



## The Land Problem in Russia

Count Ilya Tolstoy

---

## An International Platform

J. G. Phelps Stokes

---

## Mr. Hurley and Labor

Published Weekly  
New York, N. Y.

February 23, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy  
Two Dollars a Year



**OSCAR H. GEIGER**  
WHOLE SALE FURRIER

6 WEST 37<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
NEAR 5TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE  
GREELEY 2870

NEW YORK

BY LAJPAT RAI  
**ENGLAND'S DEBT  
TO INDIA**

A very important work on Britain's fiscal policy in India. \$2.00 net  
B. W. HUEBSCH Publisher New York

**LEARN Suggestive Therapeutics**  
A course of essentials which may be completed at home in 180 hours. Concise, definite and practical. Well adapted for use of physicians. For full particulars, address, Dept. F-23., Weltmer Institute, Nevada, Mo.

**The Public**  
A Journal of Democracy

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

New York, N. Y., Feb. 23, 1918  
Volume XXI Number 1038

**Contents**

Editorial .....	227
The Land Problem in Russia, Ilya Tolstoy.....	235
A suggested Platform on International Relations, J. G. Phelps Stokes.....	238
About Chinamen.....	241
The Democracy of Mark Twain.....	242
Correspondence .....	243
Books .....	245
News .....	248

EDITORS:  
MRS. JOSEPH FELS

JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER SAMUEL DANZIGER  
GEORGE P. WEST STOUGHTON COOLEY  
BUSINESS MANAGER: STANLEY BOWMAR

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

Single Copy, Ten Cents Yearly Subscription, \$2.00  
Canadian, \$2.50 Foreign, \$3.00

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



Rathery and Cicero at the Seventh Bottle

**MY UNCLE BENJAMIN**  
By CLAUDE TILLIER

A rollicking, witty, satirical French classic. "A novel," say Charles Monselet and Benjamin Tucker, "that belongs in a class with 'Tom Jones,' 'Don Quixote' and 'Pickwick Papers.'" Illustrated with 30 full page masterpieces by Preitorius.

*At all bookstores \$1.60 net. Boni & Liveright, N. Y., Publishers.*

# The Public

A Journal of Democracy

---

Volume XXI

New York, N. Y., February 23, 1918

Number 1038

---

## Editorial

The effort of Germany to make imperialism safe on her eastern border by encouraging the dissolution of Russia into component nationalities, is already proving itself a dangerous game. To satisfy the nationalist aspirations of two adjoining peoples, with the inevitable mixed belt, is an impossibility; to make a friend of the Ukraine is to make an enemy of Poland. It is the policy of Austria to withdraw as soon as possible from the welter of nationalist strife; an independent and friendly Ukraine provides the safety she requires; further interference might start dangerous fires. But the Germans with characteristic stupidity may be counted upon to do what their interest forbids. The latest reports show a resumption of hostilities with a forward movement of troops on the northeastern front, thus belying the supposition that non-resistance has any efficacy. But it indicates blindness as to the future.

\* \* \*

The Bolsheviks, exponents of internationalism, are in the curious position of attempting to overwhelm the emerging nationalities of Russia, thus making themselves the successors of czarism. And just as czarism by oppression kept alive and strengthened nationalist feelings, so the Bolsheviks, by their sanguinary opposition, are hastening that local integration which will provide the component provinces of the future federation. The menace of continued aggression on the part of Germany may prove a useful factor in the achievement of the new unity. With the Bolsheviks out of the way, and German greediness growing with successive devourings, the centralizing tendencies now in abeyance may operate with surprising celerity.

The shipyard workers striking for \$6.60 a day have been told that their action is unpatriotic. Yet, Mr. George J. Baldwin, a representative of their employers, was driven to say in explaining to the Senate Commerce Committee why his corporation needed \$6,000,000 profits: "You can't keep a corporation alive on patriotism. Our stockholders must have their dividends." In other words, no \$6,000,000 dividends, no ships. And because an increase of wages may cut into dividends workers are driven to strike and then denounced as slackers and lacking in patriotism. Mr. Baldwin has frankly admitted what was not unknown before. But his admission makes it less difficult to insist that the workers should not be required to make all the sacrifices. If cutting down of a \$6,000,000 dividend reduces a corporation to living on patriotism alone, then denial of a \$6.60 wage to its employes must compel them to live on less. It would not deplete the \$6,000,000 dividend to give the employes what they want, and the stockholders would still have something in addition to their huge supply of patriotism to live upon.

\* \* \*

A significant paragraph appeared in the *Sunday Standard* of New Bedford, Massachusetts, Feb. 10, in an advertisement of the New Bedford cotton mills. These advertisements are something out of the regular run of publicity, and as the New England cotton manufacturers have long stood as the personification of the protective tariff this statement is worth attention when it says: "Quality is the cornerstone on which New Bedford's success as a cotton manufacturing center has been built in the past, and on which it must rely more and more in the future.

Operating in competition with mills in other States where wages are lower, and hours of labor longer, and where laws which add to production-costs in Massachusetts do not exist, New Bedford mills have to seek business largely on the basis of the quality of their products." One would like to know if any such statement as that was made to the tariff committee. It would also be interesting to know why the New Bedford mills can meet the competition of low wages in Southern States, with which there is free trade, but can not meet the competition of British mills. These cotton mills claim to be paying higher wages than are paid in other States, and to be subject to labor regulations that do not apply elsewhere. May not this be the explanation of the superior quality of their output? Good wages and good treatment secure the best labor, which in the end is the cheapest labor. The next time Congress finds itself in the throes of tariff parturition, it will be interesting to hear the testimony of the New Bedford mill men.

\* \* \*

Straining at gnats and swallowing camels appears to be the only phrase that covers much of the criticism of profiteering. Objection is made to pouring millions of dollars into Hog Island to convert it into a shipyard. Two thousand dollars an acre it is said is too much to pay for waste swamp land. But has not one of the principal owners given a perfectly respectable reason for that price. The land, he says, has been in the possession of his family for more than a hundred years. Truly republics are ungrateful. Here is a self-sacrificing family that has "held" this land for more than a century. A generation would have been a long time; but this is more than three generations. Besides, much of the land is swamp. The feat would have been remarkable had the land been dry; but swampy, water-soaked land! During those long, dreary years a great city of industrious people grew close by, and spread out toward the "held" land. People of the city wished to use the land; they offered large prices for it. But no, the owners preferred to bear the burden alone. And so they continued through the long, trying years to "hold" the swamp land. If such service is not to be rewarded, then, indeed, have we fallen upon evil days. Let the iconoclastic critic pause, ere it is too late. If the nation is not fittingly to re-

ward the family that has "held" Hog Island for more than a century, what shall be said of other families that are "holding" vacant land of vast area throughout the country, including enormous water power and undeveloped mineral resources? Are we not striking at the very basis of modern industrial conditions when we question the price a man sets on his land? Let critics have a care lest they set people to thinking.

### Mr. Hurley and Labor

The strike of carpenters employed in shipbuilding was only symptomatic of conditions in the shipyards that call for drastic action. The carpenters have gone back to work, smarting under the implication cultivated by Mr. Hurley that they are enemies of their country who would ruthlessly take advantage of her necessities. But there is no assurance that other difficulties as serious will not arise in the future, involving further delays. Only Mr. Hurley's status as an employer with a reputation for efficient management and his standing in the business community have saved the entire shipbuilding situation from an exposure of inefficiency that would have aroused justly all the popular wrath and condemnation that certain interests tried in vain to launch against Mr. Baker. The best evidence, for those who have no mind for details, that something is wrong in the management of the shipbuilding program is the fact that the Navy Department, with a huge job of shipbuilding on its hands, has lost not a day through labor disturbances, but has worked in complete harmony with the carpenters' and the other unions engaged in ship construction. It may yet appear as an unfortunate mistake that the entire shipping program was not put in the hands of the Navy Department, where an excellent organization has shown itself capable of great expansion without loss in efficiency.

Officers of the carpenters' organization have no confidence in the Shipping Board because they are convinced that Mr. Hurley has been unable to conquer his prejudice against dealing with employees on a basis of collective bargaining, that his prejudice against unions and union members shows itself in large acts and small, so that while the saturnalia of extravagance and inefficiency at Hog Island went uncorrected and unrebuted, the first sign of recalcitrance on the part of workmen

stirred him to bring down on their heads all the opprobrium that could be manufactured by references to the Tuscaria and the boys in the trenches. They would deserve the severest condemnation that Mr. Hurley could visit upon them if they had wantonly laid down their tools like spoiled boys because every demand had not been instantly met. But what are the facts? At the very moment when Mr. Hurley was dispatching his Tuscaria telegram to Mr. Hutcheson, the Carpenters' National President, addressed to him at Indianapolis, Mr. Hutcheson was in Washington trying in vain to obtain an interview with the Shipping Board head. The carpenters' officials had been trying for weeks to reach an agreement with the Shipping Board that would standardize wages and conditions at the shipyards and provide for the employment of carpenters through the regular employment service of the Department of Labor. In the meantime, carpenters employed in the New York and Baltimore yards refused to continue at work under existing conditions, and went on strike against the instructions and advice of their leaders.

Specific grievances at individual yards are not as important as the situation that lies back of them. Private contractors in each instance have been left free to hire and discharge men as they saw fit, and to pay them whatever wages they pleased. A carpenter might leave his home and go to a distant shipyard where housing and working conditions were bad, and where the chaos that characterizes any new construction job begun in a hurry made the work difficult and trying. In many instances he was put to work at common labor, in other instances he was forced to accept employment at his trade at wages less than those prevailing in the district. If a foreman discharged him, whether with prejudice or without, he found himself out his railroad fare and his pains. In some instances large numbers of skilled men answered the Government's call only to find that there was no work ready for them. Worst of all, no uniform consistent policy prevailed. At one shipyard in California applicants for work learned that they must first pledge themselves to buy sandlots on the installment plan from landowners in league with the shipbuilding company. At another yard applicants were examined as to their membership in a union, and if union men they were told they must first tear up their cards. A conviction became widespread in the carpen-

ters' organization that the open-shop metal trades association and the big steel companies were determined to resist unionism in the shipyards, and that in this they had at least the passive sympathy of Mr. Hurley. Unions in the metal trades had, it is true, signed agreements with the Shipping Board, and the Board's Wage Adjustment Commission had been active. But an initial attempt to include the carpenters' organization in this agreement had failed, and since then the men's representatives had felt themselves antagonized and frustrated in every effort to reach a working basis. They had dealt with the War Department in the building of the cantonments without friction, and their relations with the Navy Department, engaged in rushing the greatest fleet of destroyers in the world to completion, had been entirely harmonious. Secretary Daniels had given personal interviews to the President of the carpenters' organization, once after hours at his office, at another time at his home in the evening. Mr. Hurley sent out subordinates to see him, and at the very time when Mr. Hutcheson was attempting to arrange an interview in Washington addressed to him a highly provoking telegram at Indianapolis.

The Carpenters' Union has a membership of 300,000. Nine thousand of its members are in the Army and 3,500 more above military age are working at the trade for the Army in France. The union maintains a highly efficient employment service, with machinery in every district of the country for furnishing skilled men quickly wherever and whenever they are needed. This machinery has been offered to the Shipping Board, with the assurance that the organization stands ready to furnish as many skilled men as are needed, provided only these men can be assured that some uniform standard of wages and treatment will prevail. The union urges that all employing be done through the employment service of the Department of Labor. No demand is made for the closed, or union shop, either directly or indirectly. On the other hand, members of the union have been refused work by private contractors because they would not tear up their union cards.

But Mr. Hurley will stand no nonsense. He will show them who is boss. We will see who is running this job.

And all the other gestures of that medieval American industrialism that seemed to work so

well in the days when the unemployed were clamoring before the gates of every factory, ready to take the places of men who might dare assert their rights.

Mr. Hurley's cavalier handling of the labor problem is in striking contrast with his toleration of the waste and incompetence at Hog Island. It is a contrast that has not been lost on the workers. Either the Government must take over all shipyards and place every employe on the Government payroll, or administration of labor conditions at the private yards must be vested in a board responsible to the Department of Labor, and in which all classes of workmen will have confidence. Mr. Hurley has demonstrated that he is constitutionally incapable of enlisting the confidence and support of the workmen, and a wage board subordinate to him cannot function effectually. As an employer and industrial executive Mr. Hurley would be an exception if he were any different. His is the type of business executive still prevalent in America. It is a type that depends for results on the existence of a large labor surplus, and the stand-for-anything mood that such a surplus imposes on those workmen fortunate enough to obtain employment. We may be able to forget Hog Island and give Mr. Hurley another chance to prove his efficiency as a manager. But labor administration in the yards should be taken out of his hands.

### An American Labor Party

Perhaps nothing would accomplish so much for the cause of labor in this country as the refusal on the part of Congress to enact legislation nullifying the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hinchman case in which the reactionary majority of the court held that union organizers may not solicit employees without the consent of the employer. This decision and the contempt proceedings and damage suits that will follow it threaten the existence of organized labor, and with a reactionary federal judiciary to deal with, it is scant comfort for responsible union officials to know that the enlightened thought of the country is solidly behind them. The dissenting opinion by Justices Holmes, Brandeis and Clarke is the opinion that eventually will prevail, but meanwhile the growth and the very life of the labor unions is in jeopardy. One of the most important matters to be considered at the forth-

coming convention of the American Federation of Labor will be the planning of a campaign to obtain legislation nullifying the absurd mandate of these stupid old men, who, like their predecessors, have usurped power to thwart the will of the people as clearly expressed in Congressional enactments.

Why, then, would a refusal by Congress to reassert labor's rights react to labor's advantage? Because the American labor movement has reached a stage where its interests require active participation in politics through a separate organization devoted singly to the welfare of the wage earner. Thus far, the old parties have been able to prevent the formation of a labor party by now and then throwing labor a bone. The Clayton Act to legalize union activities was such a bone, and labor rejoiced on the assurance that it was a large and succulent one. But the Hinchman decision may have stripped the meat from it, and a refusal by Congress to make good its intention might convince labor that something was wrong with the system. It was the Taff-Vale decision of similar import that united the British workers in a determination to enter politics "on their own," and the result is the powerful Labor Party that today stands as the chief support of President Wilson's international policy.

