

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

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy



Anglo-American Labor

Alsace-Lorraine—A Human Problem

The Teachers' Outlook

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

March 23, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

The Lecture Bureau OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOSEPH FELS COMMISSION

ANNOUNCEMENT SEASON 1918-1919

THE American people are interested in world events from an international viewpoint as never before, and never has there been so marked a tendency to encourage and establish a better understanding between progressive thinkers throughout the world.

Questions are constantly arising from our changed economic standards. The demand for speakers who are qualified to aid in interpreting and in solving economic, social and political problems in an intelligent and broad-minded way is steadily increasing. The International Joseph Fels Commission recognized this demand several years ago and established a bureau for the purpose of bringing organizations and lecturers together. This lecture service is available to all groups and organizations. Financial benefit is neither solicited nor desired, fees, if any, being paid directly by the organization to the lecturer.

Another successful year has been added to the history of the Bureau. The many requests for speakers for the coming season prove that the lecture service has been helpful, and we know that you will be interested in the democratic method used by the lecturers of this Bureau in dealing with present day issues.

EARL BARNES JOHN J. MURPHY
JOHN DEWEY GEORGE L. RECORD
FREDERIC C. HOWE JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER
HENRI LAFONTAINE COUNT ILYA TOLSTOY

and many other speakers are available through the Bureau. Individual circulars and full particulars will be given on request.

ANNA BRIDING, Secretary,
Lecture Bureau,
INTERNATIONAL JOSEPH FELS COMMISSION,
122 East Thirty-Seventh Street,
New York City.

If you want to understand the I. W. W. from the historical point of view read André Tridon's concise presentation,

THE NEW UNIONISM

"A CLEAR exposition of the philosophy and practice of syndicalism, its history and its present status all over the world. His account might be looked at as a valuable handbook, supplementing the works of Simkhovitch, Spargo, John Graham Brooks, and other writers, who do not apply so thoroughly the doctrine to the concrete experience of the agitation that is daily taking place."—*Boston Transcript*.

[\$1.00]

If you want to understand syndicalism as it is rooted in philosophy, treat yourself to Georges Sorel's classic,

REFLECTIONS ON VIOLENCE

"It is doubtful if any book can be named that is better calculated to state the spirit and method of revolution than this special volume by Georges Sorel. The Introduction alone will convince any reader that this study is not to be skipped by one who would know the most penetrating, observations upon the various anarchisms of the hour."

—*American Economic Review*.

[\$2.25]

If you want the Socialist reaction to the revolutionary labor movement see John Spargo's clear statement,

SYNDICALISM, INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM and SOCIALISM



"THE best exposition of syndicalism and its allied subjects is John Spargo's book. It is a careful piece of work, dealing from the orthodox Socialist standpoint, with the origin, methods and philosophy of syndicalism and its relation to Socialism."

[\$1.25]

—*The Independent*.

Obtainable through good booksellers
everywhere or of the publisher

THIS MARK ON
GOOD BOOKS

B. W. HUEBSCH 225 FIFTH AVE.
NEW YORK CITY

Read "THE FLAMINGO'S NEST"
"A Lively Narrative"—*Cleveland Plain Dealer*
A HONOLULU NOVEL
260 pages. Express paid, \$1.35
R. SPRAGUE, 2112 Durant Avenue, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA



OSCAR H. GEIGER

WHOLESALE FURRIER

6 WEST 37TH STREET
NEAR 5TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE
GREENEV. 6876

NEW YORK

WANTED — A Dramatist — Who can exploit what is faithful, original and Historical; No silly pantomime of "The Movies" kind in this Drama.

Address, 102 E. D. F. No. 6, Janesville, Wisconsin.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI

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

Number 1042

Contents

Editorial Notes	355
Japan and Russia.....	357
Anglo-American Labor Again.....	357
The Wastage of Peace.....	360
The New Morality, David Starr Jordan.....	362
Labor and Capital After the War, Frank T. Carleton	363
America's Advantage, John Willis Slaughter....	367
Alsace-Lorraine, Theodore Schroeder.....	371
The Teachers' Outlook.....	372
Correspondence	373
Books	375
News	377

The conception of a League of Nations seems to have fallen temporarily between the doctrinaire and the opportunist stool. It is the eternal fault of liberalism to cast its conception of progress in rigid moulds and to strive for situations instead of principles. This is often accompanied by a vivid imagination that sees things made at a stroke in forgetfulness of the slow striving through tentatives that is the character of growth. And human relations are matters of growth. It is not surprising that the *London Nation* should look toward the formation of a League of Nations as the one necessary solution of the world's difficulty. But any effort toward its creation, it is considered, must remain in abeyance until the war is over and the Central Powers are in a position to sit down calmly with their opponents and make the League a reality. This is merely to sacrifice the principle to the doctrine and end by doing nothing at all. Opposed to it is the view expressed by Mr. Wells in "What Is Coming": "The primary business of the Allies is not reconciliation with Germany; their primary concern is to organize a great League of Peace." The difficulty with British liberalism is that, apart from free trade, it has never learned to think internationally. Its leaders were "little Englanders," facing no problems

of empire or world until forced by the exigencies of administration to accept traditional, and, therefore, tory methods. It is different, however, with Mr. Lloyd George. One would expect from him at least respect and appreciation of the principle; instead, he has taken occasion, in a recent speech, to discredit the conception. Not only must the League of Nations be deferred until the Allies win, but it may be considered a useful instrument for the Germans. He asserted, according to report, that on the subject of a League of Nations the German Emperor was absolutely sound; he was prepared to put Germany at the head of it. The substitution of wit for statesmanship will not be encouraging to those who hoped that the Premier had developed a vision of international co-operation. The present alliance against Germany is a League of Nations; what it becomes depends upon the wisdom of its leadership. It may have a far-reaching purpose in which Germany may qualify to participate, or, on the other hand, it may revert to the selfishness of the Paris Economic Conference. The general confiscation of enemy property, justifiable as a war measure, has, nevertheless, its bearing upon future policy. Its counterpart is to be found in the statement of Dr. Helfferich, that Germany must exact trade advantages at the point of the sword. Surely, the sacrifices of these years are worthy of a better issue.

* * *

No utterance since the beginning of the war, apart from those of President Wilson, has been finer or more calculated to clarify issues and give them effective realization in the minds of Americans than the notable speech of Senator Borah on Monday. It is not only a call to determined effort, but it emphasizes again the principle for which this nation is struggling. A multitude of minor matters, territorial and other, tend to dis-

tract from the central fact that our mode of life and government is at stake. The constant obtrusion through the daily sequence of events of some new factor requires an act of subsumption to the ultimate issue. The boundaries of the Ukraine and of Rumania are unimportant until the day of settlement arrives, and it will arrive when the military power of Germany is crushed. Dark days in the fight of democracy for existence merely call for a renewal of consecration and a strengthening of effort. There is no intermediate stage between success and failure. After the past month talk of a negotiated peace is an absurdity. Senator Borah well says:

In such a contest there is little room for compromise. We can no more quit than Washington could quit at Valley Forge. We can no more compromise than Lincoln could have compromised after Chancellorsville. We can and should keep the issue clear of all selfish and imperialistic ambitions, but the issue itself cannot be compromised. Cost what it may be in treasure and blood, the burden as if by fate has been laid upon us, and we must meet it manfully and successfully. To compromise is to acknowledge defeat.

The making of speeches will not, of course, win the war, but they can and do mobilize the moral forces which constitute the motive power of organization and fighting.

