

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. Post Office will send it to some soldier or sailor in our forces at the front. No wrapping—no charge.

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General

The Public

An International Journal
of
Fundamental Democracy

Patriots and Profits

Mineral Land Monopoly

By Cecil L. St. John



September 28, 1917

Volume XX
Number 1017

Published Weekly
NEW YORK

Five Cents a Copy
One Dollar a Year

Do You Know Henry George?

TOM L. JOHNSON said that the day was not far distant when the professional or business man who did not understand the philosophy of Henry George would stand discredited in any intelligent community. Is not that day here?

Everyone who believes in the singletax and gets even a shadowy glimpse of the potentialities of an application of it, should have this complete set of the works of Henry George, including his life. A great personality lives on every page of the ten volumes. They contain practically all that Henry George wrote, and his life, by Henry George, Jr.

LIST OF VOLUMES

Volume I—Progress and Poverty

Henry George's first book. It made its author world famous.

Volume II—Social Problems

A presentation of the "momentous social problems of our time," unencumbered with technicalities.

Volume III—The Land Question

Contains three short works: (1) "The Land Question," (2) "Property in Land," a passage-at-arms with the Duke of Argyll; (3) "The Condition of Labor," an open letter to Pope Leo XIII. in reply to the Pope's encyclical letter on "the condition of labor."

Volume IV—Protection or Free Trade

"An examination of the tariff question: with especial regard to the interests of labor."

Volume V—A Perplexed Philosopher

An analysis of Herbert Spencer's various utterances on the land question.

Volumes VI and VII—The Science of Political Economy

The great book on which the author was at work when he died. It recasts the science of political economy in conformity with the natural order.

Volume VIII—Our Land and Land Policy

Contains the pamphlet which was the precursor of "Progress and Poverty." Also contains selected miscellaneous writings, speeches and lectures.

Volumes IX and X—The Life of Henry George

An intimate view of Henry George—written by his son, Henry George, Jr. It presents Henry George the man, and traces with his life story, the development of his thought, and his career as a writer and speaker.

This beautiful set of books, 10 volumes, of uniform size, bound in buckram with gilt tops, untrimmed edges, delivered anywhere in the United States or Canada, \$12.00

A special edition bound in leather . . . 17.00

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

CONTENTS

Editorial	927
Mineral Land Monopoly—Cecil St. John.....	934
News of the Week	936
Press Opinions	943
Books	944

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

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio	FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia	HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia
LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York	HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois	R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota

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
GREELY 2676

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.

YOUR CHANCE IS IN CANADA—Rich lands and business opportunities offer you independence; Farm lands, \$11 to \$30 acre; irrigated lands, \$35 to \$50; Twenty years to pay; \$2,000 loan in improvements, or ready made farms. Loan of live stock; Taxes average under twenty cents an acre; no taxes on improvements, personal property, or live stock. Good markets, churches, schools, roads, telephones; Excellent climate—crops and live stock prove it. Special homeseekers' fare certificates. Write for free booklets. Allan Cameron, General Superintendent Land Branch, Canadian Pacific Ry., 119 Ninth Avenue, Calgary, Alberta.

Advertise in The Public

The Public

An International Journal of Fundamental Democracy

Editorial

The German reply to the Pope's peace proposals has excited in Allied countries nothing more than a smile of incredulity. It is like a piece of psychological drama, the difficulty of which is always to make convincing the crucial event, the change of mind. Noble and peaceful professions have to extricate themselves from the memory of nearly all of German history from Frederick the Great to that little scrap of paper. Belief in the moral force of right hardly carries conviction when it has so recently been administered to corrupt the American Congress and inoculate Rumanian cattle. Only when the German people indicate their desire for peace in a way that becomes a mandate to their government, will the world be willing to believe and to discard their arms. That the note adheres to the Reichstag majority resolution will be loudly trumpeted as an adequate response to President Wilson's demand for a democratic guaranty. But the point at issue is that the Imperial Government may adhere or not as it pleases. The wishes of the German people will become dominant and effective when the cult of military invincibility is destroyed, and this will take place when their eyes are removed from the war-map and fixed on the tide of battle. There is no need to go to the bitter end if no doubt is left as to what will happen if it should be reached. The Allies' object is no longer the frustration of imperial ambition; it is the elimination of the imperial menace.

* * *

Germany's object in the note is merely to bring about a cessation of hostilities. If she can do this by the simple, if cynical, device of lip-service to high principles, she will have made inoperative the united purpose of the Allies that now animates an over-

whelmingly powerful and smoothly running war machine. In these circumstances she could make her appearance at the peace table clothed in the majesty of an undaunted imperialism, and get her objects by the simple expedient—of threatening to use military force. The world is now united for the job of ending this threat; let the job be finished.

The opinion of both continents has rightly discerned the difference between the German and the Austrian reply. The latter is characterized not only by its sincere desire for peace, but also by its sincere adherence to some arrangement for securing and preserving peace. If allied diplomacy had not been unbelievably stupid in every Balkan problem since the treaty of Bucharest, there might be hope of breaking the central European combination without much further fighting. But since the Italian Government has so effective a press service in the United States, through which we learn that only Italy can win the war, influences are at work to prevent an effort to break the central alliance. Would it have any effect upon our papers to learn that there are dangerously democratic ideals to be found in Italy as well as Russia, that socialism is a powerful influence, and that Italy is the birth-place and native heath of the I. W. W.?

* * *

On August 17 The Public said editorially: "Not only to Germany, but to the British and French governments, must Mr. Wilson demonstrate our grim readiness to fight before he can win respect for our demand that the forthcoming peace shall fulfill the hopes of the plain people of every nation. The war governments of France and England * * * come to us for help, not as supplicants for favors, but almost in the attitude of forgiving us for past delinquency. For us such an attitude may be never so absurd; if it is held strongly enough it might very probably

find expression in a rebuff or an inconclusive answer to any proposal for a revision of treaties that Mr. Wilson might at this time advance. Mr. Wilson's supreme opportunity to act effectually for what is best in American democracy would then be lost or compromised."

Comes now Max Eastman, one of the most intelligent and certainly the most brilliant of our pacifists, and says, in an editorial in the *October Masses* :

There is high hope in this letter to the Pope, of permanent just peace and international federation for the world. * * * Perhaps the President's reason for waiting was that he wanted to lend enough money and guarantee enough support to the Allies, so that he would be in a position to tell *them* what their peace terms were to be. If that was the reason, we make our bow to him as the most astute and really powerful statesman of the world, and we give thanks that he really likes peace better than war.

The conventions of modesty forbid our praising the wisdom of these words. But we can speak freely our admiration for the intellectual honesty that leads Mr. Eastman to say so plainly that perhaps, and even probably, he has been mistaken and unjust in his earlier denunciations of the President's policy.

* * *

The news comes that the Congress of Hayti has been dissolved by the United States Navy, and self-government in that little nation practically destroyed. That may have been necessary to preserve order and protect property. But such order is the order of Warsaw. An excuse offered at the time of our interference with Hayti was that it was necessary to preserve the Monroe Doctrine, as otherwise, it was said, European governments might take matters into their hands. But that excuse has no force to-day, if it ever had. Any European government whose interference at the time might have been feared, is to-day otherwise engaged, and all but one are allies of the United States. Hayti is one of the small nations whose right to independence and self-government has been violated.

* * *

One of The Public's good friends among the pacifists has eked out the catch-phrases of the clan with a clever epigram to the effect that we are fighting "to make the world safe for hypocrisy." It has been repeated in Socialist halls and around cafe tables from New York to San Francisco. Those who

accept it as a true thrust are those who see the struggle for democracy as the storming of a single height. They are blind to the foot-hills fought for throughout the centuries and gained at great cost as vantage points for the next upward thrust of the peoples. They attach no value to those avowals of the democratic faith by even the most reactionary and undemocratic of politicians in England and America which to others mean that the intention, the ideal of democracy has conquered, and it only remains to carry out the intention and realize the ideal. That is a big task in itself, but not so big as would be the task of reformers living in a world under the dominance of a system founded on outspoken contempt for democracy.

* * *

Judging from selections in the New York Tribune's column headed "Enemies Within," that paper considers all to be enemies who would uphold constitutional rights, would expose or prevent plutocratic plans to secure private profit from the war, or will not halt in the fight against predatory privilege. The "enemies within" which it sees include enemies of junkerdom and Prussianism in the United States. Its quotation of anti-plutocratic utterances along with others of a different kind indicate that it is more concerned with defending real enemies within than with a war upon enemies without. Might it not have been patriotism of the Tribune's kind which caused Dr. Johnson to define it as he did?

* * *

For the first time in a generation, organized farmers and organized wage-earners have come together on the same front against their common enemies—the beneficiaries of privilege who eat their bread in the sweat of other men's brows. The St. Paul convention of the Nonpartisan League held in co-operation with the American Federation of Labor, expressed the sentiment of the plain people of America. It showed that loyalty to the government can be practised without sacrificing the cause of economic democracy at home. The farmers of the north-west are not asking for their share of the swag. Wheat at \$2.20 means scant profits or none at all to the North Dakota grower,

whose crop this year has been small. He is willing to forego a higher price. But he insists that the millers, the steel men, the copper men, and all others who stand to profit from the war be forced by the Government to make similar sacrifices of their personal interests. The convention's protest against the war revenue bill is sure to be heard at Washington. The program calling for public ownership, direct legislation, and a 2 per cent tax on unused land gives a lead badly needed by our legislators and executives. That Mr. La Follette should have spoken in apology for Germany at the last session is regrettable. But Mr. La Follette was not the convention. Only in the ears of our witch-burners will Mr. La Follette's pro-German utterances drown out what was so obviously the voice of the plain people raised in a demand for plain, simple justice.