A strong Labor Party is the need of the hour in this country. With Woodrow Wilson in the White House, it would act as the left wing of his support, and in presidential elections it would, for some years at least, merely throw its support behind the candidate of another party whose purposes most nearly squared with its own. What is the situation at present? Labor is represented, after a fashion, by about eighteen men of both parties known in the House of Representatives as "the labor group." They have been skillfully led by men of the calibre of Keating of Colorado and Nolan of California, and they have accomplished much by standing together as a compact group for certain measures. But they are a pitiful minority in a body of nearly 500 members. It is doubtful if their existence as a separate group is known to all their fellow-members. Outside of Congress it is not known to one man in a thousand. Their leaders speak with no authority that carries to the country, or even to Washington. Pledged to support certain legislation asked by the Ameri-

can Federation of Labor, they owe no obligation to labor except in this relatively narrow field of remedial legislation, much of which falls within the category of trivial enactments designed to aid labor in small and technical ways. Their authority as a group is limited to measures that have received the official indorsement of the American Federation of Labor or its Executive Council, and they are powerless to speak authoritatively for labor on the many issues that arise over night in these quick-moving times. Their achievements are not to be belittled. The eight-hour day is being widely observed in the nation today because of clauses inserted into appropriation bills through their influence, and the enactment of the Clayton Act was a first important step in mitigating the power of reactionary or venal federal judges. The point is that they function as a group only in the narrow trades union field, and as a group are subject at all times to the decisions of men whose grasp of affairs is limited to the technique of trades unionism. Men belonging to this labor group have been free to work and vote for a protective tariff, to oppose wealth conscription, to favor water-power grabs, to ally themselves with the most reactionary wing of the Republican Party. And they have used this freedom. There has been the spectacle in Washington of Congressmen notorious as servants of privilege and monopoly receiving labor's official O. K. because they had "voted right" on a workmen's compensation bill!

Wage earners as a class are today intent on a thorough-going economic reconstruction. They have definite ideas regarding international policy, and their influence is likely to be sorely needed on short notice in support of democratic principles and against reactionary and imperialistic designs. They should function continuously and effectually as a political force. Their point of view should be reduced to definiteness and made articulate as it could be only by the deliberations of a political organization responsible to them alone. And, policies having been adopted at frequent conferences, their representatives in the political field should be placed in positions where they could present these policies to the country and the Government and obtain for them either acceptance or at least a respectful hearing. It is true enough that today there is no such thing in this country as a body of political opin-

ion or a program of political action that could be identified as that of labor. To formulate a program on which labor could stand in the political field would involve many difficulties. But labor's political vagueness and disorganization, so far from constituting an objection, is the strongest argument for replacing them with a program and an organization in the political field. It is a pitiful and deplorable inadequacy in the American labor movement. The rank and file are thinking. Scores of leaders have evolved programs for themselves and their unions. But when we come to look for the political cutting edge of the labor movement we find only a little group of Congressmen whose efforts as a group are limited to advancing the relatively trivial technical interests of trades unionism. To study the work of this group would be to come to the conclusion that American wage earners had no aspirations and no interests outside of the shop, and that even there their interest stopped with the obtaining of an eight-hour day, safety appliances, and workmen's compensation. Not a single agency exists within the American labor movement for changing the basic principles on which property is owned and industry conducted. Wage earners as a class may believe that coal and iron and copper should be mined and sold to the account of the people. They may believe that private ownership of land should be limited by the theory of beneficial use, and that monopoly in land or natural resources should be abolished. They may feel that the attack on Secretary Baker is inspired by profiteers and imperialists, and that now is the time to say so in the name of labor. They might have felt last summer and fall that Russia could have been saved to the Allies by manifestations of sincere and cordial sympathy and understanding; they may think and believe many things in the course of the next few pregnant years—things that will need saying loudly in the name of labor. There is no agency for saying them.

The fault and the failure cannot be laid at the doors of existing agencies. Administering the affairs of trades unionism is an intensely practical business job. A schedule of Mr. Gompers' days in Washington would probably show an impressive burden of details, each of vast importance to some particular trade, some large group of organized workers. We cannot blame Mr. Gompers for refusing to add to his ad-

ministrative duties that of voicing labor's views on every important issue as it arises, as Mr. Henderson voices the views of British labor. We can blame him only if, in the face of the need, he either fails to initiate or discourages others in initiating a new agency for expressing labor's interests in the wider political and economic field.

The question is a serious one as to whether American labor will be content with the present policy of the Federation. Ferment and change are going on throughout the world. American wage earners will continue to reject pacifist Socialism and Bolshevism. But both will gain many recruits among men who would prefer to work with a labor movement of the British model, unless the American Federation of Labor more adequately meets the needs of the time. It must realize that all of the demand for a more radical political and economic policy does not emanate from pacifists and impossibilists.

### Penrose in Command

There is nothing very surprising in the disclosure that the man who had been chosen to manage the Republican National Committee was in 1914 a strong partisan of the German Government and a defender of the march through Belgium. Those who now control the Republican Party have much more in common with the rulers of Germany than they have with the Russian revolution or the labor movement of England. There is not such a wide difference between German military methods and the methods sanctioned by Messrs. Gary, Frick, Perkins and Morgan in suppressing organization among the employes of the Steel Corporation. The detective force of the Carnegie Steel Company, under their management, has a truly Prussian efficiency. One can imagine a little group of Republicans of this type getting together at the Union League club and saying, confidentially to themselves after a round or two of hot toddies: "After all, you've got to hand it to Germany. They manage these things supremely well. No nonsense with labor agitators, and a fellow like Baker wouldn't last two minutes in Berlin!"

Mr. Adams of Iowa was eliminated, it is true, after publication of his letter extolling Germany. But he was retained as vice-chairman

of the National Committee. And Republicans of the Lincoln tradition will find little comfort in the election of Mr. Hays of Indiana, when all its circumstances are considered. Penrose was supreme during the committee's sessions at St. Louis. It was his approval that elevated Mr. Hays to the management of the assault now being prepared on the Government at Washington, and it was Penrose, who, in a formal statement, gave the committee's action his blessing at the close of the meeting. A condition of Mr. Hays' election is that the few Progressives who held seats on the committee are to be eliminated. To make this doubly sure, the power of appointing members of the executive committee was taken from the chairman, and henceforth they are to be elected. This will remove from the committee, among others, Mr. Chester H. Rowell of California, the committeeman who tried in vain to dissuade Mr. Hughes from throwing California and the Presidency away by snubbing Governor Johnson and accepting the embraces of every venal stand-pat politician in the State. As for Mr. Hays himself, what does the designation of him as a progressive signify? His chief claim for distinction was his management of the Indiana campaign of 1916, which resulted in the election of a Republican Governor and of two Republican Senators. The latter are Messrs. Harry New and James Watson. Their success was progress backward toward the worst days of the Mark Hanna regime. Watson will be remembered as the Congressman on whom the genial Colonel Mulhall and the more sedate Jim Emery of the National Association of Manufacturers most relied in the days when they were engaged in writing that slimy record that was uncovered by the Mulhall lobby exposé. It was Watson who took their money for exerting his influence with Congressmen, while he was still in Washington just after the expiration of his term, and while the National Association of Manufacturers was seeking friendly tariff legislation. And so, while the Republican National Committee's vice-chairman is in no position to denounce the brutality of Prussian militarism, its chairman is hardly better off in dealing with such other manifestations of Prussianism as the Zimmerman-Bernstorff-Luxburg disclosures. Not unless, that is, he stands prepared to repudiate the associations and activities of Mr. Watson, whose

election to the Senate was an important part of the success with which he is credited.

If democracy with either a large or small "d" has anything to fear from an organization in such hands, then we might as well confess that the American people are unfit for self-government and give it up as a bad job. The line-up is so bad, in fact, that it is a matter of concern whether the more honest and intelligent, and therefore more dangerous, of our champions of privilege will not abandon the Republican Party as their medium and organize a drive on the next Democratic convention. They never hesitate to abandon partisanship when it suits their purpose, and the Democratic Party still has considerable elements that offer an opening. But President Wilson's leadership stands in the way. On the whole, the situation is decidedly encouraging.

Mr. Perkins' announcement that Colonel Roosevelt will be the candidate of the re-organized party in 1920 is not surprising. Time was when Mr. Perkins was almost the sole friend of the Colonel among men of standing in New York's financial district. It is so no longer. Judge Gary's luncheon to him is of recent memory. The Colonel is no longer either crazy or a drunkard,—two of the amazing fictions that were tenaciously believed by Wall Street in the days of the tennis cabinet. Age has sobered him. Today he regards any critic of the Mooney prosecutions as an anarchist. He has no sympathy with those who condemn the Bisbee deportations. And, best of all, he is an ardent champion of universal compulsory military service as a permanent policy; he has no foolish sentimental regard for the rights of small nations that get in the way of American enterprise, such as Colombia or Mexico; and nothing would give him greater satisfaction than to send a fleet or an army to protect American interests. Those interests would, of course, be Wall Street interests. But the Colonel would doubtless assure us that he would send a fleet to protect the foreign loans of American working men with exactly the same dispatch that he would send a fleet to protect the foreign loans of American capital.

### Community Control of Land

Slowly but surely the idea is filtering through the gray matter of man that property in land is radically different from property in the things

that labor makes out of land. A dramatic example has been furnished in connection with the housing of workers in munition plants and shipyards, where unused land that has lain idle for a generation has suddenly acquired enormous value when the Government wishes building sites. Another example is seen in the efforts of city governments to exercise greater authority over the use of lands by apportioning the various activities and interests into zones. These and many other facts intimately associated with industrial and social life are provoking thought that must soon compel readjustments in community control of land.

City zoning is an attempt to meet the demand of the community for some means of restraining the individual who is disposed to carry his own right into the field of his neighbors' rights. Certain vague and indefinite rules to prevent one man from using his property in a way to cause injury to another—such as acts that come under the head of nuisances—have long been recognized; and other restraints have been included in title deeds in newer platted cities, but sufficient license in the use of city lots has remained to cause grave injury, both to immediate neighbors and to the city as a whole. The seriousness of the problem, and the necessity for finding a means of correction, is set forth in December "Buildings and Building Management," by Lawson Purdy, who, as president of the New York City Department of Taxes and Assessments for eleven years, had the best of opportunities for studying the question.

The advent of the skyscraper accentuated to a high degree the natural tendency toward congestion on Manhattan Island; but the harm done by modern high buildings under ancient building regulations was not appreciated until much damage had been done. Even when far-seeing men did realize the loss, remedial action was delayed by an excessive reverence for the title deed to land, and the fear that the courts would in this, as in so many other questions, cling to the letter of the law. But conditions compelled action. The overcrowding of streets, to the great inconvenience of the general public, might have been endured, but to play at ducks and drakes with land values was another matter. When the erection of super-skyscrapers caused a value at one point of \$200 or \$300 per square foot, while other land within 600 feet was reduced to \$10

per square foot, and a block on Fifth Avenue declined in value from \$17,000,000 to \$7,000,000 property owners were emboldened to brave the terrors of adverse court decisions.

The fact that competition, which regulates ordinary commercial transactions between individuals, does not control where monopoly lodges is evident from New York's experience with the new style of architecture. Speaking of the structures of twenty to fifty stories to which tenants flocked to get light and air from above the surrounding buildings, Mr. Purdy says: "The fact that these buildings paid so well made it seem as though the land on which they stood was worth a great deal more money than any one had ever supposed. Of course, that led to others putting up similar buildings. And, presently, those who at first stole the light and air could steal no more, and one or two sides of a building were practically put out of business, and where they had obtained \$2.50 or \$3 a square foot rent per year, they were cut down to \$1.25, and sometimes less." He notes a similar decline in values where tall loft buildings for the garment makers were erected among three and four-story dwellings, and where factories invaded the shopping district of Fifth Avenue. The same result followed the advent of the apartment house. "Go into the suburbs," he says, "where we had nice single-family detached dwellings and some one came and planted a store right out at the building line and destroyed the value of all the houses thereby, and another man, when private restrictions ran out, put up a tenement house, and the value of all the private houses within 100 yards dropped overnight because of the construction of that tenement house."

But notwithstanding these conditions a vast deal of mischief had to be done before men of standing and influence, particularly in the real estate world, would act. Action, however, has been taken. The city has been laid out in zones as far as may be in an effort to overcome the maldevelopment of the past thirty years. To many it appeared to be heroic treatment. It was like tearing at the heart strings for the property owner to be told that he could or could not do this or that thing to his own bit of earth. And what is more, the recalcitrant ones who may wish to have the zoning set aside by the courts are confronted by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Hadacheck's brickyard in Los An-

geles. This was a case in which a brickyard was absorbed by a growing city. As a brickyard, the land was estimated to be worth \$800,000, as residence property, \$60,000. When the city excluded manufacturing from the residence zone the value of the brick-making land fell from the higher to the lower figure, and the owner appealed to the courts. "But the courts of California," writes Mr. Purdy, "said that Mr. Hadacheck had to give way to the public interest, and the United States Supreme Court almost expressed sympathy for Mr. Hadacheck, but said that the individual interest had to give way before a great public interest."

Here is meat for reflection. The Supreme Court has sanctioned the subordination of an individual interest in land to the community interest in that land. It is but a short and logical step from turning a brickyard into residence lots—though in doing so the owner is deprived of values that he had considered his—to requiring the owner of a vacant lot to improve it or give it to some one who will improve it. This action of the court would also include the right of the city to require the owner of an old and inadequate building to replace it with a good one. Such action might take the form of taxing vacant lots out of existence, as Congress taxes State bank notes out of existence. There is no law forbidding the issue of currency by State banks; but the tax of ten per cent on their circulation is sufficient. The same principle would apply to vacant lots. Here again Mr. Purdy, in considering the possibility of the court's declaring the New York zoning unconstitutional, makes this sage comment: "The thing must be done, and we don't believe the courts will declare it unconstitutional, for the courts are just human beings like the rest of us, and when they are frightened they do things they ought not to do, but if you feed them slowly with new ideas by persons in whom they have confidence, and they see that public sentiment is behind the idea, then the police power grows. . . . The police power in law is a developing power, and it should develop in harmony with the needs of the community." It is quite apparent to the man in the street that the city is well within its rights when, as a political and social unit it limits the privilege of a few in order to extend the rights of all, and when the man in the street has become sufficiently nu-

merous there will be no difficulty about the right of the community to control its own lands, either

through legislatures or courts. The immediate need is to "feed them slowly with new ideas."

## The Land Problem in Russia

By Count Ilya Tolstoy

The land problem as it exists in Russia at present rises from deeply rooted historical bases.

"All land must belong to the people without repurchase." This cry now heard from all Russian peasants does not indicate the birth of a new socialist party. On the contrary, this demand has permeated the Russian people for a long time, it was born with the peasants, imbibed with the mother's milk, and for this reason it is mighty and powerful, like the life which gave it birth.

Until 1861, when the peasants were liberated from serfdom, *land in Russia had no market value.*

On the contrary, the vast forests and steppes were only unnecessary ballast, impeding the development of the nation, and the entire attention of the government was directed towards the populating of these lands by new settlers. Depending upon the exceptionally high birth rate of the Russian people, the Russian Czars and landowners drew up ukazes "to prevent the vain standing of land," stating that "peasants should be placed thereon," thus directing their attention solely towards the colonization of new land.

During the period of serfdom the object was not the possession of land but of "orthodox souls."

Deeds of purchase were only drawn up for people, whereas, the land on which they lived and which they cultivated was considered their inalienable right, and changed hands from one owner to the other automatically and without barter. It is natural that when Emperor Alexander II liberated the peasants and only gave them a part of the land they had previously cultivated, the peasants were unable to understand the reform. They could not realize why they should pay for land without market value, and for this reason they considered for a long time that they were paying a tax not for land but only for themselves.

