

FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT

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

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

Stanford University  
7 FEB 1918

# The Public

A Journal of Democracy

**The Democracy of Germany**

**A Call to Liberals**

**France on Trial**

Published Weekly  
New York, N. Y.

**January 25, 1918**

**Ten Cents a Copy  
Two Dollars a Year**

**IF** Napoleon, when he had just returned from Elba, had written a book telling the world what aims and aspirations were guiding his epoch making manoeuvres;

**IF** before signing the Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln had caused to be published a startling exposition of his policies, which perplexed even those closest to him,

*How many millions of people would have eagerly perused the pages of those books?*

## The Bolsheviki and World Peace

by

LEON  
**TROTZKY**

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY LINCOLN STEFFENS

*the man who knows and understands him*

**Is the Most Important and Sensational Book of the War!**

It opens the eyes of the war-ridden world to the real aims and aspirations of the Bolsheviki and the remarkable man who wrote it. The man, who six months ago was living in a Bronx tenement, who is now paying off old furniture bills and small loans made to send him back to Russia,

*is the only man in the world who obtained a definite statement of peace terms from the military-mad autocrats of Prussia.*

History will perhaps place the name of Trotzky alongside that of Woodrow Wilson.

This Book proves what the leading English and French publications now acknowledge, what our own editors now realize—that TROTZKY wants WORLD PEACE, not a separate peace—that the BOLSHEVIKI are ANTI-PRUSSIAN—ANTI-HOHENZOLLERN—ANTI-HAPSBURG. Trotzky tells in this book how he would make the world SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY. He says, "Russian freedom must not be had at the expense of the freedom of Belgium or France." "Every Nationality must have the right to determine its own destiny."

**JUST PUBLISHED**

**\$1.50**  
Postage  
10c Extra

**BONI & LIVERIGHT**  
Publishers

115 West 40th Street, New York

**\$1.50**  
Postage  
10c Extra

*When you order, please say you saw the advt. in THE PUBLIC.*

# The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI

New York, N. Y., January 25, 1918

Number 1034

## Editorial

The Chamberlain bill to place every department and every agency of the Government under the absolute control of a War Cabinet of "three distinguished citizens of demonstrated ability" was nothing less than a bold coup d' état by the privileged classes of this country to take the Government out of the hands of President Wilson and his Cabinet and deliver it over to the party of militarism, protective tariffs and bellicose nationalism. It is an attempt to overturn the election of 1916. Mr. Chamberlain is either the gullible tool or the subordinate accomplice of men who see in the prevailing nervousness and unrest an opportunity to destroy Mr. Wilson's prestige at one blow, as a preliminary to the abandonment of this country's war aims and the substitution of their own program—a program involving control of Government by our great financial and industrial groups for the purpose of committing the nation to the sort of nationalism that conduces to economic imperialism abroad, and the preservation unchanged of the established economic order at home. Seeing the inevitable world-wide trend toward an economic reconstruction, these men think to check and defeat it in America by unseating and replacing by their own agents the understanding democrats who stand between us and a profound social disorganization. If the men behind this bill had their way, they would within six months destroy the morale of this nation and call into being a peace movement that could not long be resisted. Its specific exclusion of Secretaries Baker and Daniels and of President Wilson himself from the proposed War Cabinet speaks for itself. They will not succeed. We cannot trust the Senate. We probably can trust the House. And certainly we can trust the American people, whose voice will be heard in decisive tones before action can be taken. Mr. Chamberlain, dined

and cheered on Saturday last by the Security League in New York as he urged permanent universal military service, praising Roosevelt and praised by him and by Root, will awake to find himself not, as he supposes, the man of the hour, but the leading actor in one of the most discreditable episodes of American history.

\* \* \*

Conditions were propitious for this attempt to overturn the American scheme of government and discredit our liberal leadership. The press, reacting with great unanimity and precision to the will of the privileged interests, distorted the Garfield order suspending industries for five days into a catastrophe brought on by Mr. Baker's action of last summer in vetoing exorbitant coal prices. They ignored the fact that coal production in every month of this year has run ahead of the car supply, and that the transportation failure is entirely responsible for the fuel shortage. They ignored the fact that transportation has broken down because our railroad promoters and financiers began long before the war to starve the roads of needed new equipment, while setting aside large surpluses, in order to give the country an ocular demonstration of the need of higher freight rates. The admitted efficiency of the Shipping Board as reorganized; the splendid record of the Navy; the unprecedented speed with which the War Department has raised and equipped an army of 1,500,000 men and transported a considerable force to France without mishap; the competency of General Pershing, to which every French or British military authority pays tribute—all these have been pushed into the background while the public was fed on wholesale denunciation from the lips of politicians and disgruntled business men. England and France are not only able, but

willing and eager to equip our men with artillery as they arrive in France. That there should have been delays in the delivery of certain supplies was inevitable. The failure rests with American business, with the manufacturers and contractors who, in their zeal, promised fifty per cent more than they could perform. This national crisis will be a test of the power of a press maintained in the interest of a privileged class to befuddle and mislead the American public. It is unfortunate that this press has had the cooperation of such liberal journals as *The New Republic*, whose attacks upon Mr. Baker have been exactly in the intemperate tone and model of those appearing in newspapers that are interested and inspired; that even the *New York Evening Post* permitted itself to become hysterical in discussing the fuel order; unfortunate above all that the country has no alert, intelligent organization through which the common man can become instantly and effectively articulate. Yet THE PUBLIC is confident that the plan for which Mr. Chamberlain is agent will be buried beneath the indignant protests of the people.

\* \* \*

Colonel Roosevelt's conception of the qualities requisite to citizenship in a democracy was amazingly disclosed on Saturday last in the course of a speech before the National Security League. After repeating his assault on Secretary Baker and the Washington Administration and praising Senator Chamberlain in enthusiastic terms, he launched into a plea for universal military service as a permanent policy and said: "It will teach the young man to obey orders on the dot, without questioning, without letting his lower jaw hang down while he says 'Why?'" It will teach him to do that, and it will also teach him to act on his own initiative." To do the goose step to music with court-martial as the alternative, that is, will breed initiative. We needn't concern ourselves with the Colonel's logic too seriously here. For that little "Why?," which he would delete from the common man's vocabulary, is here to stay, and it is destined to dispose effectually of the pretensions of Colonel Roosevelt and all of his kind.

\* \* \*

When the United States Senate passed Senator Fletcher's bill appropriating \$50,000,000 to house shipyard employees, it virtually acknowledged the falsity of the claim most frequently

put forward in defense of the prevailing system of land tenure. The claim is that private ownership of land is essential to establishment of homes. Experience shows it to be in most cases an obstacle to home building. The vacant lots and crowded tenements of every city, together with the spread of landlordism in rural districts, have long borne witness to that. In the case of the shipyard employees the fact could no longer be blinked, but the Senate action is not a remedy. It partakes more of the nature of a surrender on the part of the Government to landed interests. The appropriation is for a purpose that land monopoly has made unattractive or unprofitable to private interests. And because Congress is unwilling to destroy the power to engage in such holdups, it must itself submit to them. "Tribute to land speculators and no defense against them" is the real meaning of the Shipping Board's recommendation of Government housing and of the Senate's action in accordance therewith.

## A Call to Liberals

A suggestion made to-day, which took the form of a prediction, was that the great captains of finance would be likely to make known before very long that the financial support they are giving the Government entitled them to express the hope that the President should bring into his inner councils some of the men in whom the people have supreme confidence. And in adopting this course, it was said, the President probably would be given to understand that he should waive aside political considerations and take men without regard to past or present party affiliations. That was the spirit of the country, it was asserted.—*Washington Correspondence New York Times*.

A new and momentous issue has arisen in this country within the past three weeks. The masters of business enterprise have awakened to the direction and intent of President Wilson's international policy. They have come with a shock to the realization that he and his advisers and the people behind him are in very truth waging a war for democracy and a stable peace. And they are groping their way toward an alignment of their forces that sooner or later will interpose itself as a formidable obstacle to a realization, through Mr. Wilson's policy, of the world's most precious hopes.

Only by compromise or surrender in the field of this country's fundamental war aims can the issue be avoided or the conflict long postponed.

And only through an awakening of the country's liberal forces and their drawing together in a powerful, conscious, intelligent political alignment can we give Mr. Wilson the requisite support and save enough of his program to justify the waging of this war.

THE PUBLIC has been exceedingly slow to admit the emergence of this issue. For a time it seemed that the great financial and industrial interests in this country would continue to give the President whole-hearted support—that points of difference between his intentions and theirs would be left until after the war. Much in the flood of recent criticism has been legitimate, and always it must be our difficult duty to judge between this sort of criticism and that which is disingenuous, which consciously or unconsciously is animated by other considerations than the successful prosecution of the war.

The genuineness and the full meaning of President Wilson's democratic intention were slow in manifesting themselves to the American business community. The process began early last summer, when Mr. Wilson and Secretaries Baker and Daniels showed a disposition to interfere with the free play of business enterprise in the field of prices. But the War Industries Board came into play as an agency for adjusting prices on a plane entirely satisfying to the large producers of steel, and fairly satisfying to producers of copper. Coal was a different story. Secretary Baker vetoed a tentative agreement on prices reached between Secretary Lane and Mr. Francis S. Peabody, for the operators, and Dr. Garfield as Fuel Administrator later fixed prices at much lower figures. Mr. Peabody himself testified last week that the operators have made huge profits under them, and production has increased to a volume far beyond the carrying capacity of the railroads. But a grudge remained. Then early this month came rumors from Washington that the tentative price arrangements were to be set aside in the near future in favor of the pooling device recommended by the Federal Trade Commission. The steel trade reacted badly, and satisfaction gave place to alarm. For, under a pooling arrangement, each producer would receive only a just and reasonable profit, to be determined by the Trade Commission after an investigation of costs that would begin with the cost of getting out raw materials.

More significantly, Mr. Wilson's intention began early to show itself in another field, where it touched the preconceptions and the privileges of the business community to the quick. This was the field of labor, and Secretary Baker was the agent through whom the Administration acted to give vitality and meaning to our war slogan, and so to enlist the confidence and active support of that common man who held the success or failure of our national enterprise in the hollow of his hand. A business man now conspicuous in the assault on Baker was among the steel masters who, six months before, flew into a rage when asked to sign munitions contracts providing for the eight-hour day and arbitration of industrial disputes. By a hundred acts and in a score of ways Mr. Baker showed his understanding and sympathy for the democratic movement in industry. In the doing of it he accomplished a work of preparedness that had the most direct and fundamental bearing on this country's military efficiency—a work without which military efficiency could not exist nor the war go on. But he also ran counter to some of the strongest and most precious preconceptions in the minds of men who domineer finance and industry in America.

All this is fragmentary and, relatively, unimportant enough. Our masters of business enterprise would put up with many things for the winning of the war and the attainment of those aims that to them are identified with victory. These aims are definite and distinct, and to procure a thorough public understanding of them and their significance is the need of the hour. They are, in the sight of America's leading business men, entirely worthy and highly patriotic. In the sight of the intelligent liberal they are fatal to democracy and peace, and so they must appear to the people of this country if we are to escape a repetition in this world of the disasters now upon it. In their most dangerous form they appear to America's great financial and industrial leaders as a vision—a vision of America as the financial and industrial center and master of the world; of American industry standardized and integrated to the last degree, pushing over the world through great legalized combinations, supported by tariffs and subventions; of American finance reaching into the backward places and obtaining control of rich undeveloped natural resources for fiscal exploitation; of American

bankers and American landlords taking toll of new continents now that the exploitation of this one no longer satisfies their craving for fresh risks, fresh masteries, fresh prizes worthy the enterprise of kings. As part of this vision they see an America drilled and regimented for efficient production—an America under the sway of scientific management, an America of workers responding to the patriotic stimuli of national pride and national honor, every immigrant "Americanized," every agitator silenced, every class difference smothered—by what? By the glamour of national prestige, by the cult of obedience, both to be fostered at a stroke by the institution of permanent compulsory universal military service! Great armaments as a visible sign of national power and prestige, equally potent to impress the malcontent at home, the competitor abroad!

A terrible program—terrible not for any deliberate animus of greed or aggression, but terrible for the very absence in the thoughts of its promoters of any suspicion that it is other than patriotism of the highest order, terrible for its failure to see America in terms of the ninety millions who own one-tenth of the wealth, of the expropriated masses whose toil furnishes the means for it all, whose future would become more precarious still, and who, if they are not warned, will respond like thoughtless schoolboys to the appeal of nationalist pomp and pride.

No alert and thoughtful newspaper reader will doubt the reality of this vision and the paramount place it occupies in the imaginations of our financial and industrial leaders. Time and again it has been put into words by spokesmen for our most powerful groups. It dominates their utterances at conferences and conventions. It animated the formation of the American International Corporation two years ago. Its direction became apparent during the Mexican crisis, when Mr. Vanderlip spoke scornfully at New Orleans of a Government that would not safeguard the foreign investments of its bankers, against revolutions or what not. It is more than a vision—it is an organized propaganda, with its preliminary objectives already clearly outlined. These are: the preservation of what we have of a protective tariff and the restoration of what we had under Taft, the cultivation of a more intense spirit of nationalism, looking to a more aggressive foreign policy, and, of primary im-

portance, the institution of permanent compulsory universal military training.

Within the week, hotels throughout the country have become a medium for a great nation-wide propaganda to induce Congress to commit itself to the retention of the army cantonments after the war and to a permanent policy of universal service. The campaign is being conducted by the Universal Military Training League, of which Mr. Howard H. Gross is the President. Mr. Gross is an expert in propaganda and publicity work. His last important job of this sort was the creation of sentiment for a non-partisan tariff commission, favored by protectionists as the surest and safest means of getting what they want. So there is a peculiar fitness in the choice of Mr. Gross to conduct the propaganda for universal service. He has, of course, the powerful cooperation of the National Security League and half a dozen similar organizations. Just now he is working through the International Federation of Commercial Travelers and the American Hotel Association, which acceded to the request of their best customers and urged hotel managers to display the posters, petitions and leaflets. These are unusually frank. One poster asks: "Shall the human liberties of our children be safeguarded by a democracy universally trained in youth to know and respect the obligations and service of citizenship, or be left to the mercy of theorists and a mob subject to alien and vicious influences?" A circular letter speaks of "the rumblings at home, which show the serious possibility and dangers of control by elements recognizing no sense of mutual responsibility." And still another warns us that "owing to the possibility of social unrest when the stress of the war finally reaches the American people, there is uncertainty as to legislation in the future, and we believe this is the time to urge action to safeguard the nation."