The Labor Commission

The appointment of a Commission comprising Secretary Wilson of the Department of Labor, two representative employers and two trade union leaders is the President's response to those who have urged more fundamental treatment than prosecutions for the labor troubles in Arizona, Montana and the Pacific Coast states. The Commission will leave soon for a tour of the West. They will endeavor to ascertain the underlying causes of the unrest, and their recommendations will undoubtedly be a determining factor in the shaping of the Government's future policy. The work of this Commission is worth careful watching. Those familiar with the situation in Arizona, where a few copper companies have used medieval methods to safeguard their enormous profits, express the belief that the Government operation of the mines may be an early and inevitable development. The Commission was appointed at the request of the American Federation of Labor, acting for the Arizona State Federation of Labor and the wage earners of the West. In Arizona the situation is complicated by I. W. W. activities and the presence of some 14,000 Mexican miners and laborers. Our future relations with Mexico and particularly our opportunity to win the confidence of the public opinion of that country will be seriously prejudiced if

these Mexican miners are driven into the I. W. W. camp, as a preliminary to their suppression by the blood and iron methods adopted at Bisbee. Members of the American Federation of Labor charge that the copper companies encourage the I. W. W. because miners acting under that banner can be dealt with ruthlessly without arousing effectual public protest. Employer members of the Commission are Col. J. L. Spangler of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Verner Z. Reed of Denver, Col. The labor members are Mr. John H. Walker, President of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, and Mr. E. P. Marsh, President of the Washington State Federation of Labor. Mr. Walker is a Socialist, a leader in the United Mine Workers, and an authority on the co-operative movement. Mr. Marsh has had more experience with the I. W. W. than almost any other trade unionist in the country, because they have been more active among the lumber workers and other migratory laborers of the far Northwest. That he understands the relation between labor unrest and the land question was shown during his testimony before the United States Commission on Industrial Relations at Seattle three years ago. He said:

Let me tell you and assure you, Mr. Chairman, that in this city, and I think it is typical all over the State, that the longing for a piece of land is in the hearts of the people. They want a piece of land, but it is held by speculators out of their reach. The time was when a man could come West, as he was displaced in the East, and settle down on a piece of land. You cannot do it to-day.

Mr. Marsh has here said a vast deal in a few simple words. May he emphasize this profound truth in his report to the President!

Mr. Hoover's Warning

Exhorting the nation's business men at Atlantic City, Mr. Hoover draws a horrid picture of impending state socialism, involving bureaucratic control of the Prussian type, if business does not voluntarily co-operate for the winning of the war. He offers them the defeat of this socialism as their reward, and makes it clear that he is willing to do his share. "If we receive this support," he said, "we will have demonstrated the falsity of radical claims as to the neces-

sity of socializing our industries." Again, he tells them that theirs is the choice between democracy and bureaucracy, and by democracy he means the voluntary co-operation of business men for winning the war. Mr. Hoover is a practical man faced with the necessity of getting immediate results. If he and the other administrators at Washington can control prices and regulate business by fiat, and at the same time convince business men that they are voluntarily surrendering personal advantage, so much the better for everyone. But to accomplish this is out of the question, and Mr. Hoover knows it. What he probably implied was that if business men now yield gracefully to government control and surrender some of their excess profits during the war, they can at its close go back to the old laissez faire game of getting all the traffic will stand. But if Mr. Hoover sees the crusade against profiteering as merely a war measure, the people do not. Either they will deliberately choose the state socialism which Mr. Hoover so dreads, with all its bureaucratic tyranny, or they will insist upon such radical changes in the fundamental rules of the game as will render state control unnecessary. In either event, they will reject Mr. Hoover's description of the present system as democratic. As between Bethlehem Steel and United States Steel, Morgan and Rockefeller, Astor and Vanderbilt, one coal mine owner and another, the system may be democratic enough. It is a system based on the ownership of the land and natural resources by comparatively few men, and on the right of these men to use their ownership for extortion. The people will either take that right away from them by taxing land values and thus purge private industry of privilege, or they will authorize and direct their government to continue price fixing after the war, and eventually to take over the entire management of industry. They probably will resort to both of these remedies, in different fields. The American spirit dislikes state socialism as fervently as Mr. Hoover. But between even a cumbersome and vexatious bureaucracy and a grinding plutocracy it will choose the former. There are worse things than state socialism when control of an industry is divided between government officials and representatives of the workers employed in

the industry. That sort of state socialism is coming for our railroads and telegraphs. Taxation of land values is coming for urban and agricultural lands.

Mr. Hoover surely did not "think through" the subject when he delivered his Atlantic City address. He is intent on immediate results. But he is too big a man to stop with them. Cannot we be confident that before his task is done he will be converted to the need of radical changes in the fundamental rules that govern production and distribution? If he cannot reconcile himself to state socialism, let him inquire into the merits of the proposal that industry be freed of privilege and given a new birth of freedom by removing the land from monopoly control.

Undemocratic Woman Suffrage

Not all woman suffrage measures are democratic or deserving of commendation. One example of undemocratic suffrage is that provided in the Shafroth bill which has passed the United States Senate. It allows the Legislature of Hawaii to give territorial suffrage to women who own property. A property qualification is a denial of democracy. It confers upon the property owning class power beyond its rightful due. It makes of doubtful value a further provision of this law allowing the question of full suffrage to be submitted to the voters, which means—class prejudice being what it is—Hawaiian democracy would be forced to make its fight against unfair odds. While unjust laws make acquirement of property a practical impossibility to the majority of the people, the property qualification is as indefensible as a sex qualification. True friends of suffrage in the House should not allow this bill to pass without an amendment making suffrage universal. Suffrage organizations should protest against this effort to make a class privilege of a natural right.

Another undemocratic suffrage measure is that which has become a law in Canada. It limits woman suffrage to wives, mothers, sisters or daughters of soldiers. Thus it penalizes women whose male relatives have not enlisted. Even granting for argument's sake that failure to volunteer is a fault, wherein is the justice of putting a penalty therefor on persons other than those who

have committed it? And why penalize the woman who has no husband, son, brother or father qualified for military service? Moreover, the law robs of suffrage many women in the progressive western provinces, whom provincial laws have enfranchised. It changes the right to vote from the universal right of all citizens in a democracy to an aristocratic privilege of certain families. Like the plutocratic Hawaiian bill, it should be condemned by all democrats.

The Army and Politics

The largest relative majority cast against woman suffrage by the men of Maine was that registered by the Maine soldiers in camp in Massachusetts. These soldiers were the national guardsmen of peace times and the volunteers who have swelled their ranks since war begun. They are young men who were attracted by military life even in peace times, and we cannot expect from them very clear understanding of fundamental democracy. The great producing classes—the farmers and the wage earners—are meagerly represented among them. We can expect something better from our national army of drafted men. Indeed, not the weakest argument for conscription is that it creates an army truly representative of the people. The men who return from active service in France at the close of this war will enjoy a political and social prestige so great as to make their views on political and social questions a matter of great concern. But there is good reason to believe that we shall be spared an after-the-war politics in which flag-waving and the flaunting of war-records shall decide the issue, as they did for so many years after the Civil War. Those post-bellum years were heedless of more vital issues because it was an era of free land and boundless opportunity. The Great West was still in the making. But when peace comes next year, or the next, our people will be too engrossed with economic problems to bestow their votes as so many tributes to military heroes. A striking military achievement by some outstanding leader may produce a candidate whose name will provide enough glamor to obscure vital issues. But having honored their hero, the voters will get back to more serious business. Military prestige will

have a formidable political rival in the growing strength of organized labor and organized farmers. Russia's revolutionary leaders are not soldiers, nor are the masses in this country any longer the simple folk who listened uncritically to the spread-eagle oratory of a generation ago. If among the returning soldiers there arises a leader who sees democracy in economic terms, and not merely as the catch-word of a callow nationalism, so much the better. There are many such among the men of the new armies.

Patriots and Profits

Amos Pinchot has published a powerful arraignment of the great industrial corporations that are making huge excess profits out of the war. He has gathered valuable statistics showing the enormous toll that is being taken by the basic industries that are furnishing the government and the people with its necessaries. The resulting document is one that deserves careful consideration at the hands of the Congressmen and editors to whom it was sent, and of all others who wish to follow the major domestic issues of the war. Mr. Pinchot selects as his target the industrial leaders who constitute the advisory boards of the Council of National Defense. He shows that in many instances they are directors or officers in the corporations that are profiting enormously from war business. After a scathing attack on these men, whom he likens to a school of sharks tearing at the flesh of a defenseless whale, he turns to the war revenue bill with its 30 per cent tax on excess profits, contrasts it with the British tax of 80 per cent, demolishes the arguments of the Congressmen, financiers and publicists who opposed a higher rate for this country, and appeals to public opinion to force a change in policy at the next session of Congress.

In discrediting Mr. Pinchot's effort, the metropolitan press will be aided by his frank avowal that he was opposed to the war and has not changed his views as to the rightness of entering it. Here and there he permits himself to write with biting sarcasm, but on the whole it is a sincere attempt to waive that question as one that is closed and to advance a policy that will do as much to help with the war as to aid the cause of justice and democracy at home. The Public

accepts it as such, and is willing to waive the question of whether this is a righteous war as one that has no bearing on the question of how large war profits should be. It does exceedingly regret that Mr. Pinchot has selected the advisory boards of the Council of National Defense to bear the brunt of his attack. These men were already under suspicion and criticism, and their every act is being closely watched in Washington by Congressmen and others. Short of revolutionizing industry overnight, Messrs. Wilson, Baker and Daniels had no choice but to make use of the existing industrial machinery. Secretary Baker's sharp rebuke of the Committee on Coal Production and Secretary Daniel's encounter with the steel manufacturers have given ample evidence that the "advisory" in the title of these boards and committees is an eloquent and meaningful qualification. The Federal Trade Commission is straining its resources to obtain as quickly as possible the accurate knowledge of manufacturing costs required for control of prices. That its resources are adequate for this tremendous task is too much to expect. The field of activity in Washington is too vast and complex and the need for haste too great for the complete elimination of graft and exorbitant prices. Vigilance and criticism are in order. But to ask us to believe that the Administration has complacently tolerated and even invited an orgy of profiteering at Washington in connection with Government contracts is to do the gravest injustice to a group of singularly devoted, courageous, and vigilant public servants.