Knowing from bitter experience that as "souls" they represented in themselves prop-

erty, which was pawned, exchanged, given as a present and sold, they could easily understand the need of redeeming themselves, whereas, the repurchase of land belonging to nobody but God was incomprehensible to them.

According to the law of 1861, the peasants were granted the right to refuse a part of the land allotted to them, thus receiving a smaller share, subsequently termed the "beggar's share." Many of the peasant communes, unable to grasp the full meaning of this and considering that the land would be theirs in any case, refused these shares and are now suffering severely for lack of it.

It is easy to see that the landowning nobility cruelly exploited the peasants in such cases, and coincidentally with the land shortage developed discontent and class hatred among the peasants.

Simultaneously, the Russian Government, after the reform promulgated by Alexander II in this incomplete form, refused all attempts to ameliorate the condition of the people and stood solidly by the landowner and nobleman. These conservative elements had always been the true supporters of autocracy, as a consequence of which the political efforts of the Government were blindly directed towards the strengthening of the landowning class at the expense of the majority of the Russian people, formed by the peasants and the working men.

The Turkish War of 1876 placed a heavy burden of expense upon the Russian treasury. To cover this, the Government resorted to new taxes, the customs being selected in particular.

These taxes caused Europe to retaliate by raising the duty of our bread grains.

A bloodless customs war was started, during which Russia, to receive the money needed by her, was obliged to lower the price of her bread grains and at the same time throw such quantities of cheap grain in the market as she could not spare without the danger of a famine at home. At that period, Russia only disposed of twenty poods of bread grain annually per capita.

As a result, Russia fed German hogs with her cheap bread and went hungry herself.

Nobody can forget the terrible famines of 1881, 1890, 1891, and of 1896.

The last commercial treaty drawn up with Germany placed our agriculture in an even worse situation than before, for it created a tax, payable by Russia to Germany's credit, graded to nine rubles for every dessiatin (equal to 2.7 acres) of Russian ploughed land.

The second cause of the poverty of the peasants lay in the irrational distribution of their communal lands.

According to the principle of justice, the peasants divided their land into a number of grades: for ploughing, for grass and for forest; into the best, middle and worst quality, and besides this into the closest, furthest and farm land. In this way every family received land divided into numerous small pieces, never less than ten, fifteen and sometimes thirty or more.

With the growth of the population this subdividing increased every year.

It can be positively stated that the Russian peasant loses over half his time on the useless covering of distances, in needless traveling from his farm to the field, and from one piece of land to another.

The third reason for the condition of low development of the peasant farm is the lack of tools, and the poor quality of those he does possess. According to the statistical data of 1910, only 52 per cent of the peasants worked with ploughs. The remaining 48 per cent, or almost half of the peasants, still cultivate their land by primitive methods, using wooden ploughs.

The other tools, such as harrows, scythes, sowers, grinders and others are no better. Besides this, the horse of the peasant is very small and weak, owing to lack of food. Before the war 32 per cent of the peasant farms lacked horses, 32 per cent owned one horse, 22 per cent owned two horses and only 14 per cent had over that number.

The most striking indication of the intensification of farming is obtained by the study of the quantity and methods employed to manure the soil.

Possessing only enough manure to cover 14 per cent of the total surface of ploughed land, Russia uses hardly any artificial fertilizers.

The following is a table showing the manur-

ing of Russian fields as compared with those of other European countries:

AMOUNT SPENT IN POUNDS STERLING  
ON ALL MANURES, FOR EVERY 100  
DESSIATINS

Belgium .....	8,911
Germany .....	5,460
France .....	3,267
England .....	2,794
Russia .....	56

There is small wonder that the yield of our peasant lands is so much below that of other western countries.

Although Russia has the best soil in the world, her crop is several times below the crops of other European countries.

The following is a table of the harvests during the years 1901-1910, per acre:

	Rye lbs.	Wheat lbs.
Belgium .....	2,320	2,900
England .....	....	2,100
Germany .....	1,900	2,170
France .....	1,245	1,250
Russia .....	830	830

To illustrate the above it is sufficient to compare the yield of the Russian wheat-grower with that of his Canadian comrade. The Canadian produces eight times more bread per worker than the Russian. For this primitive condition of the peasant farm the Russian Government is alone responsible.

Without any agrarian or agricultural program, the Government only concerned itself with getting money from the people. Not helping them to solve their difficulties, far removed from correcting those injustices permitted by the reform of 1861, depriving the people of education and giving them in its stead government vodka, the Russian Government only tightened the noose and ruined not only the peasants, but also Russia.

The popular uprisings which occurred periodically in Russia had as their foundation the demand for land on the part of the peasants, but they forced the Government to squeeze the people harder by denying them the most primitive rights.

Then came the revolution of 1905. The wave of revolt swept across Russia and the discontent of the people, accumulated through the centuries, found vent in savage robberies, incen-

diarism and destruction of the property of the landowners.

The revolution failed. But the Government following the idea of Stolypin, who was then Premier, learned the lesson and took upon itself for the first time the preparation of a Government agrarian policy.

The gist of this policy was the total elimination of the peasant communal land and the creation of individual farmers and small owners, who would become the future bourgeois defenders of private landed property in Russia.

With this in view, the powers of the Peasant Government Land Bank were considerably broadened. It was through this bank that separate farms and sections were sold to the peasants, thus facilitating the creation of the farmer peasant.

Owing to this measure, during the years 1905-1916, the peasants bought 3,025 million desiatins of land formerly owned by the nobility. The owners of this bought land together with the individual peasants, who had left the commune and become private owners, according to the plan of Stolypin, should have formed the advance guard of small bourgeois, the support of the principle of property and also of autocratic power.

Stolypin's reform, from the point of view of the autocracy, was undoubtedly practical, but as it had come fifty years too late, it did little toward changing the contemporary position of the peasant.

At the present moment, after fifty-eight years of various sufferings, Russia must once more draw up a decision regarding that same painful land problem,—the question with which are involved the life and well-being of 180 million people.

It is in the theoretic resolution of this fundamental problem in Russia that unfortunately all our socialist parties disagree. I do not consider that any one of them has offered an entirely satisfactory program.

I cannot indicate here, for lack of space, the defects in these programs. It will suffice to give their chief aims.

The program most comprehensible to the people is offered by the left wing of the National-Socialist Party in Russia, the party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, which offers *socialization of land*.

According to this proposal, land, like all elements—air, water, sunlight—cannot belong to anybody and must consequently become the property of the people. It would be *untaxed*, and *without repurchase* would be given to all those wishing to cultivate it themselves, not through hired labor. Private property under such a plan of organizing agricultural work would be maintained only in the case of the house, outbuildings, tools and the live stock.

It is not the land that would be taxed, as is the case now, but the homestead, the income.

As the soil bears differently in different locations, the equalizing labor norm and the taxation of the farm products must be graded according to these natural conditions of the soil, its bearing power, the character of crop, the climate and similar factors. The distribution of the land is in the hands of the Government and local organs of self-government.

This program has been developed and amplified by the leader of the party, V. M. Chernov, the ex-Minister of Agriculture in the Kerensky Government.

To the best of my knowledge, this program has the most general support among the needy in Russia. Its application will be impeded by the peasant owners, Cossacks and all the small bourgeois.

The program of the Social Democrats, Mensheviks, of the National Socialists and of the Laborites includes, as with the Revolutionaries, the requisition of all crown, fiscal, monastical and private lands, excepting small holdings, and suggests the organization of a general government land fund.

This fund, according to the plan of the Menshevik Socialists, must be under the jurisdiction of local representatives of self-government, such as the commune and district Zemstvos, acting in accordance with the laws drawn up by the Government.

It is thus that the government lands, *nationalized*, or according to the Mensheviks, *municipalized*, enter directly into the people's fund for rental to working farmers. The difference between this plan and the preceding is that whereas with socialized land the worker receives only as much land as he can cultivate himself, nationalization admits hired labor, thus including saw mills, factories, large farms as well as small ones.

The program of the Bolsheviks is merely that

of nationalization by an uncompromising application of Marxian principles.

All the moderate socialist parties, realizing the importance and the responsibility of land reforms, postpone the final decision for the Constituent Assembly to decide upon. The Bolsheviks, unfortunately, are in this case as well the preachers of violence and encourage usurpation, thus only further complicating and entangling this already difficult life problem of the Russian people.

I will not linger on the programs of the Constitutional Democrats and Nationalists, for they offer only temporary measures and possess only momentary importance.

I fear that not one of the above programs will be found practical, and I foresee many and many years of disorder in Russia before this problem is in any way solved.

From the above facts the reader will see that the programs of both the strongest socialist parties in Russia approach in their essentials closely to the theories of the famous American economist, Henry George.

Unfortunately, this theory, though close in spirit to the Russian people, beautiful, ethical and at the same time highly rational, is little known in Russia.

In spite of the efforts of my father, who thoroughly agreed with the ideas of Henry George, and gave much time and labor towards spreading them, the idea of Singletax has not taken root in Russia. Several hundred thousand books and pamphlets that were printed and distributed among the people melted away in the mass of inhabitants and gave no direct results. At the present time the entire edition of "Progress and Poverty" has been sold out in Russia and cannot be bought.

Meanwhile, the establishment of Singletax in Russia seems to me the only just solution of the

land problem, both for the interests of the workers and for the application of socialism. A singletax on land, lightening the burden on the working farmers who do not speculate in land, would undoubtedly easily kill without struggle and injustice all capitalistic farmholdings, based only on the constant growth of land values. Under such a system, land, like merchandise, loses all its interest and value for capital and automatically passes into the hands of the workers.

This system frees the Government from care and participation in the domain of farming, and automatically, without any struggle, settles the quarrel between capital and labor, in favor of the latter, and solves the entire labor question together with the land problem. It guarantees the just distribution of wealth, and once for all makes impossible the existence of undeserving human poverty.

Statistics show us that if in Russia all the fiscal, church and private lands are confiscated for the benefit of the peasant, no peasant will receive even one additional dessiatin to that which he now owns. Statistics also tells us that with the increase of population, in twenty years, the area owned by every man must inevitably diminish by half.

It is clear that the division of land on the basis of private ownership can lead only to temporary results.

It is the problem of wise statesmanship to see beyond that.

The Russian people are being offered several solutions to the land problem. It is not yet known which of these will be followed.

All large land holdings have been abolished; the land belongs to "nobody." The decision now rests with the Russian people, whose hands will work it, how they will obtain from the land their just benefits and secure their just rights.

## A Suggested Platform on International Relations

By J. G. Phelps Stokes

States have not merely the duty of promoting the well-being of their own citizens, but also a

similar duty of furthering the common welfare of mankind.

In furtherance of the common task of promoting the general welfare of humanity the States should be associated in an appropriate fede-

---

The writer gratefully acknowledges his obligation to Senator Henri La Fontaine of Belgium for many valuable suggestions.

tion. No State should be permitted by the associated States to despoil or oppress another, or to take advantage to itself through wrong.

Relations between the States should be controlled by the same principles of right, equity and morals as those which control relations between individuals. As governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and as laws derive their validity from the general consent of the people over whom they exercise their sway, so in international affairs, treaties and agreements derive their validity only from the consent of the peoples of the contracting States, and no treaty or agreement between governments is binding upon the respective peoples unless ratified by them.

A State's rights to liberty are to be measured by the rights to liberty that its people enjoy within it. A State which restricts undemocratically the liberties of its people, restricts correspondingly its own right as a State to complete liberty of action. The independence of democratic States must be safeguarded by the States collectively, but over autocratic States there may be exercised by the associated States such restraint and pressure as may be necessary to safeguard such fragmentary liberties as their peoples already possess, and to promote their freedom.

Communities, whether autocratic or democratic, are entitled to only such degrees of liberty as men and women enjoy within them. Political groups organized for purposes of tyranny over others, or for purposes of gain through harmful exploitations, have no right of liberty to pursue such purposes. Their liberties of action may be restricted by democracies in the interest of the oppressed peoples and of all humanity.

Rights to liberty never include the right of a group or an individual to oppress others or to seek gain through injury to others. No State acting independently, has a right to forcibly control or hamper the actions of another, except in so far as an individual State, may, like an individual citizen in smaller affairs, restrain, if able, the violence of another pending the arrival of democratically constituted international forces. The associated States have the right to enforce international law.

The earth is a vast reservoir of products useful to men. Monopoly of any portion of that reservoir by individuals, groups or nations is intolerable where adverse to the just interests of

others or to the common interests of humanity. The exchange without hindrance, of the earth's products and of the products of labor, and the utmost freedom of peaceful human intercourse and communication, is essential to the welfare of mankind. No restrictions should be permitted upon communications, travel, trade or commerce, except as may be necessary to thwart actions or purposes prejudicial to democratic interests. All countries and colonies should be open on free and equal terms to the peoples and commerce of all nations, and no tolls should be levied, except as needed to defray the costs of useful services actually rendered.

The sea must be open without hindrance, to the peaceful navigation of all peoples. The associated States should assume the costs of adequately policing the same, and of maintaining the security of passenger and freight traffic and communications thereon, therein and thereover. All waterways, natural or artificial, uniting with, or flowing into seas must be accessible to the peaceful ships of all nations, without discrimination.

The gathering of prohibitive or discriminatory taxes on trade and commerce, and inequitable discriminations among the peoples of the various nations in the matter of franchises, privileges and rights, more than distances, mountains and oceans, have kept the peoples of the various nations aloof from one another and have given birth to hostile international feelings and to resultant wars and devastations. Commerce, trade and peaceful intercourse among peoples must be free in the interest of humanity. Just as freedom of trade among the States of the American Union promotes the just interests of the several states and of their peoples, so freedom of trade among the nations of the earth would promote the just interests of mankind.

Great natural resources should be collectively organized for the common good by the people within whose territories they occur, but nothing can be held to justify exclusive monopoly of anything adversely to the interests of mankind. No individual, group, tribe, or nation may exercise exclusive control over more lands, waters, rivers, forests or other natural resources than he or it makes beneficial use of, and reasonably conserves. Mere priority of occupation or possession conveys no right to exclusive control of resources or natural highways necessary to the

welfare of mankind; but efficient and beneficial use, conservation and maintenance thereof for public benefit justifies national control thereof so long as the common interests of mankind are advanced thereby.

Nations must not permit or countenance monopolies of any sort within their borders, except such public monopolies, exercised by governments, as promote the just interests of all.

No law-abiding people shall be governed without its consent, nor otherwise than as its adult citizens decree; provided, that in the case of very backward peoples who are satisfied with a continuance of ancient and undemocratic conditions inimical to the common interests of mankind, temporary colonial policies are at times justified, where such policies actually and purposely enlarge the democratic opportunities of such peoples and fit them by educational and other appropriate means for efficient self-government as democracies, and promote meanwhile the common interests of mankind. Every colonial policy shall be subject at all times to revision and control by the associated nations, and shall be discontinued as rapidly as the respective backward peoples become capable of efficient democratic self-government.

