of the Week..... | 1059 |
| Correspondence | 1063 |
| Books | 1064 |

Founded, 1898, by LOUIS F. POST and ALICE THACHER POST

EDITORS :
MRS. JOSEPH FELS
SAMUEL DANZIGER **STOUGHTON COOLEY**
JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER **GEORGE P. WEST**
BUSINESS MANAGER: STANLEY BOWMAR

Published Weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.
122 East Thirty-Seventh Street, New York City

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

Entered as Second-Class Matter January 11, 1917, at the
Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of
March 3, 1879



OSCAR H. GEIGER WHOLESALE FURRIER

6 WEST 37TH STREET
NEAR 5TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE
GREELEY 2670

NEW YORK

FUR MANTLES CAPES COATS
AND AUTO-COATS

FUR SCARFS STOLES and MUFFS

FUR REPAIRING

I shall be pleased to serve readers of THE PUBLIC

Joseph Fels His Life Work By Mary Fels

A story of one who had the true faith; of the brotherhood of man and the worth of men. *The table of contents is a sufficiently eloquent appeal to the liberal-minded:* The Making of a Business Man; Social and Personal Life; The Situation in England; Farm Colonies; Why Small Holdings Fall; Political Interests; Home Colonization; The Methods of Monopoly; The Single Tax; The Contest with the Leisured Class; The Fels Fund Commission; Educational Experiments and Suffrage; Later Activities.

Bound in cloth; price, postpaid, only \$1.00.

The Public Book Department 122 E. 37th Street New York

On Charity "Tag" Days, or other occasions, a few copies of "The Disease of Charity," by Bolton Hall, can sometimes be used to advantage. Per dozen, 24c., postpaid. The Public Book Department, 122 E. 37th St., New York City.

The Public

An International Journal of Fundamental Democracy

Editorial

A bad time is coming for America. It is due in the middle of the campaign of 1918. At that time, great armies will be assembled in France ready to crush the German resistance and force a decision, but will be deterred because of a lack of munitions of war. Reorganized Russian armies will stand on the eastern front ready to break through in a dozen places, but will be paralyzed by a lack of munitions of war. Italy and Greece will be eager to hammer a hole in Central Europe, but will have no hammer. These same munitions of war will be piled mountain high on our seaboard waiting for transport. Then will be our time of helpless rage and humiliation. Then, everyone, high or low, official or what not, who is directly or indirectly responsible for the inadequate supply of ships will have experience of a nation's execration. What a pity some of these men were not in England at the time of the 'shell disclosures.' And this matter is incomparably more serious. Are we fatuous enough to suppose that our allies who have carried the burden of war for three years, and will be nerved by our entry to their supreme effort next year, will not face the following winter with despair gnawing at their intrepid spirits? Their progressive exhaustion cannot go on indefinitely. Our time to do our part is *next year*, or we may find ourselves a year later bearing the full brunt, with all the disadvantages of distance, and the unimaginable expense in life and treasure. This is not hysteria; it is a protest against criminal complacency; it is based on an understanding of European affairs which is not befooled by that German revolution that some of our papers so futilely anticipate, which has seen the war too closely at hand to believe it is going to be won by parades on Fifth Avenue. Our enormous preparations have a value that is contingent upon one absolutely indispensable condition—a suffi-

cency of ocean tonnage. The very minimum that can make our weight a conclusive factor in Europe next year, is double what our shipbuilding program expects to produce. It is certain that Admiral Capps and Chairman Hurley are doing all that two humans can—until the American people get behind them. A fraction of the effort that was put into the Liberty Loan will do the work. Is labor needed? American mechanics will rise to this emergency as readily as they serve in army or navy. Is steel needed? No one has suggested that it will not be forthcoming. Mr. James A. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation, made the declaration that the United States shipbuilding commission should build 6,000,000 tonnage instead of only 3,000,000 in the next eighteen months.

* * *

The intolerance and brutal stupidity of those public officials who have indulged in wholesale and indiscriminate prosecutions is directly responsible for such atrocities as the kidnapping and torturing of Mr. Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the People's Church, Cincinnati, president of the recent Ohio Constitutional Convention, and a loyal American citizen of the finest type. On Sunday, October 28, Mr. Bigelow was seized as he was entering a hall to address a Socialist meeting, placed in an automobile, and taken to Florence, Ky., where he was stripped of his clothing, beaten unmercifully with a blacksnake whip, and dipped in crude petroleum. He was in a serious condition when found on Monday. Press dispatches report that he was the victim of an oath-bound organization, sworn to wreak vengeance on pacifists and others not in accord with the Government's war policy. This band of cowards, as low as the most depraved and brutal of the Kaiser's soldiers, filled twenty-one auto-

mobiles. They are blood-brothers of the most debased exponents of Prussian brutality. In Theodore Roosevelt they find their inspiration, and in the acts of certain microcephalous officials representing southern junkerism their sanction. Nothing less could be said for them if Mr. Bigelow were a pacifist of the La Follette type. It happens that he is not. Last May Mr. Bigelow's pacifist associates in the Peoples' Church tried to drive him from the pastorate because he supported his Government. A resolution was introduced and voted down. Describing the incident in a letter to one of the editors of THE PUBLIC, Mr. Bigelow said: "I took the stand concerning the war that I did not have the information to warrant me in saying that Wilson's course was not for the best, and that I certainly had no warrant in joining in any attack on the motives of the President. In view of the decision that had been made by the Government, I said that Germany should stop fighting and agree to peace terms as outlined by the President's January 22 speech. Therefore I said I became a partisan of our Government and advise all others to put aside their misgivings now and help in every way consistent with their conscience." Where Mr. Bigelow's conscience may have led him since he wrote this in May, THE PUBLIC does not know, nor is it material to know. It was clear to everyone in his community that he is led only by his conscience, that no taint of disloyalty or self-interest attaches to any word or deed. Our witch-burners in public office cannot escape responsibility for this foul deed of their disciples in Cincinnati. Can we not have from President Wilson himself a word that will consign all such to the public contempt they so richly merit?

* * *

America's only Congresswoman has been lecturing in Massachusetts and her addresses indicate that it would be well if the House of Representatives had a majority in accord with her. These lectures show her to be an advocate of the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, the preferential ballot, and other measures needed to perfect political democracy. But she does not stop there. She has advanced views on industrial democracy, and knows what is essential to its establishment. "All the great movements for democracy are founded on free land," she said, and this constitutes a refreshing contrast to the many misguided though sincere re-

formers who think it possible to maintain freedom upon a monopolized earth. The statesmanship of Miss Rankin alone refutes all the objections brought forward by opponents of political equality of the sexes. It stands forth as a splendid illustration of what President Wilson described in his endorsement of suffrage as "the spirit and the capacity and the vision of the women of the United States."

* * *

An improper though legal use of the Referendum is the holding up of Ohio's limited woman suffrage law. The right to vote is one which a part of the people cannot morally withhold or take from the rest. The invocation of the Referendum in this case implies a denial of the right of all of the governed to participate in their government. It asks a majority of male voters to take action such as no majority is justified in taking. True, friends of popular rule should rebuke this effort to discredit democracy by voting to uphold the law. The fact that the liquor interests are responsible for raising the issue should furthermore be borne in mind when the next appeal is made to libertarian principles against anti-liquor legislation.

* * *

In contrast with the failure of Congress to take any action toward curbing of war-profiteering by landlords, the fact is noteworthy that Great Britain has attempted, though in a crude and unscientific manner, to protect her people from such extortion. The British law forbids collection of rents in excess of what was charged at the time that war began, unless additional improvements have been made. In other words, the landlord may not add anything to ground rent. While the practical value of the law may be questioned, it is commendable inasmuch as it recognizes the principle that landless workers are entitled, in war-time at least, to a place on the earth without submitting entirely to the landowners' terms. It is interesting to note that the Independent Labor party is keeping tenants advised of their legal rights under this act, that they cannot be evicted for refusal to pay in advance, and that excess rents actually paid may be recovered through civil suit. At most, however, the law can give but temporary help, and it is not surprising that it has been evaded in many cases. But this is better than nothing.

Woman Suffrage in New York

In the brilliant campaign of New York women for the suffrage, to be concluded on Tuesday next, the one great obstacle has been popular disapproval of the picketing at Washington and the refusal of the average voter to discriminate between the little group of belligerents led by Miss Alice Paul and the great majority of suffragists who oppose their tactics. Mr. Wilson has written a letter asking voters not to permit the picketing to prejudice them against the suffrage cause, and it has been reproduced throughout the State in display advertisements. The suffragists themselves have repudiated the pickets in every speech and on placards in every parade. It has been a cruelly unnecessary obstacle, and one hardly knows whether to be more impatient with the pickets or with the masculine intelligence that insists upon confusing a political reform with the merits of a few of its proponents. More than one million women in New York State have enrolled as petitioners for the ballot. A majority of them are actively engaged in war work. Suffrage for women has achieved all the prestige of a popular movement that may at any election receive the indorsement of a majority, and to use I. W. W. tactics at this stage is hopeless stupidity. Just as irrational is the attitude of men who make the picketing an excuse for denying the claims of the women who stand shoulder to shoulder with them in service and sacrifice. If suffrage wins in New York it will be because the picketing has been offset by a realization of women's big part in community service and by that war-time quickening of democracy for which Mr. Wilson pleaded in his address to the delegation of suffragists that visited him at the White House. The grange organizations have been more active than ever before. They have supplemented their favorable resolutions with working committees of farmers, and these committees have appealed to the class interest of the farmers by urging that the women of New York City will join with them in making war on the middleman. Organized labor has been appealed to on the ground that their women should fill up the ranks of working class voters thinned by enlistments and conscription. The liquor interests have been less active than usual. Every party has indorsed suffrage, and in the state military census last

summer many a local politician was converted to suffrage through his close association with the suffrage women who aided in the work. And it may be that suffrage will win on Tuesday in spite of the pickets. Curiously enough, a defeat for which they would be largely responsible would play into their hands by discouraging some of those who have worked hardest to accomplish their end by orderly persuasion. But a defeat in New York next Tuesday will settle nothing. The leaven is only beginning to work. THE PUBLIC has an abiding faith that political equality for women is to be one of the war's by-products of which we can be sure.