* * *

For this reason many of those who feel the deep significance of this time and seek endlessly for means to further the common purpose must have read with chagrin the *Evening Post's* editorial on "Wanted a Panic." No one wants a panic, and no one wants a mere futile wringing of hands; but the fact remains that the curse of this country is complacency; that our people, contrary to the assertion of the *Evening Post*, have not realized what war means; that we are not pulling together to a common end; that an effective public opinion has not yet driven our organizers to their maximum effort; that war arrangements are still tender to the possessors of money; that we are capable of wrecking the first essential, the production of ships, for the sake of maintaining the antiquated open-shop treatment of labor. No writer is worthy of his vocation who is not striving to give his countrymen a greater vision and a deeper earnestness. It is not a panic to see this war as full of serious consequence for us as for our Allies. We should

see the thing as if we were on a small island, with our daily food threatened by submarines; we should see it as if the Germans held a line from Philadelphia to Buffalo. If either of these situations applied to us we should not be in a panic, but the arrangements on which we are now engaged would not be half failures, obstructed by selfish groups. Our cause is that of our Allies. The menace to them is for us also. And it is a pity for our greatest newspaper to become the satirist of those who are endeavoring to make America see the thing as it is. This nation is in a state of mind similar to that of England during the first year of war. It required untiring work to arouse the lion, and the same result can hardly be accomplished here if the most influential representative of our press counsels an attitude merely supine.

* * *

"Welcome to the democratic fold," might well be the salutation to The New York *Times*, on its advocacy of the referendum for the Federal Prohibition amendment, were it not for the suspicion that its conversion to popular rule is for this time and occasion only. The *Times* has been wont to sneer at the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall as the wild vagaries of disordered minds, and to consign them, together with woman suffrage, to the nethermost depths of demagoguery. Legislation by representatives, it has said, is the only sane way. Experts chosen by the people, that is to say, by that part of the people embraced in the male sex, should determine what is good for the country. The very fact that a direct vote of the people would sometimes reverse the action of the experts, was enough, in the minds of all true conservatives, to condemn any resort to direct legislation. But suddenly a legislature confronts them that wishes to do something not approved by the *Times*. Presto, the representatives of the people elected to pass upon matters that come before them must not act upon this. The people alone can act. Let it be referred to the voters. This is good democracy, even in the mouth of such a conservative paper as the *Times*. We wonder, however, if it will look any more kindly upon the idea of referring other important questions to the people. There have been occasions when other persons thought the legislature, city council, or even Congress itself, no more represented its constituents than the *Times* thinks the men at Albany represent the people of New York State.

Japan and Russia

The problem of Japanese intervention has, during the week, undergone modification in some of its conditions, but is as far as ever from a solution. Allied diplomacy is at the parting of the ways; and the steps it may presently take are the most serious since its discreditable failure in the Balkans. Mr. Balfour has shown in unmistakable terms, the confidence of the British Government in the proposed Japanese movement into Siberia. British liberals are suspicious and hesitant, and this for the simple reason that the action, if taken now, would involve cynical disregard of Russian circumstances and feelings. Opinion in America is divided in terms of sympathy for Russia, and suspicion, or confidence, in Japanese motives. The situation is a tangle, but it need not be surrendered to opportunism, always shortsighted, and in this case, full of the possibilities of disaster. What is necessary is to ascertain a line of principle, and calculate the probabilities of events in terms which it provides.

First of all, this is either intervention in the war to aid the cause of the Allies, or it is merely occupation of Siberia. It is practically certain that the action itself will be taken; we are only concerned to understand what it means. Japanese activity in the Far East, both political and commercial, gives reason to believe that there is no national indifference to the new opportunity for penetration. This activity has been characterized by feverish impetuosity in securing the Japanese hold upon the far eastern situation. There is recognition of a Siberian ambition in the profound fear and hostility of the Siberian population. In the long run this region as a market for manufactures, will fall to Japan, whatever the political situation, and anything in the way of aggression will only defer the benefit. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that Japan contemplates a policy of aggrandizement. It would only alienate the two friends with whom her future is cast,—Great Britain and the United States. Japanese statesmen well understand that if these friends should become foes, it would mean a strangle-hold of economic isolation upon the Island Empire. Consequently, the belief has full justification that Japanese action would be taken with promises amounting to guarantees, and that these promises would be most scrupulously carried out. But under these circumstances, Japan

can have neither motive nor reason for the occupation of Siberian territory.

On the other hand, the policy of the Allies must contemplate the possibility of active Japanese aid in Europe. A fair interpretation of General Foch's pronouncement is, that he sees the need of maintaining operations against Germany from the east, and Japan provides the instrument. But the military view is too limited by immediate urgencies. If a great Japanese force could be deployed on the eastern front, it would in all probability bring the war to a speedy conclusion; but any attempt to place it there encounters the whole existing Russian situation. For a Japanese army to fight its way westward, training and utilizing the Chinese, is a venture in which America at any rate would never co-operate. The policy of Japanese intervention must, therefore, be seen through a Russian policy. Here, again, a calm judgment on the basis of principle, will provide the best guidance. We may take it for granted that Russian affairs will dispose themselves in a way that express the Russian people, and in a way that will permit the resumption of functions necessary for continuing life. No nation can live under Bolshevism. Russia will have nothing to do with a distinctly capitalist-landlord scheme of things. The only possibility is, then, that development will proceed along the line laid out by the moderate socialists. The Allies would be wise to keep their hands off Russia until this group is again ascendant. But be prepared with aid of every kind, financial and economic, with a Japanese and possibly an American army, to make the final drive for liberation and the end of the war. With this course of action Japan would be co-operating in the best spirit of the western Allies, and she could be sure of the fullest reciprocity in the future. After all, it is better to have one hundred and eighty million friends than that number of enemies.

Anglo-American Labor Again

Mr. William English Walling sends to THE PUBLIC a letter and an article in which he develops at length his position toward the British Labor Party and the proper attitude that should be taken toward it by the American labor movement. His position is so nearly identical with that of Mr. Gompers that his views are worthy

of the most careful consideration. We shall, therefore, give his letter in full, and follow it with comment of our own. Mr. Walling writes:

You certainly must agree that this is a time for pro-war radicals to stick together. And by pro-war radicals I mean those who support the American Government in the war for the reasons assigned by President Wilson in his diplomatic messages. You have also recognized consistently that the anti-war radicalism of Berger and Hillquit is radically wrong, while you have supported the American Federation of Labor.

At its last convention a few months ago the American Federation of Labor stood almost unanimously with Mr. Gompers. Yet you now take the opinion of a rabid pacifist against Mr. Gompers on the relation of British and American labor—a matter to which he has given the closest possible attention for 25 years. And you accept against him the views of a man who was in hot water with all radicals only a few years ago because of his open defence of the Rockefeller Charities against the Industrial Commission. In England and America such men are now hypocritically aiding the Socialists in their efforts to pervert the labor movement and turn it wholly to the service of peace-at-any-price.

The article I enclose herewith shows that Mr. Kellogg's attack in *The Survey* is infamous. What greater mischief could he do than to attempt to create discord between the wholly harmonious British and American unions? The British labor delegation now here as Mr. Kellogg knows, is thoroughly representative of the British labor unions. We have no socialistic Labor party in America. Hence any delegation from that body could be received only by the Berger-Hillquit people who are overwhelmingly repudiated by American democrats, labor unionists, and internationalists.