The cause of liberty does not require that tyrants be permitted to rule over native tribes or elsewhere, or that they be allowed to keep their peoples in ignorance; nor does it require that either rulers or groups of people be permitted to retain exclusive control of natural resources or of natural highways needed for beneficial use by mankind. It is imperative that in all such matters, public attention be directed primarily to the common needs of humanity. Wherever the smaller interests of a group conflict with the larger interests of mankind, the larger interests of mankind must prevail.

The international spirit and consideration of the greatest good for the greatest number should determine all human relations. He is no good citizen who seeks advantage for himself alone, or advantage for himself at the cost of injustice to another; and that nation is no worthy member of the family of nations, which looks with unconcern upon oppression anywhere or which seeks unjust gain, or which fails to endeavor by all feasible means to promote justice, equity and happiness throughout the world.

To facilitate the favorable settlement of in-

ternational disputes, we call for the establishment of an international judicial organization to which shall be referred all disputes between nations, all disputes between a nation and the citizens of other nations, and all disputes between the citizens of different nations. Such international judicial organization should include two principal divisions—an International Court of Mediation and an International Court of Justice. The International Court of Mediation should on request of either party to an international dispute, tender its friendly offices in the hope that through its intermediation such dispute may be amicably adjusted. Failing, it should refer the issue to the International Court of Justice. The findings of the latter, unless overruled on appeal by representatives of the associated States in special conference assembled, should be binding between the parties, and should, if necessary, be enforced by the armaments of the associated States. No State, however, should be called upon to aid in the enforcement of a decision against itself, but may justly endeavor to resist such a decision if deemed by it flagrantly oppressive. Pending all such proceedings the armed forces of the associated States should be employed to maintain order conformably to established law.

Where a State is attacked in violation of the principles of justice and law collectively affirmed by the associated States, the other States, if called upon, must share in its defense and make such defense efficacious.

In order to promote better understanding and more friendly and helpful mutual relations among the nations and between their peoples, and in order to facilitate the just development of international law, and the development of just and mutually helpful relations between advanced and backward peoples, we call for the organization of an International Parliament to meet at frequent stated intervals, and to which each nation shall be free to send such delegates as it choose, who should consider such international questions and problems as may arise, and propose such modifications of international law and usage as may seem likely to promote the welfare of mankind. Such proposals as may be formulated by the International Parliament, should be referred to the respective States for ratification or rejection by their peoples, and should receive the support of the associated States and their forces only

if ratified by the people in democratically conducted referenda. The votes of the nations in such referenda, and in the sessions of the Parliament, should have weight proportionately to the democracy of their laws and procedure.

As a means to secure appropriate weighting of the votes of the several States to the end that democratic tendencies may ever prevail in the international referenda and in the sessions of the International Parliament, the following method of procedure is proposed: At the commencement of each session of the International Parliament each of the assembled States shall by its representatives voting as a unit, and without debate, deliver to the clerk of the session a ballot upon which the names of the assembled States shall be arranged in order corresponding to the relative degrees of democracy achieved by the respective peoples as judged by the voting unit; each such unit placing opposite the name of that State which it thinks the most democratic State, a numeral corresponding to the total number of States participating in the vote; and each such voting unit placing opposite the name of that State which it judges to rank second, by virtue of its degree of achieved democracy, the next smaller numeral; and so on throughout the list of States participating in the vote. Each State in every such referendum and in every session of the International Parliament shall have as many votes on each project that is before it, as shall correspond in number to the sum of the numerals found opposite its name in the classificatory ballot thus previously taken, and the weights of the votes of the respective States as thus fixed shall prevail and continue in effect until a reclassification is effected at the next ensuing session of the International Parliament.

## RELATED THINGS

### About Chinamen

Jones and I were discussing the war over a cafe table. Jones' grandfather made millions in grain and ships, and Jones is looking after the family interests.

"What this country needs right now is about five million Chinese coolies," said he. "France has come to it and is hollering for more. If it weren't for these damned labor unions we'd do it tomorrow. And there'd still be plenty of work

for every man in this country who wants to work. It might hurt the I. W. W. and the other agitators, but it wouldn't hurt anybody else."

"How about a race problem?" I suggested timidly.

"I'm against the Japs coming in, but the Chinamen are alright," said Jones. "They mind their own business and behave themselves. And they are good workers. It's got so in San Francisco, where I live, you can't get a good Chinese servant any more. You have to get a Japanese. The Chinese cooks we used to have were the best in the world, but they've all come East and started chop suey restaurants on their own. Can't blame them—they're making more money."

I suggested that before Chinese immigration was stopped the Coast didn't look on Chinamen so kindly. Small boys followed them in the streets and threw rocks, and the miners as far East as Wyoming, on one occasion, chased several hundred of them into the desert and threw others down the mine shafts to their death. Even now in an old-fashioned mining camp, it was part of the fun of the monthly spree to chastise a Chinaman, and even to kill one, while regarded as bad manners, was no capital offense.

Jones didn't think there'd be any trouble.

"We're coming to it, anyhow," he said. "Do you think this country is going to give up the merchant marine it's building up during the war? No. And its shipping interests are not going to be held up forever by Furuseth's union, with the Government standing in. It's the only thing that will save the country. There's no limit to what these unions are asking. The agitators will own the country if it goes on. Right now the big fellows are selling the best industrial stocks in America and buying Government bonds. After the war they will put their money in South America and China. And they'll get better returns, too."

"Wouldn't it be better for the Government to help China develop its own unparalleled resources, by arranging loans on easy terms, and so keep its population at home?" I asked. I felt that Jones, as a practical business man, worth several millions, knew much more about these things, and that I must appear presumptuous in raising questions.

"Government, nothing!" snorted Jones.

"What would this Government do to help develop China? They threw cold water on every legitimate proposition looking to a loan of the sort that would appeal to a conservative financial interest. We'll do it without their help, and later, if we need it, we can depend on the patriotism of the American people, and don't you forget it. After this war America isn't going to stand for the miserable picayunish foreign policy that has let Mexico go to rack and ruin. This 'too proud to fight' business might have been alright in the old days, when we were a provincial nation. As for Chinamen, there's enough of them to work their own resources and help us out at the same time."

"How about the Chinese as a nation?" I said. "If they get the idea that our capitalists are exploiting them at home, and if our workingmen over here resent their coming and make things unpleasant for their immigrants, won't they join with Japan and start trouble? It seems to me we might be sowing the seeds of another great war."

"Oh, hell!" said Jones. "You don't mean to tell me you're taken in by this universal peace talk? Why, there'll always be wars, as long as the human race endures."

That settled it. Jones ordered another Scotch and gloomily lit a fresh cigarette. He inhaled a long puff, blew it out, and then squinted up at me from under his impatient brows.

"How long do you think this fellow Baker will last?" he said.

## The Democracy of Mark Twain

When Mark Twain published his "A Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court," he made a laughing-stock of evil institutions, and of the deluded mortals who uphold them. Nor did he confine himself to the safe and popular pastime of ridiculing the evils of a past age or of distant nations.

"A Connecticut Yankee" is not only a splendid piece of literature, with its alternating humor and pathos, it is a textbook of democracy, economic as well as political. The superficially patriotic American will enjoy its flings at monarchy and hereditary aristocracy. But it is much to be feared that the superficial patriot will begin to squirm when he notes the logical con-

clusion of the truths he has applauded. What Mark Twain had to say about self-government, for instance, applies with equal force to the Philippines, to Hayti and to nations held subject by European countries. He made short shrift of the plea that some are unfit to govern themselves. "A man is a man at bottom," he said, "ages of oppression cannot crush it altogether out of him." Then he put himself on record in a way that really did not need the events of today to vindicate.

"There is plenty good enough material for a republic," he said, "in the most degraded people that ever existed—even in the Russians;—plenty of manhood in them—even in the Germans, if one could but force it out of its timid and suspicious privacy, to overthrow and trample in the mud any throne that was ever set up and any nobility that ever supported it."

In the course of the tale, the Yankee meets with a self-made man named Dowley, one of the type who is sure that conditions are all right because he has prospered. And of course, this self-made man is a protectionist, "solely for the good of the workingman," not for himself. Dowley tells the Yankee that wages in his country are double what they are in Arthur's kingdom, where steps are being taken toward free trade, and when the Yankee admits it, the protectionist shouts in glee. The Yankee's "admission" happens to be one that does not affect the logic of his position at all, but Dowley's mind is not capable of grasping that fact. "You confess it!" he joyfully exclaims every time an incidental mention of the fact is made. Finally, the Yankee explains in a way that a kindergarten pupil or a member of the American Protective Tariff League should have understood. The conversation and result follow:

"Now look here—let me illustrate. We pay four cents for a woman's stuff gown, you pay 8.4 cents, which is 4 mills more than double. What do you allow a laboring woman who works on a farm?"

"Two mills a day."

"Very good; we allow but half as much; we pay her only a tenth of a cent a day and—"

"Again ye're conf—'

"Wait! Now, you see the thing is very simple; this time you'll understand it. For instance, it takes your woman 42 days to earn her gown at 2 mills a day—7 weeks' work; but ours earns

hers in forty days—two days short of 7 weeks. Your woman has a gown and her whole seven weeks' wages are gone; ours has a gown, and two days' wages left, to buy something else with.

There—now you understand it!"

"He looked—well he merely looked dubious; it's the most I can say; so did the others. I waited—to let the thing work. Dowley spoke at last—and betrayed the fact that he actually hadn't gotten away from his rooted and grounded superstitions yet. He said, with a trifle of hesitancy:

"But—but—ye cannot fail to grant that two mills a day is better than one."

Still undismayed, the Yankee tries once more. He makes up a list of things a laborer would need, compares their cost in the two countries and the wages current in each, and then shows that the free trade worker could lay in a full supply and save five or six week's wages in a year, while the protected worker would save nothing. This he thought was a crusher. "But, alas, it didn't crush. . . . What those people valued was high wages; it didn't seem to be a matter of any consequence to them whether the high wages would buy anything or not. They stood for 'protection,' and swore by it, which was reasonable enough, because interested parties had gulled them into the notion that it was protection which had created their high wages. I proved to them that in a quarter of a century their wages had advanced but 30 per cent., while the cost of living had gone up 100; and that with us, in a shorter time, wages had advanced 40 per cent. while the cost of living had gone steadily down. But it didn't do any good. Nothing could unseat their strange beliefs."

The able artist who illustrated the book was a singletaxer, Dan Beard. Where the moral is missing from the text, it appears in the illustrations. It is regrettable that Mr. Beard was not called upon to perform a similar service for later works. It would have strengthened the splendid posthumous story, "The Mysterious Stranger," which Mark Twain did not see fit to publish during his life time. One need not agree altogether with the views on theology therein expressed to appreciate its lesson. There is the delightful story wherein the hero (an angel named Satan) goes to India, plants a seed and causes a magic tree to grow at once, upon which are all kinds of fruit. The people come with baskets

to gather them, and as fast as they pluck, the fruit is replaced. But finally there happens what might easily have been foreseen.

"A foreigner in a white linen suit and sun helmet arrived and exclaimed angrily:

"Away from here! Clear out, you dogs; the tree is on my lands, and is my property."

The natives put down their baskets and made humble obeisance. Satan made humble obeisance too, with his fingers to his forehead in the native way and remarked:

"Please let them have the pleasure for an hour sir—only that and no longer. Afterward you may forbid them and you will still have more fruit than you and the state together can consume."

"This made the foreigner very angry and he cried out: 'Who are you, you vagabond, to tell your betters what they may do and what they mayn't? And he struck Satan with his cane and followed this error with a kick."

One is reminded of a thought strikingly similar conveyed in Henry George's "Open Letter to the Pope," wherein he asked if God were to "infuse new vigor into the sunlight, new virtue into the air, new fertility into the soil—would not all this new bounty go to the owners of the land, and work not benefit, but rather injury to mere laborers?"

In another place Twain expresses impatience with the degrading use of humor when turned toward trivial things. "Your race in its poverty," he makes "Satan" say, "has unquestionably one really effective weapon — laughter. Power, money, persuasion, supplication, persecution—these can lift a colossal humbug—prod it a little, weaken it a little, century by century; but only laughter can blow it to rags and atoms at a blow. Against the assault of laughter nothing can stand."

S. D.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### "Capital"

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In THE PUBLIC of January 25, Mr. Alex. Mackendrick, reviewing Liebknecht's "Militarism" says: "The only jarring note . . . in Dr. Liebknecht's book is the constant assumption that 'capital' is the natural enemy of liberty."

First of all, socialism and singletax are difficult

only as "languages" not at all as systems of thought. In socialist phraseology "capital" means merely "private monopoly," or strictly (Capital III, 948) "Capital signifies the *means of production monopolized by a certain part of society.*" Capital I, 839, "A negro is a negro. In certain circumstances he becomes a *slave*. A 'mule' is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain circumstances does it become capital." . . . "*Capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons established by the instrumentality of things,*" i.e., a monopoly is not a "thing" but a "relation between persons, established by the instrumentality of things." In socialist patois "capital" means a monopolized means of production; anything the possession of which enables one to get more service than he gives. A "capitalist" is a monopolist. "Capitalism" means production under privately monopolized means of production.

I am not arguing, but merely showing what socialists, including Marx, mean by "capital." Now, granting that "capital" means privately monopolized means of production, is it not perfectly plain that "capital" (that is "private monopoly") is the natural enemy of liberty?

The principal difference between Marx and George is in their use of words—in their "patois" and not in their philosophy. In four pages of THE PUBLIC I could make this perfectly plain, but will wait till either some one challenges the above statement concerning Marx and George, or until the editor requests me to furnish the article. Mr. Mackendrick goes on to use "capital" in the usual sense, not knowing that "capital" in the socialist patois is as peculiar as is "land" (which includes wild horses, swans and water), or as "singletax," which is not a tax at all but merely a rent.

The second clipping following Mr. Mackendrick's review of militarism, is from Henry George. "For a man, who, out of the proceeds of his labor is obliged to pay another man for the use of ocean or air or sunshine or soil, is in this deprived of his rightful property, and thus robbed"—and this robbery is through the "ownership of the means of production by a part of society," which monopolization Marx calls "capital."

I am not at all defending Marx's misuse of words. If Marx had called his great work "Private Monopoly," and had attacked "Monopoly," socialism would long ago have won the world. As it is, many of our socialist friends still think "capital" means "the means of production"; whereas "capital" means only "privately monopolized" means of production, of which land is the chief; for as Marx says, Capital III, 748: "does property in land acquire the faculty of capturing an ever increasing portion of surplus value," and "surplus value" means, with Marx, value for which the creating working man has never been paid; as land values, goods values, etc., above labor cost. "Singletax" is the chief plank in Marxisan socialism.

W. H. KAUFMAN.

Bellingham, Wash.