The Russian Land Problem

A notable service has been done that portion of our public that wishes to maintain a just and balanced view of Russian affairs, by the publication, in a recent issue of *The New Republic*, of Mr. Brailsford's article, "A Clue to Russia." The author's long and intimate and first-hand knowledge of Russia gives him a special qualification to analyze the situation in that country. Readers of these columns will not be surprised to hear that the whole progress of the revolution since April has been the emergence of the land problem. With the machinery of Czardom out of the way, the ancient land-hunger of the people at once took on solid and insistent form. "No revolution can succeed in Russia without peasant support, and the peasants will follow a revolution only when its leaders promise them land. The present revolution was made by peasants, since the revolted regiments of the Petrograd garrison, whose delegates formed the Soviet (Council), were all composed of reservists only recently called up. The main body of the Socialists has been commendably willing to cooperate with 'bourgeois' parties, but from the first there has been one point on which it admits no compromise. It stands for the abolition of private property in land. The Russian revolution was inspired by Socialists, and in those first days of fighting when the Liberals watched it inactive from a balcony they lost all chance of directing it. It was rather naïve to imagine, as our English press did and still does, that Socialists had shed their blood merely to set up a Liberal republic." Mr. Brailsford warns the western reader not to dismiss the Russian scheme as

"visionary doctrinaire Socialism." The whole peasant tradition is antagonistic to the private ownership of land. "He grew up in the Mir, or village commune, which owned the inadequate stock of common land as its collective proprietor and parceled it out periodically in thin and hungry strips among its families. The institution is as ancient as our common Indo-European origin, and it has formed all the peasant's conception of property. To him the immoral, the anti-social thing is to seize and possess and bequeath more land than one can till." The restoration of the land is a foregone conclusion. No political party in power, however conservative, could avoid the issue. "It is what nine-tenths of the Russian people demand. . . . The dangerous point of the scheme is its insistence on expropriation without compensation. Here again, it is fact rather than theory which is decisive. 'The State,' as a Russian Socialist expert put it to me, 'cannot pay compensation, and the peasants will not.' . . . The peasants care nothing for Socialist theory and have a certain intuitive dread of 'Maximalists' and of Petrograd. But they will vote only for candidates who promise them the land." Mr. Brailsford points out, what readers of THE PUBLIC already know, that the Korniloff rebellion was an attempt of the reactionary land-owning class to seize control. "It is a fairly safe axiom in politics that land is one of the two or three things for which a propertied class will always be willing to make a civil war." Writing in the London *Herald*, Mr. Brailsford puts the matter even more strongly: "That is the explanation of this and all future attempts at counter-revolution. The propertied class is ready to do what in all ages and in all countries the possessing class will always do: it is ready to fight for the land. It has probably no objection to the breaking-up of the Crown lands and the vast Church estates. It might even accept a scheme of land purchase, like that of the cadets in 1906. But it would rather destroy the Revolution than face the compulsory uncompensated breaking-up of large private estates."

In view of the fact that the press of this country, and especially that of England, showed such amazing eagerness to support the counter-revolution, actuated partly by hatred of radicalism and partly by the old superstition that the propertied class is the responsible and dependable element in a nation, the clear interpretation given by the

London *Nation* is especially important as confirming Mr. Brailsford's view that the Russian reaction is not thinking of the war at all, but of its own interests. *The Nation* says: "The inverse of the peasant's land-hunger, that is to say, the defensive instinct of the propertied class, is the real motive of the counter-revolution. To be sure the Conservative elements talk of many other things—of Finland, of the Ukraine, even of Constantinople, of discipline, and the shame of retreats, and of the death penalty. What it means is land." And again: "It is a class struggle which is going on. We do not mean to imply that the burning issue of discipline in the army is unreal. About that the party of order and property is in deadly earnest. It wants an army which will do as it is bid. But does it want an automatic army primarily to fight the Germans? Such an army is also useful for internal needs. An army of peasant citizens, with committees, public meetings, and trench newspapers, could never be used to suppress a troublesome council or to enforce a landlord's rights. For this latter purpose the one essential is implicit obedience to superior officers."

The party which will have to face the practical solution of the land problem is the one at present in power. Its numerical strength comes from the fact that it includes the peasants and derives from the tradition of the communal village. This party, the Social Revolutionary, has as its program the total abolition of private property in land with the return to ownership of the commune. It is natural that so large a party should fail to be homogeneous, particularly when so great a variety of outside questions play a part in general policy. In the main, the party has had little to do with the terroristic elements in Russia that conspired to fight the old régime by attacks on its members. The party at present is divided into three wings. The right is led by Kerensky and Breshkovskaya, who are endeavoring to relate the land-question to general policy, to maintain their standing with the Allies and to carry the war with Germany to a successful conclusion. Whatever may have been Kerensky's mistakes, it is his policy to carry the revolution forward into evolution, to secure its ends by adjustment and magnanimity. The center of the party is led by Chernov, who, as Minister of Agriculture, formulated a concrete method of returning the land to the people. This led to a concerted attack on

the part of reactionaries and to his fall from office. He is considered the father of the Social Revolutionary party, and perhaps his recent attacks on Kerensky reflected a personal bias. The left wing of the party is headed by Maria Spiridonovna, one of the tragical figures of the revolution of 1905. This wing is sometimes found in association with the extremists of the Labor party, the Bolsheviks or Maximalists. The great peasant masses are not greatly interested in party differences. In the united councils of working-men, soldiers and peasants, their representatives are the most conservative elements. There need be little worry in the future regarding the Maximalists. As they gained ascendency in the Soviet, this body correspondingly lost influence in the country.

In all this confusion of party difference, a practical unanimity is maintained on the question of the land. Meanwhile, the fact of mounting public expense, with the sources of revenue already drained, is carrying the movement unconsciously toward the true solution. So much of Russian wealth is in the hands of land-owners that methods must be devised for tapping these resources. Reports are abundant that local committees in almost every province are instituting a land tax. A recent telegram from Rostov-on-Don states that the local Zemstvos organizations, taken over by the peasants' committee, have levied a tax of five kopeks on every *desiatin*. It is interesting that in this crude manner, practical necessity is driving toward a solution which cannot be found in national policy.

A War-Time Necessity

With signs multiplying that this is to be a long war, the necessity of looking far ahead in our industrial mobilization becomes more apparent. The President's Commission has effected what looks like a satisfactory solution of the labor troubles in the Arizona copper mines. Any such solution must involve machinery for real collective bargaining, and the Arizona settlement does this. But copper is only one of a dozen commodities in the production of which we cannot afford interruption. There is first of all steel, and there are also oil, meat packing, textiles, and automotors, trucks and airplanes. In none of these great industries is the labor force organized. We know not what days of food

shortage, intensive production, and privation lie ahead of us. Certainly if the industrial population is to be tested, the men employed in these industries are to be. A great labor upheaval in any one of them might cripple us at a crucial moment. In England a Commission on Labor Unrest has just completed its report. It insists on 100 per cent. organization of both employers and employes, and the application of the principle of collective bargaining. Mr. Gompers, the Government and the great employers cannot look too far ahead or move too firmly in applying this lesson of English experience. The Commission now in this country, headed by Sir Stephenson Kent, must be heeded in its insistence upon organization and the establishment of adequate machinery for continuous negotiations between workmen and their employers. The professional agitators who have made a fat living by cultivating the resistance of our large employers to industrial democracy and organizing them in such bodies as the National Association of Manufacturers can no longer be permitted to stand in the way. They are already years behind the employers who make up the membership of their various associations, men for the most part too busy to realize into what a bog they were being led. Any innovation must be cautiously applied. It is a situation of infinite difficulty. In the steel industry we have the same problem that confronts a political organization like the old Russia. The working force has been so long controlled through spies, guards, and arbitrary power of discharge that the employing corporations are afraid to abandon the iron hand. Responsible labor leaders shrink from the responsibility of trying to control vast numbers of men newly admitted to a voice in determining their working conditions. But it is better to begin now than to wait until conditions are less placid.

The National Housing Convention

The Sixth National Conference on Housing in America met at Chicago, on Oct. 15th, 16th and 17th. Eighty-four Civic and Social organizations of the State and City acted as the hosts of the Conference. About 500 delegates were present, representing fifteen states. The meetings were well attended. The subjects discussed were "Real Estate and Housing," "Cheaper Workingmen's Dwellings," "Hous-

ing as a War Problem," "Employers and Housing," "Housing in its Relation to Tuberculosis," "Chicago's Housing Problem," "The Housing of the Individual Worker," "Housing Famines," "Ventilation" and "Enforcement of Housing Laws." Lawson Purdy, President of the New York Department of Taxes and Assessments, spoke on the "Zoning of Cities," especially with reference to its effect on housing. His address made a most favorable impression on a large gathering which contained many members of the Chicago Association of Commerce.