It is in the handling of war contracts, in its progress toward price-fixing, that the Administration has been conspicuously alert, enlightened and forceful. We may be sure that if the industrial leaders who serve as volunteers in advisory capacities at Washington were using their quasi-official standing to put through contracts at exorbitant prices for their own concerns, we should hear of it through disgruntled competitors and hostile Congressmen. These men have been placed on their mettle. They are on the defensive. They have pledged their cooperation. They know only one way of playing the game that is business, and they need watching. But they would be far harder

to watch and much less vulnerable if they had remained at home, in the position of frank profiteers.

THE PUBLIC has pointed out the limitations of price-fixing even if the Federal Trade Commission had enough time at its disposal to collect accurate data on manufacturing costs in every industry affected by war profits. The point is that, short of such revolutionary changes as the Singletax or government seizure, obviously not to be accomplished overnight by executive fiat, the Administration has acted with vigor to prevent exorbitant prices and to protect the government from extortion. Secretary Daniels has earned the bitter hatred of the big steel interests, and Secretary Baker is far from popular with those coal producers who wanted more than a fair price.

This is by way of preface to an emphatic indorsement of that portion of Mr. Pinchot's open letter which attacks the war revenue bill, not only as a betrayal of democracy at home but as a measure calculated to promote disorganization and hence to retard the prosecution of the war. Even if the Government's efforts to prevent excess war profits through price-fixing could be completely successful (as no one pretends that they can be), there would still be no excuse for a revenue policy that raises less than one-fourth of the first year's war expenses, exclusive of loans to the Allies, by conscription of wealth, and more than three-fourths by borrowing at a good rate of interest. War profits aside, our vast accumulations of wealth in the hands of a few men controlling our natural resources and the basic industries dependent on them are a national scandal. These accumulations are being added to at the rate of hundreds of millions a month while price fixing waits on the gathering of the requisite data. For the year 1917 the Government will take, under the sliding scale of the completed bill, about 31 per cent. Mr. Pinchot says:

England levies a flat 80 per cent. tax on war profits. Let us see what such a tax would mean to our more prosperous corporations, remembering, meanwhile, that it is, quite rightly, agreed by all factions in Congress that corporations which have made small excess profits shall be taxed very little or entirely exempted. Again using the Steel Corporation as an example, its average profits for 1911, 1912 and 1913 were \$63,500,000. Its net profits for

1917 will, as estimated, be over \$550,000,000; deducting \$63,500,000 from \$550,000,000—to get the amount taxable as war profits under the English plan—we get \$486,500,000. Now suppose, as is proposed by the liberals in Congress, our government follows England and takes 80 per cent. of this by a war profits tax and allows the corporation to retain the remaining 20 per cent. This would give the government \$389,200,000 and allow the Steel Corporation to retain \$97,300,000—a sum larger than it ever made in any year from its organization up to 1915 inclusive, plus the \$63,500,000 of “pre-war profits” not subject to the war profits tax under the English plan. Thus we have \$160,800,000 to be retained and distributed by the corporation among its stockholders. This is much more than double the average earnings of the corporation during the most prosperous three years’ period in its history. It would seem to an outsider that it should be enough to keep the officers, directors and stockholders from feeling they are being victimized by a hostile Congress, quitting their jobs and leaving the government in the lurch. But apparently that is not the way they look at it. Not at all. Anyone who suggests even half as big a tax is looked upon as an assassin of business; he is denounced as a plotter against American enterprise and a traitor to the war. And yet this tidy little sum of \$160,800,000, which seems inadequate to keep the patriotism of big business in working order, would enable the corporation to pay its bond interest, 7 per cent. on \$360,000,000 preferred stock and 26.6 per cent. on its \$508,000,000 common stock. In Heaven’s name, what do these gentlemen want?

Nor is there any escape in the situation for those apologists for the revenue programme who admit its failures in justice but urge acquiescence for the sake of the war. Already its influence is being reflected in the attitude of the victims of exploitation. By serving notice on our industrial and financial monopolists that they are entitled to excess war profits to the extent of 70 per cent. of all they can extort, Congress has also served notice on the wage-earners and the farmers that they can go the limit in advancing their own interests without doing violence to the Government’s conception of patriotism. Mr. Pinchot shows that for every dollar that went to the employes of the Steel Corporation in 1913, the amount that went to the employes in 1916 was \$1.27, while for every dollar that went to the stockholders in 1913 the amount that went to the stockholders in 1916 was \$3.34. Since 1916, both wages and profits have advanced, but the discrepancy is to-day greater than it was a year ago. Mr. Pinchot rightly says:

Another phase of the situation which should, but apparently does not, commend itself to Congress, is that as well as generally undermining the war’s

moral and physical strength, an unwise revenue bill, such as is being framed by Congress, invites national disorganization. For, by leaving untaxed the bulk of the immense wealth accumulated in war profits, it obviously invites every farmer to hold his product back for higher prices, and every workman to strike for higher wages. If the rich, who do not particularly need the money, are going to make a killing out of the war, why should not ordinary people make a good living during it? The farmer has not made money out of the war, in spite of the high prices we pay for his products. He, too, has been the victim of the high cost of living, of the trust, the manipulator, the food pirate. He has sold his crops at fair prices and then watched the gamblers hold them back. The farmer is willing to do his share in the war; he is willing to work from dawn to dark, but he is not encouraged in patriotic sacrifice by the knowledge that he is being robbed while he works by some of the very people who are sitting in places of authority, fixing the price of his products and advising him to get up a little earlier, go to bed later—and eat less for the war’s sake.

As for the workman, take the case of Phelps, Dodge & Co., in Arizona. Their mines were the scene of the activities of the I. W. W., who in Bisbee urged the employees to strike. The net earnings of Phelps, Dodge & Co. in the pre-war period averaged \$7,442,339 a year. In 1916, the net earnings were \$21,974,263. God knows what they will be this year. Does any intelligent man suppose that, if Phelps, Dodge & Co., instead of taking the \$14,000,000 above average earnings out of the people and the government, had sold copper at a reasonable price or paid their employees a fair share of their abnormal profits, there would have been any labor troubles in their district?

Again, suppose the wage earner is an employee of the U. S. Steel Corporation. His employer is netting about \$550,000,000 this year as against the pre-war average of \$63,500,000. This, too, is an invitation to strike for more pay. If the employees do so, however, they are denounced by the press as undesirable citizens under the influence of the Kaiser’s money.

To an outsider, neither in the labor nor the capitalist camp, it would seem more helpful to the country if those in authority descended on the directors’ meeting instead of on the employees, and said to our Mr. Garys, Mr. Ryans, Mr. DuPonts, and Mr. Arnouers, “Boys, be patriotic; don’t rob the public. Remember we are at war. This is no time to exploit either your country or your employees. Lower your prices; raise your wages; declare no record dividends. You are dividing class against class by your price and wage policy. You are hurting the war; you are giving it a bad name. Wait till after it’s over, if you want to make big money. Don’t assume that your stockholders are hogs. America has her load to carry now. The people are poor; don’t make them poorer; they need food to fight on, to work on. Be patriotic, if you want your country to be successful. Play the game like good sports. You were Americans before you were directors. Be Americans now.”

Since Mr. Pinchot wrote this, the strike

of 25,000 mechanics at San Francisco and the belligerent demonstration of the north-west farmers at St. Paul have clinched his point.

What is happening in the United States to-day will give intense satisfaction to those radicals who believe that economic democracy must be achieved independently of the State by the voluntary action of co-operating groups of workers, and who are intelligent enough to see the tremendous impetus now being given to that sort of action. THE PUBLIC shares the view that such action is

the main reliance of the democratic movement. But for as many years in the future as we are concerned with, these voluntary groups must work in co-operation with the State and use the State to supplement and co-ordinate their activities. To-day the State is more than ever indispensable as the agency through which American democracy is resisting the supreme effort of the autocratic impulse. The politicians who are its personnel cannot persist in a policy that places them in antagonism to the workers and producers.

Mineral Land Monopoly

By Cecil L. St. John

The Singletax Year Book recently published by Mr. Joseph Dana Miller, affords a splendid "point of departure" for the discussion of various difficult phases of the philosophy of Henry George.

One of these, "Taxation of Forest and Mineral Lands," is there (p. 225 et seq.) dealt with in part as follows:

"The proper method of assessing mineral land is one of the most perplexing problems of any system of taxation.

"Mineral lands differ from any other natural opportunities, such as city lots, farms or forest land, in that their use involves the destruction of their value by the exhaustion of the mineral. The site value of a city lot or even the site value of farm and forest lands is not diminished or exhausted through use; but the only value of a mine is in the product that must be taken away in order to realize the value. In most cases it is impracticable to determine in advance the total productive capacity of a mine (or gas or oil well, or quarry), and even if this could be ascertained accurately, the time of exhaustion would depend upon the rapidity of the working, and this in turn would be influenced by the market prices of the product.

"Nevertheless, mines have a value, and this can be ascertained and taxed just as well, at least by the application of Singletax principles, as under the ordinary methods of taxation.