Again, universal military service is urged in order "to knit together lines of cleavage that are widening, that democracy may be made safe from within."

The values at stake here cannot be better shown than by a quotation from the latest book of Prof. Thorstein Veblen, probably our greatest economist. In "The Nature of Peace" he writes:

"Proceeding upon the abounding faith which these peoples [the American people] have in

business enterprise as a universal solvent, the unreserved venality and greed of their business men—unhampered by the gentleman's noblesse oblige—have pushed the conversion of public law to private gains farther and more openly here than elsewhere. The outcome has been divers measures in restraint of trade or in furtherance of profitable abuses, of such a crass and flagrant character that if once the popular apprehension is touched by matter-of-fact reflection on the actualities of this businesslike policy, the whole structure should reasonably be expected to crumble. If the present conjuncture of circumstances, e. g., should present to the American populace a choice between exclusion from the neutral league, and a consequent probable and dubious war of self-defense, on the one hand; as against entrance into the league, and security at the cost of relinquishing their national tariff in restraint of trade, on the other hand, it is always possible that the people might be brought to look their protective tariff in the face and recognize it for a commonplace conspiracy in restraint of trade, and so decide to shuffle it out of the way as a good riddance. And the rest of the Republic's businesslike policy of special favors would in such a case stand a chance of going in the discard along with the protective tariff, since the rest is of substantially the same disingenuous character. Not that anyone need entertain a confident expectation of such an exploit of common sense on the part of the American voters. There is little encouragement for such a hope in their past career of gullibility on this head. . . . The infatuation of the Americans with their protective tariff and other businesslike discriminations is a sufficiently serious matter in this connection, and it is always possible that their inability to give up this superstition might lead to their not adhering to this projected neutral league."

And finally: "The preservation of the present pecuniary law and order, with all its incidents of ownership and investment, is incompatible with an unwarlike state of peace and security. This current scheme of investment, business and sabotage, should have an appreciably better chance of survival in the long run if the present conditions of warlike preparation and national insecurity were maintained, or if the projected peace were left in a somewhat problematical state, sufficiently precarious to keep national ani-

mosities alert, and thereby to the neglect of domestic interests, particularly of such interests as touch the popular well-being. . . . So, if the projectors of this peace at large are in any degree inclined to seek concessive terms on which the peace might hopefully be made enduring, it should evidently be part of their endeavors from the outset to put events in train for the present abatement and eventual abrogation of the rights of ownership and of the price system in which these rights take effect. . . . On the other hand, if peace is not desired at the cost of relinquishing the scheme of competitive gains and competitive spending, the promoters of peace should logically observe due precaution and move only so far in the direction of a peaceable settlement as would result in a sufficiently unstable equilibrium of mutual jealousies; such as might expeditiously be upset whenever discontent with pecuniary affairs should come to threaten this established scheme of pecuniary prerogatives."

The supreme sin of President Wilson and of Secretary Baker in the eyes of the American business community is that, as promoters of peace, they have not observed the "due precaution" of which Prof. Veblen speaks. They actually desire a democratic and stable peace. On Jan. 8 Mr. Wilson addressed a message to the world in which he included among the country's war aims a demand for "the removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace." That, in the eyes of the business community, was heresy of the rankest sort, and for the first time in its treatment of the President the metropolitan press broke into a chorus of alarmed disapprobation and warning. As for Secretary Baker: In his annual report he presented a strong recommendation against permanent universal training, on the ground that the country's future military policy should be determined by conditions existing after the signing of a peace treaty. In other words, Mr. Baker took our war aims seriously. He actually believes in them. It is now only too apparent that for the influential business community they were so much sentimental nonsense, serviceable only as catch words for the populace.

Today Mr. Baker is bearing the brunt of the most powerful and virulent offensive launched in our generation against a public man. Mr. Wilson is the real target, and the attack will be trans-

ferred to him the moment the financial community becomes convinced that he is determined to adhere to the policies already declared. They still hope to convert him into their agent, to obtain his consent to sacrifice Baker, and with Baker the principles for which Baker stands. These principles are Mr. Wilson's principles, and they will not succeed.

THE PUBLIC does not assert that our captains of finance are united in a single gigantic conspiracy. There is much deliberateness, much far-sighted planning behind the present onslaught. But, more important, there is a vague instinctive rising in opposition to the enemy—to men and measures that are now seen clearly enough as powerful menaces to privilege. The occasion is propitious. Minor mistakes and failures, inevitable in the raising and equipping of an army of 1,500,000 men, have been magnified out of all proportion. Senator Chamberlain's ambition has been a useful agent. Irritation over the coal famine has helped. Was it not Baker who vetoed the fixing of exorbitant prices for coal last summer? And ignoring the patent fact that transportation, not coal production, has failed, it is Baker against whom the avalanche of denunciation is directed. Each and every one of those many acts of the past nine months by which Mr. Baker has enlisted the confidence and support of the workers and producers now becomes another grievance for his critics. There are specific instances without end. The War Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has been particularly conspicuous in the attack. On that committee are Mr. Waddill Catchings, President of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel and Iron Company, who resented Mr. Baker's insistence on the eight-hour day and arbitration in the contracts for munitions; Mr. Harry A. Wheeler, a Chicago banker who, while President of the National Chamber, wrote to Mr. Rockefeller and urged him to subsidize its official publication as a convenient organ for propagating Mr. Rockefeller's peculiar ideas; Mr. Lewis A. Pierson, New York banker and president of Austin, Nichols & Co., owning a chain of wholesale grocery stores recently proceeded against overcharging by the Food Administration; and Mr. Charles Nagel of St. Louis, a stand-pat Republican. These are four of the seven members of the committee that has been perhaps the noisiest in its denunciations of the Secretary of War.

But to be particular is to resort to muck-raking in a situation that calls rather for understanding. America's privileged classes are merely acting as they must be expected to act. The success of their offensive—the discrediting of the Wilson administration and the loss of a supporting majority in Congress as a result of the elections next fall—would be more disastrous to American democracy and the cause of humanity everywhere than any similar victory for the dark forces in our times. It would be one of the great tragic disasters of all history.

There is nothing of partisanship in this issue. As aggressive a political opponent as Senator Hiram W. Johnson of California believes that Mr. Baker stands between us and militarism in this country. Nor need any liberal or any radical feel entire satisfaction with the Wilson administration in other respects in order to recognize the necessity of standing firmly by it now on these cardinal issues. It is not that the defeat of the protectionists and of universal military training will remove all the dangers. But it is the unmistakable fact that these policies are our first line of defense, that if liberalism is vanquished here then no liberal or radical movement can hope to escape the paralyzing influence of bellicose nationalism in the years after the war. Any adequate economic reconstruction will be indefinitely postponed, and gradually pacifist America will be transformed into a nation of questionable superiority with relation to those European nations in which privileged classes have used the national power for purposes of aggression and exploitation.

### “A Dangerous Precedent”

An amazing solicitude for the welfare of the wage-earner on the part of our bankers and industrial magnates manifested itself in their protests against the order of Dr. Garfield suspending industry for five days. The *Saturday Evening Post's* conception of our industrial workers as plutocrats with bank rolls and Fords, fared no better than Mr. McAdoo's conception of them as prospective purchasers of Liberty bonds. Instead, there was an outcry against the wide-spread suffering and privation to be inflicted by four days of unaccustomed idleness. Even the National Association of Manufacturers telegraphed to the President a warning against suffering and

grave social unrest. Business for once dropped its pretensions and admitted the naked truth that our industrial population leads a miserable hand-to-mouth existence, never as much as four days' wages ahead of the specter of hunger and want.

Yet not even at the urging of the Federal Government would our masters of industry permit themselves to yield to sentimental weakness. On this question of wages, "the focal point of interest among steel and iron men," the *New York Times* tells us, "was in the offices of the United States Steel Corporation," a concern whose net earnings for 1917 have been estimated at approximately \$500,000,000. A special meeting of the Finance Committee was called in Judge Gary's office, attended by J. P. Morgan, George W. Perkins, James A. Farrell, president of the corporation, and Judge Gary. Henry C. Frick, owner of that marble palace of art on the upper Avenue, kept in touch with his colleagues by telephone while the meeting was in progress. In an adjoining room waited members of the Committee of the American Iron & Steel Institute, a euphonious name for "independent" steel companies like the Bethlehem, Lackawanna and Republic. It was for four men, with Mr. Frick's telephoned concurrence, to decide the question for the entire industry. Should half a million workers and their families, off there in the bitter cold hills of Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio, be thrown on their own resources for the five succeeding days, or should the Corporation set aside the \$3,000,000 required for their wages? The conference at length adjourns. Judge Gary emerges and speaks to the waiting reporters,

"We shall probably not pay the wages of our men when they are not actually employed," he said. "To do so would be contrary to the custom of the trade and would establish a precedent that would eventually be unfair to the employer and the employee."

A precedent, that is, that the human element in production means something more to these men than so much impersonal muscle, flesh and blood—a confession that the workers must not be turned off to shift for themselves, perhaps to starve, whenever in the future business enterprise may call for the practice of that sabotage which is otherwise known as curtailment of production. "Unfair" is a mild word. Such a confession would be fatal to the whole scheme on which industry is conducted. Wise Mr. Gary!

## "Poor, Benighted Unionists!"

This is such a mess of a country and Germany is really so far advanced on the road to socialism that the war is only an awful bore to the men with flowing ties and the women with bobbed hair who discuss the Revolution around cafe tables in the Washington Square section of New York. The ignorant coal miners of America—more than 400,000 of them banded together in a winning struggle for industrial democracy—feel differently about it. Their delegates assembled in biennial convention at Indianapolis cheered the President of the United Mine Workers, Frank J. Hayes, when, after asking the question: "Shall we be found wanting in this present emergency?", he answered it for them as follows:

"There can be but one answer by free men, and let us in this convention firmly resolve that every atom of energy we can contribute to the winning of the war will be given gladly, freely, and in the same loyal spirit as those who go out to give their lives, if need be, for the peace, freedom and security of the civilized world. Let there be no mistake about this war and its relation to the great humanitarian movement in which we are engaged. It must be evident to every close observer that the triumph of the Central Powers means the menace of militarism throughout the ages—means a world in turmoil and agony for centuries to come. What chance would labor have against the edicts and pronouncements of military autocracy? A philosophy based upon the right of a few to rule and conquer can find no place in the minds of liberty-loving men. It is a matter of particular pride that approximately 20,000 members of our organization have enlisted in the military forces of our nation. Our hearts go with them across the sea, and we know that these heroes of ours, who have faced the perils of the mines year in and year out, will not be found wanting when they face the foreign foe. While we are earnestly desirous of peace, we recognize that it is unattainable as long as the German emperor and his cohorts seek to dominate and force upon the world the creed that might makes right. . . . The International Executive Board has exonerated from the payment of dues all members who enlist in the service of the country."

"Bourgeois unionists, lacking in vision," ex-

claims the pacifist-socialist. Perhaps they are. They are also the men who bought rifles in the open market, issued a call to arms, and then forced Rockefeller's gunmen to sue for truce in the days following Ludlow. They are the men who have increased coal production by 50,000,000 tons, and who would have produced the other 50,000,000 tons of excess required this year if cars had been forthcoming. They are men who can fight industrial tyranny in America and Prussian militarism in the world at the same time, men who can and will nullify a medieval Supreme Court decision and whip still other industrial autocrats here at home while lending valiant aid in the struggle against a European manifestation of the same dark forces. They are the men who compose our greatest labor organization, our one great union organized on industrial lines, and they are using it to build up, slowly, painfully, but steadily and surely, an industrial democracy, meanwhile giving their powerful support to such fundamental economic reforms as public ownership and the singletax.

No wonder our cafe-table revolutionists feel far away from them!

### Chinese Coolies or Free Land?

The land question cannot be evaded in this country any longer. Journals pretending to cover the field of liberal thinking with relation to economics can no longer shut their eyes to it, nor dismiss it with vague suggestions looking to government purchase and colonization of minute tracts here and there. In every agricultural district in the country the farmers are facing a labor shortage during the coming summer so serious that the production of food in sufficient quantities and the performance of our part in the war are placed in jeopardy. The relief proposals advanced by politicians for meeting this shortage show how desperate is the situation. Governor Whitman has asked the New York legislature to authorize the conscription of labor, and in California the committee on farm labor of the State Council of Defense has brought in a report urging the importation of Chinese coolies.

Careful surveys made by the Department of Labor and the American Federation of Labor show that there is no actual labor shortage in this country—there is merely a faulty distribution. Among the populations of our cities are mil-

lions of native Americans brought up on American farms and other millions of immigrants recently arrived from the rural districts of Europe, where for generations they and their fathers have tilled the soil. There is no more a dearth of human material for the creation or extension of a healthy agriculture today than there was in the period of expansion following the Civil War, when young men by the hundreds of thousands took up free land west of the Mississippi river and converted it into fertile acres. Along with this human material we have nearly half a billion acres of agricultural land lying idle. Why? The Department of Agriculture has answered in its official bulletins. So have men as competent to speak as Mr. Herbert Quick of the Federal Farm Loan Board and Prof. Elwood Mead of the University of Agriculture. It is because the man without means has been driven from the farm-field by the existence of conditions that make of farm labor an underpaid, hopeless, insecure, vagabond occupation. Where farm labor once led naturally and easily to farm-ownership and independence, it is today a blind-alley occupation. In the years of unemployment preceding the war, land owners succeeded in obtaining labor because our industries had created a large class of homeless, migratory wretches driven to following the harvests because nothing better offered. Today these men are more profitably employed. And we are paying the price of a system of land-tenure that has made of farm labor the least desirable of occupations.