## Are We a Democracy?

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Since the beginning of our present conflict, the subject matter of your editorial, entitled "Are We a Democracy?" has seemed to me to be the most vital matter for our consideration next to the war itself. The determination of a post-bellum policy that is consistent with our avowed aims in prosecuting the war must not be one of the things any one of us must dare to be uncertain about. If such a policy is not adopted, even victory over Germany is of secondary importance, and it is nothing short of a duty that devolves upon every public-minded man to see to it that men are chosen for office whose minds do not linger in the "age that is dead and gone," and if any man fears the silent opposition of his vote and the votes of those like him will not be sufficient to stem the tide of thoughtless reversion to a condition we are fighting to eliminate from the world, then it is that man's duty to fight publicly with every faculty and wit with which he has been endowed to defeat such reversion as decisively as the militaristic program of Germany must be defeated. The unprecedented sacrifice the men in battle are making is too prodigious to allow the more fortunate who remain at home to seek to betray the children of these heroic dead back in the despotic militarism they died to abolish. I can see nothing inconsistent in the policy of our President. He spoke of an age that is dead and gone, but it may rather be said that he alone of the leaders of great nations of the world lived in an age that was not yet born, and which he is now, by steadfast and inspiring faith in the realization of Right, bringing into existence. Menaced by the possibility of a victorious nation who had proclaimed herself bound to no solemn pledges, nor to any law but expediency and military necessity, and with the vision of the necessity in the near future of either adopting a permanent domestic militaristic despotism like Germany's or being forced to adopt a foreign one, in the event that we remained at peace, it was decided that nothing was left but to discourage imperialistic autocratic ambitions throughout the world by a decisive defeat of the hitherto successful German war machine. Realizing the magnitude of the task, it would have been fatuous, contemptible equivocation not to use every power the nation could possibly commandeer to strike the most forceful and quick blow that she is capable of delivering to bring about such discouragement. It would have been worse than shortsighted, it would have been tragic, had the government stopped to question which were better—temporary suspension of democratic and free institutions or permanent abolition of them. But the speed with which the new era has dawned upon us has been so great as to confuse minds unaccustomed to think quickly, and thus we have the apparent contradiction of dazed Congressmen proposing in substance that in order to make democracy really safe, *after* the war we remove it from Washington altogether and conceal it safely in a history book, but which apparent contradiction, however, must in no wise discourage those

with clearer vision, who must determine that our dead shall not have died in vain and their sacrifice rendered futile and abortive, and that the kingdom of the doubters in the practicality of Right shall not come to pass.

A. KAY.

New York.

## Insurance or Pensions

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I am exceedingly interested in the article, "Insurance or Pensions?" in the February 8 issue of THE PUBLIC. This is particularly true for the reason that the "Tontine" method of raising money is not new to me.

I think, when it is sifted to the bottom, the real object of adopting the Tontine system, for the reasons suggested, is to raise public money. The system was employed by the French Government for that purpose many years ago.

You say it is like a lottery excepting there are no blanks. I note you are careful not to say there are no losses. A little refund under certain contingencies works well as a sop. You know there cannot be large profits without proportional losses to the less fortunate. "You cannot get wool unless you have sheep to shear."

The fact is "Tontines" or pooling of interests, or the "survivorship benefit" schemes may well be viewed with suspicion, especially when they are advanced as a beneficent institution.

It is purely a lottery and can only result in still further enriching the more fortunate at the expense of the less fortunate. Such a scheme is not productive of one penny but merely a juggler, passing money from one fellow's pocket to the other. If there were no necessary loss to any in order to make it attractive as an investment, all very well. You know that is by no means true of this scheme.

May we not as well throw down the bars to all forms of lottery? Do you think the adoption of such a scheme will have no adverse affect on the national morals.

I am surprised at your quiescent attitude toward this proposal.

Let the expense of the war and all government expenses in the future be proportionately borne by all and such special benefits as are due to any, be received in just proportion.

R. G. VAN NUYS.

Frankfort, Ind.

\* \*

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Your article on "Insurance or Pensions" published in the February 8 issue interested me very much. Perhaps you are not aware that the very system which you credit Charles Frederick Adams with working out was incorporated into the Brotherhood of the Commonwealth, founded by him in 1904. Louis F. Post,

founder of THE PUBLIC, and many other well-known men, are members of its advisory board.

A copy of the Brotherhood bulletin may be obtained by writing to the secretary, P. O. Box No. 9, Brooklyn. It gives detailed explanation of the working of the plan.

If THE PUBLIC will call attention to these facts they will no doubt prove of great interest to many of your readers.

CLARENCE E. HAUSER.

Brooklyn.

## BOOKS

### Into the New World

*The Soul of Democracy.* By Edward Howard Griggs. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. Price \$1.25.

Every problem is ultimately a personal problem, whether it concerns a world crisis or only a minor contingency. Each must grasp his scheme of things in a way that makes it possible for him to live with it. To understand the meaning of what we are doing is an uncomfortable necessity involved in being human; to remake comprehension into directive purpose is a supremely satisfying privilege. Dramatic events in the process of world change must in the end be translated into terms of human and personal values. The thesis of democracy, as of this book, is that "the state is for man," supplemented by another, "man is for mankind." The war and subsequent reconstruction are not, then, matters of mechanical determination, but matters of individual and moral concern, matters that involve and depend upon hopes, fears, hatreds, loyalties, ideals. Mr. Griggs' book is one that will help innumerable persons to find their spiritual bearings.

Just as modern drama begins with persons living ordinary lives according to ordinary standards, and projects into this situation the disturbance that requires readjustment, so Mr. Griggs begins with the ordinary cultivated man's stock of ideas, and projects into it the lessons of world-change. It is the sudden illuminating flash of insight disclosing obscured significances in the spiritual no-man's land of war, it is the sure guidance of one who has explored the region where moral and social readjustment must take place—that gives this book its charm and value.

Democracy is for the majority rather an atmospheric effect than a concept of thinking, and the fight for the preservation of democracy is due to vague instinct rather than reasoned purpose. To understand this thing, to grasp its implications, to see it as a world-order with its inevitable consequences for individual life, and this in terms so simple that no intelligent member of the community can be excused a lack of comprehension, was a task awaiting the effort of some great teacher. And the accomplishment is commendably free from the technical language of moral philosophy and political science as well as the pedantry of scholarship. The pre-eminent requirement of the present is a balanced sanity, sufficiently tenacious of the

past, but stepping out with bold inquiry into the future.

Taking democracy as the great central moral fact of life, the chapters embrace a wide range, from international ethics to the evolution of leadership. As was to be expected of one whose work is that of a teacher, Mr. Griggs shows special competence in his treatment of education. "The path of democracy is education," but our mechanized schools and autocratically ruled universities are far from meeting their responsibilities. To protect and foster the quality of individual initiative and point it to the service of man, is the essential of democratic education.

The effect of the war upon feminism is studied in one of the most interesting chapters of the book. It is strange that a social order which receives so much feminine admiration is one that most adversely affects the status of women. "Militarism and feminism are counter currents in the tide of history. All recrudescence of brute force carries the subjugation of women." But with "the general stimulation of radical thinking that the war involves," there will be "a profound acceleration of the feminist movement throughout, at least, the democracies of the world."

The present hour is one of sacrifice, to be faced unflinchingly for the ideals we have so proudly proclaimed. "'Awake America' means Americans awake! For in democracy the individual is the soul. On each person rests the responsibility. Let us accept the bitter burden and meet the supreme test, giving time, money, service, life, and those we love better than life, for the sake of the safer, freer, nobler world that is to be."

## Conservation and Laissez Faire

*The Foundation of National Prosperity.* By Richard T. Ely, Ralph H. Hess, Charles K. Leith, Thomas Nixon Carver. Published by The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Price, \$2.00.

The book consists of four separate treatises on conservation. Professor Ely confines his discussion to "Conservation and Economic Theory"; Professor Hess dwells upon "Conservation and Economic Evolution"; Professor Leith presents facts concerning "Conservation of Certain Mineral Resources," and Professor Carver speaks of "Conservation of Human Resources." The work is useful for the facts it presents, as well as for its arguments and theories. Needless to say, it is not a radical production, but expresses rather the views of thinkers who realize the impracticability of orthodox treatment of the land question, and yet stop short of or turn aside from the logical alternative.

Professor Ely finds that conservation requires abandonment of the laissez-faire idea, using that term not in its proper sense, but as currently misconstrued and misapplied. He will find true individualists in accord with him since they have never felt any other way. The conditions to be let alone are those only which rest upon a sound economic foundation. Things fundamentally wrong should necessarily be cleared away. Misapplication to these of the laissez-faire doctrine has brought upon it undeserved disrepute.

In his outline of proposed conservation policies, Professor Ely would still leave undisturbed some

institutions to which the thorough individualist would not apply laissez faire. The surface of the earth he would leave, with some exceptions, under absolute private ownership. But there must be a separation, he holds, between what is above and below. Public policy requires "as large an ownership of mineral treasures by society in its collective capacity as possible," and mineral lands now publicly owned should so remain. The same applies to water and to shore lands. Forests and oil-bearing lands should also, for the most part, be publicly owned. He finds, however, that "agricultural and arable land gives the best results when it is privately owned in suitable areas, and when as a general rule the man who cultivates the land is its owner." Yet he finds exceptions even here. He thinks it best that the American Negro be a tenant of private individuals and presumably, though he does not say so, of white landlords. Nevertheless, he says that "when the state is well administered it may and, in fact, does make a good landlord, setting standards for other landlords."

Professor Hess finds that "a combination of Malthusian doctrine of population and the Ricardian theory of rent constitutes the foundation of modern theories of economic welfare and wealth distribution, and in considerable measure of public land and financial policies, in so far as they are in accord with scientific demands." These theories he observes "furnish a logical defense of the private right to own property and to receive an income therefrom, quite as well as a basis for the regulation of property and income in accordance with changing economic conditions and social needs." He also would do away with laissez-faire, and urges as a program:

The gradual adaptation of natural resources to their highest use—"use" being interpreted in terms of social benefits rather than private gain.

Restoration of partially exhausted resources when possible and socially expedient.

Prudential utilization of exhaustible and non-renewable resources, and the substitution therefor of less exhaustible resources whenever possible.

The reclamation and development of impotent resources by irrigation, drainage, etc., whenever socially expedient.

The need of such a program may seem to critical readers as tending to weaken defense of the private right to own property in land, and Professor Hess does finally arrive at conclusions which must leave the landowner wondering how much is to be left of his right. Professor Hess finds two ways of controlling private property in behalf of the general welfare: the direct exercise of police power, and operation of the taxing power. Exercise of police power includes control of streams, mineral deposits and irrigation. Taxation, he finds may stimulate exploitation of mines and forests "and thus may defeat the objects of conservation," while "a like tax upon unused and unimproved agricultural or urban lands may hasten their development and use, and will discourage over-liberal appropriation of lands from the public domain by speculators, and thereby promote conservation." He

also finds "a growing opinion that the 'unearned increment' or spontaneous increase in the value of real estate incorporated in public utility properties, should be considered as a *public equity* in the property, rather than as an automatic and continuous accrual to private values." In public purchases of public service properties, he suggests, no compensation for unearned increment should be given. He does not suggest that the same principle applies to unearned increment in other privately owned lands.

Professor Leith presents many facts and estimates concerning the coal, iron and copper resources, and recommends a program of government control for purposes of conservation. Regardless of what one may think of his suggestions, his facts are of undoubted value to students.

Professor Carver's contribution treats upon the human factor. He makes an interesting, as well as instructive text of the story of the much-derided Indiana farmer, whose sole ambition was "to grow more corn, to feed more hogs, to buy more land, to grow more corn, to feed more hogs, etc." He makes clear that so far from deserving the ridicule cast upon him, this farmer was an ideally useful citizen. He served humanity according to his ability. A singletaxer in Professor Carver's place would go even farther and show that the farmer could have been more useful had unwise laws not compelled him to sink in purchase of lands money that might have been devoted to raising hogs. The same system that required him to do this made it possible also for him and others to buy land, not in order to grow corn but to hold up some farmer who would want to do that. Human idleness, which Professor Carver finds a great waste, together with ignorance and vice, surely bears a strong relation to the predatory opportunity that this worthy Indiana farmer saw fit to disregard.

In discussing waste of human resources, Professor Carver does not confine himself to the involuntarily unemployed. The idle retired business man still able to perform useful service, the pensioner and the loafer who live on inherited wealth, are included. He finds that we support more lawyers than any other country, and that "much of our very best talent goes into the legal profession instead of going into productive work." Unprofitable litigation is only less wasteful than war. He finds the same fault with superfluous clergymen.

What fundamental democrats will recognize as the core of the whole problem is brought out by Professor Carver, in expressing impatience with oft-repeated suggestions that the state either protect the weak against the strong or allow the strong a free hand. He says: "It is time to begin talking about protecting production against predation." There are more bits of similar timely common-sense. "The more millionaires there are in the country, the better off the country is, provided each millionaire has earned his millions." Not many millionaires will find comfort in that. The statement, together with the preceding quotation, comes near to presenting the whole science of political economy in a nutshell. It is no disparage-

ment to Professor Carver's able collaborators to say that his share in the work is by far the most valuable and instructive. It is refreshing indeed, to read such economic wisdom as the following:

If the individual is in part a producer, and in part preying upon other people, that part of his work which is productive must be protected and rewarded, and that part which is predacious must be punished. The state need not give itself the slightest concern over the question as to whether he is weak or strong—that would be a silly question anyway. But the question whether his activities are productive or predacious is a matter of the utmost concern.

In other words, Professor Carver wants a fair field and no favor. That is the policy which the term "*laissez faire*" was designed to describe by the French physiocrats, who first employed it in economic discussion. And therein lies the solution of every economic problem.

S. D.

## Tammany Exposed

*The History of Tammany Hall.* By Gustavus Myers. Published by Boni & Liveright, New York, 1917. Price \$2.50 net.

The author of this interesting book claims to have adhered strictly to the rôle of the impartial historian. Whether or not he has faithfully carried out his purpose would be as difficult to determine as for a non-Mason or a non-Catholic to judge of the impartiality of a history of Masonry or Catholicism. Mr. Myers' work has the appearance of fairness; and the criticisms levied against the secret political organization are well bolstered by citations of authority, while his appraisement of its opponents shows that he is not blind to actual conditions. The book appeared in 1901, without a publisher's imprint, because no well-known publisher was willing to brave the possible anger of the organization. It now appears in response to a persistent demand, under the imprint of a firm that has striven to supply the public with works that might otherwise disappear from circulation. There will be many readers who will commend them for republishing "*The History of Tammany Hall*."

No factor or agency bulking large in the life of a nation, and extending over a period of time equal to that of the nation itself can fail to be of interest to the student of history. Tammany Hall is such an agency. About it cluster the traditions that mark long-continued power. Revered by friends, and execrated by opponents, it is to-day what it has been from the foundation of the American Government, a mysterious political entity, defying those who would destroy it, and baffling those who would understand it. It is the one local political agency in the country that has achieved a national reputation.

The question arises in inquiring minds, Why Tammany Hall? Why should a political agency so hated by its opponents, and feared even by those who must act with it, persist in a democracy. The answer is found

in political and economic conditions that have accompanied its growth. For, America, though inspired from the beginning by the loftiest ideals, has been slow in realizing her aspirations. Though proclaiming to the world that all men are born with equal rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," she still has a vast number of citizens who find conditions hard; and wherever any considerable number of men feel themselves aggrieved, there will be found some agency championing their cause. To those without, it may appear as evil and filled with all things undesirable; but to those whose cause it champions it will seem lovable and beneficently friendly.