You proceed to accuse Mr. Gompers of "a profound contempt for the people." It is impossible that you believe this atrociously unjust accusation. Mr. Gompers knows, if you do not, the success of the German Socialist propaganda. He knows that the Hillquit-Berger position, which you rightly call contemptible, is identical with that of one-half the French Socialists and one-third the British Laborites, with the rest largely wavering. Mr. Gompers has observed what the German propaganda did in Russia, not by individual financial corruption but by a more scientific alliance with crazed fanatics. The German Socialists are doing a similar and equally effective work among the war weary and idealistic Socialists of the Entente countries, a work of infinitely greater subtlety.

The peace terms of the British Labor party are, approximately, the terms of international democracy. They are rejected by the Teutonic Socialists practically *in toto*. Hence the only reason for an international Socialist meeting would be that these just terms are not a "minimum" as Henderson claims but are to be the basis of compromise, that is the treacherous abandonment of the democratic claims of some of the smaller peoples!

You give all the credit for the above-mentioned peace-program to the Socialist Laborites and none to Lloyd

George, who had definitely endorsed 75 per cent of it in advance—just as he now accepts it all.

I enclose a series of two articles which show that I have sharply distinguished the Laborites and the Bolsheviki. In the third article of this series I wholly endorse the Laborite domestic program.

You say we lost Russia because Mr. Gompers' policy was carried out by governments. Another gross and inexcusable injustice! Mr. Gompers has opposed the Stockholm Conference for reasons similar to those I give in the article I send herewith. He has opposed recognition of the Bolsheviki. Nobody was stronger pro-Kerensky. He never said or did anything to suggest the slightest opposition to an inter-Entente Government Conference to restate war aims, and his unqualified support of Kerensky involved the acceptance of this basic idea of the foreign policy of all the Russian Socialist parties—the Bolsheviki alone excepted.

You demand proof that the British Laborites and French Socialists are weakening in their determination that Prussianism be defeated and discredited before there can be any thought of laying down arms. As you are apparently unfamiliar with these movements, Mr. Gompers, who follows them from day to day, could easily supply you with evidence showing a very dangerous and rapid tendency towards a Bolshevik surrender among the extremists in both countries.

The Inter-Allied Socialists are fully aware that they are coming to America to aid the Hillquit-Berger Socialism, to which the Belgian Huysmans has frequently pledged his undivided support—and being the secretary of the international Socialist bureau he will head the delegation. The American Socialists, knowing this object, are wild with enthusiasm at the hope of at last Europeanizing the American labor movement, dividing the working people and preparing for an eventual international general strike (to follow the proposed international conference). You rightly say that if the delegates allow their visit to be capitalized for the Hillquit-Berger sort of Socialism "they will deserve and receive the suspicion of American democracy." Shall we allow them to finish their semi-Bolshevik propaganda and then respond only with ineffective suspicion? Is not an ounce of prevention worth a pound of cure? Does not the prevention consist in warning the American working people in advance of the avowed and notorious objects of the invaders?

Your denunciation of Mr. Gompers is not only unjust. You could not have done a worse disservice to this war for democracy.

THE PUBLIC has no interest in any controversy that has arisen or may arise between Mr. Kellogg and Mr. Gompers. It is not concerned with personalities except as they affect facts and principles. It quoted from Mr. Kellogg merely the statement of fact, that representative labor leaders in the Nottingham Conference had told him that the delegates now in this country did not truly represent British labor. We have from Mr. Walling only the flat assertion that they do. To

call it a trade union representation is an evasion of the issue. A group of trades unions, organized for purposes private to the unions themselves, has no public significance. Mr. Walling surely will not deny that the vitality and real importance of British labor function, not through the federation represented by the delegates now here, but through the new party, reorganized and consolidated, into which the Trade Union Congress, as the political agency of organized labor, has been merged. Mr. Walling seems to regret that this is so, but it is a fact with which it is foolish to quarrel. That this great labor movement is a political party, with a definite program, that it will probably determine the course of reconstruction, and that it, in common with all European labor movements, is socialistic, do not provide justification for a refusal or failure on the part of Americans to establish contact and working relations in the stupendous international task. It is hardly consistent for Mr. Walling to accuse it of wavering toward Bolshevism and in the next breath to accept its program. There is far more danger, in the long run, in a dispersed and inarticulate body of workers than in the responsible and tempered British movement. What THE PUBLIC desires is, that the American people shall have contact through proper representation with this British Party.

THE PUBLIC did not assert that Mr. Gompers opposed Kerensky's demand for a restatement of war aims by the Entente governments. It did say that Mr. Gompers' present policy in dealing with the British Labor Party was the policy of the Allied Governments in dealing with the Russia of Kerensky, and that we lost Russia on account of it.

Mr. Walling and THE PUBLIC start on common ground. Both realize that the danger of German victory lies in a possible weakening of Allied morale, and particularly the morale of the organized workers. Mr. Winston Churchill, the American novelist, came back from Europe four months ago and reported the situation there in a nutshell: It was a question of whether revolution would come first in the nations of the Entente or of the Central Powers. Since then our faith in a German revolution has evaporated, but substitute "weakened morale" for "revolution" and Mr. Churchill's diagnosis holds good today. Mr. Walling assumes that THE PUBLIC is in favor of an international labor conference at which

the Central Powers and the neutrals would be represented. It is an unjustified assumption. Between churlishly rebuffing the workers of England and accepting any plan they may evolve for meeting German working class representatives there are many stopping places. Mr. Gompers within the past ten days has found one of them. He has sent a cordial cablegram to the British Labor Party. And we predict that the American Federation of Labor will give a cordial greeting to any delegation that comes to this country from that Party and its affiliated organizations in other Allied nations.

THE PUBLIC has two reasons for believing that the American democracy should show the greatest cordiality to the British Labor Party. First, because it believes the war should go on until Germany is defeated, it believes that the strong pro-war labor elements in America must cultivate the friendship and confidence of that organization in England which of all elements in the British population is most susceptible to agitation for an inconclusive peace. Mr. Walling apparently would have us rebuff the British Labor Party because one-third of it is pacifist. Could there be a better way of increasing the influence of that third than by putting the English pacifists in a position to say: "America is sheer jingo. They don't speak our language. President Wilson is splendid, but American labor leaders talk like the worst of our Tories. The imperialist party is now openly challenging and seeking to undermine the President's policy, and labor is letting them do it. We can't depend too much on America."

THE PUBLIC's second reason for advocating co-operation with British labor is that under an opposite policy the pacifists who said these things would have too much truth on their side. This war must become a holy war for democracy, with labor in the political vanguard, or it will be a German victory. And if we in America cannot find common ground with the democratic forces of the other Allied nations and make that ground the field for the rallying of our moral forces, then we might as well reconcile ourselves to defeat, either by Germany or our own Tories, or both.

Mr. Walling admits that two-thirds of the British Labor Party is strongly opposed to an inconclusive peace. But he damns it as a Socialistic body. It is Socialist only incidentally, just as the great Machinists' Union of this country is incidentally Socialist. On Saturday last Mr. Arthur

Henderson, Secretary of the Labor Party, and one of those in whom Mr. Walling has least confidence, made a public address to a meeting of women in London, in which he said:

I have been imagining during the last few days, having regard to what has taken place in Russia, that some German emissary might come along and say: "Why do we fight? Why cannot we settle it? We are prepared to come to a compromise with you regarding colonies, and we are prepared to make considerable concessions to France with reference to Alsace-Lorraine."

That would be a cynical peace, containing the seeds of future war. It would not be a clean peace, and it would not be an honorable peace. It would be the desertion of Russia, and the women of this country must stand against it like flint.