A perusal of the subjects enumerated indicates that the National Housing Association limits its scope almost entirely to the technical side of the housing question. Its publications, Reports of its Annual Conferences, deal almost entirely with that aspect of the case. It seems to avoid consideration of bad housing as one of the symptoms of economic injustice or social disease. At its last session in 1916, the Conference devoted one section to the discussion of "Housing and Taxation," which developed the existence of much latent land-value taxation sentiment among the delegates, but no reference was made to the subject at this year's gathering.

The explanation of this anomalous state of affairs may be found in the origin of the National Housing Association. It is a direct off-shoot of the Charity Organization Society of New York. Originally its annual gatherings were held as a part of the National Convention of Charities and Corrections, a body which by its title, indicated its belief that poverty and crime were close akin and might profitably be considered at the same time. The Housing question loomed up to such proportions as to deserve a special gathering of its own, and the National Housing Conferences came into being.

Under the leadership of Lawrence Veiller it has attracted the attention of civic bodies throughout the country and has been asked to furnish information to many of the leading cities. Lawrence Veiller is a remarkable man and deserves more than passing comment. It is hardly too much to say that, in a sense the National Housing Association is the creation of his brain and an extension of his personality. For many years the salaried agent and director of the Charity Organization Society, he has worked ceaselessly and intelligently for the regulation of the people of New York City in matters re-

lating to housing, sanitation, tuberculosis and the administration of the lower courts. He has been extraordinarily successful, has incurred the odium of the landlord groups who have felt his interference and has remained unknown outside of the special fields which he cultivated. Mr. Veiller has unabated faith in law as the only remedy for human ills. He believes with Mr. Burleson, that some people are poor and need regulation, because they are made that way; and that it is the bounden duty of the intelligent and wealthy to supplement the shortcomings of the weaker brethren. He has little patience with the idea that poverty, with its attendant ills of bad housing, tuberculosis, neglect of children and other similar evils, has its origin in economic maladjustment. There always have been poor, there always will be, Kismet! The only thing to do is to mitigate the inevitable evils attaching to poverty. This brief sketch of Mr. Veiller's viewpoint will help to elucidate the attitude of the convention, because he was its moving spirit.

As might be expected where a domestic question like this was discussed, the women were in the majority at most of the sessions. The delegates were generally men-officials of cities and towns or of philanthropic societies, but the local audience was chiefly made up of women, who showed an intelligent interest in the questions discussed. The subject is one to which they may be expected to devote much time when the extension of the suffrage gives them a real influence on its determination.

The National Housing Association apparently does not regard as an obstacle to improved housing generally, the admitted fact that all American communities impose a heavy burden upon citizens who erect dwellings upon vacant sites, whether for their own use or the accommodation of others. At a time when the high cost of labor and materials has brought building to a full stop, although the need for additional housing is keen and unsatisfied, it would seem an obvious emergency measure that the city or town should exempt buildings from all possible burdens, but no public bodies seem to think so.

Mr. Wilson's Democracy

At last we have from Mr. Wilson that for which the plain people of this country have looked for so long—a clear statement of his

realization that this war means a strengthening and rejuvenation of our democratic purpose, not only in the field of international relations, but in the field of social and political progress at home. As he was the first statesman to elevate democratic principles of diplomacy into a practicable policy, forcing every Allied government to accept revolutionary departures from the purposes that have governed nations at war, so now he is the first responsible statesman among the Allied nations to interpret the deeper intra-national meaning of the conflict now raging.

Addressing the delegation of New York suffragists at the White House, Mr. Wilson said:

"The whole world now is witnessing a struggle between two ideals of government. It is a struggle which goes deeper and touches more of the foundations of the organized life of men than any struggle that has ever taken place before; and no settlement of the questions that lie on the surface can satisfy a situation which requires that the questions which lie underneath and at the foundation should also be settled, and settled right. I am free to say that I think the question of woman suffrage is one of those questions which lie at the foundation. The world has witnessed a slow political reconstruction, and men have generally been obliged to be satisfied with the slowness of the process. In a sense it is wholesome that it should be slow, because then it is solid and sure; but I believe that this war is going so to quicken the convictions and the consciousness of mankind with regard to political questions that the speed of reconstruction will be greatly increased. . . It seems to me that this is a time of privilege. All our principles, all our hearts, all our purposes, are being searched—searched not only by our own consciences, but searched by the world—and it is time for the people of the states of this country to show the world in what practical sense they have learned the lessons of democracy—that they are fighting for democracy because they believe in it and that there is no application of democracy which they do not believe in."

Here we have Mr. Wilson's unmistakable repudiation of the nationalism that sees this country as one in which democracy has been fully and finally achieved, as one superior in anything except its acceptance of the democratic ideal, its attainment of that ideal in strictly political

forms, and its striving to extend the application of democracy to other fields where it is not now applied.

Mr. Wilson's meaning becomes clearer when we call to mind his efforts, even amid feverish preparations for war, to extend the application of democracy to industry. Unlike those patriots who urge that we forget democracy at home for the period of the war, Mr. Wilson realizes that just because men are to die for the principle abroad, it is to have a new birth at home and be extended in its application more rapidly than ever before. The process is already under way, notably in the field of labor organization and collective bargaining, and in the field of control of private industry in the public interest. Most of the pacifist complaint fails to distinguish between the fate of democracy and the fate of minority groups that oppose the majority in its main purpose. Democracies in deadly earnest are never patient with obstructive minorities. What the pacifists complain of is not the defeat of democracy—it is the intolerance of democracy which they mistake for the intolerance of officials.

Not only for Russia is this war to produce a revolution. Ours in America will not be consummated in this generation. But it has already begun. In Mr. Wilson we have a leader who understands it and who will place no obstacle in its way. During the war he will spare what effort he can to advance the cause, and when the war is over the people will look to him to strike mighty affirmative blows.

Coercion or Tolerance

Much of the persecution and witch-burning to which public officials have lent themselves and their authority can be better understood by remembering that we are a polyglot nation, with millions of unassimilated aliens and signs not lacking within recent years that the melting-pot works slowly and imperfectly. It is to remember that we were all a little uncertain and apprehensive when war was declared, picked up the morning paper a little anxiously, and were a trifle surprised when nothing happened. We had been fed on sensational stories of a hostile mobilization in Mexico and wild plots against Canada. There was much tension beneath the surface of our thoughts, and the responsible au-

thorities, if they did not expect trouble, were at least prepared for it. Apparently there had to be an outlet for all the determination and pugnacity thus mobilized for dealing firmly and promptly with "enemies within." And when those of German blood proved that they were at least sensible, if not loyal, there was nothing to do but take it out on whatever heterodox and obstreperous folk there were. These happened to be our pacifists and the more vehement of our reformers. Always a source of annoyance to the standpat mind, it was easy for certain officials to go through a rationalizing process that identified them with the nation's enemies.

That the first spectacular opposition to the war, with its intemperate charges, and open defiance of government should have brought down the heavy hand of authority was then inevitable. And that the severity of those in authority should for the moment have had the effect of intensifying that opposition was equally certain. But that crisis is passed. It is now apparent that the prosecutions, taken in their best sense, were precautionary rather than punitive. They have served their purpose. The emphatic warning, backed by summary action, has done all that severity can accomplish. Meantime the objectors have yielded to the logic of events, less through fear of prosecution than from reassurance that the war has been entered into in good faith, and is being prosecuted with the highest motives.

If evidence were needed to prove that unreasonable opposition to the Government's war program has subsided it is to be seen in the popular response to the Liberty Loan appeal, in the quietness with which the conscripted men have responded to the call to service, in the good temper of the men in camp, and in the thousand and one little incidents that indicate a growing understanding between opponents. So marked, indeed, is this change that the question arises, has not the time arrived for a return to the practice of justice. Will it not be better to decide the cases still pending in the courts in the light of a more rational second thought, rather than in that of the first wild outburst of passion?

It should not be forgotten that the opponents of the war, with the exception of enemy spies, and the few aliens and natives who have been duped by them, are American citizens; and they will be American citizens when the war is over.

Whatever tends therefore to widen and perpetuate a division on war lines weakens to that extent forces that must be brought to bear, not only on the prosecution of the war, but upon the great questions that will come with the return of peace.

Traitors and spies must suffer the penalties of the law; but there are still pending in the courts numerous cases in which there is not the slightest evidence of malice on the part of those charged with disloyalty. Words spoken in a moment of passion, and at a time when fear, hate, and suspicion loomed large in the public mind, have been seized upon by a zealous prosecution as indicating traitorous sentiments in the mind of the speaker; when as a matter of fact nothing more was intended than a vigorous protest against war measures that had come too fast to be understood and assimilated. A more sober second thought has modified this earlier opinion. It is becoming daily more apparent that these intemperate outbursts were in no sense due to a desire to aid Germany, but to a fear that American liberties at home would suffer.