Tammany Hall, even if measured by its enemies, suggests the times of Robin Hood and the English nobles. No moralist has arisen to defend brigandage itself; yet who that has heard the story of the men in Lincoln green has not felt a thrill of admiration for their magnanimous leader? Denounced he might be by church and state, and condemned by all the canons of morality, yet did the poor of his day condone his offenses, and not a few aided him in escaping the law. They were not careful in their analysis of ethical questions; but they felt in a general way that whereas the hero of Sherwood Forest robbed the rich, and shared with the poor, the nobles took from the poor, and gave back nothing. This is not to say that Tammany Hall retains the morals of Robin Hood; but it is not difficult to imagine that the poor of this day, and particularly the uninformed immigrant, should magnify the little favors and the great professions into championship of their cause as against some undefined but very real oppression.

The common mind estimates things by comparison. If not Tammany Hall, what? New York City is not always governed by Tammany. "Good Government" sometimes wins an election; occasionally "Fusion" triumphs. But what is the visible effect? Do not the poor continue in their poverty? Are not the conditions of life for the great mass of the people as hard as before? Who could tell from a study of prices, wages, or rents whether Tammany or some anti-Tammany organization was in control of the city government? It is not difficult to understand why the chief men and women in the community, the great merchants, manufacturers, bankers, and men of affairs should have preferred the Mitchel administration, for instance, to a Tammany administration. It embraced a broader vision, and it covered better execution; but what was there in it to appeal to a man out of a job, or to those who found prices mounting faster than wages. It is not necessary to ask what Hylan will do; it was sufficient to know what Mitchel had not done.

Nor is it a matter concerning only the very poor, and those interested in political jobs. There is a large element of intelligent and purposeful people who, though they turn against Tammany because of its indecency, return to it as the only effective means of rebuking betrayal in the name of "good government." For these people know that good government means something more than personal integrity and conscientious administration. Police graft and the prostitution of the public

service to the support of a political machine are most reprehensible; but when all is said and done the amount of wastage is comparatively slight, and almost none of it comes from the poor. But franchise exploitation and the private appropriation of community-made land values mounts into fabulous sums, most of which come from the poor. Tammany at its worst causes little hindrance to industry. Landlordism at its best, by holding land vacant for speculative purposes, and taking its annual toll from the land that is used, keeps industry always on the rack, and prevents capital from paying decent wages to labor.

"The History of Tammany Hall" is interesting to the student of affairs as an example of what can be done through organization; and it is also instructive in ways of how not to reform civil government. It must be evident to the reflective mind, in the light of past experience, that the only way to stop the petty filchings of Tammanyism is to put an end to the colossal drain of landlordism. The author is entitled to the thanks of the public for his careful and painstaking work; and the publishers are to be commended for republishing this valuable contribution to the history of American politics.

S. C.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending February 19

### Congressional Doings

The House passed on February 12 the Senate bill appropriating \$50,000,000 for housing of shipyard employes. It empowers the Shipping Board to buy, lease or condemn land or buildings and to build, sell or lease them. Another bill is pending appropriating a similar amount to be used by the Department of Labor in providing housing facilities for employes in industries other than shipbuilding. [See current volume, page 213.]

\* \*

The Railroad Control bill was reported favorably by the House Interstate Commerce Committee on February 15. A minority report was signed by Congressmen Esch of Wisconsin, Hamilton of Michigan, Parker of New Jersey, Winslow of Massachusetts, Dillon of South Dakota, Sweet of Iowa, Stiness of Rhode Island and Cooper of Ohio. They declare that they will support the bill, but urge that the Interstate Commerce Commission return its power unimpaired and that the date of two years after the war, fixed for the return of the roads to the owners, is too long. They hold it should not be more than one year and that some hold six months to be long enough.

### Hog Island Investigated

The Senate Commerce Committee, investigating affairs of the American International Construction Corporation at Hog Island, heard testimony on February 12. The total expenditures at the shipyard up to January 31 were \$23,313,362.38. Of this \$4,283,390.26 was for ships. The Government has advanced or guaranteed all funds. Charles N. Black of New York, who

sold the land to the corporation at \$2,000 an acre, told the committee that he was actuated by patriotic motives in fixing that price. When reminded that adjacent property had been sold for \$350 an acre, Mr. Black said that his property fronted on the river. The land was assessed for taxation at \$100 an acre. Mr. George J. Baldwin, chairman of the corporation, told the committee that the corporation expected a profit of \$6,000,000 from its contract. Asked by Senator Johnson why it insisted on profits, while claiming to be actuated by patriotic motives, Mr. Baldwin replied: "You can't keep a corporation alive on patriotism. Our stockholders must have their dividends." Asked to name the stockholders, Mr. Baldwin mentioned as the largest, Frank A. Vanderlip, Ogden Armour, C. A. Stone and E. S. Webster. These are directors of the corporation, together with C. A. Coffin, W. E. Corey, Robert Dollar, J. P. Grace, R. F. Herrick, Pierre S. duPont, Otto H. Kahn, R. S. Lovett, Ambrose Monell, H. S. Pritchett, P. A. Rockefeller, John D. Ryan, W. G. Saunders, J. A. Stillman, Guy E. Tripp, T. N. Vail, A. H. Wiggin, Beekman Winthrop and William Woodward.

#### Shipyard Strike Menace

A threatened strike of ship carpenters on the Atlantic Coast, on Government work, was stayed, at least temporarily, on February 17, after an interchange of telegrams between President Wilson and William L. Hutcheson, president of the United Brotherhood of Ship Carpenters and Joiners. The men are now receiving, nominally, \$4.88 a day. But payment of this rate, according to Mr. Hutcheson, is being evaded. The publicity campaign has filled New York with idle carpenters and the shipyard owners are alleged to have taken advantage of this by classifying skilled men as unskilled, and paying them but \$3 a day. The union's demand is \$6.60 a day, the rate fixed for the same work by the Wage Adjustment Board on the Pacific Coast. In answer to Mr. Hutcheson's request for a personal interview, President Wilson replied that he would first require that the men allow the Wage Adjustment Board to pass upon the matter, and that until every method of adjustment has been tried to the limit the men have no moral right to strike. He said further:

It is the duty of the Government to see that the best possible conditions of labor are maintained, as it is also its duty to see to it that there is no lawless and conscienceless profiteering, and that duty the Government has accepted and will perform. Will you cooperate or will you obstruct?

In reply Mr. Hutcheson said he would instruct representatives of the union to use their influence with the men to return to work, but that he had no power to sign an agreement with the Adjustment Board "which would deprive our members of their constitutional rights," and again requested a personal interview as "the only way in which to solve the question."

#### Labor Conditions in the Packing Industry

At the meat packers' wage arbitration hearing before Federal Judge Alschuler at Chicago, on February 13, a

number of witnesses testified concerning labor conditions. One witness, Mrs. Anna C. McQuillan, presented a statement of living expenses of her family of five for one year. It totalled \$1,288.84. It included \$240 for rent, \$60 for fuel and \$50 for clothing. It allowed nothing for sickness or incidentals. Father Louis W. Grudzinski, whose parish is the stockyards district, said that his parishioners employed in the stockyards are underpaid and their children undernourished. The average family has six or seven children, he said, and these cannot be properly provided for on wages received. Another witness said that the most her husband had ever earned at the yards in one week during several years was \$23 for 80 hours. Miss Agnes Nestor testified that 27½ cents an hour was the pay for common labor at the yards for men and 20 cents an hour for women.

\* \*

J. Ogden Armour testified at the hearing on February 18. He said he considered \$3.75 a day more than sufficient for a family to live on, but added that he would agree to pay any rate that Judge Alschuler as Federal arbitrator, might fix. He also favored paying women the same wages as men, and to pay overtime for work on legal holidays, although the Armour Company has never paid it. He would not commit himself on the eight-hour day. He was followed on the stand by Victor Olander, of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, who quoted reports of the Department of Labor and testimony of large employers to show that the eight-hour day had proven successful, from a business standpoint, wherever tried. He showed that the nations had made the worst showing in the war in which organized labor is weak.

#### Find Railroads Deliberately Mismanaged

In summarizing reports of special investigators the Interstate Commerce Commission supports the charge of the railroad brotherhood that railroad managers have neglected their duties since the Government assumed control. It finds that trains have been made up and allowed to stand for hours on tracks because of shortage of engines, thus clogging freight-yards and stopping traffic. Locomotives have been held in roundhouses when they should have been put at work. Crews have been held idle at terminals for 16 hours while waiting for engines and then relieved by other crews. Trains on sidings have been held up until the 16-hour law forced roads to send out relief crews.

#### The Prohibition Amendment

The Maryland Legislature finally ratified the Federal Prohibition Amendment on February 13, making the sixth state to do so. The Montana House of Representative adopted a ratification resolution on February 16, and the Senate Committee reported it favorably on the same day.

#### Both Party Committees for Suffrage

Federal woman suffrage has been endorsed by the Democratic National Committee. On February 11 the result of a vote by mail on the question was announced.

Of 48 members 28 are favorable, 14 opposed and 6 non-committal. By a 5 to 2 vote the Executive Committee adopted resolutions pledging the party to support of the pending amendment and urging favorable action by the Senate. On February 12 the Republican National Committee in session at St. Louis adopted unanimously a resolution approving the amendment.

#### Russia

Dispatches from Russia and from Stockholm and London indicate great confusion within the country. Disorder, pillaging, and killing are reported from Petrograd and other points. Since breaking off peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk and withdrawing from the war without signing a treaty the Bolshevik Government has given its attention to subduing the governments of Finland and Ukraine, which are branded as bourgeois. In Finland the regular government appears to be gaining the upper hand. In the Ukraine the capture of Kiev, the capital, is announced from Petrograd. Odessa is under bombardment by the navy, which is in the hands of the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks are reported to be making extensive plans for a campaign against General Alexieff's Cossack army. They have demanded of the Roumanians that they evacuate Bessarabia, and give free passage to Bolshevik troops through Roumania. No plans have been announced to meet the new German invasion. [See current volume, page 214.]

#### European War

An unexpected turn has been given to military operations by the breaking off of peace negotiations between Russia and the Central Powers, and the withdrawal of the former country from the war, without signing a treaty. The armistice expired on the 18th when, as announced from Berlin, German troops began an advance from Kovel to aid the Ukrainians in their struggle against the Bolshevik government. German troops are announced also as having begun an invasion of Russia in the north by crossing the Dvina River southeast of Riga in an advance on Dvinsk. Their immediate object is said to be the seizure of Estonia and Livonia. General military operations for the week have been confined to raiding parties, artillery action, and airplane work. [See current volume, page 214.]

\* \*

Peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk were broken off on the 11th when Foreign Minister Trotzky declared the German terms to be impossible, and formally withdrew the Russian delegates from the conference. He announced that Russia had withdrawn from the war, but that she would not sign a peace with the Central Powers. A treaty of peace was signed, however, between the Ukraine and the Central Powers fixing the boundaries of the new republic, providing for the restoration of consular relations, state treaties, and civil law, and providing also for indemnification for civil damages, the exchange of war prisoners, and the general conditions of peace. Among the commercial agreements is a provision that all articles transported across the territory of either party shall be free of duty. The

boundaries of Ukraine as drawn include the Polish province of Cholm. This has so incensed the Poles that an uprising is threatened. The pro-German party in Poland, which was slightly in the ascendent, is reported to be making common cause with the anti-German party on account of this betrayal of Polish interests. It is reported that Foreign Minister Count Czernin has notified Berlin that Austria will not participate or aid in a campaign of Russian conquest.

\* \*

President Wilson appeared before Congress on the 11th to redefine his position on the question of peace terms in the light of the speeches of Count Czernin and Chancellor von Hertling. He reiterated the principles laid down in his address of January 8, but amplified them to meet the more friendly address of Count Czernin. The fourteen provisions of the January speech, the President said, were not absolute, but provisional, and were meant to serve as a working basis until better ones were found. What America contends for, he declared, is a peace based upon the following principles:

First, that each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent;

Second, that peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power; but that

Third, every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival states, and

Fourth, that all well defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the world.

\* \*

The number of men lost on the transport *Tuscania*, torpedoed off the northeastern coast of Ireland, is announced as 164 soldiers and 7 members of the crew. The British ships lost by mines and submarines during the week were 13 vessels over 1,600 tons, and 6 less than that tonnage. Air raids upon London are becoming more frequent, but though a few non-combatants are killed or injured, no military damage is done. A raid of about sixty airplanes on Paris resulted in the killing and wounding of a number of persons, mostly women and children, as they are the more numerous.

\* \*

America's attention is still centered mainly upon ships for the transportation of men and supplies. The friction between men and contractors appears to be in the way of final settlement, and all strikes at the yards have

been called off. The Government has undertaken to enroll 250,000 expert mechanics who will place themselves at the call of the Government whenever men are needed at the shipyards. It is announced that the response has been so generous that the number is nearly complete. Reports from General Pershing at the front are optimistic. The men are satisfied with conditions and are in fine spirits.

\* \*

## NOTES

—William H. Hays of Indiana was elected chairman of the National Republican Committee on February 13.

—Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, former British Ambassador to the United States, died at Ottawa on the 14th, while on his way back to England.

—The bodies of 38 children were recovered from the ruins of the Gray Nunnery at Montreal, which was burned on the 14th.

—Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States in November numbered 6,446; emigrant aliens to the number of 8,136 departed during the same month.

—The House of Assembly of the Union of South Africa on the 13th rejected by a vote of 54 to 39 a motion in favor of incorporating a paragraph in the electoral reform bill, giving women the franchise.

—Professor Thomas W. Page of the department of economics in the University of Virginia was appointed member of the Tariff Board by President Wilson on February 13, vice Daniel C. Roper, resigned.

—War Savings Stamps passed the \$50,000,000 mark on the 12th, and are now increasing at the rate of \$11,000,000 a week. The amount of war savings securities to be put out by the Secretary of the Treasury is two billion dollars.

—A protest to President Wilson against the torture and burning of a Negro at Estill Springs, Tennessee, was sent on February 12 by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It urged the President to denounce these acts as he has denounced German crimes in Belgium and on the high seas.

—Governor Whitman of New York signed on February 13 the Wagner bill appointing former Governor Odell State Ice Controller, with power to contract for cutting and storing of 2,000,000 tons of ice on the Hudson River and its tributaries to prevent an ice shortage in New York during the summer.

—Provincial Treasurer Edward Brown of Manitoba recommended to the Legislature on February 6 three new revenue measures, one providing a general property tax of one mill on the dollar, the second a tax on all unoccupied lands except that unfit for cultivation, and the third a tax on amusements.