Land values have become so inflated that only the speculator or the rich man playing at agriculture can afford to purchase a farm. Almost all sales are speculative, and in instances where they are not, the purchaser more often than not struggles futilely against bankruptcy. He had bought land that was hugely overcapitalized, and to earn interest on its purchase price is out of the question. There is only one adequate and common-sense remedy. That is to tax the water out of our idle farm lands by raising all local revenues, at least, from the taxation of land values, at the same time relieving the struggling farm-owner by exempting his improvements from taxation. It is the remedy adopted by Australia and New Zealand, and adopted with success in western Canada. Even the conservative *Sydney Bulletin*, published in the Australian metropolis, exposes the futility of state purchase and colo-

nization as a remedy. To solve our land question by this method would lay a crushing method on the State, which would be called upon to recognize inflated land values in making its purchases. Sooner or later the land of this country must be opened to the people. To oppose the taxation method is, whether consciously or not, to bring nearer the method resorted to by the Russian Bolsheviki.

Labor cannot remain indifferent to this issue. Quite apart from its paramount interest in procuring an extension of opportunity for the common man, and thereby relieving the pressure for jobs in industry, labor must find a solution of the farm problem or submit to the importation of Chinese labor. Coolies once admitted for farm labor would not remain on the farm. They would become competitors in industry as well. This must not be permitted. But mere opposition is not enough. It is a choice between coolies and some method of drawing free, independent American citizens back to the soil.

## Western Canada's Mistake

Wide circulation has been given to objections to municipal land value taxation in Western Canada presented by the City Commissioner of Saskatoon, Mr. C. J. Yorath. Yet it seems that these objections answer themselves. Commissioner Yorath says of the actual results of the system:

1. It has proved to be the most difficult method of raising revenue.

2. It induced owners to develop property beyond normal demand, with the result that increased taxation has been incurred and rents have been reduced. Six and ten story buildings were built with the result that store and office accommodations are corralled upon a small parcel of land and owners outside are prevented from development, even if they would.

3. It did not prevent land speculation. While it was in operation Western Canada passed through the greatest period of speculation in its history.

4. No system of taxation can be just which makes it impossible for an owner to earn a fair interest on his investment and result in confiscation of his property.

5. It did not spread the burden of taxation over the community, i. e., through the payment of rents, etc., as owners have been compelled to take in the way of rent whatever they were offered, which in the majority of cases was not sufficient to pay 3 per cent on the money invested.

These objections may be treated seriatim:

1. Any difficulty in collecting the tax must be due either to needless defects in the law for proceeding against delinquents, or to negligence of officials. No difficulty of that kind has been reported from New Zealand where many localities have had the same system for a much longer time. Mr. Yorath should not blame the system for faulty legislation or administration that interferes with it.

2. How increased development happened to increase taxation, Mr. Yorath does not explain. If, as we are led to suppose, improvements are exempt from taxation in Saskatoon, it could not have increased the taxes of the improvers, unless the law should be improperly administered. In that case the administration is at fault. It may be that the development increased the value of unused property and consequently the assessments. That is as it should be. The same applies to the statements that it encouraged development and reduced rents. That some owners showed bad judgment in building is unfortunate, but whatever may be the evils of an over-production of buildings, it affects fewer people and is more easily borne than a system which makes rents high and withholds land from those who would use it. In the absence of more definite information from Mr. Yorath, it must be assumed that what prevents some unfortunate owners from developing is lack of demand. Now land that is not in demand must be valueless, and being valueless the owners have nothing on which to pay taxes, and can, without loss, refrain from paying. But Mr. Yorath may consider them unfortunate because they have been deprived of a chance to forestall industry and exact heavy tribute. From a predatory point of view that is unfortunate. But it looks otherwise when one considers the producer's interest.

3. Apparently this contradicts the preceding objection. Mr. Yorath being on the ground, must be credited with knowing whereof he speaks. But he presents a picture hard to visualize: A community where land is being over-developed and at the same time held on speculation on a falling market. However, if there is land speculation—and undoubtedly there is—it is because the land value taxes fell far short of taking the entire rental value for public use. Mr. Yorath should have explained more at length. His two apparently contradictory objections can be reconciled on the assumption that exemption

of improvements attracted capital to Saskatoon to invest in buildings, and attracted people. Certain individuals in the hope of indefinite continuation of these conditions sought to monopolize the benefits by grabbing land and holding it at high prices. Had the land value tax been high enough this could have been prevented. But because it was not, speculation proceeded until inflated values kept industry from spreading, and forced it to stop. Hence the corralling of six and ten story buildings on a small space and inability of owners to improve the balance. Saskatoon's remedy is to increase the tax.

4. Mr. Yorath should discriminate between investments. His argument is remarkably similar to that advanced by slaveholders against abolition. Investments in land have not the moral basis on which investments in labor products rest.

5. This indicates that the owners of improved building sites were robbed when they purchased. They had to pay so much above the real value of the sites that, in a majority of cases rents are not sufficient to pay 3 per cent on the combined investment in buildings and land. Such

occurrences are inevitable under a system that makes land a salable commodity. Mr. Yorath complains because the robbed ones were not able to shift their loss onto others. That is not an objection but an advantage. If robbery is to be stopped the last victims must not be allowed to hold up others. That may be hard on the last victims, but it is just nevertheless, and beneficial to the rest of the community.

Mr. Yorath's story does show that Western Canada has made a serious mistake, but it is not what he supposes. The mistake was that, having begun to untax improvements and put all local taxes on land values, the Western Provinces have not raised provincial revenues the same way and have not insisted that all Dominion revenues be taken from the same source, so that the entire rental value of land would go into the public treasury. Half-way measures cannot be perfect, and must have results far from satisfactory. Canada is suffering from land monopoly. The evil must not be treated tenderly. Its total abolition should be the answer to those who would put the blame for its pernicious results upon a just taxation system.

## The Democracy of Germany

By David Starr Jordan

How long will the war last? No one can answer this. The present outlook is that it will end when the German people are ready to meet the other people of the civilized world in an adjustment in the interest of friendship and justice.

The final end must take one of three forms more or less distinctly. It may be, as Louis F. Post and others have defined it, "a German Peace," "a Tory Peace," or "a Peace of Democracy." Or, taking the names of leading exponents of each, it may be "a Reventlow-Ludendorff Peace," "a Northcliffe Peace," or "a Wilson Peace."

All our intelligence and all our resources are pledged to the latter. But this involves in Germany a degree of Democratic Control in place of the irresponsible absolutism which now dominates, and of which the Kaiser is at once the agent and the victim. A "German Peace," which would leave Belgium and France in the grip of tyranny, is and has been from the first

unthinkable to all who care for the welfare of humanity. To yield to the spirit of Empire is to admit that might is right, that in the intercourse of nations there is no such thing as equity or justice. In every empire the people must make their way to Liberty. "Militarism not only makes men arrogant and brutal; it makes them stupid." The prophecy of the brave German democrat, Johann Philipp Becker in 1862,, is now finding its verification. "Though the German nation may by no means think of conquering and oppressing other peoples, as soon as it has given birth to the monster of a united empire, it will be no longer master of its own fate, but only the ill-treated slave of the monster nursed by the nation."

The dynasty, which owns the people of a land, as a farmer owns his sheep, becomes a world-enemy. The dynastic system is the root of war. It rests on three supports—force, intrigue and superstition, and it gathers to itself the arch-ene-

mies of liberty, the three war castes—the aristocratic, the military and the plutocratic. But business, big or little, is never the real cause of war. Capitalism merely uses the machinery it finds ready to its hand. Neither do wars originate with the people. It takes a prodigious amount of lying to stir up hatred anywhere. In the words of Dr. Nicolai of Berlin, "More lies are told in the shortest war than in the longest peace."

As to the "Northcliffe Peace," the President has set his face against it and it will never come to pass. The United States has entered the war with no possibility of national gain. It will see that none of its associates shall gain anything not demanded by the interests of justice. Final success is not a matter of boundaries but of the temper of the world. We have announced that we do not fight the German people, but only the system which perverts and depresses them in so far as it is a menace to the world. What response may we expect from Germany? Not a social and political collapse such as has come to Russia. The government of Russia has betrayed its people into the hands of its enemies. It was corrupt, vacillating and inefficient. The government of Germany is efficient, persistent and desperate. Those Germans who oppose it most energetically hesitate to work for military collapse, even if it lay in their power to bring it about. They are between two fires: in a way they face two opponents: the allies and the imperialistic armies.

Yet there are thousands who do not hesitate. The German lines and the German prisons are red with the blood of martyrs. Upwards of 80,000 men have been executed in Austria since 1913 for "disloyalty." Upwards of 30,000 German soldiers have deserted to Holland. Upwards of 30,000 Alsatians have left the German ranks to fight for freedom in France. German democrats abound in Switzerland. They send their words and their circulars across the line. From Switzerland go out the ringing words of Fernau, Fried, Hodler and the author of "J' Accuse."

In a paper on the "Psychology of Blame," Dr. Alfred H. Fried says that "every nation has its advocates of imperialism, chauvinism, nationalism, militarism, but in Germany alone have these doctrines been unfolded without limit, developed without check and separated by no bar from the power of the state. Only in Germany has this happened: the result is all the more tragic, as be-

fore the beginning of the war a change for the better was felt in Germany. Only another decade, perhaps half a decade, and the catastrophe would have been averted." Professor Herman Fernau writes to a friend in France: "The question of the day is: Are there anywhere leaders in German Democracy? Where the men in whose names Democracy can act? . . . Only wait! Who in February had ever heard of Kerensky? Who outside of special circles knew anything of Tscheidse or of Miliukoff? I could name dozens of notable competent Germans, democratic in body and soul—who tomorrow may be leaders of the German nation. . . . The Prussian people today think, read, and vote democratic. . . . The Entente people should at least give up the tradition, no longer applicable, of a great undemocratic, servile, militarized German people. To cling to this is to poison the coming peace. . . . The democratic idea slumbering in every people rises with military defeat. "Bring the German people to realize this and just the same as any nation they will be ripe for that self-government which can be the only guarantee of peace in the Europe which is to come."

Circulars and posters of many kinds are scattered about Germany—to be destroyed by the police. From one of these I translate these words: "When will Peace Come? When Germany is ready for it, and that time is approaching. It will come when Germany has learned the lesson of the war; when it has found that the voice of Europe cannot be deafened with impunity. The hour of peace will strike when Germany will no longer heed the makers of the war; when the militarism and chauvinism which kindled the war are shamed and despised. . . . Before our heroic deeds, the armies of Napoleon shrivel and what have we won by it? Two years ago, the world lay at our feet, strangers from every land came to our cities—everywhere was the German welcome. Now all over the world we are despised and hated. On our forehead rests the curse of Cain. Men shun us in the streets. Our language is forbidden . . . we will no longer follow. We demand a representative government. We condemn as insane a system of government which lays all power in the hands of one single man, who may, like you, be driven with ambition and vanity. We wish to take our place among the free nations of the world. . . . You step in full armor before the world as Lord of War. You

and your worthless son send brave men to death in flames or to be drowned under the floods while you avoid every danger. Peace will come when the German people awoken from its dream."

In "Die Freie Zeitung" of Berne, an organ of German Democracy, Dr. Philip H. Rösemeier analyzes the political complexion of Germany as it exists at present. He notes especially the three great divisions, the East ruled by landed aristocracy, the West by industrial magnates, and the South with its multitudes of peasantry and small towns. On the side of war, conquest and imperialism is first the Junker group, the landed squires with a large body of small farmers, profiting also by agricultural subsidies. These all demand a "Kaiser absolute, so long as he does our will." More or less united with these in common interests are great manufacturers, especially those in iron and steel. These with the land owners constitute the "union of country squire and chimney squire" notorious in German politics. The Centrum or Catholic party is often divided but more usually sides with conservatives of the "Right" rather than with the radicals of the "Left."

Many of the small tradespeople are counted with the "Right," especially those sympathizing with agitation against the Jews. With these also are the so-called "yellow trades unions"—associations of laborers founded and subsidized by their employers. Of the conservative party, with its "National Liberal" and "Intellectual" allies, the Junker landholders are the dominating group, and from this class practically all the army officers are drawn. It is thus the backbone of Imperialism and militarism, of which the supreme chief is the head of the House of Hohenzollern.

In opposition to dynastic rule are many differing elements. The sturdy advocates of the "Burgfriede," internal peace, have never bowed the knee to the war-lords. There is a large group of "Particularists" loyal to former rulers (as in Hanover and Hesse) who have always resented the land-grabbing which annexed their provinces to Prussia. There are many of the old high aristocracy "who fear that the present war will mean the overthrow of all existing things," and there are some Junkers, "disgusted with the world-conquering mania and the new-fangled ways of exalting over victory before it is gained." The Poles, Danes and Alsations, held in Germany by force alone, "do not join

in the hymns of victory of their oppressors." "There are even officers at the front who have become pacifists or even revolutionaries." "A small and continuously growing group of intellectuals holds on to the high traditions of German idealism and refuses to fall into the Prussian parade step executed by the well known '93 Kultur apostles.' A few republicans who saw things clearly, recognized at once that this world war, or at least, its outbreak, is the work of the house of Hohenzollern and adopted long before it was proclaimed in America, the slogan 'Down with the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns.'"

"A few literary men and idealists turned away in disgust from that mixture of bestiality, Byzantinism and barbarian arrogance." "Not all bankers and financiers lost their heads in the midst of the victorious jubulations." Many of the common people resisted from the first the waves of chauvinism, even though their socialist leaders were swept away by falsehoods and senseless enthusiasms. "Those who awoke first and who first regained their senses emerged from the anonymous masses. This fact does not diminish in any way the merit of those courageous men and women who are still in prison awaiting the day of the general rising of the people."

When will that day come?