What Mr. Henderson says is important because he speaks as the representative officer of the British Labor Party. We can be sure that the pacifist third has not corrupted the two-thirds so long as Mr. Henderson takes this tone. We have to thank for it not the influence of Mr. Gompers nor of Socialists like Mr. Walling, but the influence of President Wilson. Mr. Wilson probably has no illusions with regard to the people of Germany that were not long ago dispelled. But he does realize the need of inspiring that constantly renewed confidence in our democratic and anti-imperialist purposes which alone will prevent Allied demoralization behind the lines.

There is also the all important matter of economic reconstruction. Mr. Walling accepts the major part of the British Labor Party's domestic program. But Mr. Gompers is far from accepting it. The rank and file of American labor are ready for a radical program of American reconstruction. British labor approaches this through the war. They see clearly enough that their own Government was not innocent in the years preceding this war. President Wilson has given our country an unassailable position, but American liberals who know the facts, realize that President Wilson has no party and no large organized group on which he can depend. The need of such a group is the need of the hour in this country. That is why American labor needs to co-operate with British labor, and to follow the example of British labor in outlining the program of thorough-going economic reconstruction.

Mr. Gompers is obviously hostile to such a program. He apparently is entirely satisfied with the present economic situation in this country.

Mr. Walling, on the contrary, fully realizes that American labor must come to grips with fundamentals or the imperialistic forces in America will turn an Allied victory to their own ends, and we shall not be appreciably better off. THE PUBLIC welcomes the influence of the British Labor Party because it sees in it a means of substituting for the cynical opportunism of Mr. Gompers a demand on the part of American workers for fundamental changes.

The Wastage of Peace

Food conservation, coal conservation, and the conservation of everything that will aid in the winning of the war is now the dominant thought. Still, few persons really sense the problem, or grasp the meaning of the steps that have already been taken; but all are coming to have a vague conception of conditions, and to feel that high prices stand for something beside the immediate draft upon the pocketbook. It is growing more and more apparent that thirty-five or forty million men in the full vigor of manhood cannot be taken from productive industry and set at methodical destruction without affecting the wealth of the world and the comfort of its people. Wages may be a little higher, and profits greater; there may be less unemployment and more millionaires; but a little reflection should enable any one to see that there is less wealth in the world, and that the war will end with a stupendous debt to burden future production. Hence, conservation will be necessary after the war as well as at present.

There will, however, be this difference: Conservation during the war is largely confined to the prevention of waste in the wealth that has been and is being produced; whereas, conservation in time of peace will concern itself also with the prevention of waste in potential wealth that lies in unused natural forces. The conservation of these natural forces should go on during the war as well, but the habit of waste is so firmly established, and ignorance of what is waste of natural forces is so general that it is likely at this time to receive scant attention. Something, however, is being done. The passage of the pending Administration bill for the use of water power will permit the harnessing of enormous forces that have hitherto run to waste. Better regulations for the control of forests and min-

eral lands will aid in protecting the supplies that nature holds in store. Irrigation of arid lands and the drainage of swamps will open new fields of production.

But all these, no matter how great they may be, are small when compared with the wastage of unused lands of city and country. The average person is now indifferent to this wastage because of a failure to appreciate the relation of land values to commercial values. The careless farmer who leaves his plow in the field to rust is scolded as shiftless and wasteful, but he may hold acres of good land idle without receiving rebuke. The builder who would permit a ten thousand dollar house to stand vacant would be called a waster; yet if he allowed a ten thousand dollar lot to remain vacant it would cause no remark. Nor does the average person make any distinction in estimating the service to society between the man who keeps a one-story building in a neighborhood that calls for skyscrapers, and the man who puts up a ten-story building. Neither is proper distinction made between the man who erects a modern building to meet present-day requirements, and the one who keeps an antiquated rookery beside it. The same indifference appears in society's estimate of the owner who only partly uses rich mineral lands, or lands near the market, thus compelling the working of poorer mines and those at a distance.

It is apparent that popular thought has made a distinction where there is no difference. The farmer who must devote an acre's yield to the purchase of a new plow to replace the one that rusted in the field could, with greater care, have had both the plow and the acre's yield. It is equally true that with greater providence the land owner could have both the land and the product. The lot or the acre has a value because its possession will enable the user to produce that amount over and above his wages. But land value cannot be stored or accumulated. Like water power it must be used day by day, else it will be forever lost. Hence, the lot or the acre that has value, yet lies idle, is a loss to society. It may be so situated that its increase in value from the growth of population may compensate the owner but its idleness still represents a loss to the community.

It is unfortunate that no reliable data have been gathered that will permit of a definite state-

ment as to the magnitude of this loss due to unused valuable land. A rough estimate may be made, however, to indicate its proportions. The vacant lots in Greater New York are assessed at \$567,294,125, which represents a value equal to the same amount of houses; and being unused it represents to the city a loss similar to what the city would have suffered if \$567,294,125 worth of houses were standing idle. If this loss be figured at four per cent on the capitalization it amounts to \$22,691,765 a year. At the rate of three dollars a day that lost value would have given a year's employment to 25,211 men. But that does not embrace the whole waste. The land values of the city are assessed at \$4,561,733,604, and the value of improvements at \$3,008,633,746. Manifestly much of the land that is included in the item of improved land is only technically improved. A glance at the one and two story buildings in all parts of the city, and the old rookeries that are not worth the cost of clearing away will show the enormous amount of so-called improved land that is largely vacant. If this partially improved land be estimated at no more than the amount that is wholly vacant, it would raise the annual waste to \$45,000,000, or an amount sufficient to employ 50,000 men, representing a population of 250,000.

Let this annual waste of forty-five million dollars from unused land in New York city be multiplied by the value of the vacant and the partially improved lands in all other cities and towns throughout the country; and to this let there be added the four hundred million acres of vacant farm lands, the unused water power and mineral lands, and some idea may be had of the stupendous waste that society needlessly suffers every year. It is possible that government operation of railroads may, by avoiding duplication of service, make a considerable saving to society. A saving will also be made by the Labor Department by distributing labor to points where it is most needed. Other economies will be effected by better administration, and the cultivation of habits of thrift. But all these taken together will be but a trifle when compared with the single item of unused valuable land.

This is the problem that awaits the attention of statesmen. As long as wealth is produced only by arduous toil, and one human want remains unsatisfied, there should be no needless

waste. But in the presence of war, and during the debt paying period that is to follow, the demand comes with redoubled force. The man who would let his factory stand idle when munitions are needed, or hold his ship at the wharf when men and supplies should go abroad, would be considered a slacker, if not a traitor. Yet idle land differs from idle factories and idle ships only in degree. They are alike in kind. The amount of labor in a hundred thousand dollars' worth of land value is identical with the amount of labor in a hundred thousand dollars worth of factory or ship value; and the idleness of the one is as great a loss to society as the idleness of the other. Stop the waste of oil and coal in the factory, save every screw and bolt, but let it turn out its product. Practice every economy on shipboard, but let the vessel go on its way. Apply the same rule to production as a whole. Turn all forces to a useful end; but most of all, set the idle lands to work.

The accomplishment of this end is a problem only in the sense that statesmen and publicists

lack the courage to apply the remedy. It has long been known that a tax on land values has a contrary effect to a tax on labor values. A tax on shoes or houses, for instance, adds to the cost of producing them, and is added to the price. But a tax on land values does not add to the cost of producing them—since all land has already been produced—and does not appear in the price. A heavier tax on vacant land cannot be added to the tenant for the reason that there is no tenant. And the owner, in his eagerness to recoup himself tries to get one from land already occupied, offering a lower price as inducement. All the machinery is at hand to effect this beneficent purpose. It is necessary only that taxes be removed from labor products and placed upon land values in order to drive every idle lot and acre into use. This course will lessen the cost of living by increasing the production of wealth; and it will increase wages by causing a greater demand for labor. It is by this means alone that society can stop the enormous wastage of peace.