—William D. Haywood, secretary-treasurer of the I. W. W., was ordered released on \$15,000 bail by Judge Landis at Chicago, on February 12. Haywood has been under arrest since September 28. His bail was originally fixed at \$25,000. Judge Landis ordered it

reduced to \$15,000 over the protests of the district attorney. This has been furnished and Haywood was released.

—Abdul Hamid II., former Sultan of Turkey, died on the 10th. He had reigned as Sultan of Turkey and Commander of the Faithful from 1876 to 1909, when he was deposed by the Young Turks party, and his brother, Mehmed V., placed on the throne. His reign saw national disasters, and was marked by great cruelties to subject peoples. He was facetiously nicknamed "Abdul the damned."

—That all railroad employees receiving less than \$150 a month or perhaps \$2,000 a year, need more money to meet the higher cost of living was admitted to the Federal Railroad Wage Commission, on February 18, by J. W. Higgins, of the Western Association of Railways, in speaking for the Western roads. A similar admission for the Eastern roads was made by John G. Walber, secretary of their bureau of information.

—American soldiers lost on the transport *Tuscania* were protected by Government insurance and Government compensation, announces Secretary McAdoo. Those who had not applied for insurance were covered by automatic insurance, which is payable to wife, child or widowed mother. The automatic insurance amounts to \$25 a month for 240 months. Compensation in case of death, given by the Government without charge, and regardless of rank or pay, ranges from \$20 to \$75 a month. The automatic insurance was announced to cease February 12.

—Steps toward formation of the International Free Trade League are being taken by Kenneth B. Elliman, 38 St. Botolph St., Boston, with the cooperation of Henri Lambert of Belgium, Yves Guyot of France, and others. The organization differs from the present American Free Trade League inasmuch as it will stand for absolute free trade, whereas, the executive committee of the former organization has declared for a tariff for revenue only. The two bodies occupy different fields and are not antagonistic. The new organization is intended to make an active international campaign for free trade in anticipation of peace negotiations.

—Ten of the twelve members of the National Industrial Conference Board were named on February 17 by the Department of Labor. They will pass on all labor disputes during the war. Five members represent employers and five the American Federation of Labor. These will select the two additional members. The employers' representatives are Loyal A. Osborne of the Westinghouse Electric Co., Charles F. Brooker of the American Brass Co., Ansonia, Conn.; W. J. Vandervoort of the Root and Vandervoort Engineer Co., East Moline, Ill., L. F. Loree of the Delaware and Hudson Co., and C. Edwin Michael of the Virginia Bridge and Iron Co. of Roanoke, Va. The American Federation of Labor is represented by Frank J. Hayes of the mine workers, William L. Hutcheson of the carpenters, J. A. Franklin of the boilermakers, Victor Olander of the seamen, and T. A. Rickert of the garment workers.

The ROLL of  
WORKERS for  
JANUARY

*Everyone listed below sent in,  
last month, one or more new  
subscriptions to The Public  
or has co-operated in other  
ways.*

Abbott, Mrs. H. I.  
Ackerman, E. B.  
Affeld, C. E.  
Affeld, W. G.  
Akin, J. E.  
Allen, G. H.  
Allen, Mrs. H. L.  
Allen, J. A.  
Allison, T. W.  
Allison, A. C.  
Albright, J. M.  
Anderson, Albin  
Anderson, A. A.  
Andrews, J. H.  
Annear, Thomas  
Arnold, Rev. Frederick S.  
Ascherman, G. S.  
Ashton, E. W.  
Atben, Virginia  
Atkinson, G. H.  
Bachman, H. L.  
Bailey, F. E. L.  
Baker, M. H.  
Baldwin, A. H.  
Barber, H. G.  
Bard, E. C.  
Barker, E.  
Barkis, H.  
Barnum, Thos.  
Bartlett, Gus.  
Bartlett, H. N.  
Barton, D. C.  
Bassett, E. W.  
Batchelder, H. D.  
Batchelor, S.  
Bayers, P. G.  
Beebe, F.  
Beecher, A. E.  
Beecher, Walter H.  
Beers, Ethel  
Beicher, C. E.  
Beiknap, Hon. W.  
Bell, Rev. B. I.  
Benjamin, Paul L.  
Bennett, E. L.  
Benson, V.  
Bernstein, W.  
Billinger, Martin  
Bingham, M. F.  
Birmingham, T. F.  
Bixler, S. C.  
Blackhall, C. D.  
Blakemore, Robert B.  
Blasker, C. D.  
Blanchard, P. B.  
Blauvelt, J.  
Boardman, W. H.  
Bode, F. H.  
Bodish, G. H.  
Boeck, E. H.  
Bogart, Mrs. C. P.  
Bookbinder, Dr. J.  
Boone, F. M.  
Bourland, Mrs. O. P.  
Bowen, G. E.  
Bowman, A. C.  
Bradley, Mrs. K.  
Brand, Dr. W. A.  
Brandt, H. E.  
Brendum, Hans  
Brancher, Alma E.  
Bredin, G. S.  
Bregger, L. A.  
Breuer, Lesslie G.  
Bridge, E.  
Brock, M. M.  
Brown, A.  
Brown, D. M.  
Brown, E. T.  
Brown, Frank O.  
Brown, H. H.

# THE GREAT APRIL OFFENSIVE

WITH the first issue of April, the circulation department of The Public will begin an offensive with the aim of capturing 5,000 of the finest women of the country! We want them for use in the front trenches—in the front trenches of a fight for a reconstruction that will make the world anew!

The time is ripe for such a campaign. In New York State, and in other states where the women have won the vote, there is developing educational machinery, mostly voluntary, to teach women citizenship. In our campaign we will aim to reach the LIBERAL WOMEN WHO READ. Among these The Public can be of incomparable service, as an inspirer of democratic thought and action.

*5,000 subscriptions  
from liberal women who read!*

Brown, Corp. James S.	Corser, F. G.	Ferguson, Ed.
Brown, Miss Louise	Cortvriendt, A.	Fields, W. S.
Brown, L.	Corwin, C. T.	Finn, B.
Brown, L. Z.	Cossett, Mrs. Winifred B.	Fisher, H. B.
Brown, M. L.	Craig, A. S.	Fitch, Dr. S. J.
Bucklin, Hon. J. W.	Craig, Thos. P.	Flood, J. F.
Bueche, David	Crane, A. S.	Ford, O. O.
Buell, C. J.	Cranford, Mrs. K.	Ford, E. J.
Bullard, T. E.	Crawford, I.	Forkin, Mary A.
Bullock, F. M.	Oroosey, Miss Frances	Foster, H. P.
Burke, W. H.	Crowell, Lincoln	Freeman, A. E.
Burr, Rev. Hugh C.	Cunningham, Dr. C. E.	Freeman, Miss Ellen A.
Burroughs, H. D.	Cunningham, T. S.	Frey, Eugene
Bush, Dr. A. D.	Cunningham, W. H.	Friedrick, Jack F.
Butcher, E. Z.	Cutler, J. H.	Fries, E. B.
Butler, Frank D.	Cutler, J. Katherine	Fries, Scott W.
Callahan, Col. P. H.	Daball, J.	Fromen, Dr. E.
Callingham, W. M.	Danrigier, Mrs. G.	Fuchs, Albert G.
Campbell, A. O.	Darby, Mary A.	Fuchs, E.
Campbell, F. S.	Davies, George	Fuller, J. C.
Campbell, P. F.	Davies, H.	Fuss, S. L.
Campbell, T. E.	Davis, Anna	Gallagher, Dan
Campton, J. S.	Davis, W. H.	Gardener, Col. C.
Canavan, M. J.	Davis, W. M.	Gaston, W.
Canton, G. T.	Day, H. L.	Gates, Wm. A.
Carlton, A. L.	Day, Josephine H.	Gelb, F. P.
Carlton, E. C.	DeBeck, Dr. D.	Gelman, Lawrence
Carman, Jno. C.	Demmler, W. R.	Giese, Henry W.
Garret, J. R.	Demuth, J. A.	Gifford, Dr.
Carrington, W. D.	Dennett, H.	Gilbert, H. C.
Carroll, Jos. R.	Derrickson, E. R.	Gilloughly, Rev. J. F.
Casson, C. H.	Detmer, H.	Glass, S. H.
Casson, C. W.	Dexter, A. H.	Glodrey, Mrs. Edith
Chaffee, Joan	Diack, Dr. Alex. S.	Goldberg, S.
Chapman, Mrs. Maude	Dibble, Robt.	Goode, Fred D.
Chase, D. W.	Dickey, L. S.	Gooding, G. E.
Chase, O. P.	Dolson, James H.	Gorton, H. S.
Chervin, H. T.	Doulon, P. H.	Grady, C. P.
Chesley, J. A.	Donoghue, M. V.	Graham, P. S.
Christensen, P. P.	Doyle, T. H.	Graichen, A. H.
Clark, A.	Drummer, Mrs. W. F.	Granger, A.
Clarke, E. L.	Dulin, G. S.	Grant, D. T.
Clements, L. B.	Dunlap, Dane S.	Grant, Frank
Coddington, Hester	Dunn, G. T.	Greeley, G. B.
Codman, Mrs. E. A.	Du Pont, E. Paul	Greene, N. R.
Codman, J. S.	Dwyer, Wm. M.	Greenburgh, M. B.
Coe, G. A.	Dykstra, D.	Grover, Edmund
Coffin, B. E.	Earnshaw, J. H.	Gubelman, A.
Cole, P. W.	Eaton, Allen	Guffin, J. C.
Collard, T. T.	Eckert, M.	Gugler, Ralph
Colmore, Rt. Rev. Chas. B.	Edmunds, Miss Amy	Gwynn, E. B.
Cook, G.	Edson, J.	Haeckl, Chas.
Cook, O. R.	Edwards, J. P.	Haggerty, J. J.
Cooley, G. B.	Edwards, Marguerite	Hale, F. N.
Coolidge, H. A.	Eisendrath, Mrs. J. N.	Halcy, Margaret A.
Conney, J. H.	Ellery, James B.	Hall, H. A.
Colwick, A. M.	Elwyn, B.	Hallinan, Josephine
Comings, G. F.	Emerson, E. A.	Hamilton, Mrs. A.
Connor, Dr. Mary H.	Emerson, M. L.	Hamilton, F. B.
Cope, M. M.	Engleman, A. D.	Hamlin, H. B.
Copeland, M. C.	Evans, S.	Hamlin, Jos. B.
Cork, T. C.	Falsey, A. W.	Hampton, G. P.
Cornick, Dr. Boyd	Fels, Mrs. Joseph	Hanrahan, James J.

Hardinge, H. M.  
 Harlan, P. K.  
 Harned, M. B.  
 Harpham, C. F.  
 Harris, A. M.  
 Harold, Eura L.  
 Harrsch, Wm. G.  
 Hart, N. H.  
 Harter, Miss E. L.  
 Hartman, Miss C. Z.  
 Hartzell, P.  
 Haskins, C. N.  
 Hastings, John B.  
 Hazard, G. A.  
 Hayes, F. F.  
 Haywood, J. H.  
 Hayward, Mary Smith  
 Healy, A. A.  
 Hecht, Chas.  
 Heim, C. H.  
 Hennessy, O. O'C.  
 Herman, A. S.  
 Herre, Dr. Albert O.  
 Herzkovits, J.  
 Heverin, F. H.  
 Hewitt, J. H.  
 Heywood, H.  
 Hickman, Mrs. V.  
 Hill, J. W.  
 Himrod, Bernard  
 Hoag, R. B.  
 Hoeveler, J. A.  
 Hoffman, Al H.  
 Hogard, F. L.  
 Hohler, C. L.  
 Holbrook, Miss Ida O.  
 Holland, L. B.  
 Holly, W. H.  
 Hoover, M. A.  
 Hoover, W. H.  
 Hopper, J. J.  
 Hoskins, W. H.  
 Houston, J. W.  
 Howard, H. S.  
 Howard, J. B.  
 Howe, S. G.  
 Hudson, Omas J.  
 Huff, Wm. K.  
 Hunt, Dr. H. F.  
 Hurley, E. W.  
 Hutchins, F. L.  
 Ingram, F. F.  
 Irons, L. A.  
 Irving, F. M.  
 Ito, R.  
 Jackson, H. A.  
 Jackson, Henry R.  
 Jackson, Walter P.  
 Jacobson, J. H.  
 Jenkins, G. T.  
 Johnson, Axel.  
 Johnson, A. M.  
 Johnson, Dr. Bertha F.  
 Johnson, C. A.  
 Johnson, D. D.  
 Jones, A. H.  
 Jones, Benj. H.  
 Jones, David B.  
 Jones, F. P.  
 Jones, H. O.  
 Jordan, David Starr  
 Jordstad, O. M.  
 Keating, A. C.  
 Kenney, Fred  
 Ketchum, A. J.  
 Kiefer, A.  
 Kies, B. E.  
 Kilgour, A. D.  
 Kilgour, Robt. D.  
 Kilpatrick, Wm.  
 King, Mrs. S. E.  
 Kingsbury, I. F.  
 Kirsteln, C. A.  
 Kittredge, G. E.  
 Knapp, A. H.  
 Knight, H. W.  
 Knowles, S. E.  
 Koch, W. E.  
 Kohlsaat, P. B.  
 Kostir, W. J.  
 Kramer, L. W.  
 Kreeger, A.  
 Krug, Mrs. Julia  
 Lambross, Sarah Grant  
 Lamp, Dr. E. R.  
 Lang, E. G.  
 Lasher, G. S.  
 Laurence, Peter  
 Lawson, V. M.  
 Lee, M. C.  
 Lehr, A.

Lair, S. C.  
 Lenhouts, O.  
 Levine, Hyman  
 Levitt, I.  
 Levy, Aaron W.  
 Levy, F. A.  
 Lewis, E. A.  
 Lightbridge, J. P.  
 Ling, F. E.  
 Little, Mrs. Mary  
 Littlefield, F.  
 Lloyd, R. L.  
 Long, C. M.  
 Long, Mrs. F. B.  
 Lustgarten, Mrs. M.  
 Lynch, F. W.  
 MacDonald, D.  
 Malany, Rev. R.  
 Marder, Clarence O.  
 Marr, R. O.  
 Marshall, Miss M. A.  
 Marston, Mrs. Mary  
 Martin, C. B.  
 Martin, C. R.  
 Martin, E. P.  
 Martin, F.  
 Matthews, Wm.  
 McClintic, H. P.  
 McCorkle, Daniel S.  
 McCue, O.  
 McDowell, A. S.  
 McFarlane, H. W.  
 McGuire, J. H.  
 McGuire, M. J.  
 McJanet, J. P.  
 McKenzie, D.  
 McMakin, W.  
 Mecklem, A. M.  
 Menger, Geo.  
 Merrill, C. E.  
 Missgett, W. L.  
 Miller, L. O.  
 Milliken, Sam'l.  
 Mimmack, A. E.  
 Moore, O. S.  
 Morse, Mrs. A. S.  
 Mosher, J. H.  
 Moulton, O. L.  
 Munro, Wm. W.  
 Monroe, F. H.  
 Murphy, Chas. C.  
 Murphy, L. S.  
 Mylcrealine, Miss Frieda  
 Nachtrieb, J.  
 Nadler, H.  
 Nagel, G. W.  
 Nasb, R.  
 Neal, C. E.  
 Neidheiser, F. W.  
 Newcomb, L. E.  
 Newcomb, Thos. W.  
 Newell, H. D.  
 Newkirk, A. F.  
 Newton, J. R.  
 Nickerson, Miss Rheba D.  
 Niederhauser, Mrs. C. H.  
 Nilsson, O. A.  
 Nixdorf, W. M.  
 Nollen, N. S.  
 Norris, T. F.  
 Norton, E. Q.  
 O'Brien, C. A.  
 O'Dea, P. J.  
 Olander, J.  
 Oldegrave, W.  
 Oliver, J.  
 Oliver, W. G.  
 Olsen, O. L.  
 O'Rourke, Wm. P.  
 Orton, O. W.  
 Osborn, W. M.  
 Page, H. M.  
 Pardee, Otway  
 Paris, Francis N.  
 Parker, H. D.  
 Parkhurst, C. S.  
 Paskins, J. S.  
 Paterson, A. W.  
 Patrick, Harry L.  
 Patterson, G. W.  
 Pauli, A. O.  
 Peake, F.  
 Pearis, H. W.  
 Pendleton, D. D.  
 Pendleton, M. L.  
 Perkins, J. B.  
 Perley, L. O.  
 Pernod, Alex.  
 Peterson, F.  
 Pettingill, H. C.  
 Phelan, E. J.