Is it not the part of wisdom for the Government prosecution to recognize this change, and to encourage it by moderation, rather than to discourage it by severity? How can the public authorities do more to reassure doubters as to the sincerity of their professions in behalf of liberty? The heart of the American public is sound. The vast mass of the people, whatever may have been their original state of mind when war was declared, are now at one for a vigorous prosecution to the end. No organization has made headway against this sentiment. Not even the intrepid Senator LaFollette has been able to crystalize anti-war feeling. As the gifted Wisconsin Senator has alienated a large part of the support that would have been his in the struggle for an equitable tax bill, by his intemperate charges as to the motives of those who are supporting the war, so the Government can repel the growing sentiment in its favor by too great severity in punishing its opponents. In nothing is the old saying that like breeds like truer than in government. To visit the full force of the law upon some pacifists, not because they are pacifists, but because they are Anarchists, Socialists, I. W. W.'s, or other unpopular cult or party, is only to strengthen their hands, and embitter their spirit. This is an occasion when

a wise discretion will accomplish more than force.

It is not only time to call a halt in these prosecutions. It is time for certain officials to remember that they are serving a democracy, and to forget the snobbish nonsense with which they have persuaded themselves that they must keep a firm hand on the mob. It is significant that those officials in Washington who have been able to expend their energies in mobilizing and equipping our military forces have had no time or thought for pacifist-baiting. Our prosecutions and suppressions have been left for officials who could increase their authority and give vent to their belligerency in no other way. It is for them to cease condemning the American democracy without a hearing. We have already proved that the fundamental theorem of democracy will work.

In other words, the dissenting minority will accept the majority decision and submit to it. Let the authorities suppress every slightest manifestation of German nationalist sentiment, every activity that can be reasonably suspected as of enemy instigation. But to go further is to confess how weak-kneed is their faith in democracy, how deeply-ingrained their distrust of the people. The people must be permitted the free exercise of their intelligence in choosing between the two opposing views of this war. The only thing that could prevent an overwhelming decision in favor of the Government would be for the Government to attempt a coercion of their intelligence. Such coercion is the best means of swelling a negligible minority into one of imposing size and of dangerous temper.

War Patriotism

By Louis F. Post

II

Agitators against our participation in the war—both the kind who “do not know the road but only see the goal,” and the kind who sympathize with the German side—are apt to denounce the American government for making war in the name of democracy while betraying democracy by pulling down democratic standards. They refer with special condemnation to the inconsistency of declaring a war for democracy without recourse to the democratic device of a people’s referendum. They also criticize conscription of troops for foreign service as unconstitutional, a particular in which they do not stand alone. They complain, too, that suppressions of publications and public meetings of war-obstructive (not to say pro-German) tendencies, are unconstitutional and undemocratic—in which, also, they are supported by a sentiment that is neither irresponsibly agitational nor saturated with German sympathies. And they climax their criticisms by asking with reference to such things, What shall it avail us if in going to war to make democracy safe for the world we lose our own democracy?

From first to last those objections are without substance.

No war-referendum was constitutionally possible. None would be so now. In our Constiti-

tution, which marks the highest degree of democracy this country has actually achieved, the referendum has as yet acquired no place. An amending process is provided through which our people may adopt the referendum method of democratic expression whenever they wish to do so. They have either neglected to act or have not desired to act. It is, at all events, the only way of altering our organic law lawfully. To alter it in any other way would not be democratic but revolutionary. As long as the Constitution remains unamended, its existing provisions—not sporadic demands of irresponsible groups, however good their intentions, but the appropriate provisions of the Constitution itself—must determine and direct our national action. Were it otherwise, we should be an aggregation of anarchists instead of a democratic nation. Inasmuch, then, as the existing provisions of our Constitution lodge the power of declaring war exclusively with Congress,¹ a war referendum would have been Constitutionally valueless. Such a referendum, to be of any value could have been had only after the adoption of a Constitutional amendment.² This would have necessitated a Constitutional convention assembled on

¹ U. S. Constitution, Art. I, sec. viii, par. 11.

² U. S. Constitution, Art. V.

the formal demand of 32 States, or else a favorable vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress formally ratified by 36 State legislatures. Could the Kaiser's government have wished or intrigued for any more aidful and comforting response to its virtual declaration and overt acts of war against this country than those dilatory proceedings would have been?

These observations apply alike to mandatory and to advisory referendums. A mandatory referendum without a Constitutional amendment would have been a nullity. The obligation to decide upon war or surrender having been reposed in Congress by the Constitution, Congress cannot transfer that responsibility to anybody, not even to the people themselves, without first acquiring authority to do so by an enabling amendment to the Constitution. And having no power to transfer the authority to the people for mandatory action, an appeal to popular advisory action would have been sheer trifling with the most important function which the people have by the Constitution invested that body with. It would have been worse than trifling. The taking of an unconstitutional advisory referendum, in connection with which no ballot-box safeguards could have been legalized, would not only have served no responsibly advisory purpose, but it would have offered untold opportunities to the treacherous government with which we have since engaged in war, to carry on with absolute impunity a pro-German campaign of the most vicious kind. Even bribery could not have been prevented or punished, for the whole proceeding would have lacked legal sanctions.

That an advisory referendum was demanded in good faith by good citizens, is true. It is just as true, however, that it was earnestly desired and secretly sought by emissaries of the German government. Had Congress undertaken it, the advantage would all have been with that autocratic government and not with the democracy of the United States, however the votes had been secured and whichever way they had been cast and counted.

The objections to conscription, whatever may be fairly thought of this military policy in contrast with volunteering,⁸ are absurdly disputatious in so far as they rest on Constitutional lack of authority. There is no lack of Constitutional

authority. Our Constitution empowers Congress to "provide for the common defence,"⁴ "to declare war,"⁵ to "raise and support armies,"⁶ and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying these powers into execution.⁷ What further Constitutional authority would be necessary to authorize conscription for military service in time of war?

And what difference, on Constitutional grounds, does it make whether the service is to be at home or abroad? Constitutional authority to legislate having been conferred in general terms and without limitations, the occasion for its exercise, the necessity for its exercise, and the mode, extent, time, place, and circumstances of exercising it, are subject to the judgment of the legislative body upon which the authority is conferred by the people. In this instance that body is Congress, and Congress has expressed its judgment through the conscription law.

But some war critics raise a further point. They insist that conscription is expressly prohibited by the Thirteenth Amendment, which abolishes "slavery and involuntary servitude." The point seems curiously far-fetched, when the origin and history of the Amendment are considered. Was not that amendment adopted with reference altogether to a system of slavery under which some persons, owned as chattels by other persons, were in a state of involuntary servitude? Plainly its adoption was without the slightest reference to any of the obligations of a citizen to his government. To cite the Thirteenth Amendment against an act of Congress enforcing military service is as childish as it would be to cite it against laws enforcing jury duty.

As to suppression of war-obstructive publications and public meetings, there come criticisms from sources similar to those out of which the other objections rise. These criticisms appeal to the Constitution with much more force at first blush than the others do. They refer to the fact that Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to abridge freedom of speech, of press, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble.⁸ This is, indeed, true of the Constitution. But upon

⁴ Art. I, sec. viii.

⁵ Art. I, sec. viii, par. 11.

⁶ Art. I, sec. viii, par. 12.

⁷ Art. I, sec. viii, par. 18.

⁸ U. S. Constitution, First Amendment.

⁸ See "Our Fighting Factors" in the "Public" of August 17, 1917, pp. 789-91.

examination the criticisms take nothing from it. They ignore the further fact that the same organic law of our nationality which imposes those democratic restraints upon Congress, authorizes it to declare and to wage war. Considered in connection with this authorization, one which is of the utmost necessity at the present stage of social progress, those criticisms are as captious as any which in the desperate days of the Civil War were shot at President Lincoln.

Is it not manifestly impracticable to wage war effectively if all the liberties of speech and press and assembly, so essential to the development of democracy in time of peace, may in time of war be foolishly or treacherously used to obstruct military activities or otherwise to aid the enemy? In so far as their exercise may obstruct prosecution of war, after a war is declared, they are flatly in conflict with the power of Congress to declare war.

What, then, is the reasonable inference? Is there a "no thoroughfare" when Constitutional war-powers and these Constitutional guarantees of personal freedom conflict? Have we no Constitutional alternative but to abandon or emasculate the war powers of Congress in order that personal freedom shall suffer no restraint, or else to chuck those guarantees of personal freedom into a Constitutional scrap pile? Shall our democratic government be at the mercy, when engaged in war, of powerful and treacherous public enemies because disloyal or narrow-thoughted citizens insist upon those Constitutional guarantees without reference to the exigencies of war? Are we as a nation hamstrung in any such wretched fashion by the very democratic safeguards our government is ordained to foster?

Not at all. Our Constitution, very imperfect though its democracy may be, is not democratically suicidal. The conflict between Constitutional war powers and those Constitutional guarantees of personal freedom does not confront us with any "no thoroughfare." Our Constitution offers to treacherous enemies no liberty to hamstring our nation in time of war under cover of liberties which it guarantees to its citizens in time of peace. It does not necessitate a choice between surrendering national sovereignty and abandoning democratic freedoms. There is no irreconcilable conflict between Constitutional powers of declaring and waging war, and Constitutional

limitations upon abridgments of speech, press and assembly—no Constitutional dilemma involving suicidal impalement of democracy upon either horn it happens to choose.