The New Morality

By David Starr Jordan

As the war drags towards its end, we envisage signs of the dawn of a larger freedom. "War to end war" now looks forward to the achievement of a "clean peace" on the basis of a "new morality" among nations. A "clean peace" in the mind of Mr. Asquith and the British Liberals¹ is one in which no selfish interests, national or personal, shall prevail and no advantage accrue through military invasion. Such an ending will find few precedents in history.² It is the part of Democracy to create precedent.

In ringing words President Wilson has defined the purposes of the United States and of allied Liberalism: "We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensations for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind."

If this stoutly remains our aim, we shall open

¹ "England is liberal at heart in spite of all the crimes spoken in her name." (Massingham.)

² The Treaty of Ghent, closing the War of 1812, may be a case in point.

the door to a new world-outlook as inspiring as that disclosed by the Renaissance, by our own Revolution or by the Emancipation Proclamation. Deeds, not words, must decide. Yet we are leading the way from obstructive Nationalism with its oppressions and rivalries forward to the open fields of a broad humanity. From the first impulse to the rescue of Belgium on to the last grapple with a dynastic state, the purpose of Democracy everywhere has been unflinching and continued.

But if this war were to be regarded as a struggle for commercial advantage, a trial of strength between a nation with "too much" on the one hand, and a nation that "craves more" on the other, it would offer no moral value, for all Imperialism is bad—even if not equally bad. Whatever the outcome, the resultant human sacrifice would then be waste, pure and simple. The issues of the day, however, are not definable in terms of commercial gain. Should they be made so, the whole future would be again darkened.

The old morality of nations was limited in

scope, with no higher ideal than national advantage. It relied on force and boasted of its triumphs. An "obscene sea of slaughter," a Jena or Sedan, for example, was officially held to outweigh achievements of science and constructive altruism. This point of view was an outgrowth of the mediaeval conception of the sovereign state, an entity in a moral vacuum.

The germ of the "new morality" inheres in the spirit which called us into the war. Its essence, international and unselfish, is the appeal for a new world order. "Without that new order," says President Wilson, "the world will be without peace."

"We want no territories but a system that makes it of little importance who holds a given area; in place of dealing people and provinces about as though they were cards, we ask an arrangement by which people, as long as they do not upset the world, may determine their own affiliations." (Krehbiel.)

We would base the liberties of all on the same stable foundation as our own. We crave no victory at all except to block aggression. We mean to allow no considerations of force to affect the final adjustment. In "fruits of victory" or "dust of defeat," our efforts shall enure to the well-being of this whole world. Out of these purposes rises a new moral might which cannot fail to appeal even to our adversaries. Once

understood, it may raise the standard around which free men of all nations shall rally. "The force of America is the force of moral principle."

"The new morality" inheres in the four imperatives proclaimed by President Wilson on February 11, 1918. He insists

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

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

3. That every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interests and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival states; and

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

On a basis such as this, international order must rest; modern civilization will be content with nothing less. The acceptance of these principles would mark the end of the mediaeval era in world-politics. It would square international relations with the advances already achieved by science, ethics, and religion within the social order.

Labor and Capital After the War

By Frank T. Carlton

At the conclusion of the war, the old, troublesome problem of the relation of labor to capital, of the employe to his employer, is inevitably to be pushed into the foreground. Unrest among the wage-working population is not a new phenomenon; but the workers are now better organized and better informed upon economic questions than ever before in the history of organized labor. Urgent is the need of a cool, calm and intelligent discussion of the industrial situation.

The war has forced upon England, France, Germany and other warring European countries a well-defined national outlook. The individual and his personal business plans have been subordinated to social or national aims and control

as never before in the history of modern nations and modern business. America entered the war late; and the full force of war readjustments is not yet upon us. Furthermore, American business men and Americans generally have been extremely impatient of governmental or social control and interference. Business anarchy, wastefulness and rule-of-thumb methods have prevailed to an alarming degree. But in the fierce after-war competition for markets which is certain to follow the treaty of peace, American business men are to face as competitors nationally regulated and directed business organizations. They are to confront the competition of war-chastened and war-welded nations whose business efficiency is a by-product of war

necessity. Another big peace problem will be the replacement of the enormous amount of wealth which has been destroyed in this gigantic struggle. The urgent need of replacing the wastes and of again putting behind us the specter of famine and of fuel scarcity will lead to a more insistent demand than ever before made in times of peace for the highest pitch of efficiency in all kinds of industrial activity.

After the war is ended, therefore, one of the prime necessities will be the continued efficiency of our industrial organization. The relation of labor to capital will be a matter of paramount importance to national security and national progress. The nation cannot afford in the post-bellum era to allow quarrels between employers and employes to reduce productivity. The common weal will require the employer, the investor and the land owner to forego unusual profits and income; and the worker should do "his bit." The efficient mobilization of labor and capital requires industrial peace; and industrial peace can come only through mutual concessions under the direction of public authority. A big after-the-war problem will be: How may industrial peace be assured in the years directly succeeding the signing of the treaty of peace?

Since August, 1914, organized labor in the United States has been offered unusual opportunities to strengthen its position; and labor leaders have not been slow to take advantage of such opportunities. Immigration, mixing nationalities and classes, has been a potent factor in checking the growth of class consciousness; and it has furnished a large supply of labor. But for over three years immigration has been reduced to a very thin stream. For months in succession employers have complained of a scarcity of labor, and wages have risen as a consequence. The rapidly rising cost of living has also acted as a spur to aggressiveness on the part of organized labor. Since the United States became an active participant in the war, the Federal Government has recognized organized labor as never before in its history; and in the present national emergency the Government has received the loyal support of conservative labor organizations. Industries have weathered the war period and will continue to do so. Large profits have been received and unprecedentedly large sums have been paid in the form of taxes. The nation has spent enormous amounts for war

purposes. Surely, clear-sighted and hard-headed labor leaders will argue that high wages may be paid in a time of peace, or at least that reduction in wages will be an unnecessary part of the program of readjustment to peaceful conditions. In short, American labor in 1918 has caught a new and splendid vision of future opportunities, and it has made some very tangible advances over 1914. The subordinate position in the industrial world occupied by labor in the pre-war decades will not again be accepted gracefully or without a bitter struggle. Whether for good or for evil need not be here discussed; in the judgment of the writer, this is the situation which confronts the American people.

American workingmen are at present somewhat opposed to government ownership; they fear bureaucratic control. The public official has too often emulated the private employer in insisting upon low wages and the like. Many public officials have had the point of view and the outlook of the conservative and union-smashing private employer. Again, government ownership would spell standardization; and the maintenance of the *status quo* is feared by wage earners anxious to raise their economic and social level. Now is an excellent time for employers, opposed to further extensions of the economic functions of government, to gain the good-will and support of employes by the sort of scientific management which recognizes employes as men rather than as hands. In recent weeks, however, the leaders of organized labor are beginning to discern the magnitude of the power now resting in the hands of the Government; and active participation in Government instead of opposition to it may loom up as the most feasible program for American labor. Labor leaders are considering plans for participating in governmental activities. Progress in this direction will result in a change from antagonism to tolerance of government ownership. The recent appointments by the Administration of union leaders to responsible administrative positions has given the wage workers a vision of a government sympathetic to the hopes and aspirations of organized and unorganized labor. Under such a government, public ownership would no longer be feared by organized labor.