Dr. Rösemeier cautions us against too ardent optimism. There will be a revolution in Germany, but most likely not of the Russian or the French pattern. It is claimed that 70 per cent of the German people would welcome the passing of the Hohenzollerns. "Very likely, but would they help to bring it about? Can they bring it about against the consecrated organized forces of the military and at a time when Germany is surrounded by an "angry ring" evoked by her shameless theory and practice of conquest and frightfulness?

"We are convinced that the revolution will come, but only illusionists and optimists . . . can believe that it will come soon and can count on its arrival as a sure factor. The best way to hasten the revolution is to rob German authority of its firmest support—namely the army—militarism—or if a personal name be preferred, Hindenburg."

Dr. Rösemeier quotes the answer of the socialists of Rome to Dr. Sudekum in 1914, "the

classical reply which in its epigrammatic brevity hit the nail on the head." "At present the best way to live up to one's anti-militarism is the military struggle against German militarism."

From a private letter of a prominent German-American I quote the following: "Some one attempted to start a movement among German-Americans for a Republican Germany about the time the United States declared war. But this was sterile of results, perhaps because unsustainable, but probably because it was premature. Sympathies that had followed along racial lines in this terrible struggle, could not be immediately reversed, nor had America's position been so definitely defined and determined as it is now, and German-Americans still thought and felt that the designs of the Allies were not free from desire to crush and dismember Germany; and to them, the government was still the people—and the call of the blood is strong. Their feeling then was more positive than apathy; it was to some extent a resentment at America's action; and this was not entirely confined to the German-Americans.

"But now we are positively and actively in the war; and our purpose, thanks to President Wilson, is the loftiest ever proclaimed, and is free from that petty revenge which some smaller souls desired to impress upon it. In the light of this the disappointment of German-Americans is gradually becoming less; and it would entirely disappear were we able to direct the sympathies of their kinship properly towards these ideals.

"There are between ten and twenty millions of Americans of German stock. Many of them are now, under the draft, giving up their sons to fight Germany. These will be ready to embrace the comforting thought that they are giving their sons for freedom and to liberate the German people and not for dismemberment and the disintegration of their race. The espousal of such a thought and object by all German-Americans would, to these, be an absolute assurance of the steadfastness of this, our purpose. Through the ramifications of this portion of the German-Americans we would soon be able to reach the others, and thus secure from them all a united and even bitter sentiment against Kaiserism, which they would then learn to look upon as the real cause of the present misery of their race.

"In our efforts to accomplish this we would meet with no organized opposition. The individual opponent could be easily taken into camp. Duly recognized and commissioned he would become as vehemently helpful as he was otherwise before. Once well under way, the effects of this movement would appeal to every phase of character. The lot of the German-Americans would change from the unhappy, almost repressed condition which they now occupy, to that of the most enthusiastic, most concerned and happiest workers in the great cause of humanity. It would unify America's sentiment, and in every way minister to our effectiveness. This united sentiment of the German-Americans would have a powerful effect on the German proletariat."

In 1913, I learned of a Congress of German democrats in Nürnberg. I attended the meeting, held under the direction of the "Friedensfreunde" (Friends of Peace) of Southern Germany. About 3,000 people were present. In the great city hall, D'Estournelles de Constant made the great effort of his life, an appeal for friendship between Germany and France. Professor Walter Schücking of the University of Marburg responded in like eloquent fashion.

The secretary asked me to come back to Germany and speak in as many cities as I might have time. I gave addresses in Frankfort, Wiesbaden, Mannheim, Stuttgart and Munich in favor of democracy and peace, in what I prayerfully thought was the German language. I said, among other things, that their war-system had perverted and poisoned ("verdreht und vergiftet") all their teaching of history, of patriotism and even of religion. I had a good following of intelligent people. Since the war began, several of these have sent—through Switzerland—word that they had not changed their opinions since 1913. And when the day of free speech and free voting comes to Germany these people will be heard from. Many of them are now actually in Switzerland doing active work for Democracy. Some are in prison and a few have fallen on the field of battle, forced into martyrdom for a cause in which they did not believe.

In New York and in Chicago, the Friends of German Democracy are very active in their efforts. But the Pan-German union still holds the seat of power. The German General Staff is with them, and the machine guns bark in every city square. Civil authority is powerless wher-

ever it can be said to exist. The war-makers are playing a desperate game, for they know that if they fail, their power is gone forever. All the other great nations have set themselves free from the dead hand of the middle ages. In Germany alone has inherited domination strengthened itself with all the resources of chemistry, economics, philosophy and trade. Bebel once said: "Behind every war lurks a revolution," and this thesis has been explained and ampli-

fied in the monumental work of Jean de Bloch.

The revolution in Germany must come in one way or another. It may be delayed; it may be bloodless. It may follow long after the signing of the treaty of peace.

But it will come, and in that day we shall see the end of rival armament, of enforced militarism and of the suppression and oppression of rising nationalities within the prison walls of crumbling empires.

## Economic Alliances, Commercial Treaties, and Tariff Adjustments\*

By Edward P. Costigan

### II

#### MOVEMENTS TOWARD TARIFF PROVISION IN FRANCE, ITALY AND JAPAN

The era beginning with the return of peace will therefore demand something akin to professional skill in the consideration of the elements at stake, the forceful presentation of those factors in official conferences, and the drafting, with discrimination and particularity, of the actual agreements. The period will see the consummation of many specially negotiated arrangements. France has legislative committees, practically in the form of a tariff commission, investigating tariff duties and the international phases of commercial treaty relations; and there is general expectation that the French pre-war tariff system is about to undergo substantial changes. In Italy, where all outstanding commercial arrangements are being formally terminated, elaborate plans are on foot for the establishment of a tariff system to be based on agreements with other nations. The employment of concessional and retaliatory tariffs is being counted on to assure mutually beneficial arrangements, and the program is being fortified by governmental studies of separate Italian industries, now in progress under the direction of a Royal Commission, concerned with the reform of Italy's tariff system and commercial treaties. Similarly, Japan, in April of this year, created

an Extraordinary Investigation Department, one branch of which is concerned with tariff, commercial and industrial studies. Representatives of the various countries mentioned are not confining their tariff investigations within the borders of their respective countries, but are, even now, visiting other parts of the world, when possible, and conferring with representatives of the various governments, in the different national capitals, with the object, among others, of making a complete survey of the opinions of world leaders on the significant features of economic and industrial preparedness. These are but a few of the signs, pointing to a world equipped to grapple hereafter, with keener perception, and from a fresh viewpoint, with tariff and commercial problems. It thus appears that in different directions there is an assembling of all available tariff and commercial data. Exhaustive inquiry is being prosecuted into the best means of advancing national well-being and commercial expansion. There is, too, as a necessary part of wisdom, searching examination of historical backgrounds, and of the respective outlooks of leading nations on commercial, financial and general economic problems. To sketch the outlines of the situation in its tariff aspects, and, incidentally inquire into the existing equipment of the United States for adequately meeting the tariff and commercial plans of other countries, in their new economic adventures, may, therefore, be regarded as of immediate interest.

\* Continuation of address before the American Economic Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society, at Philadelphia, Pa., December 29, 1917.

TARIFF SYSTEMS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
CANADA, GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE  
AND GERMANY

Historically, the search for revenue and protection to young industries, marked the beginning of this country's autonomous tariff experience. The single tariff set of rates, applicable alike to all imported commodities of whatever origin, fixed by Congressional action and subject only to Congressional change, long continued as the prevailing system of the United States. From time to time there developed, however, certain modifications through commercial agreements and authorized Presidential action. A striking instance of the former was our reciprocity agreement with Canada of 1854. To the use of Presidential authority I shall make brief reference later. Generally speaking, it may however be said that we have had and have but one set of customs duties. Our northern neighbor, Canada, in contradistinction, for a considerable period has used a so-called "multiple" system, with three outstanding sets of rates, in addition to sur-taxes used for penalizing purposes—the lowest a varying scale of specified duties amounting to preferences for the encouragement of British imperial trade; another intermediate group of rates, the benefits of which were, in 1910, extended to France, and through the operation of the most-favored nation clause in Great Britain's commercial treaties, to numerous other countries; and a third, higher and general set of rates, applying to the rest of the world's commodities, largely including those of the United States, seeking entry to Canadian markets. In Europe, on the other hand, within recent times, several tariff systems have been notable. One is most naturally identified with Great Britain, where, through adherence to the results of Cobden's corn-law agitation, the outbreak of the war found a single and very limited set of customs duties applied, regardless of the country of origin, representing, unlike the United States, a policy substantially of free trade. The few duties so levied were frankly imposed without other significance than revenue purposes. A second typical European tariff system is that most prominently identified with France. It is commonly spoken of under the designation "maximum and minimum." It has two sets of rates, the so-called "maximum" being generally applicable to imports, the lower or "minimum"

set being reserved for extension, through commercial treaties, to nations offering reciprocal advantages. Finally, must be mentioned the tariff system, long and typically associated with Germany, and frequently referred to as "general and conventional." The higher or general rates date back to tariff legislation in the decade following the Franco-German War. Those rates represented the standard by and from which concessions were computed. The conventional rates, in instances, took the form of a pledge not to advance the general rates within a given time, but more usually and in the sense commonly understood, have represented a lower scale of duties built on and resulting from commercial agreements with such countries as Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, and Sweden.

EFFECT OF EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN  
INTERPRETATION OF THE MOST-  
FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

As these references will remind you, during the last half century there has been a special moulding of their respective tariff systems by leading nations, with the object of trading commercial benefits, though, of course, tariff bargains have a much longer history. Through this more recent period it should also be recalled that a potent element, in extending the influence of bargaining treaties, has been "the most-favored-nation clause" in such treaties. The unconditional European interpretation of that clause has resulted automatically in the extension to other countries, sharing such treaty privilege, of whatever advantages have been conceded by any one of the treaty group, to the products of any third country. It will be remembered that this extension of treaty benefits has not always occurred without serious complaint in France, and, under different circumstances, in Germany, against the manner of its operation. In France, for instance, there were at times protests because Germany, after the Treaty of Frankfort, through the most-favored-nation clause, had access to French markets on the same terms allowed other countries, even while Germany's growing protectionist policy was excluding France, in common with other countries, from Germany's markets. In the United States, from the beginning, a different interpretation was placed on the most-favored-nation clause, and thereby a different policy was adopted. As is well known,

we have preserved the use of such forms of that clause as have enabled our government to maintain, and the Supreme Court of the United States to sanction the view, that the benefits of our most-favored-nation treatment pass only to those countries making concessions to us which we regard as equivalent to the concessions of the particular country entering into the treaty. We have in addition extended without price any concessions gratuitously granted by us elsewhere. Generally speaking, however, with us mutual disposition to exchange benefits does not suffice. The widening of the American promise becomes effective only on the receipt of like consideration. This construction favors specialized agreements. It enables a country with extensive economic resources to practice careful, perhaps too careful, bargaining, the more so if such country has efficient and mobile bargaining powers. On the other hand, the European interpretation of the clause has in the main aided the development of the different tariff systems abroad—more especially the general and conventional system—during the last half century. It has simplified a complex situation, by reason of its direct tendency to prevent the substantial nullification of commercial agreements through more important subsequent concessions to some third country or countries. Though Great Britain has generally secured most-favored treatment, from a bargaining standpoint, by virtue of her policy of opening her ports equally to the products of all countries, she has been least advantageously placed to gain concessions. Moreover, the self-governing Dominions of Great Britain, in recent years, in the development of their own fiscal and tariff policies, have been more and more insistent—under conditions, within the Empire, of proven loyalty, which Great Britain might not easily ignore—on their emancipation from the most-favored-nation obligations in the commercial agreements of Great Britain. As between the double tariff systems of France and Germany, that of France, for obvious reasons, has served less efficiently as a bargaining medium. It has been less elastic. Both its maximum and minimum rates have been fixed by the legislative branch of the government, whereas, the German conventional rates have not required legislative sanction. Because of this difference, the maximum and minimum rates of France have been less subject to flexible change, and, the fact that,

in certain instances, the concession of minimum rates with most-favored-nation benefits, could not be claimed by certain other countries coincided with a series of disastrous "tariff wars"—notably those in which France became involved with Spain, Switzerland and Italy. From these controversies France emerged, with her trade seriously impaired, and under the necessity in some cases of making concessions even below the minimum scale. Germany, while not free from tariff quarrels, and, while occasionally compelled to yield ground, succeeded, on the whole, in maintaining her own economic program and in negotiating important commercial agreements, so satisfactory from the German standpoint, that, after long trial, their renewal was sought and obtained. Moreover, the specialization in tariff classifications resorted to by Germany, though often criticized as evasive of commercial agreements, represents a striking example of the possibility of using technical skill and accuracy to promote commercial profit. It is patent, therefore, that the elasticity and effectiveness of the German practice should be expertly examined, if future free-flowing commerce is to continue subject to modification by bargaining methods and conditions.

#### THE UNITED STATES HAS NO EFFECTIVE METHODS FOR GUARDING AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

In the face of these European conditions, the United States, at the end of varied and unsatisfactory experiments, finds itself without either a definite bargaining policy, or effective weapons for tariff negotiations. Our isolation from Europe, our form of government, and our internal development long subordinated the consideration of this phase of our tariff question, though certain American public men, among them Jefferson, while Secretary of State under Washington, early urged the propriety of such a commercial program. This advocacy has found support, in our generation, among such representatives of a different general policy as Secretary of State Blaine and President McKinley. It may, indeed, be doubted whether there is anything fundamentally controversial in the proposal to establish in the United States, in conjunction with our tariff—regardless of the level on which its general rates may be adjusted—well considered provisions for tariff and com-

mercial negotiations with foreign countries. Assuming this to be reasonable, we should frankly face the prospect of future and similar use of their respective tariff systems by leading foreign countries, and should plan, within proper limits, to safeguard our foreign commerce against unfair and artificial exclusion of our products, and

arbitrary and avoidable discrimination. To achieve this is to do more than borrow a leaf from the book of European experience. It is a step toward economic preparedness; an illustration of our capacity for meeting and solving, with national equipment and efficiency, after-the-war emergencies.