Reconciliation of the conflict between our Constitutional war powers and those Constitutional guarantees of personal freedom is not even left to inference. It is expressly provided for by the Constitution itself. The treason clause⁹ is the reconciling provision. Not only does the Constitution vest in Congress full authority to declare and to wage war, not only does it also guarantee personal liberties which in time of war might conflict with the war-waging power and imperil the country's cause; it further provides, and by way of reconciling those possibly conflicting provisions, that treason shall consist in giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

Given, then, the Constitutional power to declare the war which Congress has declared against the government of Germany in response to that government's prior declaration and actual waging of war against the United States; given the consequent status of war; given the fact that unrestrained freedoms of speech, of publication and of assembly in this country afford aid and comfort to the government of Germany as an enemy power—given those conditions, and it follows that publications and meetings contributing to the obstruction and possible defeat of the United States in this war are protected by no Constitutional guarantees. Taking place during a Constitutionally declared war, they are manifestly excluded for the time from the Constitutional guarantees of personal freedom, in so far as they fall under the treason clause of the Constitution.

There is a parallel in the Constitutionally guaranteed right of the people to "keep and bear arms."¹⁰ This right is as rigidly secured by the Constitution as the rights of free speech, free press, and peaceable assembly. But who would have the folly to contend for an indefeasible right to keep and bear arms in such manner or under such circumstances in time of war as to give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States?

Nor can the persons who in time of war keep or bear arms, or speak or otherwise publish statements or opinions, or participate in or foster meetings, be the judges, Constitutionally, of the

⁹ U. S. Constitution, Art. III, sec. iii, par. 1.
¹⁰ Constitution, Second Amendment.

treasonableness of what they do or wish to do in those respects. For decision on such questions the Constitution has made provision through the legislative, administrative, and judicial machinery which it has established. Citizens who insist upon Constitutionally guaranteed rights of speech, press and assembly, the exercise of which in time of war is treasonable in the judgment of the appropriate Constitutional authorities, must either resort to revolution or agitate for Constitutional amendments. The latter course, besides being democratic instead of anarchistic, would have the advantage of succeeding as soon or sooner than the former and without civil war. But neither revolutions nor agitations for Constitutional amendments can succeed in the face of adverse public opinion. And in time of war, when public opinion realizes as that of our country is rapidly coming to do, that we are in a life and death struggle against the principle of world autocracy—incarnate, militant, treacherous, ruthless and defiant—neither attempts at revolution nor activities in political agitations that may assist the enemy are likely to command much, if any, popular support.

Are they then defensible by the standards of American citizenship? Must those standards be maintained in war time at whatever cost to our country's cause, in order to preserve them for peace time? The testimony of experience is the other way. Liberties are lost by imperceptible processes through generations which see no cherished liberty abolished. They are not lost by war-time suspensions. On the contrary, the reaction from war-time suspensions, or sudden suspensions from any other cause, is instant and powerful.

Some liberties cannot be lost because they have never been gained.

The thought that agitation is necessary in war time to preserve liberty is a mistake. There need be no fear of losing any of our guaranteed liberties through their temporary suspension in time of war and for war reasons.

Liberty to give aid and comfort to the country's enemies is one; though demanded by some faction or other in every war in which we have ever engaged, it has never been conceded. It is, therefore, a liberty that cannot be lost. Methods by which it might be enjoyed in time of war are indeed guaranteed for times of peace. The keeping and bearing of arms, for instance, without

national authority; the making of speeches against the American government; the holding of public meetings in denunciation of governmental policy; the printing of attacks upon the government—these rights have been gained and are guaranteed by the Constitution, subject only to responsibility through the courts for malicious slander and libel and murderous use of arms. Such guarantees are constitutionally indefeasible, so long as peace continues and when peace returns after it has been broken into by war. The reason is that in times of peace they cannot be used to give aid and comfort to the country's enemies, for the country has then no enemies in the Constitutional sense. But when the country is at war it has an enemy. Those personal guarantees are then subject, pursuant to the treason clause of the Constitution, to any temporary modifications which the Constitutional authorities responsible to the people for the conduct of the war find necessary in order to prevent their abuse in the enemy's interest. The only Constitutional restraint upon them is such as the people exact through Constitutionally established processes of changing their representatives.

And those modifications end by their terms as well as by Constitutional limitations, with the close of the war. There is no reason, moreover, either in history or psychology, for fearing that arbitrary modifications in war-time will extend over into times of peace. The opposite effect is much more likely.

In the North during our Civil War, as also in the South, arbitrary suppressions of free speech and free press and free assembly were frequent. President Lincoln exiled Vallandigham for giving aid and comfort to the enemy by abusing freedom of speech. Under Lincoln's command soldiers took possession of two New York daily papers,¹¹ suppressing their publication for days, on account of a news article, published innocently, which might have given aid and comfort to the enemy. None of those war-time violations of democratic guarantees extended over into peace times. With the end of the war came an end to arbitrary acts except in the conquered States; and there they did not long persist. Furthermore, there was soon greater freedom of speech, press and public assembly, both in the North and in the South,

¹¹ The World and the Journal of Commerce in 1864.

than there had been before the war. So far from retarding democracy in the United States, that war, in the waging of which Constitutional guarantees were temporarily suspended for military reasons, actually advanced it. Without abolishing any of the democratic freedoms we had previously enjoyed, it gave us new ones and made the older ones more secure. Guaranteed liberties are more likely to be lost, let this be repeated with emphasis, by gradual innovations in time of peace and over long periods than by specific suspensions in time of war.

This is not to say that war is necessary to foster democracy. Democracy could be fostered better without war than with it, if there were no powerful autocratic purposes at large in the world. But successful wars for democracy or against autocracy leave no aftermath of dead liberties that were live ones before.

By no means, however, let it be understood that even in times of war, the suppression of publications and meetings which promote war-obstructive policies is always wise policy. It is probable that any propaganda organization that is under suspicion of living in the sunshine of German patronage, would fatally expose its own weakness in public estimation if left alone. It is probable that pro-German papers, if unhampered, would strengthen rather than weaken the determination of this country to stand by Congress and the President in the prosecution of our war against the irresponsible Prussian government of Germany. But this raises only a question of war policy to be decided by public servants who are responsible for the conduct of the war. As a question of Constitutionality, there is no authority whatever for any propaganda, in time of war, which gives aid or comfort to the enemy.

Were there a general and genuine sentiment in our country against the further prosecution of this or any other war in which we may be engaged, or in favor of proposing particular terms of peace, the Constitution offers a reasonable and amply sufficient mode of effective expression. It is the right of petition.¹² While this right, also, might be suspended in war time if used to give aid and comfort to the enemy, it is inconceivable that Congress would consent to its suspension unless its use were manifestly a pretense for treasonable ac-

tivities. If the sentiment were general enough to command serious consideration, any suspected treasonable purpose would be negatived by its magnitude; for treason cannot be attributed to a large proportion of the people.

It may be objected, however, that this view affords no opportunity for small groups to agitate so as to convert the people to their proposal? The objection cannot be stated without answering itself. Meetings and publications in the midst of a war and in aid of a petition for peace, if they represent only anti-war propagandists who aim not at informing the government of a pronounced public opinion against continuing the war, but only at agitations that would aid the enemy, are inconsistent with the Constitutionally guaranteed right of petition. In time of peace, agitations are vital to American democracy; in time of war, they may mean death to American democracy.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending October 30

President Wilson on Suffrage

In a letter, on October 25, to Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse, chairman of the New York State Suffrage Party, President Wilson declared that the war is no excuse for neglecting the suffrage question and said further in part:

The whole world now is witnessing a struggle between two ideals of government. It is a struggle which goes deeper and touches more of the foundations of the organized life of man than any struggle that has ever taken place before, and no settlement of the questions that lie on the surface can satisfy a situation which requires that the questions which lie underneath and at the foundation should also be settled and settled right. I am free to say that I think the question of woman suffrage is one of those questions which lie at the foundation. . . .

I perhaps may be touched a little too much by the traditions of our politics, traditions which lay such questions almost entirely upon the States, but I want to see communities declare themselves quickened at this time and show the consequences of the quickening.

I think the whole country has appreciated the way in which the women have risen to this great occasion. They not only have done what they have been asked to do, and done it with ardor and efficiency, but they have shown a power to organize for doing things of their own initiative, which is quite a different thing, and a very much more difficult thing, and I think the whole country has admired the

¹² U. S. Constitution, First Amendment.

spirit and the capacity and the vision of the women of the United States.

It is almost absurd to say that the country depends upon the women for a large part of the inspiration of its life. That is too obvious to say; but it is now depending upon the women also for suggestions of service, which have been rendered in abundance and with the distinction of originality. I, therefore, am very glad to add my voice to those which are urging the people of the great State of New York to set a great example by voting for woman suffrage. It would be a pleasure if I might utter that advice in their presence. Inasmuch as I am bound too close to my duties here to make that possible, I am glad to have the privilege to ask you to convey that message to them.

It seems to me that this is a time of privilege. All our principles, all our hearts, all our purposes, are being searched; searched not only by our own consciences but searched by the world, and it is time for the people of the States of this country to show the world in what practical sense they have learned the lesson of democracy—that they are fighting for democracy because they believe it, and that there is no application of democracy which they do not believe in.

I feel, therefore, that I am standing upon the firmest foundations of the age in bidding godspeed to the cause which you represent and in expressing the ardent hope that the people of New York may realize the great occasion which faces them on Election Day and may respond to it in noble fashion.