President Wilson's appearance in November before the delegates to the Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, bids fair

to mark a new epoch in the history of organized labor in America. The Administration has virtually recognized the right of organized labor to participate in the political and industrial affairs of the nation. Organized labor may now be expected to adjust its aims, methods and structure to conform to a new, strange and encouraging situation. Militancy, opposition and exclusiveness may give way to constructive statesmanship, cooperation and the recognition of the unskilled. Trade or craft unionism in the old and narrow sense may give place to a more inclusive unionism concerned with the rights and privileges of the unskilled. The new leaders may be expected to be industrial statesmen rather than strike directors and fiery agitators. But much depends upon the attitude of employers and upon that of associations of employers.

The American Federation of Labor is clearly capable of modifying its structure and methods to meet new situations. The obstructionists and medievalists of the hour are the leaders of certain associations of organized capital rather than of organized labor. The President in journeying to Buffalo, in appointing well-known union leaders to high administrative positions, and in his policy for the prevention of strikes in plants producing supplies for the government, has discarded the old and now dangerous policy of ignoring labor. The employer who in the face of this wise and democratic governmental policy still insists in the time of war upon adhering to the old autocratic program of outlawing union labor, is treading close to the line which means obstinate refusal to play the part of a good citizen in a time of national stress. He is blindly, but none the less certainly, playing into the hands of the Industrial Workers of the World and of the pro-Germans. Organized labor is manifesting a commendable willingness to support the government; the patriotism of the American Federation of Labor is beyond question. Employers of labor ought to be willing to do their share of adjusting to a new national outlook; and many are.

The vices of American individualistic and "profiteering" economy, which have been so clearly disclosed since the United States entered the Great Struggle, find their most extreme and discouraging expression in the treatment of the wage workers of the nation, in the extreme subor-

dination of labor to capital. And in the past, history clearly points out, wars have often lined the pocketbooks of certain groups of citizens; but the workers have ever borne extra burdens. The workers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor are today willing to bear their share of the burden of this great struggle; the Industrial Workers of the World are not. Surely now is the time for the great industrial and financial interests of the nation to prove indubitably that their patriotism is true blue and intelligent, now is the time to show clearly by actions as well as by words that no advantage is to be taken during the war of organized labor. Only in this way can the lingering suspicions of conservative labor be removed; and the anti-patriotic and trouble-breeding propaganda of radical labor agitators be rendered harmless. Industrial peace or industrial warfare in the period immediately following the treaty of peace, depends upon the willingness or unwillingness of employers to accept the new status of the labor group. If employers continue to refuse to "recognize" labor organizations, if they insist upon dictating the terms of employment without consultation with representatives of their employes, and if they insist upon "Prussianism" in industry, the struggle will be on in unprecedented fury. Industrial peace cannot be expected as long as "there is no strong sense of partnership between capital and labor"; it cannot be anticipated until labor and capital cease to be suspicious of each other.

Far-sighted American employers are studying the situation carefully; but unfortunately many employers are not far-sighted. Certainly, we cannot go back to pre-war conditions; the clock of industrial progress cannot be turned backward. The situation is full of menace. In the interests of national security and of national betterment, it should be pointed out in spite of criticism for so doing, that those who propose again to assert with firmness the old traditional rights of the employer, or who wish by force to sit on the lid, are playing with dynamite. If, with the return of peace, a definite and united attempt to put organized labor "in its place" is made by certain great associations of employers, if this large and powerful group dominates the situation after the treaty of peace is signed, and if the Federal Government be in sympathy with this group, prepare for a social upheaval of un-

precedented magnitude. On the other hand, if the Government is in sympathy with the aspirations of the labor group, an era of rapid extension of government ownership may be anticipated. Industrial peace and industrial efficiency under private ownership can only be expected, if the reasoning herein presented is valid, in case labor and capital bury the hatchet and earnestly try to understand each other.

Every enlargement of personal freedom has been vigorously opposed by those in power. It was repeatedly urged that the abolition of slavery would strike a hard blow at the foundations of human society and at the fundamentals of civilization. Similar statements were made in regard to the downfall of serfdom, the abolition of imprisonment for debt, and the elimination of peonage. But in every case enlargement of the rights of the "unblessed"—the under dogs—has resulted in betterment. The same opposition is now being manifested toward any step which means the admission of the worker into the councils of industry. And, judging from past history, we may well believe that the results will not be so calamitous as the opponents of such a step assert.

The background of experience for the average factory worker, and particularly for the typical migratory worker, is such as to lead to undervalue many of the ideals which the middle-class man of this country esteems highly. Absence of business experience, elimination of responsibility for the success of the industry, the lack or the emasculation of family life, and a growing suspicion of persons in other walks of life, all contribute to give the working man a point of view which is making more and more wage earners menaces to the present industrial and social order. On the other hand, scientific management and welfare work are too often the results purely and solely of the employer's activity and desires. His attitude and the point of view of his welfare workers are by no means the same as those of the employes. In fact, the personal equations and social reactions of the two groups are very different.

Too many welfare workers have the traditional middle-class point of view. They feel that their ideas are far superior to those of the workers; they wish to direct or "mother" the employes. Unfortunately, to many the worker is still a "hand" instead of a human being with

the likes and dislikes, the ambitions and the prejudices, the desire for self-expression and personal choice, which are attributed to the business and professional man of the middle class. Naturally, this attitude is especially galling and distasteful to a group which is rising out of ages of subjection and subordination into a position of greater power and influence. The worker asks for respect as well as for higher wages and a shorter working day. The welfare worker or the scientific management expert who never loses consciousness of his social and intellectual superiority to the wage worker, is certain to arouse antagonism and to prove on that account a failure sooner or later.

"Human engineering" is a form of activity which needs to be introduced into every workplace. Decent and humane treatment of workers in shop, mine and store will make for multiplied productivity and for industrial peace. The old-fashioned slave-driving type of employer is out of date; and not only out of date, but he is inefficient as a business manager. Considered from a business point of view, a man, a worker, is much more complex than a machine. Not only is the worker more complex on the physical side, but he possesses an intricate psychical mechanism which is lacking in the case of a machine. He requires more careful and intelligent care and treatment than do machines. But much less attention has been paid to this more complex form of scientific management than to such simpler matters as the routing of materials or cutting speeds. We do not know, for example, how far standardization and monotony of work may be carried without having the gain overbalanced by loss of efficiency.

The "human engineer's" function should be to restore, as far as possible, the personal element to industry, to make it possible for employers to gain an inkling of the problems and the aspirations of their employes; and for employes to come in touch with some of the problems which the business man must solve. Perhaps the best example of human engineering in the United States is found in William Filene's Sons Company's store, located in Boston. The recent steps, taken by the group of employers constituting the Western Pine Association in dealing with the acute labor situation in the lumber industry of the Northwest, is indicative of real industrial statesmanship. This industry now gives promise

of contributing to the scientific study of the human side of production. In striking and unfavorable contrast stands the arbitrary, foolish and illegal action of the copper interests at Bisbee, Arizona. The deportations from Bisbee were a source of widespread irritation and unrest among the rank and file of American wage workers, at a time of extraordinary stress, at a time when it was especially desirable that amicable relations between labor and capital be maintained. It will be many months before the unrest and suspicions engendered by this act of industrial "Prussianism" are dissipated. The refusal of the steel interests to sign the government contracts providing for the arbitration of labor difficulties is also imperiling industrial peace. Scientific human engineering rests upon the foundation of psychology and social psychology. It reckons with human nature as it is, not as the social worker or the moralist holds it should be; it investigates the under-the-surface causes of industrial unrest and industrial warfare. To make industry "safe for democracy" is one of the chief functions of human engineering.