"To determine the rental value of non-producing mineral properties offers some dif-

ficulties, but these are not insurmountable. A fair estimate can be made by comparisons.

"A practicable compromise for some time to come would be a combination of a tax or assessed value of the mine (which would take part of the rental value and which would be heavy enough to discourage holding mines out of use), and a royalty or production tax based upon either the value or the tonnage of the output."

Consideration of the characteristics of mineral lands above pointed out will, it is respectfully submitted, show that the determination of "rental value" of a mine is not only "difficult" and "perplexing" but absolutely and forever impossible. This, not because of difficulties of ascertaining quantities or other mechanical difficulties, but because such lands have no true "rental value," and that, therefore, such lands cannot be equitably taxed "by the application of Singletax principles."

We may agree that "mines have a value," but it does not follow that they have a "rental" value. A barrel of sugar has a value, but it assuredly has no rental value. The value of the sugar is measured by its price in the open market. The term "rental value" obviously cannot be applied to the sugar, because—

(a) "Its use involves 'its' destruction, and—

(b) "The time of use varies according to the whim or energy of the user."

To say that an object may have a "rental value" is to assert—

First, that a "lessor" may give possession to a "lessee" for a period of time, with the right to use the object for that period.

Second, that the object rented or leased is to be returned to the lessor upon termination of the lease, and

Third, that the value of the use of the object may be determined *with reference to the time of use.*

For example, we may rent a granary but we cannot rent the grain therein. We may rent a bucksaw but not a woodpile. A furnace may be rented but not the anthracite to be consumed therein. We may rent a dress suit but not a box of cigars. We rent a garden but not the potatoes.

In the first class we may either rent or buy from the title-holder. In the second class we can only get the "use" by buying and the value can be determined only by purchase in open market.

The term "rental value" has exactly the same implication when applied to mines. The inherent impossibility of determining the rental value of a mine (or, rather, of a mine having rental value) results from the following facts:—

(a) "Their use involves the destruction of their value by exhaustion of the mineral.

(b) "The only value of a mine is in the product that must be taken away in order to realize the value.

(c) "The time of exhaustion would depend upon the rapidity of the working."

From (a) and (b) it follows that the real "social problem" is taxation of minerals in the lands and not the lands themselves.

The value socially important to obtain is that of the mineral product and does not attach to the "non-mineral" portion of the mine. So understood, the analogy of the barrel of sugar is seen to express a fundamental likeness and the impossibility of a true relation of "lessor" and "lessee" becomes manifest.

The time of "working out" a mine depends upon the caprice of the "owner." So also does the return from the working of the mine for any stated period. These depend upon the amount of capital and labor that the owner may choose to use. The value of the product has therefore no relation whatever to the time of use either of the "mine" or

the mineral contents. This circumstance alone is clearly fatal to any attempt to apply the term "rental value" to a mine.

Furthermore rent is defined, I believe, correctly on page 365 of the Year Book; as "what land is worth for use . . . it is an annual value of location." Note that here the necessary relation between the rent and "time of use" is insisted upon. Also that it arises from "location." Now, location of a mine gives no measure at all of the value of the mine, as the same mine may contain any quantity of mineral from \$1 worth up to, say, \$100,000. Accessibility of course affects the value of *the mineral product*, but this is a very different thing from "an annual value of location."

Or to test our conclusion by Ricardo's definition of rent as "the excess of value that can be produced upon it over what can be produced upon the poorest land in use with the same exertion, or as we say with the same expenditure of labor and capital." Take a simple test case. A mining claim "C" contains \$100,000 of cobalt which it costs \$10,000 to remove. The adjoining claim "D" contains only \$10,000 of cobalt, which it costs \$10,000 to remove. As the net profit on "D" is zero, it is, we may assume, "the poorest land in use." By this definition the "rent" of the claim "C" is \$90,000—the excess of value of the product over what "D" produces. This is of course the purchase price of the cobalt *as it lies in the mine*, assuming that such could be known in advance of purchase. Application of the term rent to such "excess product" is manifestly absurd.

This conclusion cannot be affected by the fact that in some cases we can ascertain the quantity and quality of minerals while "in situ." while in other cases we cannot. A mine may consist of a site containing only a single gold nugget in plain view, or it may contain the same quantity of gold scattered from the centre to the surface of the earth, either pure or in various chemical combinations. In either case the value of the mine is the market value of the gold less the cost of extraction and bringing to market, *and this is evidently true in all cases.*

Comparisons with adjoining sites may sometimes be useful in estimating the quantity and quality of minerals in a given site. This may give some indication of *the value of*

the product and this is no doubt what was in mind when the writer of the above article says that "a fair estimate may be made by comparisons." In the vast majority of cases, however, it is clearly impracticable to "determine in advance the productive capacity."

The "practicable compromise" recommended in said article is in effect an admission of the non-existence of rental value of a mine. If the "rental value" can be determined at all it may be done now as well as at any future time. If a "part of the rental value" is to be taken what fraction shall be taken? Is the same fraction to be taken of the "rental value" of all mines or is a different standard to be used in each individual case? If a uniform standard is adopted of what values shall the fraction be taken? How shall we know when we have absorbed the whole "rental value" in the tax, or when we have exceeded the "rental value." No doubt a small amount may be levied and called a "rent" as is done in our Canadian mining statutes, but calling it a "rent" does not make it so. These perplexities evidently arise from the false assumption that mines have a true rental value, and disappear as soon as we admit that the "rental value" of a mine is a pure myth.

Recognition of this truth simplifies our problem. Mines having no true "rental value," a periodic tax plan is inappropriate. Whatever plan is adopted it must be one dealing with the mineral itself. As the mineral cannot be effectively dealt with after alienation of the lands, the title to the lands should remain in the state, and title to all mineral lands that have been alienated should be resumed by the state. The mineral products may then be extracted and applied directly by the state for its own purposes, as, for example, gold for currency, cement for government buildings, bridges and highways, etc. Or in the case of minerals required for private purposes the state may sell the minerals direct to the consumer. Where this is done the state must evidently perform all steps necessary to ascertain the quantity and quality of mineral sold so as to determine the proper market price. Sale in some cases might be made without removing the mineral, as in the case of a salt bed or coal vein situated upon the surface of the site. In other

cases removal and various means of measurement and analysis must be used.

These proposals constitute an important limitation of the sphere of the Singletax, and an addition to the province of State Socialism, the "bete noir" of the Singletaxer. The Singletaxer in conceding this field to the Socialist is still supreme in the vastly greater and more valuable area in which true ground rent arises. A correct appreciation of the fact that the "rental value" of a mine is a mere phantom will, it is conceived, clarify this foggy department of the "dismal science." It will further help to unite the splendid but at present discordant enthusiasms of the Singletax and Socialist schools and will greatly increase the effectiveness of the big drive upon their common enemy.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week ending September 25

Congressional Doings

In a letter to the Conference Committee of the House and Senate on the revenue bill dated September 15, Amos Pinchot called attention to the propositions put forward at the beginning of the war for a pay-as-you-go policy and conscription of wealth. He said further in part:

We went personally before the Ways and Means and Finance Committees and begged these gentlemen to remember, in framing the revenue bill, that, while rich men and large corporations are making immense, in fact quite unparalleled profits out of the war, the rank and file of the American people, who must do the fighting and produce the vast quantities of supplies which, at this time, are at least as necessary as armies, are not making anything out of the war. In fact, they are growing steadily poorer on account of runaway prices extending to almost every article that the average family has to buy. And finally, we tried and tried again to make our wise and experienced legislators realize what one might suppose would be plain enough to any sane adult, whose mind was not twisted by self-interest—that it is against human nature for a man to fight cheerfully, if he sees the cause, for which he is giving his life's blood, used by other men (yes, by our "best people," by the most wealthy, powerful and patriotic-spoken citizens in the land) for sordid and unpatriotic purposes. . . .

It is up to every real American citizen to see to it that the war is conducted honorably, and not degraded into a golden business opportunity for a small minority of unpatriotic persons.

Neither the United States nor any other country can carry on a war which will make the world safe

for democracy and for plutocracy at the same time. If the war is to serve God, it cannot serve Mammon. And any man who tries to make it do both is not merely attempting the impossible; he is fighting his own country in the most effective way. . . .

But what makes it more serious, and this is the condition to which I want to call your attention, is that some of our principal financiers and captains of industry, who have been called by the Government to serve upon the Council of National Defense, are the main offenders in the unpatriotic business of discrediting the war by commercializing it. In close co-operation with the Government, in daily conference with our highest executive officers, these men are combining two irreconcilable functions. They are sitting in the morning as foremost patriots, actively directing the mobilization of America's resources, and they are spending their afternoons in taking advantage of the necessity of the people and the Government by making legalized, but none the less destructive, financial raids upon them—raids so profitable as to make us look back, almost with gratitude, at the comparative moderation of American profiteers during the Civil War.