Scope of Postal Censorship

In a letter to publishers on October 25, Postmaster-General Burleson declared that under the Espionage Act publication or distribution of matter is unlawful coming under the following heads:

1. Advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law of the United States.
2. Conveying false reports or false statements intended to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies.
3. Intended to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States.
4. Intended to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States to the injury of the services of the United States.
5. The circulation or publication of which involves the violation of any of the numerous other criminal provisions of the Espionage act, but which are not of special interest to publishers.
6. Printed in a foreign language containing any news item, editorial, or other printed matter respecting the Government of the United States, or of any nation engaged in the present war, its policies, international relations, the state or conduct of the war, or any matter relating thereto, unless the publisher or distributor thereof, on or before offering the

same for mailing, or in any manner distributing it to the public, has filed with the Postmaster at the place of publication a true, complete translation of the article.

7. Referred to in the preceding paragraph for which publishers have received a permit to circulate, free of restrictions named therein, but which does not bear at the head thereof in the English language the fact that such a permit has been granted.

Masses Aaks for Reinstatement

In a letter to Postmaster General Burleson on October 24, Max Eastman, editor of *The Masses*, says that he has filed an application for second-class entry with the New York postmaster in accordance with a conversation he had had with Mr. Burleson on October 17. He accompanied the application with a letter disclaiming any intention to publish matter intended to interfere with operation or success of military or naval forces, to obstruct recruiting, enlistment, or sale of bonds, or impugning the motives of the government in entering war. He added to this that *The Masses* will maintain its right to criticize the government or any of its members both in regard to domestic policies and to conduct of the war "so far as such custom does not give aid or comfort to the enemy." It will maintain the right to discuss terms of peace and "will be watchful that no department of our government shall become the tool of selfish and designing interests, now, that war is declared." In closing Mr. Eastman thanked Mr. Burleson for his assurance "that there is not the slightest suspicion of German influence attaching to me or *The Masses*," and for promising to grant a mailing privilege if he could.

Preserving Civil Liberties

In order to maintain constitutional liberties in time of war the National Civil Liberties Bureau has been formed with headquarters in New York and Washington. Roger N. Baldwin is director, representing a directing committee composed of L. Hollingsworth Wood, Chairman, Norman M. Thomas, Vice-Chairman, Helen Phelps Stokes, Treasurer, Walter R. Nelles, Counsel, Albert de Silver, John Lovejoy Elliott, Edmund C. Evans, John Haynes Holmes, Agnes Brown Leach, and Amos Pinchot. The Bureau has a staff of 150 cooperating attorneys throughout the country. While the Bureau is devoting its efforts to protecting unpopular minorities in a time of national excitement, and holds that, "The rights of minorities in a democracy are as fundamental as those of majorities, and as necessary to the preservation of the democratic principle," it is not adopting a policy of obstruction, or attempting to embarrass the Government in any way. Its work will on the contrary be done in close cooperation with government officials, both local and federal.

Cowardly Attack on Herbert S. Bigelow

Herbert S. Bigelow, of the Peoples' Church of Cincinnati, was made the victim of a ku-klux outrage at Newport, Ky., on October 29. He was seized by a

crowd of masked men while about to deliver a lecture, handcuffed and taken in an automobile to a secluded place in the country, tied to a tree and severely lashed. The thugs then poured oil on his head and released him with a warning that he leave Cincinnati. The cause of the crime seems to have been Bigelow's attitude toward the war. Before whipping him, one of the party declared the act to be "in the name of the poor women and children of Belgium." On being released Mr. Bigelow succeeded in reaching the house of a priest, where he was taken care of and sent to Cincinnati. There he went to a hospital and is reported in a serious condition. In an announcement made at the hospital he stated his position toward the war to be the same as that announced by President Wilson in his "peace without victory" declaration of January 22. It was along this line that he has spoken since war was declared.

Copper Strike Ended

The copper strike in the Globe-Miami district of Arizona was settled on October 23 through the Labor Commission recently appointed to investigate industrial unrest throughout the West. The commission consists of Secretary of Labor Wilson, J. L. Spangler of Pennsylvania, Verner Z. Reed of Colorado, John H. Walker of Illinois and E. P. Marsh of Washington. The settlement requires establishment of a workers' committee for each mine composed entirely of men working at each mine, but with the right of union members to have their grievances presented by a representative of the union. All strikers are to be reinstated except those guilty of seditious utterances or belonging to organizations which do not recognize the obligation of contract. All disputed questions of fact are to be referred to an arbitrator appointed by the federal government acceptable to both sides. The Commission is still working on difficulties in the Clifton-Morenci district.

Massachusetts Constitutional Convention

The Initiative and Referendum resolution was weakened by the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention on November 23, when by a vote of 142 to 111 it adopted an amendment inhibiting use of the constitutional initiative for submission of a measure for recall of judges or of judicial decisions. Amendments were also adopted forbidding submission of religious questions, special appropriations and changes in the bill of rights.

Russia

Drifting appears to be the best word to describe present political conditions in Russia. Premier Kerensky took a bold stand in his address before the Preliminary Parliament, or Provisional Council, demanding consideration for three problems: defense of the country, restoration of the fighting efficiency of the army, and increase in industrial production. Press dispatches indicate that he is growing in strength, while the Bolsheviks are losing in power. The Council of Work-

men's and Soldiers' Delegates also has received a check from the Peasants' Delegates, who insist upon a modification of the instructions given to Skobelev, ex-Minister of Labor, who is to be a delegate to the Paris Conference. [See current volume, page 1038.]

* *

Dr. Frank Billings, head of the American Red Cross Commission to Russia who recently returned to this country, says that Russians regard America as their best friend. Continuing, he said:

Russia has not heard a word of President Wilson's reasons why we are in this war. Russia's greatest need to-day is sincere friendship from the outside. America can be of immense service, not so much in the way of gifts of money, but by way of letting the people of Russia know what is going on in this country and what the United States is doing in the war.

Mexico

An elaborately planned pro-German demonstration in Mexico City appears to have been a failure. Press reports state that not more than 300 persons took part. Banners that were intended to excite prejudice against the Allies and the United States were taken down by the police. The procession is reported to have aroused no enthusiasm. The declaration of General Pablo Gonzales, occupying a whole page in *El Universal*, and calling upon his countrymen to declare themselves in favor of the United States and the Allies and against Germany, was received with such enthusiasm that a large extra edition was published. [See current volume, page 940.]

Ireland

The Sinn Fein conference opened in Dublin on the 25th, under the presidency of Arthur Griffith, founder of the organization, and with 700 delegates present. The secretary reported that more than 1,000 clubs had been formed with a membership of 250,000. The constitution adopted denies that the people of Ireland ever relinquished their claim to separate nationhood; that the proclamation of the Irish Republic at Easter, 1916, has united the people of Ireland under the flag of that Republic; that the representatives of the Irish people assembled at the conference aim to secure international recognition of Ireland as an independent Republic; that they deny the right of the British Parliament and the British Crown or any other foreign government to legislate for Ireland; that they make use of every means available to render impotent the power of England to hold Ireland in subjection by military force. Then follow many detailed specifications of things to be done to establish the Republic and speed it on its way. [See current volume, page 964.]

European War

The event of the week has been the overwhelming of the Italian forces on the Isonzo front by a specially prepared army of Germans and Austrians. By stripping the Russian and Roumanian fronts of all but a skeleton formation the Germans concentrated in the

Julian Alps an army estimated at half a million men, with artillery far superior to that of the Italians. The blow was so sudden and so overwhelming that the first Italian army was thrown back upon the second, and both upon the third, causing a retreat upon the whole line from the mountains to the sea. More than 100,000 prisoners are claimed by the Germans, together with five to six hundred guns. Aid is being forwarded to the Italians by the Allies, and it is expected that the retreat will be stopped at the Tagliamento River, forty miles east of Venice. Important gains were made by the British in Flanders, and by the French on the Aisne and at Verdun, but they were overshadowed by the losses of the Italians. No further fighting is announced on the Russian fronts. The German lines were withdrawn northeast of Riga, and at other points, in order to build up the attacking force on the Italian front. [See current volume, page 1038.]

* *

Opposition to the German government in the Reichstag developed to a degree that has led Chancellor Michaelis to offer his resignation. It is reported that the Chancellorship has been offered to the Bavarian Premier, Count von Hertling, who is taking time to consider it. Resignation of the Italian Cabinet was announced on the 26th by Premier Boselli. The defeat of Italian arms is reported to have served to unify the quarrelling factions. Professor Vittorio Orlando, Minister of the Interior in the Boselli Cabinet, has been invited to form a new Ministry. The French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Alexandre Ribot, was retired from the Cabinet on the 23d by Premier Painlevé, and J. Louis Barthou named in this place.

* *

The German submarine toll of British shipping showed an increase during the week. Seventeen vessels over 1,600 tons and eight vessels under that tonnage were lost. This is thought to be the largest loss of tonnage since June 24, and is attributed to the going to sea of a large fleet of U-boats after being restocked with supplies and torpedoes.

* *

Brazil declared war on Germany on the 26th. The Senate passed the bill unanimously, and the Deputies approved by a vote of 149 to 1. President Braz immediately gave his approval. The Foreign Minister of Brazil has made it known that translations of dispatches sent by Count Luxburg through the medium of the Swedish Legation while the Count was German Minister to Argentina, reveal a project for a German invasion of Southern Brazil.

* *

Subscriptions to the second Liberty Loan of four per cent bonds are believed to have exceeded the maximum of \$5,000,000,000. Complete returns have not been received, but it is thought that the number of subscribers is about 10,000,000. Expenditures by the United States thus far in the fiscal year exceed \$3,446,659,764, of which \$1,770,700,000 comprised loans to the Allies. The expenditures during the same period last year amounted to \$331,238,313. Bluejackets hereafter will man the army transports, and naval officers will

be in command. This change is made for the purpose of giving the ships greater protection in the war zone. The General Board is reported to have recommended that Congress be asked for an additional 80,000 men, 30,000 for the permanent naval forces, and 50,000 for the period of the war. Training of American troops in France now includes alternate visits of the men to the trenches where they are subjected to the front line discipline. It was announced in dispatches of the 26th that one of these parties of artillerymen fired the first American shot at the German foe on French soil.