Phinney, E.  
 Picknell, Miss Ellen  
 Poe, Clarence.  
 Poirier, F. X.  
 Pomroy, Mrs. A.  
 Porter, C. H.  
 Power, R.  
 Prellwitz, Henry  
 Price, Mrs. J. Thorpe  
 Babe, Harry  
 Ramsey, J. H.  
 Rand, F. P.  
 Raper, F. W.  
 Raresheid, Lillian  
 Ratner, A. S.  
 Rauch, G.  
 Rea, T. B.  
 Reese, D.  
 Reese, E. T.  
 Reinhard, Louis  
 Reisinger, C.  
 Retteymeyer, J. F.  
 Rice, H. A.  
 Rice, W. G.  
 Rich, D. F.  
 Richardson, Ed.  
 Ricker, B. J.  
 Riefer, F. W.  
 Ringdahl, F. W.  
 Ringold, P. M.  
 Rockinstein, J. H.  
 Rockwell, W. M.  
 Rogers, Chas. B.  
 Rogers, J. A.  
 Rogers, R.  
 Rogers, R. B.  
 Rohle, Mrs. S. P.  
 Ross, A.  
 Bouillard, I. G.  
 Rowe, A. A.  
 Royster, W. W.  
 Rubin, P. D.  
 Ruf, A. C.  
 Russell, David  
 Russell, Genevieve  
 Rust, A.  
 Sale, Julian  
 Saloway, Ben P.  
 Samuels, M. S.  
 Saunders, Dr. N. B.  
 Scarlett, J. A.  
 Schaefer, John  
 Schetter, Miss Charlotte  
 Schilling, J.  
 Schoell, W. F.  
 Schmidt, G. H.  
 Schreiter, Dr. J. K.  
 Schuchardt, R. F.  
 Schultz, Walter J. H.  
 Scott, Mrs. Minturn  
 Scribner, Grace  
 Seelbach, L. C.  
 Segal, Louis H.  
 Sellers, B.  
 Sessions, R. G.  
 Sharratt, O.  
 Shea, J. W.  
 Shepard, G. H.  
 Shohan, J. B.  
 Shoop, C. A.  
 Simpson, W. M.  
 Singsen, A. G.  
 Sinton, W. K.  
 Skidmore, J. E.  
 Slatter, Th.  
 Slaughter, Dr. John Willis  
 Smith, D. L.  
 Smith, Franklin  
 Smith, L. E.  
 Smith, Marion  
 Smith, M. A.  
 Smith, W. K.  
 Snodgrass, Miss M.  
 Snyder, B. F.  
 Solberg, T.  
 Sommers, William  
 Spofford, Mrs. E. R.  
 Stafford, F. B.  
 Stafford, J. C.  
 Starkey, Horace M.  
 Stelnertz, L. A.  
 Stephenson, H. W.  
 Stevens, A. F.  
 Stevingson, H. O.  
 Stewart, H. L.  
 Stewart, Josephine I.  
 Stillman, Miss Bessie W.  
 Stone, Della Hart  
 Stoycock, Dr. C. M.  
 Strickland, F. G.

Strong, Sydney  
 Stuart, Howard  
 Swanson, F. G.  
 Swanson, John A.  
 Swanson, Thomas  
 Swearingen, Miss Laura H.  
 Sycamore, H.  
 Tabor, Mrs. E. F.  
 Taft, T. T.  
 Talbot, W. T.  
 Taylor, M. O.  
 Taylor, R. F.  
 Taylor, W.  
 Thomas, H. E.  
 Thomas, John F.  
 Thompson, D. L.  
 Thompson, T. O.  
 Thompson, V.  
 Thorpe, S. P.  
 Thun, H.  
 Tideman, S.  
 Tiedjens, H.  
 Tindall, J. S.  
 Todison, C. A.  
 Tompkins, E. M.  
 Totten, Edward P.  
 Tracey, H. H.  
 Tracey, Jerome  
 Trent, E. K.  
 Trickey, C. E.  
 Turner, H. G.  
 Underhill, E. H.  
 Urell, R. E.  
 Vallance, C. A.  
 Van Horne, W. O.  
 Van Veen, M.  
 Victor, F. N.  
 Vroman, F. P.  
 Waite, F. L.  
 Wald, Emma  
 Walker, H.  
 Wallace, J. S.  
 Wallis, Louis  
 Walter, C.  
 Warnecke, C. M.  
 Wasgatt, C. E.  
 Waterbury, L. K.  
 Webb, H. F.  
 Weber, B. B.  
 Weller, J.  
 Welch, H. B.  
 Wells, Geo. V.  
 Wells, W. S.  
 West, Geo. P.  
 Wetherill, Anna D.  
 Wharam, John  
 Wheatly, W. W.  
 White, Jas.  
 White, Miss Laura R.  
 Whitney, Mrs. E. G.  
 Whittemore, B. A.  
 Whyte, Charles  
 Wilcox, Wm. W.  
 Williams, H. M.  
 Williams, S. W.  
 Williamson, Fred T.  
 Wilmer, C. B.  
 Wilson, E. O.  
 Wilson, R. B.  
 Winchell, H. B.  
 Winkler, H.  
 Winslow, Erving  
 Winthrop, C. J.  
 Wittler, Milton  
 Wolf, Alfred  
 Wood, G. F.  
 Woodbridge, D. W.  
 Woodhouse, H. J.  
 Woodward, Graham C.  
 Woodworth, A. H.  
 Wright, J. W.  
 Young, Arthur S.  
 Young, John G. R.  
 Young, R. F.  
 Zbinden, Theodore

The  
Public,  
122 E. 37th St.  
New York

I enclose \$2. Please  
send The Public to the  
3 new subscribers herewith

Name .....

Address .....

Single Subscription, six months, \$1.

Advertisement

Advertisement

# ALLIED PEOPLE'S LEAGUE

**OBJECT** The ALLIED PEOPLE'S LEAGUE, now organizing among civilians and soldiers for the purpose of putting the tax burden of the war on public resources and of winning the world over to the practice of true republican principle, states this POLICY in the hope of securing the co-operation of every believer in these things.

**POLICY** We hold that God made for all men all coal, ore, oil, timber, water power, farm and city land, and that, to make these resources as nearly as possible of equal benefit to all citizens, the state should have as its only rightful income their full annual rent value, wherewith to pay for all public expenses, desirable betterments and, especially at this time, for war costs.

**JUSTICE, LAW, ORDER** We hold every idea of state for which men give life or labor calls for the absolute and universal recognition of this POLICY. For, without the intelligent and united interest of all the people in progressive measures and without the unquestioned control which only the state can effect over education, commerce, banking, inventions and public utilities, such as roadways, railroads, telegraph and shipping, the natural resources of the people could not have grown into the mighty sources of wealth that they have now become. When everyone pays fair value to the state for use of land in every form, there will be no taxes on food, clothes, houses, tools and working capital, which now, without right or reason, weigh down upon the people, blinding them to their own interests, and raising the cost of living outrageously. This goes on continually while profits and usury of fast increasing and enormous magnitude, realized from actual public resources, flow to the pockets of a few who have special advantages in the present laws of every country. The whole people would take, in land rent, merely what the whole people make and no more. Then what every man created would be his and his alone, and unjust conditions in many industries and between capital and labor would at once cease. Free trade between free nations would follow with consequent common advantages by and between them, giving absolute assurance of permanent defensive safeguards against common enemies.

**WAR'S CAUSE AND CURE** We hold that systematic robbery based on class land control is the secret enslaving power that lies in Prussianism, which now has all Central Europe in its bloody grasp—to the peril of all other nations on earth—and that, if the Allies can be induced at this time to favor this people's POLICY, then, not only would they be able to open up vast new power and resource in support of their own cause, but they would also be able to drive a mighty wedge between land-fat junkers and landless people in Germany, especially Prussia. This would mean even more than battles won, it would mean lives saved and years of progress gained for ALL the people concerned in the war.

**PLAN** Lists of names of all who respond to this advertisement are sent to some one respondent in each village, town or city school district, from which responses come. These persons then organize neighborhood clubs. Each club is organized to represent all community interests and to establish the people's voice and power in all public matters by dividing working activities among such groups of members as are best fitted for caring for defense and war preparation,—library, schools and education,—recreation, sports and pastimes,—co-operative purchase, investment and insurance,—building, caretaking and town planning. These groups organize

separately into state, national and international branches of the League, each branch permanently acting for one special interest of the whole as need arises. Permanent organization of the League will be established in each country by correspondence, delegates from each district co-operating to effect a head in each capital or most central city.

Since the work of the League consists primarily in equalizing the use of natural resources to all workers and to the owners of industrial machinery, it follows that, to be a power for good, the League must prove its PLAN to be increasingly successful to all adherents. It can do this by establishing a profit-sharing system of manufacture and trade that will unite the interests of workers, capitalists and consumers in supplying all of the common needs of its members and the public. This cannot be done at once, but, soon co-operative buying will be established with such manufacturers as encourage and support this POLICY, so utilizing trade, already established, to interest and ally many workers in many lands in this League of the people.

In view of the foregoing plan, it is apparent that the building of a city of THE NEW FREEDOM will lie closer to the hearts and needs of many people than could anything else at this time. It would establish desirable headquarters for the League. It would lead in general civic reform, strengthening every good and great educational movement looking toward justice and better law, order and health. Suggestions are wanted now, while government aid is being sought to establish in some appropriate place the making of munitions and war supplies as a beginning for this city. Profitable business is always to be had from the government—if the people demand it. City land rent, due to the existence of wonderful world-bounding public utilities, in which every important city shares, is more productive of wealth than gold mines ever were. This is the *real public treasury*, which the new city will have. Great opportunities wait—only action is required to bring about this one event.

**PLEA** Everybody can help in this work. The IDEAL REPUBLIC exists, not in any one place, but in the hearts of men. Government can reflect this ideal only in law. But higher than law is knowledge; or the education which every man gets at the hands of his fellows. Today nations are being shaken to their very foundations, but all troubles can be settled—*even neglect in regard to land*—if the little republic of everyone's neighborhood once takes hold. Soldiers of The Republic will work, as they fight, for a free earth. Their opinion in favor of the OBJECT and POLICY of the League will exert a mighty influence both abroad and at home. Resultant organization and action in concert will strengthen the allied cause and exist, for all time, as a democratic bulwark of defense among all free peoples.

Believing that funds, to be used only for the spread of this advertisement of the people's need and the people's plan, will be gladly given and that it will spread far enough in the time set to accomplish its OBJECT and also help mightily in the Allied Cause *this Spring* we ask everyone interested to contribute 10 cents or more, *but not later than July 1st, 1918*, it being understood by all concerned that all receipts shall be accounted for and, if possible, returned with interest when industrial work is fully organized and profit-sharing established.

In answering please give name, address (also if with colors, home address), amount sent and name of paper publishing.

**Address ALLIED PEOPLE'S LEAGUE  
Preliminary Organization, Care WILLIAM DRUMMOND  
19 South La Salle Street CHICAGO, U.S.A.**

# STATE SERVICE MAGAZINE

*Nothing Like this Magazine in the United States*

## WHY?

BECAUSE it prints in a concise yet entertaining and complete form all the vital and human information concerning the greatest State in the country.

BECAUSE it keeps tab on the big State departments, giving its readers all the worth-while doings at first hand—articles prepared by men who know.

BECAUSE it sums up every month the important proceedings of the legislature while it is in session, including breezy personal comment.

BECAUSE it presents every month the reliable political news of New York; what its public men are saying; gossip about candidates and the campaign issues.

BECAUSE it tells of historical New York—the eminent men of the past; of historic spots made so by the imperishable deeds of New Yorkers; and the scenic grandeur of the State.

## FEATURES FOR MARCH

### Greatest Waterworks in the World.

First complete magazine story of New York City's Catskill Mountain water supply. Illustrated article showing how the metropolis is supplied with water through an aqueduct more than 100 miles long and big enough through which to run a railroad train.

### From Chromo Peddler to Governor.

A story of intense human interest concerning the wonderful career of the late Frank S. Black, who rose from obscurity to the highest office in the State.

### Supreme Court Justice on Direct Primaries.

Justice William M. Ross of the New York Supreme Court takes issue with Senator Elton R. Brown that judges should be nominated in a convention instead of at the primaries. It is the first statement by a supreme court judge on a very live question.

### Beaver in the Adirondacks.

Fascinating story by a State expert of how beaver, under the care of the Conservation Commission, are being increased in their old haunts in the forest preserve.

### Saving Niagara Falls for the Public.

More than thirty years ago the State acquired adjoining lands at the Falls, including beautiful islands, and established the State Reservation. The struggle to rescue the great cataract from despoilers is not yet over. The story is told by Charles M. Dow, for many years a commissioner.

**SUBSCRIPTION: \$3.00 per year in advance; Single copies 25 cents**

**State Service Magazine Company  
LYON BLOCK, ALBANY, N. Y.**

# Did You Read "Insurance or Pensions?"

in THE PUBLIC of February 8th? The plan advocated therein is the *Old Age Pension System* provided by the

## BROTHERHOOD OF THE COMMONWEALTH

a fraternal order founded June 15, 1904.

As low as \$1.00 a year will give you an income that increases each year and when most needed—in the later years of life.

It will cost you nothing to learn about it. Write

Walter B. Danforth, Executive Secretary, P. O. Box 9, Brooklyn, N. Y.

## To Advertisers

18,000 careful and discriminating readers of THE PUBLIC will see this paragraph.

Place your advertisement here next week and those 18,000 readers will see it.

Rates increase April 1.

## The Public

Advertising Department  
122 East 37th St.  
New York