He then appended a list of members of the Council of National Defense who are making money out of the war. The list mentions Julius Rosenwald, E. J. Berwind, J. J. Storrow, S. M. Vaucain, F. C. Pratt, Theo. N. Vail, W. D. Simmons, N. C. Kingsbury, J. F. McElwain, A. B. Thielens, Andrew Fletcher, W. G. Garritt, Charles P. Hall, Julius Kessler, William H. Nichols, Horace Baker, William Hamlin Childs, John D. Ryan, James McLean, Charles M. MacNeill, Elbert H. Gary, E. A. S. Clarke, Ambrose Monell, Murry Guggenheim, Thos. F. Manville, Charles M. Schwab, Chas. W. Baker, N. Bruce MacKelvie, Charles F. Brooker, R. L. Aggasiz, E. C. Lufkin, P. A. S. Franklin and Moses L. Shuttleworth. The combined earnings of concerns in which these men are interested showed in 1916 an excess of \$640,083,669 over the pre-war average, and such figures as are available for 1917 indicate that profits will be much larger this year. An estimate of \$1,200,000,000 does not seem excessive and for all war-profiting concerns \$3,600,000,000 seems a fair estimate of this year's excess profits. He further said:

As for the workingman, take the case of Phelps, Dodge & Co. in Arizona. Their mines were the scene of the activities of the I. W. W., who in Bisbee urged the employes to strike. The net earnings of Phelps, Dodge & Co. in the pre-war period averaged \$7,442,339 a year. In 1916, the net earnings were \$21,974,263. God knows what they will be this year. Does any intelligent man suppose that, if Phelps, Dodge & Co., instead of taking the \$14,000,000 above average earnings out of the people and the Government, had sold copper at a reasonable price or paid their employes a fair share of their abnormal profits, there would have been any labor troubles in their district? If they had done this, instead of acting the unpatriotic part of greedy war profiteers, neither the I. W. W. nor any other labor organization in the world

could have persuaded the men to make trouble for their employers. The deportation of I. W. W. leaders from Bisbee was ill advised.

If somebody had to be deported on account of the strike, it should have been those who were truly responsible for it—and they were not at Bisbee.

Again, suppose the wage-earner is an employe, of the U. S. Steel corporation. His employer is netting about \$550,000,000 this year as against the pre-war average of \$63,500,000. This, too, is an invitation to strike for more pay. If the employes do so, however, they are denounced by the press as undesirable citizens under the influence of the kaiser's money. The Government and Mr. Gompers descend on the plant at the lunch hour and say, "Boys, be patriotic, don't strike. We are at war; this is no time for discord. Capital and labor must fight hand in hand. You and your employers must have only one thought till the war is over, and that thought is to make the world safe for democracy, irrespective of sordid personal gain.

I need not remind you that not only the Government, but numerous private associations, are trying to stamp out public criticism of the war. The Department of Justice is organizing raids upon speakers, political organizations and labor groups. Judges and police magistrates are imposing heavy sentences for alleged disloyalty. A few days ago a New York police magistrate stated, as a reason for sentencing a street speaker to a term in the workhouse, the fact that he was guilty of speaking disrespectfully of the part our great corporations are playing in the war. Conventions even are being held by nervous patriots to emphasize loyalty, unity, belief in the war; and prominent individuals like Mr. Elihu Root are going about the country advising the Government to incarcerate its critics, or string them to lamp posts that democracy may live; while in editorial rooms the dictionaries are being thumbed for fresh adjectives with which to denounce our objectors and iconoclasts.

On September 19 the House passed the Trading-With-The-Enemy bill, already passed by the Senate. The provision was amended which required German language papers to print English translations in parallel columns of criticism of the Government. The amendment applies to all papers printed in a language other than English, but relieves them of printing of translations in parallel columns, requiring instead that these be filed with the local postmaster. [See current volume, page 916.]

The House passed on September 21 the \$11,538,000,000 bond bill, which had passed the Senate.

At the memorial session on September 16 for Senator Lane of Oregon, one of the eleven "willful men," denounced for preventing passage of the "Armed Neutrality" bill, Senators who had favored the measure praised his courage and patriotism. Senator Chamberlain of Oregon, said:

His attitude with respect to armed neutrality and the war with the Imperial German Government

proved more than any of his public acts his great moral courage. He was at variance with the great majority of his colleagues, and did not fear to give expression to his views. He hated war, and his tender heart and the horror of bloodshed led him to hope that a crisis might be averted. But his motives were misunderstood by enemies and friends alike, with the result that he was most brutally and unjustly assailed by many of the public journals throughout the country. The injustice of these attacks, in my opinion, made acute a disease that was lurking in his system, and unquestionably hastened his death. He was charged with engaging in a filibuster against the armed neutrality bill, which was wholly unmerited. He was charged with treachery to his country which was entirely untrue.

Said Senator Jones of Washington:

Men of his stamp and courage are essential to a republic. The success of representative government depends not only upon the wisdom but upon the courage of those intrusted with authority.

Senator Husting of Wisconsin, said:

Like Henry George, he was for men . . . Senator Lane was patriotic. He loved his country; he loved its institutions; he loved its democracy.

* *

Before the House Committee on Mines on September 18, Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin charged the Anaconda Copper Mining Company with checking the production of copper through refusal to negotiate with its employees. She declared that the company discharges men who complain of working conditions or attempt to join a union. At election times it coerces the men to support its candidates. She demanded that the Government take over and operate the corporation's property.

* *

Woman suffrage won a preliminary victory in the House on September 24, on a vote to create a Committee on Woman Suffrage. It carried by 181 to 107. This is regarded as a test of strength on the Federal amendment.

* *

That a joker was inserted in the enemy trading bill is charged by Senator Norris, of Nebraska. The joker makes the Postmaster General an irresponsible censor of the press. A paragraph so drawn as to appear at first glance to apply only to foreign language papers, contains at the end the following:

and it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, corporation, or association to transport, carry, or otherwise publish or distribute the same, or to transport, carry, or otherwise distribute any matter which is non-mailable by the provisions of the act relating to espionage, approved June 15, 1917.

This it is claimed, empowers the Postmaster General to declare any matter unmailable under the espionage act, regardless of what reason he may have therefor and regardless of the language in which it may be printed.

Producers and Consumers Meet

Held under auspices of the Farmers Nonpartisan League with the co-operation of the American Fed-

eration of Labor and other industrial organizations, the National Producers and Consumers Convention in session at St. Paul from September 18 to 20, adopted a platform dealing with exceedingly many subjects. After declaring that political democracy is but a means to industrial democracy, the preamble pledges "Our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to our country and our flag in this, our war," and declares that, true to the ideals of their fathers and single in the purpose to make the world safe for democracy, politically and industrially, the farmers of sixteen States and labor unionists of eleven States "do hereby reaffirm our unalterable loyalty and allegiance to our fellow citizens and our Government in this world struggle and in their every need." Support is pledged to the Government in its great task of regulating the food supply, price fixing and dealing with profiteering. The profiteers are roundly condemned.

The Government is urged to take speedy steps to see that the substantial reduction in the price of wheat is passed on to the consumers. If this cannot be done, then the Government is urged to take over the whole wheat flour and bread business, from farmer to consumer.

The Government is urged to lend money to farmers who lack funds to buy seed wheat, to dispense with the services of middlemen in buying wheat, to imitate the French zone system of dealing with wheat and flour prices, and to make the milling value of wheat the basic test of price and grade.

The Government is urged to take the profits of war and the surplus of production "as it comes to the surface through swollen dividends and incomes" and apply them to pay for the war while it is being fought, instead of borrowing.

The following planks appear among others:

We favor direct political action through the initiative, referendum and recall of elected officials with the right of all citizens to equal participation in all elections.

As a means of raising war revenue we earnestly urge the conscription of such wealth as it may be found possible to conscript without hampering the operation of industry necessary to the support of the civilian population as well as the maintenance of army and navy to the highest efficiency and as regular war revenue sources we urged the levy of a two per cent. tax upon the value of all unused or inadequately used land, whether in city or rural districts and income taxes levied upon all incomes in excess of \$2,000, so that the total net income of any individual shall not exceed \$100,000 per annum.

We declare for public ownership of public utilities, and that all of the great basic industries are public utilities, and further, we do emphatically endorse the resolutions of the miners of Butte in favor of Government operation of the copper mines.

We heartily endorse the principle of labor unionism, and we urge that the closest possible affiliation and friendly relations be maintained between organized farmers and organized workers in the struggle of each industrially and politically.

We emphatically indorse as being worthy the support of every good and loyal citizen of our

country the reply of our Government to the Pope's peace appeal, and we commend and approve of our Government's efforts to inform the German people that our war is not a war for their injury, but for the establishment of that liberty without which all liberty and democracy is unsafe, and we pledge our support and approve all further efforts to unite our Government and its Allies behind this clear statement of our purposes, in order that the war may not continue one day longer than is necessary to attain the noble objects of the American people.

The number of delegates as stated in press dispatches to have been "several thousand" representing organizations with a combined membership exceeding 3,000,000. An address of welcome was made by Mayor V. R. Trome of St. Paul. In opening the first session President A. C. Townley of Farmers Nonpartisan League said in part:

There is a great difference between our patriotism, the patriotism of the men who toil that the profiteers may make four billions of dollars, and the patriotism of the men who make the billions. While the farmers and other producers have been raising crops to feed the armies of liberty, making ships and munitions and implements of war, a lot of gentlemen have been spending their ample leisure in announcing their patriotism. When you work sixteen hours a day for liberty and democracy you haven't much time or will to wave the flag. . . .

It is our duty to support the government in its efforts to fix prices, and if it were not for the patriotism of iron and steel and coal and flour we would have a square deal to-day. Let the Government make those gentlemen produce without profit, as it is making us do, and they will quickly say to the Government: "Here, take these things. We can't use them." And then we shall have Government ownership. Their patriotism is of the kind that it takes war profits to make work. After these fine gentlemen have been trimmed they will have some real patriotism, and the country will be ahead that much.

It will grade about No. 4, at that, but it will not be "feed wheat" or "rejected," like the kind they have now. When you take the profit out of war no one will be interested in keeping this war for liberty and democracy going any longer than is necessary to save them. If it is right to conscript your son's life, that most precious life, it is right to conscript the coal and steel that God made.

Mr. Townley further said that in consequence of intimations that interests opposed to the Government are financing the Nonpartisan League, he has written to the Department of Justice asking that it examine the League's books and records, and stated further in his letter:

We hereby challenge the National Security League, the National Defence League, the Navy League and similar organizations to make the same offer officially as we do to the Department of Justice, and respectfully ask the Department of Justice to give the widest publicity to all facts it ascertains regarding our activities and financing

and the findings with reference to above-named organizations.