NOTES

—An increase of 45 cents a ton over the previous fixed price was allowed bituminous coal operators by President Wilson on October 27.

—Prohibition in the District of Columbia goes into effect on November 1 under a special act of Congress. The law does not forbid shipment of liquor into the District, but applies to the local sales only.

—The Post Office Department turned into the Federal treasury, on October 26, \$9,000,000, representing the profit made by the service during the past fiscal year.

—A third detachment of child welfare doctors and nurses will be sent to France in response to urgent cable requests from the American Red Cross Commission now in that country.

—Finland is reported to be so short of food because of the short crop and the difficulty of importing grains that many of her people are eating bread made of equal parts of rye flour and pine bark.

—To halt decline in value of securities the Comptroller of the Currency ordered on October 14 that national bank examiners should not require banks to list high-grade assets at the present abnormally low values.

—The German crews captured in France from the wrecked Zeppelins declared that they had had no knowledge of American troops in Europe. Many German prisoners captured in trench fighting profess the same ignorance of the action of this country.

—The 200 ton ship composed of ferro-concrete, or reinforced concrete, launched recently in Norway, was built in three weeks. It is expected that the next one, by using the same frame, can be constructed in half that time, and that a ship of 1,000 tons can be constructed in six weeks.

—Before 1914 the deaths annually in France, it is estimated, were 725,000, and the births 775,000. In 1916 the deaths of the civilian population were estimated at 700,000 and of the military forces at 400,000, a total of 1,100,000. The births for 1916 dropped to 312,000.

—The estate of John D. Archbold, of the Standard Oil Company, was finally appraised, on October 27, at \$41,249,996. From this there is to be deducted the New Jersey State transfer tax of \$1,526,127, the Federal inheritance tax of \$2,915,602 and the administration

charges of \$250,000, leaving a net amount of \$38,498,247.

—Figures supplied by the Federal Trade Commission disclose that 70 coal dealers in Chicago received, between April 1 and October 1, 1917, 252,791 tons more of bituminous and anthracite coal than during the same period of 1916. The increase in anthracite alone was 79,706 tons.

—Land in Montreal owned by churches and exempt from taxation is valued by the assessors at \$131,504,182. Buildings upon this land are valued at \$75,231,744, making the total of church property exempt \$206,735,926. This is one-third of all real estate values in the city.

—The gross revenue of all railroads in the United States for August of this year was \$365,055,298, as against \$326,950,719 for the same month of last year. But operating expenses increased from \$203,307,968 to \$246,128,383, so that the net revenue of \$118,926,915 was less than a year ago by \$4,715,836.

—Indiana's limited woman suffrage law was declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court on October 26. The vote was three to one, Justice Harvey dissenting. The court held that suffrage is not a universal or inherent right but a political privilege for the people to decide in their capacity as creators of the constitution.

—The establishment of a large steel foundry at Kyushu, Japan, under joint Chinese and Japanese ownership, is announced. The capital involved is about \$10,000,000, subscribed equally by capitalists of each country. The contract stipulates that the Chinese are to furnish the corporation with 5,000 tons of pig iron a month at a reasonable price.

—More than 4,000 farm loan associations are being organized in the United States to borrow money under the Federal farm loan act. It is possible that the farmers availing themselves of these advantages will borrow \$150,000,000 from the twelve Federal land banks. Applications in August from the associations already chartered totaled nearly \$24,000,000.

—A recent official New Zealand report states that kauri lumber is being cut at the rate of 52,000,000 feet a year. At this rate the supply will last only seven or eight years; and at the present rate of cutting all lumber the New Zealand forests will be exhausted within twenty-eight or thirty years. The price of native lumber has increased rapidly. Rimu was \$5.45 a hundred feet in 1900, and \$852 in 1917; matai, \$5.47 and \$8.03; kauri, \$7.18 and \$10.46.

—Fifty-four acts of heroism were recognized by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission at its meeting in Pittsburgh on the 26th. In eight cases silver medals were awarded; in forty-six, bronze medals. Twelve of the heroes lost their lives. Pensions aggregating \$5,460 were granted the dependents of eight, \$2,000 were granted two others. Twelve thousand dollars were appropriated in addition for educational purposes, and \$21,000 were appropriated for other worthy purposes.

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. RALSTON'S PROPOSAL

I am heartily in favor of Jackson H. Ralston's suggestion of taxing the privilege of holding mineral and other lands idle, and hope we can get united action by single taxers on this.

We can show that idle lands act as an embargo on the production of food, coal, iron, copper and other necessities, and that when we fail to tax these privileges we deliberately cripple ourselves.

United action on these lines will mean the passage of such a tax at the December session of Congress.

But the intensified ability to produce wealth in cities as compared to country is an *individual* opportunity.

With the exception of speculative land values, which disappear when properly taxed, land values are not greater per head in city than in country, though differences in assessment make them appear so. Hence, I cannot join Mr. Ralston in condemning the Crosser bill, and believe it to be fair and equitable.

But the claim made by such eminent single taxers as Mr. Ralston and Mr. Post that it is unjust, appears to have paralyzed the energies of many single taxers, and I welcome any plan which will put all our dynamic power behind an effective measure.

The whole world is studying taxation.

There never has been such an opportunity to obtain practical results.

Let us get busy. NOW.

WILL ATKINSON.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

INDIRECT TAXATION OF LAND VALUES

It seems to me that Mr. Ralston has rather overdone the *injustice* of a land value tax apportioned among the States as provided for in the Federal Constitution.

Land value belongs to the people—all of it.

If a Federal tax should take a little more in some States than in others, who need complain? Surely not the landlords. They have no right to any publicly created land values. They should be thankful for what we leave them, instead of complaining that they have less left than landlords in some other state.

Consider further: Land value taxes fall upon the owner of the title to the natural resource taxed. Millions of land values in the poorer states are owned by residents of the richer states, and these *owners* would have to pay the tax—not the people of the poorer states. Suppose all the land of Colorado were owned by Rockefeller. He would have to pay all the tax apportioned to Colorado. To the very large extent that he does own the land out there, the people who live in Colorado need not worry. In the final shakedown, the proportion of Federal taxes paid by the richer states would probably be larger—not smaller. Mr. Ralston has presented a very ingenious argument for avoiding the objection he has

raised. Perhaps the courts would rule with him. If they should, it would possibly complicate rather than clarify matters. It certainly would if it settled the *right* to possess and use land on the paper title that both Ralston and Blackstone think so little of.

The right to possess and use land is a natural, inherent right. If this is not so, then no man has any natural right to live at all; for he cannot possibly live without land.

In this matter of paper titles we are very apt to get the cart before the horse. It is not the paper title that gives us the *right* to possess and use land. The *right* is inherent in the nature of things. Otherwise we must stand on the Hohenzollern doctrine that there is no right but might.

Occupancy and use is the only natural and rightful title to land.

In this connection the State has two duties to perform:

First, to protect the holder in his natural right to possess and use, and to furnish him with evidence to that end—preferably a Torrens title.

Second, to collect for the benefit of the public *all the land values*. The Crosser bill makes a start in this direction, though small, a reasonably fair start. Let us defend it, not raise objections of doubtful merit.

St. Paul, Minn.

C. J. BUELL.

BOOKS

Women and Work. By Helen M. Bennett. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. Price \$1.50.

To college girl-students, especially to those who have completed their courses and are about to enter upon the serious business of earning a livelihood or going gracefully idle, this book will be full of interest. It treats in detail of college training and working efficiency; of vocational problems; of the psychology and physiology of girls as related to occupations; of the various temperaments of girl-students, dramatic, philosophic, and scientific; and finally of the capacity of the college girl for independent action and of her relation to the world of women in general. The only fault the casual reader may find is as to its prolixity, but to college girls with experience fresh in memory this criticism may not suggest itself.

The first chapter is devoted to generalizations of a kind to which one becomes less prone with advancing years and accumulating experiences; for it is soon discovered that of all classifiable subjects, human characteristics require the largest number of examples and the broadest area of selection, before any trustworthy or useful classifications can be made. The conclusion that "the college girl of to-day is not the same type of person as the one who studied a decade or so ago," is one against which we instinctively put a mark of interrogation. She undoubtedly reacts to an entirely different environment, but that there is any "typical" difference is what remains to be proved. The second chapter deals with "Efficiency," a word which it is to be hoped will

soon disappear from our vocabulary, until at all events some master in the art of living appears who will endow it with a more spiritual significance than it has hitherto borne. With the vision of the poet, Browning perceived to what vastly different ends "efficiency" may be directed.

"This low man with a little thing to do, sees it and does it; This high man with great ends to pursue, dies e'er he knows it."