## France On Trial

By John Willis Slaughter

A situation is developing in France which promises to divide political sentiment to a degree not known since the days of the Dreyfus case. Unfortunately, since the beginning of the war the French Government has practiced a type of censorship which has rendered free expression impossible, and given to the world never more than one side of a case. The French people themselves may through their representatives keep watch of administrative acts and bring them to the bar of responsibility, but public opinion has been at the mercy of those who were concerned to further special political intentions. So long as this situation concerned only domestic politics the rest of the allied world considered it none of its affair; but the present juncture falls into a different category. France is after all the key to the European situation, partly because it is a field of battle, and partly because all questions pertaining to settlement must have their focus there. It is therefore of concern to all the allied nations whether a political fight is to divide and weaken national effort, and especially whether the issue of that fight is to further or defeat the democratic purposes of the war. This new *affaire Caillaux* is therefore a matter that concerns Americans; about which they should have an opportunity to see all the factors. This is all the more urgent, because the Northcliffe press has made it its special business to prejudge the case and poison public opinion in a sense that may easily be contrary to justice. The average American at the present moment simply takes it for granted that Caillaux is a traitor to his country and should be dealt with accordingly. This may be right or it may be wrong—in any case, let us not swallow a ready-made newspaper verdict with a simplicity too childlike, for there is much history behind the thing.

The France we know is the France of heroic endurance and courage, of a patriotism so noble and self-sacrificing that it will challenge the admiration of all time. This is the plain uncensored France of poilus and enduring women. It is not much complicated by politics. This amazing loyalty is so great and distinctive a thing as to ask for some special understanding. Its significance is the more impressive when it is remembered that France more than any other country is a land of diversity, of multiplicity of racial types, of variety of temperament. How have these elements been welded together? For a thousand years after the Roman conquest, France as the end of the great migration road, was called upon to hold her own constantly against newcomers. Each new incursion, if partially successful, had to assimilate itself to the elements already there, in order to meet the next danger. These early centuries even more than the later wars, welded France into a unity with a capacity for unlimited resistance. On top of it grew during the middle ages the cultural unity which conquered Europe. It has been well said: *La France n'est pas un sang: c'est une âme, une méthode un idéal, une civilisation.* We have here the characteristic French spirit of resistance, of endurance, of determination to fight to the death for that civilization. It cuts to the bottom. A Frenchman may be politically at daggers drawn with his neighbor, his political intelligence may pick to pieces all political conceptions and ideals; none the less when the call comes he will rally to the protection of *la patrie* with unswerving loyalty. The France we know, therefore, is a thing by itself, permanent, silent, but open for the world to see. When occasion demands it can rise and crush any political adventure. It will be remembered that the provincials descended upon

the Paris Commune at the end of the Franco-Prussian war, because they felt that the conduct of Paris was treason to France.

Apart from all this, proceeds the drama of French politics. The present situation exhibits currents that have been flowing since the foundation of the present Republic. Monarchism has died a lingering death and has left a sufficiency of offspring. For many years, since 1871, the fate of the Republic was hanging in the balance. Probably only the stupidity of the Duc de Chambord prevented the consummation of monarchistic ambitions. The French Constitution was passed by monarchists as providing an easy transition to the form of government they want. French presidents have long been regarded as mere figureheads. As a matter of fact, they have constitutional prerogatives in excess of those of British monarchs. After the attempt of Boulanger in 1887, the permanence of the Republic seemed to be assured. But what is of importance is that monarchism left a breed of reactionaries that have cursed France from that day to this. Only two episodes need be mentioned in illustration: the trial of Alfred Dreyfus and the contest with clericalism. During the past decade and a half, French political thought has been canalized into two great opposing streams. The reactionary element consisted of the remains of the old nobility, army officers, the bourgeoisie, aggressive financial interests, and some parts of the peasantry. This is imperialistic France that expanded into great colonial possessions, and ruled those possessions with that peculiarly fatal combination of bureaucracy and military force which condemned the French colonies to a place of backwardness and poverty. It is the France of territorial aggression and exclusive tariff walls. Its strength lies in the fact that it can stir the historical memory and evoke enthusiasm for the ancient glory of France. Its literary expositor is M. Maurice Barrès. Its political cutting-edge was M. Delcassé. It has its eye unswervingly upon the left bank of the Rhine.

The other great stream of political influence is represented by the industrial masses, by some of the socialist groups, by the *Confédération Générale du Travail*, the great syndicalist body, by the radical intellectuals, and the peasantry of the *Midi*. This group, rather sprawling and unorganized like liberalism everywhere, is the lineal product of the revolution; it stands for demo-

cratic conceptions and ideals, believes that the greatness of a nation depends upon its internal development—in other words, it is part and parcel of the democratic movement in which we believe and for which we are fighting. Before the war this group operated under the leadership of Joseph Caillaux.

The issue of the Russo-Japanese war, in the defeat of France's ally, marked the inauguration of German aggression in European politics. In succession came the incidents in Morocco and in Alsace that awakened the slowly dawning sense of Frenchmen that they must prepare to resist. Under these circumstances and in this atmosphere liberalism, with its ideals of social development and a nobler citizenship, was unable to thrive. Aggressive imperialism begets a defensive imperialism, and measures of defense had to be taken by liberal and reactionary alike. France was perforce nationalistic and militaristic, and the scales were therefore weighted toward reaction. M. Caillaux, as premier, endeavored to mitigate the growing tension by liberalizing French policy. He believed in applying the open door to French colonies, and thus removing one source of friction. At the same time he stood firm against German pretensions in the Agadir crisis, complicated as it was by the stupidity of his foreign minister. Then came the assassination of Calmette and the elimination of Caillaux from French politics. This is the general background of the situation.

When the war broke out France gathered herself for the mighty effort of resistance. The *union Sacrée* put an end to political dissension; the censorship closed down on the expression of opinion. The German atrocities stung the French to an inconceivable fury. It was therefore natural that the ancient glory of France and ideals of expansion should rise to dominance. Germany was to be crushed and dismembered. She was to be stripped not only of her colonies, but of the left bank of the Rhine. Some even claimed that as the Rhine was not a natural frontier, French dominance should extend to the Black Forest. In increasing measure, that culminated with the entrance of Italy in May, 1915, the imperialistic note was dominant. A great consolidation of Latin peoples seemed an immediate possibility. French patriotism was by circumstances made to flower into chauvinism. But the succeeding months, with a succession of re-

verses and failures for the allied cause, cooled the ardor of the imperialists. It was seen that the dismemberment of Germany would be a long and difficult, if not an impossible task. In view of the limitations of the Allies' military resources, the imperialists turned their minds to the possibilities of an economic war. If Germany could not be crushed on the field of battle, she was to be strangled by the destruction of her trade. This culminated in the Paris Economic Conference of 1916, with its well-known provisions. These intentions were upset first of all by the lukewarmness of free-trade England, but especially by the destruction of the whole particularist basis of the Grand Alliance through the Russian revolution and the entrance of America. French reactionary sentiment, during 1917, had a hard time to survive, and liberal ideals, for the first time, had a chance to breathe. It is still fresh in mind how the Ribot ministry received the German overtures and how the Rhine ambition received a blow from the socialists. But the socialists, for their part, were split over the Stockholm controversy, the *Confédération* was divided—as usual, liberals failed to pull together. But with the retirement of M. Thomas and the refusal of the socialists to participate in the Painlevé government, the *union Sacrée* was disrupted and the fight was on.

The usual methods by which reaction fights its battle have been adopted in France in recent months. Failure to support the reactionary program is stamped as treason to *la patrie*. Any suggestion toward a democratic peace is stamped as pro-German. The attempt is made to damn all liberal leaders by associating them with the activities of German agents. Here is where some balance of judgment is needed on the part of outsiders. We cannot say whether or not German money has corrupted French liberalism; but to those who know Frenchmen, the thing seems an absurdity. Whatever may be established in this regard, the situation is complicated by an old political hostility. Most people will remember that M. Clemenceau attempted to crush the *Confédération Générale* in 1908; everybody knows M. Clemenceau's nationalism and his attitude toward the supreme war council and the league of nations.

So far, the evidence has established nothing. Long after we had condemned Bolo as a German spy he was freely walking the streets of

Paris. The suicide of Almereyda, with the subsequent disclosures concerning *la question orientale*, have never proceeded further, so far as we know, than the scandal stage. The whole matter was of course focused up to Joseph Caillaux. Nothing has come out of his correspondence with either Bolo or Almereyda. The Vatican has denied the reports of Caillaux's intrigues in Rome. He himself asked for a suspension of his immunity in order to clear his name before a court of law. The discreditable feature in the whole proceeding is that he is to be tried by court-martial. It is a reminder of Dreyfus days. It is to be hoped that the incident will come to some speedy conclusion. If Caillaux is guilty of traitorous conduct, he should be punished and the evidence made clear to the whole world. But what is objectionable is that the whole matter should be prejudged by newspapers of the Northcliffe type, and that Americans should be forced to swallow scandal and believe that it is fact.

## RELATED THINGS

### America in China

The *Tokyo Mainichi*, says the *Japan Advertiser*, commenting on the acquisition by Americans of the right to build railways and by Danes of the right to monopolize the wireless telegraph system in China, casts aspersion on the success of Viscount Ishii. While Viscount Ishii prides that he has secured American recognition of special interests of Japan in China, America is fast gaining special interests for herself in China, referring to the railway concessions acquired by Siems, Carey & Co. The editor further describes the railway concessions in question and observes how anxious Americans are to acquire concessions in China.

Japan should not look idly on, but emulate America in the enterprising spirit with which America is pushing her way in China. But now comes another example for Japanese to note, namely, the acquisition by Danish representatives of the monopoly to establish a wireless telegraphic system in China. Danes control the Great Northern Telegraph System. It was convenient for the company controlling that system to acquire the wireless rights. 5,000,000 yen is to be raised in Denmark for establishing a wireless system in China.

Japan should not sit still when these other foreign nations are fast acquiring concessions. She should push her way forward, in order to make the joint Japanese-American Declaration really effective and practicable.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending January 22

### Washington Happenings

To enable relief of congestion in transportation and in order to conserve the coal supply a complete shut-down of all manufacturing except that absolutely essential to war and the food supply, in every State east of the Mississippi, including Minnesota and Louisiana, was ordered by Fuel Administrator Harry A. Garfield on January 16. The order was approved by President Wilson. It took effect on January 18 to continue until January 22 inclusive. In addition ten successive Mondays were declared legal holidays on which no heat or light is to be burned in stores, excepting those selling food or drugs. These are January 21, 28, February 4, 11, 18, 25, March 4, 11, 18, 25. Office buildings are also to be without heat or light on these days, except those used by physicians or dentists. A later order allows theatres and places of amusement to open on Mondays but to close on Tuesdays. Exceptions to the order are "plants which necessarily must be continuously operated seven days each week to avoid serious injury," plants manufacturing perishable foods or foods for immediate consumption, plants for printing newspapers or other periodicals. Saloons are not included in the exception of food-selling places and must close. Railroads must run on Mondays on holiday schedule. Before the order had been actually signed, a resolution asking delay in putting it into effect was introduced in the Senate on January 17 by Hitchcock of Nebraska. It passed by a vote of 50 to 19. It was not presented to Dr. Garfield, however, until 6:35 p. m. He had already signed the order at 5:45, and held it too late for attention. The resolution asking for delay was supported by 22 Democratic Senators and 28 Republicans. It was opposed by 16 Democrats and 3 Republicans. These were Ashurst, Chamberlain, Fletcher, Hardwick, Johnson of South Dakota, Jones of New Mexico, Kirby, Lewis, Myers, Phelan, Pittman, Ransdell, Robinson, Shafroth, Sheppard, Simmons, Borah, Gronna, La Follette. A similar resolution was presented in the House by Congressman Gillett of Massachusetts, Republican floor leader in the absence of Mr. Mann. It was kept from coming to a vote by objections under the rule requiring unanimous consent for immediate action. The order seems to have been generally obeyed. [See current volume, page 83.]

\* \*

In an explanatory public statement on January 17, Fuel Administrator Garfield said that the docks are crowded with supplies awaiting shipment to the war zone and ships are loaded, but are held by need of coal. "The coal to send them on their way is waiting be-

hind the congested freight that has jammed all terminals." He declared it useless to manufacture more when goods already manufactured are congesting terminal facilities and jamming the railroad yards. But once the docks have been cleared manufacturing may be resumed more efficiently than ever. Overproduction due to speeding up has caused congestion. Ships are unable to make the round trips on time to keep up with the flood of manufactured goods, and in addition there has been the trouble in transporting coal in severe winter weather. The imperative need is a clear line from the manufacturing zone to the seaboard and beyond. Congestion of transportation has stopped coal moving. Throughout the coal fields scores and even hundreds of mines are idle on that account. Coal mines cannot operate without cars. Cars cannot be supplied while the railroads are crippled by freight congestion.

\* \*

The Senate defeated on January 15 the bill to give the Trade Commission control of the output of news-print paper. The vote was 36 to 32. The majority consisted of 12 Democrats and 24 Republicans. The Democrats were Chamberlain, Gerry, Hardwick, Hitchcock, King, Ransdell, Reed, Saulsbury, Smith of Georgia, Smith of Maryland, Vardaman and Walcott. The minority consisted of 28 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The latter were Colt, Kellogg, Nelson and Norris. The Senate passed on January 18 the Fletcher bill appropriating \$50,000,000 for housing facilities for shipyard employes.