Congressman John M. Baer said in part:

To allow monopolistic concerns to fatten on the world's misery and at the same time to stab at the most vital nerve in the economic system is like an unskilled surgeon cutting the main artery in the body to cure a toothache. I believe that your Congressmen should see that food and other profiteers, the real traitors in this time of stress, should be made to pay the money cost of this war. Wealth must be compelled to pay the money cost of the war, for the common people haven't the money to give. But the soldiers should not be made to pay the immense taxes after their return with bodies maimed and broken in the service of their country.

Senator La Follette addressed a mass meeting attended by 10,000 at the close of the conference. Press reports show that his address was vigorously applauded, but his statements were so obviously garbled in the dispatches that no report can be fairly made, other than that he spoke on war issues. Mayor Van Lear of Minneapolis, also addressed the meeting. Among others who addressed the convention or the mass meeting were Congressman Young of North Dakota, J. M. Hogan, Commissioner of Agriculture of North Dakota, J. M. Anderson, president of the Equity Co-operative Exchange, Ex-Senator J. L. McLaurin of South Carolina, Senator W. E. Borah of Idaho, George P. Fischer of the Illinois Typographical Union, Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, Judge Eli Torrance of Minneapolis, President H. J. Waters of the Kansas Agricultural College, Jacob Panken of New York City, Joseph Gilbert of St. Paul, W. C. Colver of the Federal Trade Commission, Senator Gronna of North Dakota, George P. Hampton and others. A speech by J. P. Coughlin, president of the Central Labor Union of Brooklyn on "What Labor Wants" was vigorously approved by farmers and labor unionists.

Business Men's Convention

At the convention of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Atlantic City on September 18, Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane delivered an address on the war, declaring that we fear Germany and that Germany must give up hope of mastering the world with explosives and intrigue. On September 19, Food Administrator Herbert C. Hoover addressed the meeting, declaring that "one looming shadow of the war is the drift toward Socialism," and he warned the business men that Socialism will come "unless we can prove the economic soundness and willingness for service of our commercial institutions." Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson spoke on the following day. He said that there is unrest principally because the story has gone forth, in the iron and steel industry, for instance, that employers are making a profit of from 200 to 400 per cent., and similar conditions exist in shipbuilding, mining and other lines. He said that the real reason business men wish to deal with employes as individuals is because that gives the employer the advantage. Speaking further, he said:

So far as the employe is concerned he may ap-

preciate your generosity, admire your charity in the housing conditions and other fine surroundings in which you place him; but perhaps he would rather live in a log cabin, a home of his own, and on hominy of his own production than live in a palace and feel that it came from charity. The employe wants the right and privilege of doing something for himself. Now, you employers have the advantage of experience. Your contact with the world gives you a broader view than the employe can possibly have. It is only when he has the opportunity of selecting skilled men to speak for him that he comes anywhere near you in advantages.

Resolutions were adopted on September 21, demanding legislation that will give the Government control of any business it desires to regulate and calling for an arbitration board for industrial disputes and binding members of the Chamber to accept its decisions. Profiteering was denounced, and the passage of the Webb-Pomerene bill was demanded exempting export trade from operation of the anti-trust law.

Public Ownership Conference

A national Public Ownership Conference has been called to meet at Chicago on November 25, 26 and 27 as a result of a referendum vote by the Public Ownership League of America. All friends of municipal and public ownership are urged to attend. The object is to bring together advocates of the principle to study public utility problems and consider ways and means of advancing the cause. Among subjects for discussion are the proposals of the Federal Trade Commission for public ownership of railways and mines, postalization of telegraph and telephone and conservation of natural resources. Among the speakers who have agreed to come are David J. Lewis, Florence Kelley, Louis F. Post, Gifford Pinchot, R. F. Pettigrew, A. M. Todd, Judson King, Walter J. Millard, Herbert S. Bigelow, Mayor Daniel W. Hoan of Milwaukee, Charles Zueblin, F. F. Ingram, Benjamin C. Marsh and others. Full information is to be had from the Public Ownership League, Carl Thompson, Secretary, 4131 N. Keeler Ave., Chicago.

Local Primaries

Primary elections for local nominations were held throughout New York and Pennsylvania on September 19. In New York City Mayor Mitchel, Fusionist, succeeded on the face of the returns in getting the Republican nomination by a majority of 322 over Senator William Bennett. Bennett has demanded a recount, a petition for his nomination as an independent is in circulation. The Mayor lost in Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond Boroughs. He won in Manhattan and The Bronx. Judge John F. Hylan, Tammany candidate, was nominated by the Democrats without opposition. The Socialists nominated Morris Hillquitt

In Philadelphia the fight for supremacy in the Republican party between the Vare and McNichol factions led to assaults on two McNichol leaders and murder of a policeman, who had gone to their rescue.

The crime turned out to have been committed by one of a group of gunmen imported from New York City for election work. Mayor Smith, a Vare adherent, who though warned of impending trouble, had refused to take preventive measures, was arrested for complicity in the murder and held under \$10,000. bail. The McNichol faction triumphed at the election in the very ward where the ruffianly tactics were employed.

Socialist candidates for councilmen received the heaviest vote at the primaries in Erie and in New Castle, Pa. At Reading, though not highest, their vote was high enough to put all of their candidates on the ballot for the first time.

Postal Depotism Continues

Although *The American Socialist*, official organ of the Socialist party, has ceased publication and its circulation has been taken over by the *Eye-Opener*, published in Chicago, the Post Office Department has withheld its sanction to the transfer for a month and it is still withholding it. The reason given for the delay on August 28, was that the Department believed that the *American Socialist* was still being published. An affidavit was then submitted to the effect that it had ceased publication, but nothing further was heard. Finally the Free Press Defense League took the matter up with the Department in Washington and was informed that Solicitor W. H. Lamar is still investigating the matter, although he has had all facts in his possession for some time.

Labor Matters

To settle the labor troubles in the West, President Wilson appointed a commission on September 20. The commission consists of Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson, J. L. Spangler of Pennsylvania, Verner Z. Reed of Colorado, John H. Walker of Illinois, and E. P. Marsh of Washington.

A temporary settlement of the San Francisco shipyard strike was reached on September 23. The terms have not been made public. The men had demanded a 50 per cent. increase or a minimum wage of \$6 a day. The employers had offered a ten per cent. increase. A temporary schedule was agreed to pending final adjudication by the Federal Board of Conciliation. The settlement was brought about by Gavi McNab, a local attorney, as special representative of the Federal Shipping Board.

Delegates of Federal employes met in Washington on September 19 and formed a national union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. A reclassification of the service in the interest of farmers, a \$3 a day minimum wage, and pension for superannuated employes were favored. The convention also endorsed woman suffrage, the initiative and referendum and the eight-hour day.

Mexico

A dispatch of September 18 says that General Francisco Villa has offered to surrender to the Carranza general in Chihuahua on condition of being granted full amnesty and that his men receive the

honors of war. The offer has been forwarded to the War Department at the City of Mexico.

Russia

A Petrograd dispatch of September 19 says that the growing power of the Bolsheviki element in the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council is causing concern. Their program, it is reported, would exclude all property owners from a voice in the Government. The Executive Committee of the Council has resigned owing to adoption of radical resolutions by a large majority of the delegates, but the retiring members intend to offer themselves for re-election and thus make an issue of the matter.

European War

The most prominent events of the week in connection with the war are the replies of Germany and Austria to the Pope's peace proposal. Both were published on September 22. Germany's reply is signed by Chancellor Michaelis. It claims that the Kaiser has always favored peace and then goes on to say:

Appreciating the importance of his Holiness's declaration, the Imperial Government has not failed to submit the suggestion contained therein to earnest and scrupulous examination. Special measures, which the Government has taken in closest contact with representatives of the German people, for discussing and answering the questions raised prove how earnestly it desires, in accordance with his Holiness's desires and the peace resolution of the Reichstag on July 19, to find a practical basis for a just and lasting peace.

The Imperial Government greets with special sympathy the leading idea of the peace appeal wherein his Holiness clearly expresses the conviction that in the future the material power of arms must be superseded by the moral power of right. We are also convinced that the sick body of human society can only be healed by fortifying its moral strength of right. From this would follow, according to his Holiness's view, the simultaneous diminution of the armed forces of all states and the institution of obligatory arbitration for international disputes.

We share his Holiness's view that definite rules and a certain safeguard for a simultaneous and reciprocal limitation of armaments on land, on sea, and in the air, as well as for the true freedom of the community on high seas, are the things, in treating which the new spirit that in the future should prevail in international relations should find first hopeful expression. The task would then of itself arise to decide international differences of opinion, not by the use of armed forces, but by peaceful methods, especially by arbitration, whose high peace-producing effect we together with his Holiness fully recognize.

The Imperial Government will in this respect support every proposal compatible with the vital interest of the German Empire and people.

Germany, owing to her geographical situation and economic requirements, has to rely on peaceful intercourse with her neighbors and with distant countries. No people, therefore, has more

reason than the German people to wish that instead of universal hatred and battle that a conciliatory fraternal spirit should prevail between nations. If the nations are guided by this spirit it will be recognized to their advantage that the important thing is to lay more stress upon that which unites them in their relations. They will also succeed in settling individual points of conflict which are still undecided, in such a way that conditions of existence will be created which will be satisfactory to every nation and thereby a repetition of this great world catastrophe would appear impossible.

Only on this condition can a lasting peace be founded which would promote an intellectual rapprochement and a return to the economic prosperity of human society. This serious and sincere conviction encourages our confidence that our enemies also may see a suitable basis in the ideas submitted by his Holiness for approaching nearer to the reparation of future peace under conditions corresponding to a spirit of reasonableness and to the situation in Europe.