The "low man" however, eager to arrive at "the Englishman's Heaven of Getting-on," has captured the word and applied it to the uses of his sordid philosophy, without a suspicion that the high man by his side upon whom he bends the pitying eye with which success regards failure, may have been efficient in an infinitely larger and more substantial sense. The careful Martha of the Bible story only *seemed* to be more efficient than the dreamy-eyed Mary with her eager thirst for new ideas and her concern for the things of the spirit. We heartily agree therefore with Miss Bennett that the word efficiency "has in many ways become thoroughly obnoxious," and that "the justification of education is in its results, not measured by financial returns, honors achieved or materialistic products, but results as shown by finer living, a more highly socialized conscience, and a vital return to the world for its contribution to the individual." The fault indeed with the ideals inspiring many of our modern school systems is that they aim, as Ruskin complained, "at an education that will lead to advancement in life," but fail to recognize that "there may be an education which is in itself an advancement in life."

But it is futile and perhaps unreasonable to gird at the cult of efficiency under present conditions. It is but another proof of the unity of human life, that no one aspect of it can be isolated and examined without involving all the others. So long as by the pressure of special privilege the unprivileged part of the human race are everywhere running races with each other to escape the haggard spectre of poverty, they must cultivate efficiency in its most material aspect, even though they know that in the end it will avail them nothing. With the current of economic forces running against industry as a whole, and in favor of monopoly, efficiency can only bring advantage so long as others are inefficient. When education has done its work and all are efficient, the competitive struggle will be as keen on the higher plane as on the lower.

"The Problem of the College Girl" is perhaps the most acutely interesting chapter in the book. How to distinguish intelligently between "I would" and "I can,"—how to assess accurately both the scope and the limitations of one's own faculties,—how to discover the right openings after the suitable sphere of activities has been determined upon,—how to assign the proper values respectively to education as a means of self-expression, and as an instrument for the earning of a living even if that is not an immediate necessity,—these and many similar problems face the college girl at the close of her educational course. Appropriately following upon this comes the chapter dealing with "The Vocational Adviser." Provided the particular kind of wisdom can be discovered,—the broad vision, the psychological

instinct, the deep sympathy, the extensive practical acquaintance with the world of affairs; it is difficult to conceive of a more important functionary than the woman who should with such an equipment, guide college girls into the particular paths for which their temperaments, faculties and educational experiences have fitted them. When such a mentor can be found, no girls' college should be considered complete without her.

Space will not admit of following in detail the author's analysis of temperaments, further than to say that while these are exceedingly interesting, it must not be assumed that in the great average mentalities of girls, sharp lines of demarcation can be discovered such as would undoubtedly facilitate the work of the "vocational adviser." It may be questioned whether anything more than tendencies towards the dramatic, the scientific, or the philosophic ways of viewing life can be looked for in the temperaments of our college girls. The opening paragraph of the final chapter absolves the author from any possible reproach of narrowness of view in respect of her subject, and indicates her perception that the problem of the college girl is but part of the greater problem in which human liberty is involved. "The great truth which the college girl must master is the identity of her own interests with those of all women. She has considered herself too often as a member of a favored group, whose problems were of a special order, quite unrelated to those which perplexed the great world of women, and still less akin to those of that more restricted toiling mass of women workers. Seldom has she perceived the tenacious thread of economic conditions which binds together all women, . . . and that there is no inequality in wages or opportunity, no matter how far down in the economic scale, that does not reflect a corresponding disparity upon higher intellectual levels."

ALEX MACKENDRICK.
* * *

No man is such a conqueror as the man who has defeated himself.—*H. W. Beecher.*

save and serve

buy now—send your copies to "the boys"

By sending in your subscription immediately, you will be able to save considerably on the rates. November 10 is marked as the last day for the offers listed below. The time to act is now—without an instant's delay.

SAVE \$3—send in your order for Scribner's Magazine now—2 years for \$5. After Nov. 10, \$4 a year—now \$3 a year.

The Metropolitan, and Forest and Stream, now \$1.50 a year, go to \$2 on Nov. 10.

\$1 specials:—House & Garden, 5 months, or The Independent, 20 weeks, or The New Republic, 17 weeks, or Puck, 6 months.

2 years for \$3—regularly \$1.50 a year:—Cosmopolitan, Delineator, Everybody's, Forest & Stream, Good Housekeeping, Hearst's, Illustrated World, McClure's, Metropolitan, Mother's Magazine.

Write for clubbing prices on any magazines you may have in mind. We club THE PUBLIC with any periodical.

GRAUBARD BROTHERS

Subscription Service Specialists

114 South Third Street

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THIS MARK ON GOOD BOOKS



YOUR PART IN POVERTY

By
GEORGE LANSBURY

In reviewing this book in *THE PUBLIC*, Alexander Mackendrick says:

"It is written by one who both knows and cares how the poor live, and should be read by every American citizen of whatever political opinion; whether engaged or not engaged in reform or uplift agencies; whether concerned or unconcerned in the social problem."

\$1 net; at all bookstores

Published by

B. W. HUEBSCH, 225 Fifth avenue, NEW YORK

Public Ownership of Public Utilities

The movement for the people to gain control of those activities that are natural monopolies, will be aided by the wide distribution of the best literature on the subject. In addition to the suggestions made below, the student is referred to several books by Frederic C. Howe, to "Social Problems," by Henry George (Chapter XVII), and to Mr. Crosby's "The Orthocratic State," all of which can be ordered from us.

Municipal Ownership.

Debtors' Handbook. Both sides presented. Cloth \$1.

Municipal Ownership.

By Carl D. Thompson. Cloth \$1.

The Telegraph Monopoly.

By Frank Parsons. Paper 25c. (We cannot afford to pay postage on these large paper-bound books—add 7c.)

The Railways, the Trusts and the People.

By Frank Parsons. Vol I, paper, 25c. Vol II, paper, 25c. (Add 15c. postage.)

The Public Book Department 122 E. 37th Street **New York**

Books for Lovers of Liberty

Knowledge is the only fountain, both of the love and the principles of human liberty.—*Daniel Webster.*

By Henry George

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Progress and Poverty | cloth, \$1.00; paper, 30c |
| Social Problems | cloth, \$1.00; paper, 30c |
| Protection or Free Trade | cloth, \$1.00; paper, 30c |
| The Land Question | cloth, \$1.00; paper, 30c |
| A Perplexed Philosopher | cloth, \$1.00; paper, 30c |
| The Law of Human Progress | leather, \$1.00; cloth, 50c |
| Complete Works in 10 Uniform Volumes | cloth, \$12.00; leather, \$17.00 |
| The Shortest Road to the Single Tax | paper, 10c |
| The Single Tax—What It Is and Why We Urge It | 2c |
| The Crime of Poverty | 10c |

By Louis F. Post

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Ethics of Democracy | \$1.50 |
| Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce | 75c |
| The Taxation of Land Values | cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50c |
| Social Service | cloth, 75c; paper, 40c |
| Trusts, Good and Bad | paper, 15c |

By C. B. Fillebrown

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| A B C of Taxation | linen covers, 30c |
| The Singletax Handbook | linen covers, 25c |
| Taxation | 60c |
| Singletax Catechism | 5c |

By Oliver R. Trowbridge

| | |
|---|-----|
| Bisocialism: The Reign of the Man at the Margin | 60c |
|---|-----|

By Frederick Verinder

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| My Neighbor's Landmark | cloth, 85c; paper, 40c |
| German Efficiency and British Liberty | 5c |

By Lewis H. Berens

| | |
|---|-----|
| Towards the Light: Elementary Studies in Ethics and Economics | 80c |
|---|-----|

By Herbert Quick

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| The Good Ship Earth | \$1.25 |
| The Brown Mouse | \$1.25 |

By Franz Oppenheimer

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| The State | \$1.25 |
|-----------|--------|

By Arthur Young

| | |
|--|--------|
| A History of the Singletax Movement in the United States | \$1.50 |
|--|--------|

All Books Sent Postpaid

Any Book Reviewed in The Public can be ordered through

The Public Book Department 122 East 37th St. New York, N. Y.

"The Public now makes appeal," a prominent New England literary man writes this morning, *"To all that is sanest in the American mentality."* And that certainly is The Public's aim and ambition.

But how to reach the field?

In deciding to raise the subscription price from \$1 to \$2, the editors and supporters of The Public took very careful account of the danger of accentuating the difficulty of reaching new readers. Old friends are and must be our mainstay, but new readers are the materials from which a big future of powerful usefulness must be built, bit by bit. All considered, it was decided that the disadvantages were outweighed by the obvious fact that, were the additional subscription revenue resulting from the increase added to the sum appropriated for promotion work, *a much wider, a more effective circulation offensive would be made possible during the remaining months of this, and next year.*

Even at \$2, The Public will be the lowest-priced of the two or three encouragingly strong interpretative weekly journals of the country. And at \$2 we will be in a stronger position to attack our publishing problems.

It was decided to announce the coming increase well in advance; to give old readers and new an interim period to take advantage of the present price.

Every subscription received this year will be accepted at \$1 for a full year; in clubs of *three for \$2*. This applies, of course, to Christmas subscriptions (we will again have Christmas cards engraved in two colors to go with these—sample card on request), and renewals sent in now will be credited from date of expiry no matter how far in advance.

From the first or second issue in December (as soon as the paper stock ordered for the present size is used), The Public is to be one-third larger.

Liberal thinkers known to our present readers are the logical prospects for our campaign to develop an educated public opinion which is the only hope and safeguard of the policies and measures of democracy.

Urge your friends to get acquainted with The Public and its work. They will thank you. So will we.

The Public,
122 East 37th Street,
New York.

Enclosed find \$1 for which extend my subscription to THE PUBLIC one year, and \$1 for which send THE PUBLIC for one year to the two names herewith.

Name

Address