\* \*

A bill for a "War Cabinet" prepared by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was introduced by Senator Chamberlain on January 21. It provides for appointment by the President of "three distinguished citizens of demonstrated ability" to have full charge of all plans and policies for carrying on the war, to supervise and direct all executive departments "in so far as in the judgment of the War Cabinet it may be necessary or advisable so to do"; to settle, subject to review by the President, all differences between executive departments; to require information helpful to proper performance of its duties from Federal and State officials; to issue orders necessary to carrying out of its functions to any department subject to review by the President, and to make rules concerning its own procedure. The War Cabinet is empowered to fix such compensation as it may consider just and reasonable for such army and navy officers as it may have assigned to it for special duty, in addition to their regular salaries. The members of the Cabinet are to receive \$1,000 a month each. Their terms of office are to expire six months after the close of the war, unless the President fixes an earlier date after the war comes to an end.

\* \*

Immediately upon introduction of the Chamberlain bill President Wilson issued a formal statement replying to an attack by Senator Chamberlain upon the efficiency of the management of the war. He declared it

to be an "absolutely unjustifiable distortion of the truth."; The War Department, he said, has performed an unparalleled task with extraordinary promptness and efficiency. The delays, disappointments and partial miscarriages which have occurred have been drawn into the foreground and exaggerated. The investigations which have taken place "drew indispensable officials of the department away from their work and officers from their commands and contributed a great deal to such delay and confusion as had inevitably arisen." Failures have been insignificant in comparison with accomplishments. Nothing helpful has come out of the investigations. He had not been consulted about proposed reorganization by legislation (the War Cabinet bill), which comes now after effective measures of reorganization have been perfected as a result of experience. These are more likely to be effective than any other measure, if Congress would but remove statutory obstacles. "My association and constant conference with the Secretary of War," he said, "have taught me to regard him as one of the ablest public officials I have ever known. The country will soon learn whether he or his critics understand the business in hand." Senator Chamberlain, he added, showed ignorance of actual conditions in his criticism.

#### National Labor Board

A national war labor board to bring under single control all war labor matters was created by Secretary of Labor Wilson on January 15. The board will have power to deal with every phase of the labor problem. It is to be under Secretary Wilson's direction and will be known as the Advisory Council. Employers, employes and the general public are to be represented. Former Governor John Lind of Minnesota is to be chairman and representative of the general public. Waddill Catchings of the Sloss-Sheffield Iron and Steel Co. of Birmingham and A. A. Landon of the American Radiator Co. of Buffalo represent employers. John B. Lennon and James B. Casey of the American Federation of Labor represent employes. Professor L. C. Marshall of the Department of Political Economy at Harvard, also represents the general public. Other appointments are still to be made.

#### Secretary Houston Against Land Speculation

The Secretary of Agriculture gave notice on January 14 to all holders of permits for grazing livestock in the national forests that the payment of any bonus or allowance for waiver of the grazing privilege in connection with sales of livestock or ranch properties will be cause for revocation of the permit. "Owing to the great and growing demand for use of the forest ranges," says the Secretary, "which is now in most regions far beyond their capacity, the grazing privilege is of large value. Upon the national forests the Government applies a system of regulated use designed to encourage production, promote the upbuilding of the country along healthy lines and secure the greatest good to the greatest number, but makes only a moderate charge for the grazing permits." "It would be unfair," he continues, "for the public to forego a maxi-

mum return for the value of use of its property and then allow those granted the privilege of use to collect the value from others or the price of surrendering their privileges."

#### The Prohibition Amendment

The Virginia Assembly on January 12 passed the Senate resolution ratifying the Federal Prohibition Amendment. Both houses of the Kentucky Legislature took the same action on January 15, making the third State to ratify.

#### Municipal Ownership in Seattle

Seattle's municipally owned and operated street railway, but recently established, after a long fight led by Councilman Oliver T. Erickson, is being extended to carry passengers from the business center to the extreme northern city limits. Part of the work had to be hastily done before a hostile court could issue an injunction.

#### Russia

The Constituent Assembly met in Petrograd on the 18th, with something over the required quorum of four hundred members present. The members had come from all parts of Russia for the purpose of forming a constitutional government. M. Tchernoff, Minister of Agriculture in the Kerensky Cabinet, was chosen chairman by the Social Revolutionists over the Bolshevik candidate by a vote of 244 to 151. The Bolsheviks withdrew from the Assembly, which continued its sitting till early in the morning of the 19th under a menacing guard of soldiers and sailors who finally compelled adjournment. Before adjournment, however, decrees were adopted awarding lands to peasants, and to send delegates to the Entente Powers to consult on terms of peace. A decree has been issued by the Central Executive Committee of the Congress of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates dissolving the Constituent Assembly. The decree says that the revolution created the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council as the only organization able to direct the struggle of the exploited working classes for complete political and economic liberty. The decree states that this objective cannot be obtained without an absolute break with the bourgeoisie. It charges that the members of the Assembly were elected from old election lists which recognized the old regime, and that any attempt to deprive the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council of authority would be a step backward. Premier Lenine said the conflict between the Workingmen's and Soldiers' Government and the Constituent Assembly had been growing since the February revolution in which the Constitutional Democrats scored a success over Czarism; but in October a social revolution took place and the working masses, through the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, became the supreme authority. Continuing he said:

By creating the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates the Russian proletariat brought something new into the revolution. There is no equal in the history of revolutions in Western Europe, except the Paris Commune. The Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates

are not bound by any rules or traditions to the old bourgeois society. Their Government has taken all the power and rights into its own hands. The Constituent Assembly is the highest expression of the political ideals of bourgeois society, which are no longer necessary in a socialist state.

Arthur Ransome, in a special cable to the *New York Times* from Petrograd, says that if the Soviets, or workmen's bodies, had submitted to the Assembly, "which was actually the legacy of a revolution before their own, the result would have been the formation of a republic without reality, and a government without power. . . . When opinion in the country really changes we shall find the character of the Soviets' change."

\* \*

A movement for self-government is developing, according to report, in the eastern provinces of Siberia. A conference convenes on the 23d at Blagovestchenk, capital of the Province of Amur on the Amur River, for the purpose of organizing an administration. It is announced that the delegates will be chosen by proportional representation, one delegate to each 50,000 of population. Attempts will be made to have the western provinces join in the movement when communication has been opened.

#### European War

Increased artillery fire on the west front is interpreted by some to indicate more serious winter operations than have prevailed for some time. Extensive raids have been made by both sides at the Verdun front. On the Italian front Austrian attacks have been made on the lower Piave, but without success. The British report small gains north of Jerusalem. At the mouth of the Dardanelles a naval battle occurred on the 20th between the German ships Goeben and Breslau and the British patrol. The Breslau was sunk and the Goeben grounded. The British lost two small monitors. [See current volume, page 86.]

\* \*

Peace conferences between the Russians and Germans were resumed at Brest-Litovsk on the 16th. It was announced that a settlement in principle of the future relations between the Central Powers and the Ukrainians had been reached during a private meeting with the Ukrainian delegates. The discussion between the Russians and the delegates of the Central Powers turned on the question of the conditions to be recognized in disposing of Poland, Lithuania, and Courland. Dr. von Kuehlmann, the German Foreign Secretary, said his Government was willing to permit the peoples of the territories occupied by German and Austro-Hungarian troops to vote in regard to their political future not later than one year after the conclusion of a general peace; but that Germany could not undertake any obligation regarding the withdrawal of the armies. The Central Powers would give a binding promise that these forces would not engage in political activity or exert political pressure. Foreign Minister Trotsky insisted upon absolute clarity on the question

of evacuation, declaring that the presence of organized troops in the regions in question would grievously prejudice the taking of a free vote. Trotsky has gone to Petrograd to report to the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, and will return to Brest-Litovsk on the 29th. Berlin papers say that unless Trotsky accepts the demands of the Central Powers negotiations will be broken off.

\* \*

Friction within Germany and Austria continues. The Pan-Germans appear to have complete control in Germany, where they are insisting upon annexations and indemnities; but the Socialists and Liberals keep up a vigorous opposition. There is also some sharp feeling between the Austrian and the German press. The Austrians are disposed to accept the Russian proposal of no annexations and no indemnities, while the Germans refuse to accept such terms. A peace strike by Austrian labor led to the resignation of the Austrian Cabinet. The Prussian Chamber of Lords has passed a resolution declaring that the German Emperor, according to the terms of the Constitution, has the exclusive right to make war and peace.

\* \*

British merchantmen sunk by mines and submarines during the week amounted to six over 1,600 tons and two under that tonnage, being the most favorable week but one since the unrestricted campaign began. The Admiralty report states that of the British vessels damaged by enemy action between January and October, 1917, all but four had been saved. Another mutiny at Kiel is reported in which thirty-eight officers are said to have been killed. The trouble is reported as local among the crews of submarines because of the decreasing number that return to German ports.

\* \*

Negotiations between the Governments of the United States and Holland, which have been pending for a long time regarding the charter of Dutch ships in American ports, have been signed under a provisional agreement that provides for one round trip for the more than eighty vessels now in American ports. They are not to go into the war zones, but five of the steamships will carry material for Switzerland, and two will take cargo for the Netherlands Overseas Trust. It is part of the agreement that the ships will carry 150,000 tons of food for the relief of the Belgians, and may be used later for the American coastwise trade or go to Java for sugar. A temporary stoppage in the building of wooden ships has occurred through failure to get lumber for the Eastern yards.

\* \*

The British Labor party, in conjunction with the parliamentary committee of the Trades Union Congress, has issued an address to the Russian people in regard to peace and the issues of the war. Referring to the interruption of the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, "because the Germans have refused to admit the principle of self-determination of peoples and the doctrine of no annexations," the address says:

In applying the Russian principle to our own case

we are conscious of the problems raised, but we do not shrink therefrom. The British people accepts the principle of no annexations for the British Empire. This applies in our case to the middle East, Africa and India. . . . We accept the principle also for India and other dependencies of the British Empire, though we believe that the record of the British Government here gives little occasion for reproach.

We intend to meet this by more rapid development of self-government. We respect the sovereign independence of the Turkish people in their national home, but we believe that the domination of their government over other peoples is a hindrance to their own national development.

Our Government is pledged to some of those peoples—Arabs, Palestinians, Armenians—that the Ottoman rule shall not again be imposed on them. This responsibility should be undertaken by the peace conference and a permanent international organization that we hope will be there constituted. . . .

We adjure the peoples of Central Europe to declare themselves or make their governments speak for them in answer to Russia and ourselves. We call on them to renounce annexations in Europe with the same good faith in which we are renouncing them in Asia. We call on them to give the same self-determination to the French, Alsatian, Italian, Polish and Danish members of their states as Russia has given to Finland, Courland, Lithuania and Russian Poland.

## NOTES

—Six members of the I. W. W. arrested at Seattle on December 20 by United States marshals were freed on January 4 after a hearing and the charges dismissed.

—Premier Hughes of Australia after resigning has again accepted the Premiership. Later returns show that the vote of the Australian soldiers sustained conscription. [See current volume, page 87.]

—The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia upheld on January 14 the order of Postmaster General Burleson revoking the second class privileges of the *Milwaukee Leader*.

—Land value in Adelaide, South Australia, according to E. J. Craigie, secretary of the Single Tax League of South Australia, increased from \$17,760 in 1837 to \$35,499,330 in 1917.

—General Calles, Governor of the Mexican State of Sonora, has notified the public that those who violate the law strictly forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors of any description will suffer the death penalty. The reason given for this severity is the war condition brought about by the rebellion of the Yaquis.

—A mob wearing the uniform of United States sailors wrecked the plant of the Pigott Printing Co. in Seattle on January 5, committing damage estimated at \$15,000. The concern prints the local labor organs, *The Industrial Worker* and the *Daily Call*. Work done for the Red Cross was also destroyed.

—That saloonkeepers in New York State may refuse to serve Negroes was held by the Court of Appeals, the highest court in the State, on January 15. The decision was rendered in an appeal from a judgment in favor of a Negro who had been discriminated against in a saloon.

—A bill to relieve New York real estate owners of taxation has been introduced in the Legislature on the suggestion of the New York Real Estate Board. It imposes a habitation tax on all tenants paying \$600 a year or more. The tax varies from \$5 on the minimum amount to \$4,400 on those paying \$25,000 rent. It is estimated that this tax will take \$16,000,000 off of real estate.

—An appeal to President Wilson for nationalization of the packing plants was made on January 18 by a delegation of packing house men headed by John Fitzpatrick and Edward Nockels of the Chicago Federation of Labor. They were accompanied by Samuel Gompers and Frank Morrison of the American Federation of Labor, and by Frank P. Walsh, their counsel. In urging action, the delegation said that there is danger of a strike due to refusal of the packers to meet the men.

—At the annual convention of the American Live Stock Association at Salt Lake on January 15 the Federal government was asked to exempt stockmen from the draft, suspend operation until one year after the war of the 640-acre homestead law, to make permits for grazing on Indian lands five years instead of one year, suspend tax on oleomargarine, and to assume control of the packing house industry. These measures were held necessary to relieve the meat shortage. The association endorsed the appointment of Francis J. Heney as attorney for the Federal Trade Commission and his investigation of the packing companies.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### The Farm Press

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Page 1265 of THE PUBLIC, issue of December 28, contains a paragraph beginning "What is the matter with the farm press of the United States?" which it is a surprise to find in such a place because it is both ungenerous and ignorant. It is true that there are many weekly papers printed in what may be called the country that are local gossip sheets in the main, padded with "patent insides," containing also paragraphs on "feeding, breeding, planting, and poultry," as the editor says, but these are not to be confused with the genuine farm paper, which is as legitimately concerned with these topics as is *The Wall Street Journal* with finance or *The Inland Printer* with typography or *The Photo Era* with its special topic. "Surely the farmer's mental pabulum is not confined to these," the editor says truly. The farmer looks for other things to the same sources that supply them to other people, which may be illustrated. My own

table shows at the present moment a Boston daily, the *Springfield Weekly Republican*, *The Public*, *The Woman Citizen*, *The Rural New-Yorker*, *The Christian Register*, *The Review of Reviews*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, *The Century*, *The Geographic Magazine*, *Bird-Lore*, *The American Fern Journal*, the local gossip sheet and a miscellaneous collection of circulars, bulletins, etc., connected in one way or another with my varied interests, besides three or four new books and some not new that have come from their shelves for consultation or for pleasure reading—and I am a woman farmer at that. My near neighbor could offer almost double my number of titles, and other farmers of the township and vicinity could make much the same showing. Perhaps the time will come when it seems necessary to form a special farmers' party, politically, in New England and the East, but conditions here are different from those that fused the farmers of North Dakota into a white-hot opposition to the Big Business that had dominated them so long.