Disregarding various reform programs fathered by employers and reformers, organized labor has reached the definite conclusion that betterment must be sought chiefly through two instrumentalities, organization and leadership. Help or advice from outside the wage-earning group is considered to be inimical if it tends to lessen the dependency of the worker upon his union and upon the leaders of organized labor. That this

is the attitude of union men is becoming increasingly clear; and as long as large groups of employers actively oppose labor organizations, it is absurd to anticipate any perceptible modification. The American labor organization of today is primarily a militant organization; its aims, ideals and structure show distinctly the handiwork of opposition placed against the drab background of social and industrial inferiority.

Labor organizations are here and here to stay; but unfortunately some business and professional men cannot read the signs of the times. Like the king of olden times, they are futilely trying to keep back the tide. If organized labor is a fairly permanent industrial institution, the labor problem is not one of smashing unions, but of working with them. Peaceful, collective bargaining with responsible unions, as in the coal mining and the stove molding industry, offers an encouraging tentative solution for certain of the serious labor problems of the after-war period. A labor organization evolved under adverse conditions and in an environment of bitter antagonism will of necessity be militant, aggressive and difficult to deal with; but mellowed by experience with kinder treatment and definite recognition, the characteristics of unionism will be greatly modified. But whether employers do or do not agree with the conclusions reached, labor in the United States is now too strong industrially and politically to accept without a long and bitter struggle the time-worn policy of repression and exclusion from the councils of industry.

America's Advantage

By John Willis Slaughter

It is undeniable that at the present moment the position of the United States is one of moral leadership in the world. That our participation in the war has been shorn of the accusation of selfishness, is admitted even by our enemies. The contribution we are making is not merely from our human and material resources, but also from our body of moral and political principles. Increasingly, as the war goes on, does the spiritual

battle-line take on definition and importance. If comparison is made between the first and last years of the war, the fact comes out with striking contrast that we watch the actual battle-front principally to see that the situation has not been materially changed, while attention and interest are focused upon the conflict of ideas and principles. These months of pause without military result are not wasted. The world is in a death

grip, but it is thinking and forming new resolutions. In the first month military events were everything. Ideas seemed to have no importance in the universal intellectual demoralization. Now, people know with great clearness what they are fighting for. Multitudinous intentions are concentrating into reasoned, concerted purpose. Into this conflict of invisible forces America enters with an equipment incomparably superior to that of any other nation. It was our good fortune that what America really wants and intends has been interpreted with consummate skill by our President.

At the same time, it is useful to understand that the American advantage is not fortuitous; that it does not inhere in any innate superiority of the American people as compared with the depravity of the European. The moral qualities of the civilized white races would be found pretty much on a par, apart from special circumstances. These circumstances of position, history, education, and economic outlook, are all important. If then, we are in a position to deal a death blow to militarism, and bring to an end the system of aggressive imperialism, if we are able to contribute to the new world an effective leadership, these virtues, of which we are and may be justly proud, derive from the special circumstances of our history. It is well for us to recognize this in general, and to understand in detail the reasons for our national qualities.

The first and most commonplace fact is that we are a peaceful nation, a nation of pacifists. The reason for this is the obvious one—that we were threatened by no outside enemies for a century after 1815. A few Indian tribes, some insignificant Mexican forces, and a small Spanish army in Cuba, have provided the only elements that called for military activity beyond our frontiers. German militarism, British navalism, was with us Atlantic Oceanism—a fortunate circumstance made into a virtue. In the second place, the security of isolation was supplemented by the pause between European expansion of the eighteenth century and that of the last two decades. Within this period we grew into a great and formidable nation, able to neglect and even to forget and despise Europe; able above all, to avoid tempting or provoking her. This was due to our economic sufficiency. Our multiplying population pushed out a frontier toward the west, seemingly capable of unlimited inclusive-

ness. The people in our way, Indian or Mexican, were brushed aside with the ruthlessness which the white man has always shown to elements he considered lower in the racial scale. The West and opportunity, the future and buoyant hopefulness, space and individualism, these are terms that stand in close juxtaposition. Europe expanded externally always encountering obstacles; America expanded internally, with little or nothing in the way. Our ethical and political qualities are in a large measure a function of our elbow-room. It should never be forgotten that America is a nation of small working landowners. Our democracy is a product of our farms. Meanwhile, the growth of manufacture freed us even from the necessity of trading with Europe. Our food and raw material came to be matched by manufactured commodities of our own production. Surplus wealth found instant reemployment. This was while European traders and investors were compelled to look beyond their national boundaries.

During this time we were not wholly unconscious of the possibilities of aggression from the outside. The Appalachians and the Rockies, with the granary of the Middle West, made us an impregnable fortress, except for the entrance to the Mississippi Valley. England and Spain were camping at our cellar door. In spite of the altruism that we professed and felt, it was a national necessity for us to secure ourselves in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. Beneath the surface, through a multiplicity of motives, this unconscious intention runs. What is important is not that we have, in a small way, descended to the policy of military necessity, but that this has not spoiled nor even affected our world attitude. We can still safeguard and purify what we are doing in the Caribbean, but it is none the less true that the war of liberation in Cuba involved the instinct of self-preservation.

That war brought momentous consequences by discovering us to ourselves as the inhabitant of a world made small by the triumphs of technology in communication. At first, surprised and embarrassed by finding ourselves a world power with Oriental and Caribbean responsibilities, we tried hurriedly to learn the rôle from the older, more practiced nations. This is why we were seriously infected by the extraordinary epidemic of economic imperialism, at that time rampant in the

world. Our fate seemed for a while to be that of the usual foreign trader and investor, urging his goods with the assistance of diplomacy, and protecting himself by his country's bayonets. We had plenty of adventurers to foster this attitude, and to insist that we were in danger of being crowded into a corner. But the situation passed. Our internal market for commodities and investments was still expanding; so there was no great surplus to place abroad. Those world responsibilities were found to be irksome and dangerous, and for the past ten years we would if we could, have freed ourselves from the Philippines and returned to the non-imperialist American basis. But experience taught us that we were quite capable of international adventure, and that we were, in any case, in contact with a great, rapidly readjusting system of nations. But in the main, and even through two years of world war, our impulse was to maintain our policy of isolation.

The lesson to be learned from our historical background is that foreign policy is correlative with, and conditioned upon, domestic policy, and if the latter is left without considered guidance, to be determined by circumstances and group ambitions, always striving for dominance, we shall be forced into an attitude toward other nations and peoples that reflects our attitude at home. If then moral leadership means anything to us, if it is our desire to assist the world to a new international system in which probable peace is substituted for inevitable war, then it is important for us to understand how this advantage may be preserved.