The Austrian reply is signed by Emperor Charles. It compliments the Pope most highly, expresses a strong desire that the war may end, declares that "The future arrangement of the world must be based on the elimination of armed forces, on the moral force of right and on the rule of international justice and loyalty endorses the Pope's suggestions of restriction of armaments "gradually to a fixed limit, and whereby the seas, which rightly belong to all the nations of the earth, may be freed from domination or paramountcy, and be opened equally for the use of all," and advocates compulsory arbitration of international disputes. It then states:

If, as we most heartily desire, agreements should be arrived at between the belligerents which would realize this sublime idea and thereby give security to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy for its unhampered future development, it can then not be difficult to find a satisfactory solution of the other questions which still remain to be settled between the belligerents in a spirit of justice, and of a reasonable consideration of the conditions for existence of both parties.

If the nations of the earth were to enter, with a desirable peace, into negotiations with one another in the sense of your Holiness's proposals, then peace could blossom forth from them. The nations could attain complete freedom of movement on the high seas, heavy material burdens could be taken from them, and new sources of prosperity opened to them.

Guided by a spirit of moderation and conciliation, we see in the proposals of your Holiness a suitable basis for initiating negotiations with a view to preparing a peace, just to all and lasting, and we earnestly hope our present enemies may be animated by the same ideas. In this spirit we beg that the Almighty may bless the work of peace begun by your Holiness.

* * *

Gains were made by the British on an eight-mile front at Ypres on September 20. The German report admits that they were compelled to retreat.

Elsewhere on the Western front fighting has made little change. On the Italian front an Austrian attack on the Trentino district was repulsed on September 21. The Rumanians reported on September 19 a successful storming of a height south of Grozehti, in the Ocana region. On the Russian front the Germans have made a further advance, taking the town of Jacobstadt, on the Dvina, on September 22. [See current volume, page 917.]

British losses from submarine attacks for the week ending September 16 were 62,000 tons, as against a weekly average for August of 118,000 tons; for July of 115,000, and for the six months since the warfare began in February of 135,000.

Another air raid on England took place on September 24. Airplanes appeared in different parts of Kent and Sussex and some reached London. Casualties reported are 6 killed and 20 injured.

By a vote of 23 to 1 the Senate of Argentina declared on September 19 for breaking off diplomatic relations with Germany. The Chamber of Deputies was about to vote on the resolutions on September 23 when Foreign Minister Pueyrredon presented a report from the Argentina Minister at Berlin informing him that Chancellor Michaelis disapproved of Luxemburg's suggestion concerning sinking without leaving a trace of Argentina vessels. The minister further stated: "There is no doubt, therefore, that the German Empire condemns the conduct of Luxemburg, whose opinions were purely personal, and it disapproves absolutely. You may be sure the German Government will faithfully keep its promises." Another note from the minister denies the truth of the report that the Kaiser sent Luxemburg a message of approval. On receipt of this information the Chamber of Deputies postponed action.

On September 21, Secretary of State Lansing gave out the following message:

The Secretary of State issues the following message from Ambassador von Bernstorff to the Berlin Foreign Office, dated January 22, 1917:

I request authority to pay out up to 50,000 (fifty thousand) dollars in order as on former occasions to influence Congress through the organization you know of, which can perhaps prevent war.

I am beginning in the meantime to act accordingly.

In the above circumstances a public official German declaration in favor of Ireland is highly desirable, in order to gain the support of Irish influence here.

On the following day the Committee on Public Information made a statement regarding evidence of disbursements in the United States having been found among the papers of Wolf von Igel. These papers are said to show that money was paid to militant advocates of Irish independence in the United States, and to pro-German publications. The committee mentions by name the *Gaelic American* and *Fair Play* as papers where editors are alleged to have

received money. Judge Cohalan, of New York City, is charged with having urged in April, 1916, that aid be given by Germany to the revolutionists in Ireland. Jeremiah O'Leary and George Sylvester Viereck are also charged with similar plotting.

On September 23, Secretary Lansing disclosed that the Rumanian authorities had discovered in the German legation at Bucharest boxes of explosives and microbes. This was immediately after the country had declared war and the legation was in charge of the American minister. Enclosed in the inside of a box of microbes was a note as follows:

Inclosed 4 small bottles for horses and 4 for cattle. Utilization as formerly stipulated. Each phial suffices for 200 head. If possible, to be administered directly into the animals' mouths, otherwise into their fodder. We ask for a small report about successes obtained there, and in case of good results the presence for one day of M. K.—would be required.

NOTES

—The Daylight Saving Act of Australia has been repealed.

—Rates on the State-owned railways of New South Wales and Victoria have been increased 10 per cent. In the case of coal when carried in privately owned cars the advance has been made 15 per cent. In Sydney the lowest street railway fare has been increased to three cents. It has hitherto been two cents. The charges of four cents and six cents for long trips remain as before. Interstate railroad passenger fares between Sydney and Melbourne, and Sydney and Brisbane remain the same.

—The value of church property in the United States exempt from taxation in 1916 was \$1,650,000,000, according to Director Samuel L. Rogers of the United States Census Bureau.

—The House of Keys, the local legislature of the Isle of Man, has protested against the veto by the British Treasury Department of a bill it has passed levying an inheritance tax. The proceeds of this tax were to be applied to old-age pensions. The House of Keys claims the right of other self-governing parts of the Empire to raise local revenue for the island in whatever way it may see fit.

—The Dutch authorities at The Hague, in order to conserve the coal supply have ruled that the gas pressure in that city be reduced between the hours of four and nine p. m. each day to such a degree that it cannot be used for warming or cooking purposes. Street car companies must reduce the amount of coal used for generating purposes to 75 per cent. of July consumption.

—Governor Ferguson of Texas was convicted on September 22 of misappropriation of funds by the State Senate. This sustains 10 of 21 charges made in impeachment proceedings. The vote against the Governor was 27 to 4.

—Mrs. Robert Lansing, wife of the Secretary of State, has been elected secretary of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage and announced her acceptance on September 22.

—The price of copper was fixed at 23½ cents per pound by President Wilson on September 20 after a conference with operators, who agreed to exert every effort to keep up production, sell at the same price to public and government, and refrain from reducing wages.

—After a conference with the Food Administration Board on September 20, beet sugar producers agreed to make the retail price of sugar after October 15, eight cents a pound. The price to wholesalers will be 7¼ cents.

—Exploitation of the American flag for profiteering was charged by the Federal Trade Commission on September 21 against the Association of Flag Makers of America, which includes 20 of the largest manufacturers in the country. The Commission claims that the association has violated the "unfair competition" clause of the Anti-Trust law.

—In reply to an inquiry from the War Department as to terms on which his assembling plant at Cambridge, Massachusetts, might be had by the Government, Henry Ford telegraphed: "No rent; take it."

—The British House of Commons has by an overwhelming majority voted for the abolition of the Grill, described by the International Woman Suffrage News as "that tangible indignity behind which women auditors in the House of Commons have so long been compelled to sit."

—The Swedish elections ended on September 24. Exact figures of the new Parliament are lacking, but Liberals and Socialists made extreme gains and will have a large majority in the lower house. No announcement has yet been made by the Cabinet, which is Conservative, that it will retire.

—The prize of a free college course offered by the Delaware Singletax Association for the best essay on Singletax by a high school student was awarded on September 20 to Miss Violet E. Morris, of Harrington, Delaware. This is the second year the prize has been awarded. It was won last year by Miss Louise A. Nelson, also of Harrington.

PRESS OPINIONS

The Shame of America's Judiciary

New York Globe, September 15.—The time has arrived for every serious-minded, patriotic American to take note of the Mooney case in San Francisco. This week the Supreme Court of California has affirmed the regularity of the sentence of death pronounced against Mooney after a farcical trial. . . . Mooney is innocent of the crime charged against him. . . . He is the victim of a group of wild men, controlled by the fiercest kind of class hatred, who happen temporarily to be in control of San Francisco's judicial machinery. The testimony given against him is admitted to be a mass of crude perjury. It is contradicted by the most convincing evidence and by documents and circumstances whose weight no one challenges. The case thus appeals to every lover of law and order who realizes that it will go ill

with this country when confidence is lost in the courts. The accusation thus entered against the courts of San Francisco is not a matter of opinion. It is a judgment entered by a regularly empanelled jury. Against Mooney's wife was brought the same charge that was brought against him. The case against her was the same as that against him. The witnesses who swore that they saw him in a taxicab with a suitcase near the scene of the explosion swore that she rode by his side. The jury in her case rejected the testimony as false. If false as to the one defendant it was false as to the other. Mooney has been brought under the shadow of the gallows not because he is a murderer, but because he sought to organize a strike on the San Francisco street railways. A powerful corporation, whose record has been one of corruption and crime, vowed to "get" him. Its detectives "framed up" the testimony, controlled the district attorney's office, and packed the jury. . . . The case, moreover, has an international aspect. When the American mission was in Russia a meeting to protest against the crime was held. The leaders of Russia are not likely to have faith in America as a land of democratic justice and freedom if Mooney swings. They ascribe the capitalistic prosecution of him as comparable to the race savagery of which we complained when Belliss was on trial. . . . Our influence in Russia will be greatly decreased if we do not see that justice is done, and this will make it more difficult to win the war.

BOOKS

Herbert Spencer. By Hugh Elliot. Published by Henry Holt & Co., New York. Price \$2.