M. A. MARSHALL.

Still River, Mass.

## Single Tax and Liberty

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

An encouraging thing about THE PUBLIC recently is, that there are appearing those that question principles that are accepted beyond dispute by the little family of singletaxers who comprised THE PUBLIC's readers in times that are passing. It speaks well for the success of the organ and for the spread of the movement, that its influence is reaching outsiders.

There are some statements, however, notably those of Mr. W. Rupert Holloway, which are hard to let go unchallenged. For instance, he says: "The lecturer seemed to believe that true competition and economic freedom can be assured by singletax (i.e., by law), but all other freedom must emanate from the 'solitary soul' outside of law.' The singletax as well as the ethical principles of fundamental democracy are not the product of human minds expressed in statutory law, but are the recognition of a set of natural laws which operate to the benefit of mankind, if left to do so by those who continually seek to correct the oversights of the Almighty.

Therefore, it is correct to say that in the matter of individual liberty, man should be left free to work out his own salvation unhindered by any statutory law that ignores or violates a natural law.

The fact that the drink evil is with us, is but a manifestation of the fact that in devising statutory law, the laws of nature have been ignored, thus poisoning the social fabric. Many singletaxers recognize the liquor question as a condition that is with us, and that requires the stretching of a point to the extent of fighting it with the political weapons that are at hand. The sin of tolerating the drink evil, however, does not compare with that of ignoring its economic cause.

The hypothetical question of the singletax con-

trolling wealth, while socialism controls men, may be answered by stating that the singletax system does not seek to control wealth, but to see that no private individual controls the source of wealth, or at least not without first compensating the community to the extent of its full annual rental value. I have never known any brand of socialism, however, that did not seek to control men in some manner. Character is a quality that must be developed amid proper environments, and it is difficult to see how this can be accomplished in a rotten economic condition. Democracy presupposes popular control, but unless the statutory law that results from such control is founded wholly upon the laws of nature, it will soon be made manifest that its reliance is built upon quicksands.

H. A. JACKSON.

N. Tonawanda, N. Y.

## Greenback Finance

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

IN THE PUBLIC of December 14, Wm. E. Dodd writes about a speech some one made at a singletax meeting in which "there was more of misinformation and more of dogmatic error than it has been my lot to listen to in a long time."

"Three billions of money were issued, we were told, to the people, and it was made legal tender."

Mr. Dodd then says: "How much more effective would have been the true story? The Government did not conduct the Civil War on the basis of paper money, only some four hundred and fifty millions of greenbacks were ever issued."

In the "National loans of the United States, from July 4, 1776, to June 30, 1880," Rafael A. Bagley, page 81 says: "Under these acts legal-tender notes have been issued amounting in the aggregate to \$1,640,559,947. The difference between the amount authorized and the amount issued is accounted for by reissues from time to time as authorized by law.

On page 82: "Fractional currency has been issued, amounting in the aggregate to \$368,720,079.51, including reissues, making a total of \$2,009,280,026.51." I want to know where is the misinformation? What is dogmatic error? Will Mr. Dodd, or the University of Chicago, or some one give a clear answer?

GEO. F. SPURRIER.

Paso Robles, Cal.

\* \* \*

Man being a land animal, every person has a natural right to as much land as is necessary for his support. Land, therefore, is not property in the sense in which are the products of labor applied to land. For the only true foundation of any right to property is man's labor. What right, therefore, has one man more than another to land to which not an hour's labor has been applied?—*Galusha A. Grow*, in Congress, 1852.

\* \* \*

History is little else than a picture of human crimes and misfortunes.—*Voltaire*.

## BOOKS

## No Mental Panics

*Faith, War, and Polcy.* By Gilbert Murray. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. Price, \$1.25 net.

Under this rather unattractive title hides vastly more than a dollar and a quarter's worth of stimulating comment on the war by the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford. It is another collection of papers printed, at various times from October, 1914, to March, 1917, in some of our best English and American reviews.

The writer himself modestly says that "such interest as this book may possess will be in large part historical." He thinks it will be interesting to note how one Liberal's mind developed during the war. There is that, however, which makes the book of greater value, namely, the calm idealism, worthy of one who hobnobs with things and thoughts Hellenic, which enables the author to look at the world as it thunders chaotically and still remain a thinking man. One is reminded of Romain Rolland. This book has all the deep spirituality of *Above the Battle* combined with a knowledge of the world of national and international politics which the creator of *Jean-Christophe* has never been able to acquire.

Professor Murray has changed his mind about quite a few things in these three years. He has made some curious mistakes in judgment, too. But to one thing he has held true, from beginning to end,—a recognition that this war cannot and ought not to end in the destruction of Germany politically or commercially to the profit of her rivals and the strengthening of nationalism, but rather in the fortifying of those rules of international right by which and by which alone, in the end, national greeds and national jealousies can be overcome and nullified. He stands, and stands firmly,—speaks and speaks clearly,—writes and writes lucidly,—combating in himself and his readers all those silly jingoisms of which in England Lord Northcliffe is the crafty exponent and which such American newspapers as the *Chicago Tribune* are more and more openly mouthing. (Incidentally one of the most delightful and helpful of these essays is the one called "The Turmoil of War," in which the author explains the surface moral degeneration of English life as an attempt at relief from strain, like the laugh, at a touching moment of a play, which comes from some overwrought spectator). He will not be stampeded into hysteria. The war remains for him a Christian war, one fought not for the benefit of the fighter alone, but for "right," and "justice" and "fraternity." To him the most terrible cost of the war is in the apparent deterioration of idealism among the allied peoples. Yet even were this as real as it seems at a glance to be, it would still be better, he is sure, than the triumph of Kultur and the end of democracy.

It is a strengthening of this idealism which he looks for from America now that she is in the war. He hopes "not that she will send us more food or loans or munitions, or help us against submarines, or even lighten the burden of the front in France; but that in the up-

building of democracy and permanent peace throughout the world, America and Great Britain will take their part together, united at last by the knowledge that they stand for the same causes, by a common danger and a common ordeal and a common consciousness of sin." "While her soul will never be searched as ours has been, for that reason her balance of mind may be less shaken, and that is a quality which will be extremely welcome at the Peace Conference."

He utters ringingly a horror of militarism in any form,—he who is no cringing pacifist. "We have seen," he says, "I trust convincingly, the evil of the militaristic form of state, a greater and more degrading evil than we ever surmised. It has turned the most educated nation of Europe into a nation of lost souls." And he sees that competing states must always be militaristic. "We must learn to agree, we civilized nations of Europe, or else we must perish." He well understands that all imperialists are of one breed, no matter what nation they live in. He does not hesitate to say that England has her very powerful Von Tirpitz's and Bernhardi's, whose influence must be combated at home while similar forces are fought abroad. He fails to realize, though, one sometimes thinks, that America has her "Kulturists," too. He faults us occasionally for being too selfishly pacifistic, especially those of us in the Middle West. Alas, he is unaware that the most widely-read jingo sheet in American journalism is published in the metropolis of that same Middle West.

He rejoices in the fact that all the allied combatants were, at the beginning of the war, in the hands of Liberal governments, and that America, neutral and combatant, has been "guided by a leader so wise and upright and temperate as President Wilson." So, surely, do all democrats everywhere.

To this reviewer, at least, the most interesting thing in this book lies not in its deep thoughtfulness or even in its moral idealism but in the way in which, again and again, the author takes occasion to bewail the jingoistic and cheaply patriotic twaddle in the daily press and its influence on the public mind. One hears this from many thinking and democratic-minded patriots. But after all, why worry about it? As Professor Murray in one place at least recognizes, "Our nation is nothing like as unjust or greedy, nothing like as factious and fond of lies, as intolerant, as cruel, or as stupid as it would seem, and does seem, to a foreigner studying our newspapers." Right, Mr. Murray! The same is true over here as well. Most folks believe less than half of what their newspapers tell them and care less than that, a good deal, about the hysterical things which their papers think. The ordinary newspaper is read today for relaxation more than instruction and its editorial comments, when not ignored utterly, are generally regarded as complements to the funny pictures.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

\* \* \*

What is required to ensure that justice shall prevail is that the word "community" be substituted for the word "landlord" wherever the latter word appears.—*Joseph Fels.*

## The Philosophy of Force

Militarism. By Karl Liebknecht. Published by B. W. Heubach, New York. Price \$1.

Karl Liebknecht may well be regarded as one of the most striking figures in European politics of today, and though at present hid from sight in a German prison, it is probable that the world has not heard the last of him. If, as the result of the titanic struggle that is rapidly approaching its crucial moment, we are to see a new Germany, a real fatherland emancipated from the tyrannous grip of Kaiserism and Militarism and the hypnotic influence of a philosophy that has lain upon it for a generation "with a weight heavy as frost and deep almost as life," we can think of no more appropriate leader than the man who is now suffering for his courageous defense of human liberties. Dr. Liebknecht was born in Leipzig in 1871, was educated at the University of Berlin, from which institution he received his doctor's degree in political economy and law, and began in early life the struggle against militarism that resulted in his sentence by the Imperial Court to a year and a half of imprisonment. The confidence reposed in him by the working people of Berlin is evidenced by the fact that they at once elected him as their representative in the Prussian Landtag, and afterwards in 1912 selected him as representative in the Reichstag, where he made his memorable stand against the war vote in 1914 and boldly affirmed that the Germans were the aggressors in the war. All this and more of a biographical character is told in the preface written by "A personal friend of Karl Liebknecht," and forming a fitting introduction to a notable book.

"In the last analysis," writes Dr. Liebknecht, "the supremacy of physical force is the decisive factor in social subordination," and in the first chapter it is shown how militarism is the subtle means by which a small minority may acquire the physical force to dominate a large majority. Some interesting historical facts are recorded relating to the rise and development of militarism, especially in Germany; and in the second chapter it is shown how modern capitalism develops a kind of militarism peculiar to itself, and how the establishment of oversea colonies necessarily involves protection both by navalism and colonial militarism. "But," says Dr. Liebknecht, "militarism does not serve only for defense and attack against foreign enemies; it has a second task, viz., that of protecting the existing state of society, that of being a pillar of capitalism and all the reactionary forces in the war of liberation engaged in by the working class. Here it shows itself purely as a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes." In the chapter, "Means and Effects," it is demonstrated how insidiously the militarist spirit works towards producing what is called "the proper spirit," not only in its army but among the innumerable citizens whose commercial interests are bound up with the maintenance of the army; how civil servants are subtly imbued with the sentiment of patriotism; how the little weaknesses and vanities inherent in human nature are utilized and exploited by glittering marks of distinction or ornamental gewgaws that will satisfy the love for finery

and swagger. The virus of the great illusion thus gets into the blood, the illusion that in standing by the country and its army the people are standing by their own interests rather than the interests of the small minority who control the resources of the country.

But Dr. Liebknecht is no pessimist, and fully believes that "through the ages an increasing purpose runs." Militarism, while in the pursuit of its own ends, inevitably generates the poison by which it is ultimately to die. "The day of the great reckoning" when the people will rise fearlessly against their rulers, he conceives of as being at hand. The endless expedients practised by militarist governments to inflame the sentiment of patriotism, he regards as evidence of an uneasy recognition that the great day is inevitable as doom,—and as a preparation for its advent. In the light of all that has happened since the book was written, may we not believe that "the day" has now arrived, despite the deafening clashing of those unspent forces of superstition that still masquerade under the name of patriotism? The poison is working itself out. The fever is at its height. The hope for the world lies in that period of calm reflection that usually comes with convalescence, when reason and the will of God have a chance to prevail.

The only jarring note that believers in fundamental democracy may find in Dr. Liebknecht's book is the constant assumption that "capitalism" is the natural enemy of liberty. For still the conviction remains deeply rooted in the minds of most of us, that capital is at best only an instrument by which labor becomes more effective, and through the use of which human toil may be lightened. Capital is a dead thing and can produce nothing until labor can be induced to lay hold of it. Why is it that labor instead of requiring inducement to use capital, is reduced to the position of a suppliant, and must beg permission to use it even on terms that are painful and degrading? There is only one intelligible answer; that labor is prevented from employing itself through the shutting-up of opportunities,—because of being locked out from the great workshop where nature guarantees a minimum wage to all who are willing to toil. If, for the word "capitalism" we are permitted to substitute either of the words "privilege" or "monopoly" in each case where it appears throughout the book, the appeal to liberal minds will be complete. Militarism is certainly the buttress of privilege in all its protean forms, and the problem that faces the world today if it would realize the things that belong to its peace, is to effect its total abolition.

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

\* \* \*

"No man has a right to more land than he and his can use, and no right to that unless he is using it."—*C. W. Woodman, State Labor Commissioner, Austin, Texas.*

\* \* \*

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.—*Henry George.*

# The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Founded, 1898, by **LEWIS F. POST** and **ALICE TEACHER POST**

New York, N. Y., January 25, 1918  
Volume XXI Number 1834

## Contents

Editorial .....	99
The Democracy of Germany—David Starr Jordan .....	108
Economic Alliances, Commercial Treaties and Tariff Adjustments, Edward P. Costigan.....	112
France on Trial, John Willis Slaughter.....	115
America in China.....	117
News of the Week.....	118
Correspondence .....	121
Book .....	123

### Editors:

**MRS. JOSEPH FEIS**

**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.

# \$10 Prize

offered by the New Voters Committee of the Single Tax Service League for an article of 1,000 words on "Economic Democracy, via the Single Tax." The material must be suitable for a leaflet or dodger to be distributed among our new voters in New York State.

Mss. must be sent before February 15, 1918, to Amy Mali Hicks, Chairman, New Voters Committee, 9 East 17th Street, New York.