An eminent British philosopher has remarked that the only sure way to understand a great man is to begin by letting oneself go in a complete abandonment of blind and uncritical admiration, provided this can be done without prejudice to the reaction which must come to an independent mind when the time arrives for holding the subject of admiration at arm's length, for weighing him up, measuring him round, and estimating him in his true proportions; which is perhaps but another way of saying that only after we have fully appreciated a man's virtues are we qualified or entitled to pass judgment upon his faults or shortcomings. That Mr. Elliot has run through the whole gamut of this experience as a disciple of Herbert Spencer would be evident to the reader of his book, quite apart from the personal confession given in the introduction. Qualified as he thus is for the task of "placing" Spencer in his appropriate niche in the Temple of Fame, Mr. Elliot has produced a book that is satisfactory in every respect, and which was urgently required to complete the bibliography that has grown around the memory of this remarkable man.

Probably no other genius has ever been the subject of such diverse opinions or has been so widely misunderstood as the great apostle of the Under-standing. From Carlyle's "immeasurable ass!" up to the unstinted admiration accorded him by John Fiske, all shades and degrees of contempt, indiffer-

ence and adulation have been expressed by men as well as by manikens. What has been the reason of this astonishing fact? So far as the mysterious reactions of human minds upon each other can ever be understood, an elucidation if not a complete explanation has been provided in this valuable book. Few biographers have had to deal with a character so strangely compounded of greatness and something that looks like littleness. The theories of modern psychology as to the parts played in human life by the subliminal mind and the surface-consciousness respectively must be invoked to throw light upon the curiously contradictory combinations of colossal achievement with habits of idleness, of a faculty for soaring among the Immensities and Eternities, with a certain childish egotism which exudes from the pages of that autobiography which Spencer's sincerest admirers will wish had never been written. Mr. Elliot remarks that while the nineteenth century erred by vastly over-estimating Spencer, the Twentieth century is in danger of forgetting him altogether. This is unfortunately too true. In his own country the reaction towards oblivion had set in even before his death in 1903, in commenting upon which a French editor remarked that if Mr. Spencer had been a celebrated comedian, a distinguished athlete, or a champion football player, Britannia would have wept profusely, but that being only a philosopher she exhibited no signs of grief whatever. Time, however, brings men and opinions into their true perspective, and it may now appear that the temporary occultation from which Spencer's genius has suffered has not been due to a deficient appreciation of philosophers, but to the inevitable reaction from an almost servile admiration to a too cold and critical estimation of his logical aberrations and divagations of judgment.

Mr. Elliot has undoubtedly laid his finger upon what was at once the source of Spencer's strength and weakness—his predilection for deductive reasoning. There is ample evidence that, with a facility with which few men are endowed, he reached forward in early life to broad generalizations intuitively, and without the necessity of laboriously working towards them by the inductive method of observation, comparison and interpretation of facts. These generalizations were, for the most part trustworthy, and must remain as a perpetual testimony to his marvellous instinct for the apprehension of cosmic laws. But all special endowments have their own attendant dangers, and the danger which follows this gift of instinctive generalization is that of making the facts fit the theory rather than the theory the facts, as is done by the inductive reasoner. And a still more subtle danger lies, as Mr. Elliot has indicated, in the tendency, not to twist or distort facts but to select them; to lay hold of those that agree with the generalization and ignore the others, forgetful of the truth that one unexplained fact may discredit the widest theory. To quote Mr. Elliot in illustration: "According to Spencer, the militant and industrial regimes are antagonistic; a rapid industrial development carries with it an immense increase of individual liberty and a reduction in the functions of the State. And yet in Germany the industrial development has gone with a corresponding

military development and an extension of state functions." The partial discredit into which Spencer as a sociologist has fallen, is probably due to the discovery by the common-sense of mankind that some few of his generalizations have failed, like this one, to cover all the facts they were supposed to have held together.

The theory, for example, adopted early in youth and given to the world in the pamphlet entitled "The proper sphere of government" assumed that protection from external enemies and prevention of aggression by one citizen upon another, constitute the only justification for the existence of a government. Having adopted this generalization as his datum, and following his natural tendency to see only the facts that suited his theory, it is not difficult to understand how he missed sight of the all-important truth that in addition to the function of a glorified police-office there remains that of administering the social estates for the benefit of society, a function and duty which will lie upon government as long as society endures, and long after police forces have become unnecessary. The very existence, indeed, of "social estates," (so logically deduced in "Social Statics" from his own law of equal freedom) seems to have been forgotten in all his subsequent dissertations on the proper functions of government.

Again, it seems as though Spencer's whole philosophic system had suffered from his occasional unwillingness to trust his own theories to their furthest conclusions. For example, the analogy he draws between the body physical and the body politic is extremely convincing. The differentiation and mutual dependence of parts; the physiological as compared with the sociological division of labor; the aggregations of living cells as contrasted with integrated populations of separate human individuals; all the comparisons seem to point to an absolute similarity of constitution, and consequently to the need for similar conditions of health and well-being in the case of a society as in that of an individual organism. Had he followed this analogy to wherever it might have led, Spencer's final conclusions in sociology would probably have been vastly different from those with which his name has been associated. But at two points he explained, the analogy failed.

(1) In the individual, consciousness is concentrated in a small part of the nervous system and the separate cells have no consciousness of their own; while in society, consciousness resides in the individuals only and there is nothing to correspond with the brain of the animal organism. (2) In the individual organism the cells do not move about but are fixed in their positions, while in society the individuals move freely from one part to another. Now in the light of modern psychological and biological research, both these arguments may be questioned or even contradicted. (1) The indisputable facts of mind-healing, suggestion, telepathy and kindred phenomena indicating a control by the subconscious mind of the vital functions of the body, are explicable only on the hypothesis of a certain kind of primitive consciousness in each cell of the physical body, at least as acute as any "social consciousness" that can be found in the vast majority of men and women who make up society. And that society

has a collective consciousness quite different from that of any of its component individuals, and strictly corresponding to the brain of the animal organism, has been demonstrated by the conclusions of what is called "crowd psychology." (2) That the component cells of the physical body do not move freely from one part to another and that the individuals of the social body do, is an assumption that will not bear examination. Biologists tell us that all the cells of the physical body are renewed every seven years, and this seems to imply a constant interchange of positions and readjustment of functions for the individual cells. In the social organism again, the very obvious fact that many of its individuals do move about constantly, has to be counterpoised by the less obvious fact that the great majority of them remain fixed by the clutch of circumstance, and in spite of railroads and steamships, never move far from the positions in which they were born.

Now, by stopping short as Spencer did in the application of his own illuminative analogy; by denying to the social organism a collective consciousness and intelligence analogous to the brain of the animal, he was logically driven to the conclusion that the only thinkable form of a perfect society is that of an assemblage of individuals unrelated to each other except by commercial bonds, each attending exclusively to his own business, and with a government reduced to its lowest possible functioning, that of preventing aggression and enforcing contracts; or what Huxley aptly described as "anarchy plus the police-office." Society having no brain with which to govern itself from within, Spencer was unable to conceive of any form of government other than one imposed from without, the government of the strongest for the benefit of the strongest; and, therefore, from the viewpoint of enlightened radicalism he naturally preached the doctrine that the individuals composing a society should only tolerate so much government as would prevent the invasion of each other's liberties.

Nevertheless, and despite all possible criticisms of the methods by which his conclusions were reached, the world's indebtedness to Herbert Spencer remains incalculable by any ordinary standards. His very errors have served to stimulate the search for truth. The tenacity for example, with which he adhered to the now discredited theory adopted early in his career, of "the transmissibility of acquired characters" and in support of which he marshalled every argument that biology and psychology could supply, has but aided in setting the opposite doctrine of *Weissmanism* on a more secure basis. When a man of transcendent genius is possessed of that absolute sincerity to which Mr. Elliot so generously testifies, the world has great need of him, mistakes and all, and the most unworthy of critics is he who cannot see the sun on account of the spots. When all his limitations are allowed for, it will remain true that Herbert Spencer has left behind him a series of magnificent generalizations which, to many grateful followers groaning under the burden of an unintelligible world, have given unity to life and thought, and invested the Cosmos with a dignity

and grandeur which were singularly lacking in the earlier conceptions and imaginations of men.

ALEX. MAKENDRICK.

"A Brief Guide to Contemporary Literature"

By A. HENRY SCHNEER

985 Whitlock Ave., N. Y. C.

Price 12c. postpaid

Double the Circulation of The Public this year

A BOOK YOU SHOULD HAVE

In the Beacon Biographies of Eminent Americans there was published a few years ago a "Life of Lincoln." It was immediately hailed as one of the great biographies in the English language by Mr. Kerfoot of "Life", and by Miss Tarbell, whose own comprehensive work on Lincoln is recognized by all authorities.

It is a small book of 200 pages, pocket size. The author is Brand Whitlock and he has written a study of Lincoln that every democrat will place amongst the books he treasures. Price, 60c. The binding is cloth with gilt lettering.

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

Colorado Since the Strike

This is the story of a changed order. Who changed it doesn't matter, though no list would be complete that didn't include Mother Jones and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the United Mine Workers and the Industrial Relations Commission.

John Fitch, industrial editor of the Survey, and author of the Steel Workers, has been in Colorado checking up what has been happening there since the great strike.

This is the third visit to the Colorado coal fields and steel districts. The first was in 1909 when he prophesied just such a flare up as came in 1912. The Survey was threatened with legal proceedings if it published his findings by some of the old time managers. We published them and his prophesies came true. His second trip was while the strike was on and his inclusive portrayal commanded national attention. Now for the third chapter.

This is type of the first hard field work of The Survey as a journal of Social Exploration. It is graphic, fair, indispensable. Four months trial \$1.

THE SURVEY

The Journal of Social Work

Room 1201 112 East 19th St., New York City

Paul U. Kellogg, Editor

Edward T. Devine, Graham Taylor, Jane Addams,

Associate Editors