## A RIGID CARRIAGE INSURES ACCURACY

¶ The carriage of the L. C. Smith & Bros. typewriter moves only laterally as the written line lengthens, or when the operator returns it to start a new line.

¶ It is so supported that it is perfectly rigid, yet moves from right to left easily because it is ball bearing.

¶ In writing capitals the type is shifted—not the carriage.

¶ Accuracy and ease of operation are characteristic of the L. C. Smith & Bros. typewriter.

Illustrated Catalog FREE for the asking.

**L. C. SMITH & BROS. TYPEWRITER COMPANY**

Factory and Home Offices, SYRACUSE, N. Y.  
Branches in all Principal Cities

311 Broadway



N. Y. City

**BOOKS FREE TO MINISTERS** FOR POSTAGE  
Swedenborg's Works, cloth; "The True Christian Religion," 20 cents; "Apocalypse Revealed," 20 cents. Address Rev. L. G. Landenberger, Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

## Business As Usual

Three new subscriptions to The Public for \$2,  
each subscription for six months



**OSCAR H. GEIGER**

**WHOLESALE FURRIER**

6 WEST 37TH STREET  
NEAR 8TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE  
GREELEY 2670

**FUR MANTLES CAPES COATS**  
AND AUTO-COATS

**FUR SCARFS STOLES and MUFFS**

**FUR REPAIRING**

*I shall be pleased to serve readers of THE PUBLIC*

# OUR ROLL OF WORKERS FOR DECEMBER

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

Adams, C. F.  
Adam, Henry T.  
Adams, M. L.  
Albro, N.  
Albro, R. C.  
Aldred, H.  
Alexander, W. E.  
Allen, Lucia W.  
Allen, N. B.  
Allright, J. M.  
Alper, M. J.  
Anderson, A. L.  
Anderson, Mrs. I.  
Andrews, M. B.  
Ashenbrenner, C.  
Atkinson, G. W.  
Augsburger, F. H.  
Augur, Edmund F.  
Austin, Richard  
Ayres, M. L.  
Babson, Miss Caroline W.  
Baker, Prof. Cecil F.  
Barns, G. R.  
Bartlett, J.  
Barton, David C.  
Beach, S. C.  
Benjamin, Prof. G. G.  
Bennett, James A.  
Benson, L. A.  
Berts, Thomas  
Blount, R. E.  
Boeck, E. H.  
Boles, M. C.  
Boris, Isaac, Dr.  
Bower, W. J.  
Boyles, W.  
Bradford, A. B.  
Bragg, T. M.  
Brannin, Carl  
Braucher, E. M.  
Bresnan, E. A.  
Brink, M. G.  
Brock, A.  
Brodeur, M. N.  
Brown, D. M.  
Brudaker, Mrs. H.  
Bruner, R. E.  
Bruss, G.  
Buhlmeister, C. F.  
Bullard, Dr. T. E.  
Burr, H. C.  
Bush, W. E.  
Bussabarger, R. L.  
Butler, Frank D.  
Butler, W. F.  
Byers, R. H.  
Cairns, J.  
Campbell, Walter N.  
Canning, A. P.  
Carlson, Geo. L.  
Cartwright, Geo.  
Chapin, M. K.  
Chitwood, W. H.  
Clark, F. W.  
Clark, Mrs. Wallace R.  
Coate, C. B.  
Coffinberry, L. K.  
Coleman, Paul  
Collette, E. B.  
Colwick, A. M.  
Conner, F. M.  
Cook, G.  
Colton, A. L.  
Comings, G. F.  
Cotterill, Geo. F.  
Cowdrey, Willard J.  
Countryman, C. E.

## Democracy in Action!

Readers of THE PUBLIC who are listed on the margin of these pages—and those who will be listed from month to month—know that the cure for the evils of democracy is not wide-spread autocratic government control, however necessary in times of emergency like these, but more democracy *with its foundations and keystones rightly placed*. And they see in THE PUBLIC a powerful interpretative medium—a militant liberal journal of comment and news different from all others in that it indicates and emphasizes the foundations and keystones without which democratic institutions are like an inverted pyramid, balancing for an inevitable fall.

New readers who are subscribers for the first time with this issue can help by doing what our friends listed in the margin have done—tell others that they, too, should become acquainted with THE PUBLIC. To readers who are not subscribers, we suggest that you immediately send \$1 for an introductory twenty-six numbers. Your money will be refunded, if you do not like THE PUBLIC.

Coyne, W. J.  
Creidenberg, J.  
Cullman, Otto  
Cushman, C. F.  
Cutler, J. H.  
Daland, E.  
Davis, H.  
Davis, W. H.

De La Harwood, Miss Pearl  
Dial, J. C.  
Dickey, L. B.  
Diehm, Walter  
Doubleday, E. S.  
Drier, Miss K.  
Durker, W. A.  
Eames, Chas. R.

Earhart, H. M.  
Eaton, T.  
Eckhart, C. R.  
Ellason, G.  
Ellery, B. F.  
Emsley, W. R.  
Engholm, E. I.  
Fels, Mrs. Joseph

# Circulation Now 18,000

Circulation is growing every week, and if all who know THE PUBLIC will take advantage of the present situation—the world at war, and the people in ferment—THE PUBLIC can attain a circulation, and, in consequence, do a work that will have an enormous influence. The coupon is made for use!

Ferguson, Edward  
 Ferry, Henry L.  
 Field, T. V.  
 Figley, B.  
 Fitzpatrick, Jas. J.  
 Flacy, W. J.  
 Flanagan, Thomas  
 Foord, E. J.  
 Ford, C.  
 Fraser, W. J.  
 Freibolin, C. B.  
 Fries, J. E.  
 Fuller, J. C.  
 Gable, M. L.  
 Gamos, J. A.  
 Gaston, E. B.  
 George, A. L.  
 George, Adda  
 Geister, J. M.  
 Giegerich, H.  
 Gilbert, E.  
 Gilbert, L. O.  
 Gillespie, J. M.  
 Goodrich, Mrs. E. D.  
 Gould, K. M.  
 Grace, L. A.  
 Grant, D. F.  
 Green, Mona  
 Gribl, T.  
 Griswold, P. E.  
 Haid, H. A.  
 Harmon, R. L.  
 Harper, S. J.  
 Harriman, E. W.  
 Hartman, E. T.  
 Hauben, H.  
 Hawkinson, S.  
 Helmann, R.  
 Herbert, Mrs.  
 Hertzgard, Prof. Jorgen P.  
 Herwig, H. O.  
 Heakell, E. S.  
 Hetsel, H. W.  
 Heverlin, P. H.  
 Hickox, Miss Zillah K.  
 Hoffman, F.  
 Holland, Mrs. J. W.  
 Holloway, G. B.  
 Holly, W. H.  
 Holway, W. R.  
 Hosey, John  
 Howat, W. F.  
 Howes, R. F.  
 Hughes, E. F.  
 Hunt, C. F.  
 Hunt, Mrs. H. F.  
 Ingram, F. F.  
 Ives, F. W.  
 Jackson, Mrs. F. A.  
 Jackson, H. E.  
 Jamison, J. E.  
 Jeffers, B. F.  
 Johnson, A. L.  
 Johnson, J. A.  
 Johnson, L. J.  
 Joy, Hollis C.  
 Kastner, Albert  
 Kelly, Dr. J. L.  
 Kendrick, E. P.  
 Kess, Ernest C.  
 Kessler, H.  
 King, Mrs. E. E.  
 Kirstein, C. O.  
 Kirstein, C. A.  
 Kitchelt, R.  
 Kittridge, G. O.

Koehne, W. C.  
 Koonce, M. E.  
 Koppelman, H.  
 Kort, Charles A.  
 Kramer, J. A.  
 Krickberger, O. R.  
 Lamp, E. R.  
 Lanham, H. L.  
 Leary, R.  
 Lee, Miss M. C.  
 Letch, L.  
 Leu, B. C.  
 L'Honnede, G. A.  
 Loucks, E. M.  
 Lipman, Clara  
 Lippman, A.  
 Luke, Dr. F. E.  
 Lynch, F. W.  
 Maguire, F. W.  
 Mains, E. E.  
 Mann, W. G.  
 Mansur, F. M.  
 Manly, Rollin  
 Marsh, Benj. C.  
 Martin, C. B.  
 Martin, Chas. R.  
 Mason, Alfred Bishop  
 Marx, G. H.  
 Mathews, Wm.  
 May, Dr. C. C.  
 McClard, D. K.  
 McClung, W.  
 McGill, J. H.  
 McGill, J. D.  
 McGuire, M. J.  
 McGuffey, J. H.  
 McKendry, T.  
 McLaughlin, Dr. S. C.  
 McLees, Chas. J.  
 McMoody, A.  
 Meade, E. R.  
 Meyer, Franklin  
 Menger, Geo. J.  
 Menger, G. A.  
 Merrill, C. E.  
 Miller, A.  
 Miller, Miss Anna  
 Miller, Chas.  
 Miller, Lina D.  
 Miller, L. S.  
 Money, C. H.  
 Monroe, F. H.  
 Montgomery, E.  
 Mortimer, J. L.  
 Moeley, C. A.  
 Moulton, C. L.  
 Mulvey, Harry R.  
 Munro, J. S.  
 Mylecraine, Miss Frieda  
 Nelson, E.  
 Newell, H. D.  
 Newton, J. R.  
 Niedheiser, F. W.  
 Nichol, Miss Minnie C.  
 Norton, Mary  
 O'Brien, C. R.  
 Ogle, Chas. J.  
 Oliver, W. G.  
 Olmstead, Rev. Margaret  
 O'Reilly, D.  
 Palmer, R.  
 Paranteau, Miss C.  
 Paris, F. N.  
 Paulson, G. M.  
 Peabody, George Foster

Perks, H. J.  
 Pernod, Alex. S.  
 Peters, M. H.  
 Pfeiffer, Rev. R. H.  
 Pfeiffer, Weyland  
 Picknell, E. M.  
 Polak, E.  
 Porter, Chas. H.  
 Porterfeld, W. H.  
 Price, J. T.  
 Quill, Mrs. J. J.  
 Ranniger, Dr. G.  
 Rees, D. E.  
 Reid, A. S.  
 Reid, D. W.  
 Reiter, F. N. A.  
 Reiter, Julius J.  
 Rice, O. A.  
 Riegel, R. M.  
 Rimoldi, T.  
 Roberts, W. R.  
 Robinson, Rev. Elmo A.  
 Rogers, D. F.  
 Rogers, R. B.  
 Romberg, A.  
 Root, J. E.  
 Rusby, J. H.  
 Russell, C. H.  
 Russell, Leah J.  
 Ryan, E.  
 Ryan, P. D.  
 Saunders, Dr. N. B.  
 Scanlan, Miss Mary  
 Schleiter, C.  
 Schroeder, A. H.  
 Schuta, Walter J. H.  
 Scott, Alfred  
 Scott, F.  
 Sears, Mrs. R.  
 Sears, Wm. B.  
 Seebach, L. Carl  
 Seidert, A. N.  
 Settemeyer, Samuel S.  
 Shaffer, G. J.  
 Sharkey, G. J.  
 Shaw, M. L.  
 Shepard, H. W. D.  
 Shook, J. M.  
 Shulman, M.  
 Silbernig, J.  
 Sims, N. L.  
 Sims, P. D.  
 Sinton, W. L.  
 Sittig, A. C.  
 Skidmore, J. E.  
 Smith, C. E.

Smith, F. E.  
 Smith, F. M.  
 Smith, H. P.  
 Smith, H. V.  
 Smith, M. A.  
 Smith, Marshall E.  
 Snyder, Chas. E.  
 Soeholin, Wm., Jr.  
 Spaulding, L. H.  
 Spaulding, R. E.  
 Spencer, C. B.  
 Spiegl, John B.  
 Spurrier, F. K.  
 Stafford, M. L.  
 Starr, Western  
 Stearns, Miss L. E.  
 Steckler, T. G.  
 Steele, J. W.  
 Sternheim, E.  
 Stiles, F. C.  
 Still, Dr. S. S.  
 Stols, Rev. M. M.  
 Sturbing, Robt. H.  
 Swann, T. E.  
 Swanson, F. G.  
 Sweet, R. B.  
 Taylor, C. H.  
 Taylor, Chas.  
 Taylor, H. C.  
 Tead, Ordway  
 Thomas, E.  
 Thomas, John  
 Thomas, J. W.  
 Titus, Geo. F.  
 Trent, Ray S.  
 True, L.  
 Townsend, A. W.  
 Tucker, J. W.  
 Tuckerman, J. E.  
 Tulloch, S. W.  
 Turner, Miss H. M.  
 Usher, E. B.  
 VanGesel, W. T.  
 Van Ness, M. M.  
 Van Wagenen, G.  
 Walker, Fred S.  
 Walker, L. H.  
 Wallis, Louis  
 Walsh, Raymond  
 Warhase, Mrs. Herbert N.  
 Ward, C. E.  
 Ware, Chas. E.  
 Webster, R. M.  
 Weeks, A. D.  
 Weinstein, Geo. D.  
 Welts, E. S.  
 Welts, C.  
 Welch, Ralph  
 Wernicke, Waldo J.  
 West, D. M.  
 Whalen, F.  
 Wheelock, M. M.  
 White, C. S.  
 Whitfield, J. A.  
 Whitten, C. W.  
 Wilcox, E. J.  
 Wilcox, L. G.  
 Wilcox, W. R. B.  
 Wiles, W. W.  
 Wilkoshesky, Edmund  
 Williams, D. E.  
 Willis, T. D.  
 Wilson, A.  
 Wirtek, C. M.  
 Woodstock, E. B.  
 Woltman, Dr. Henry W.  
 Woytek, V. B.  
 Wray, Thos.  
 Wright, J.  
 Wyman, Bernice A.

**THE PUBLIC,**  
 122 East 37th Street,  
 New York.

Enclosed find \$2 for which send THE PUBLIC for Six Months to the three new subscribers herewith.

Name .....

Address .....

Single subscription, six months, \$1.