First of all, we see a group of European nations with congested populations, produced and dependent upon industrial processes. The manufacturer, whether owner or mechanic, must sell his wares for the necessities that he himself is unable to produce. These necessities are food and materials for further manufacture. Opportunity to sell commodities and purchase food is certain to be an individual and national desire. He will fight for it as a matter of self-preservation. When nations become huge manufacturing and exporting corporations, and the available areas of food production are seen to be limited, the competition is pregnant with disaster. The only conceivable alternative is a controlled system of fair division. America proposes to show the way to the establishment of that system, and

this is possible precisely because she has never so far been seriously in the world market. Our hands are not tied by the desperate necessity that grips Europe. Our power to bring about a League of Nations on the only possible economic basis, is conditioned by our power during the next fifty years to maintain our own economic sufficiency. That sufficiency can be expressed in a simple formula: Agriculture and Industry must balance accounts. But precisely in this policy America is now at the parting of the ways. Certain it is that if fifty years hence we find our industrial output doubled and our agricultural output stationary, we shall find ourselves in the universal scramble for possession and exploitation of tropical countries. There is a clear temptation, through improved methods of output, to build up industry at the cost of everything else. With this comes the temptation to secure advantageous foreign markets. The way is shown by the enterprise of the American International Corporation during the past two years. What we understand with difficulty, is that this development carries a corresponding limitation of market and enhancement of price to our own consuming public, and at the same time a lowering of all inducement to agricultural effort by the bringing in of the only things for which our goods can be exchanged—food products. The minor necessities to be imported may be disregarded as without influence on the main course of exchange. It becomes then a matter of supreme importance that American production of food and raw material shall keep step with her production of manufactured goods. The statesmanship that fails to see this is leading the country to disaster. But what can statesmanship do? It can proceed to free the areas and elements of primary production from the strangling burden that they must at present bear. Why is agriculture an undesirable occupation as compared with industry? The future of our country depends upon the satisfactory solution of this simple question. It is impossible that the type of democracy we have contributed to the world can survive if we destroy the conditions that have produced and maintained it. Another twenty years of our present course, and it will have vanished from the world. If a federal land tax were at this moment proposed in the National Congress as a means of safeguarding our national and international future, our legislators would

merely see it as something unfair to real estate dealers who have invested their money in land, as an attempt at confiscating the great western holdings, and as something that is forbidden in any case by the Constitution. To have an industrial plutocracy is really a matter of small importance. We can dispose of it on very short notice. But smothering the productive capacity of this country, through the extension of landlordism, is a matter of grave and not distant consequences. We must intensify our production of primary necessities step by step with the increase in the population. There is no finer culture medium for trouble than a great proletariat with no balance in the possession of property and with a perpetual margin of unemployment. This is a type easily persuaded that its prosperity depends upon the extension of foreign markets. Insecurity is a prolific source of jingoism. This quality increases in inverse proportion to the supply of jobs.

Beyond the principle of economic balance as America's contribution to the new world order, and indeed, as necessary to make it effective, is the principle of free exchange. Obviously, international trade, before the war, had reached the point where it was nothing more than competition in national enterprise. Any degree of governmental interference with exchange carries it out of the region of commerce into that of trade war. National backing can only be given to secure some advantage; and to secure advantage not natural to the exchange process itself is clearly a blow at other nations, certain to provoke counter measures. This statement applies not only to tariffs but to bounties, shipping subsidies, and all the rest. When goods are sold at a loss in the foreign market, and the losses met by the enhancement of domestic prices, this means that a whole nation is made to back the enterprise in its effort to capture the market concerned. England was thought to be an exception. Certainly, her trade policy was the freest and consequently the most healthy of all. At the same time, she was compelled in self-defense to use her huge maritime machinery to bolster her own trade. There was no free foreign trade. It may therefore seem a paradox to say that the United States is a great free trade nation. But this is the truth in principle. In spite of the high tariff wall; in spite of the fact that Americans are capable of the most asinine thinking regard-

ing tariffs, it remains true that American commerce has developed in terms of free trade. We are not one state, but a multitude of states, and this diversity has caused an abundance of trouble and much bloodshed. But the real triumph of this Federal Republic is the fact that in a vast territory and on a stupendous scale our prosperity has grown through an industrial life that could overflow political barriers. Industries have, therefore, been located in terms of natural advantage, and the whole system has worked with a success that has come to express our national life. The statement, therefore, that this is a free trade country, is true in principle, and the principle is our contribution to a solution of the world-tangle.

Under conditions of economic sufficiency and free exchange, no difficulty is offered by the problems of political units and racial elements. Our states are still entities that function where they can be of service. New Jersey is still a state in spite of the fact that most of its population in the north belongs to New York, as in the south to Pennsylvania. This reduction to proper proportions and to the basis of usefulness was not achieved suddenly or easily. It almost wrecked the nation. But in the end, it may be considered our greatest national success. And it did not come through the exertion of power on the part of any central power. Our national government is the expression, not the cause, of our national unity. There was a time when the governor of Massachusetts considered himself entitled to social precedence over the head of the nation. This fact needs remembrance by those who think a League of Nations depends upon the power of a super-state.

We have, too, solved the racial problem within the limits of the white race, and must in the course of a century learn what to do with Negroes and Orientals. Our experience has, therefore, proceeded beyond the conditions within Europe, and the result of this experience can be stated for Europeans in a sentence: Those nations and peoples cannot expect the melting pot to look with enthusiasm on a classified museum cabinet. We know that in ultimate analysis the solvent is liberalism, based on economic equality. We know that the submerged nationalities of Europe are peasant populations under foreign landlords. The problem points its own solution.

This is an attempt merely at explanation and

definition, and not an argument. It is open to attack from any special point of view—from that of Trotzky to that of the most backward looking

British Tory. But a world in desperate straits, searching for guiding principles, is fortunately not a debating society.

Alsace-Lorraine

By Theodore Schroeder

I have just heard a very distinguished Parisian editor discourse on Alsace Lorraine and the French title thereto. It seems to me that all such discourses are so very logical that perhaps they overlook some very important factor of the problem. It is that I wish to point out.

The editor declared that France would fight to the bitter end, to the last man, to the last dollar, for Alsace Lorraine. In the unconscious processes of his choice of the dollar as the climax of this sacrifice, he unwittingly gave me a fine insight into his personal psychology. It may be that this same property-dominated impulse, determined the nature of his argument, which emphasized the title to mines, not the freedom of the humans.

In justification of France's claim to Alsace Lorraine, he furnished us a complete record title, in "fee simple absolute" as a real estate lawyer might say. There was evidence of a title actually warranted in perpetuity. Then, with equal conclusiveness he told us how the Teutons trespassed upon France's property and without even a color of title, had wrongfully and with force of arms dispossessed France, the legal owner. Therefore, it is declared, this war must have for one of its objects: to deprive the outlaw of the benefits of his unlawful seizure, so as to persuade the German world that this particular form of robbery and looting are unsafe.

From the viewpoint of a real estate lawyer, the title of France is perfect. From the viewpoint of civilization's penal code the punishment is just. As a matter of international politics the executioner is properly selected and morally correct. Therefore no plebiscite is necessary or should be permitted to reverse the judgment. So runs the argument. But! There usually is a but to such superbly logical arguments. What factor of the problem has been overlooked? We have thought and talked of Alsace Lorraine as a piece of inanimate property which is the subject of a quarrel between two claimants, each justifying under some law of war or of morals. Only the

rights of these two claimants, Germany and France, have been considered. The land and mines have no rights. We have overlooked the fact that in this case the most essential feature is not the inanimate soil but the human beings resident in Alsace Lorraine. Less rhetoric and more careful thinking would have reminded the speaker that we are to deal with *the people* who will be and intend to remain legitimate inhabitants of these districts at the close of the war; not those of forty-five years ago nor those of three hundred years ago. An intelligent view of the problem will impel us to value the comfort of these people themselves above the lust for power and for economic opportunity of either of the absentee claimants of the legal title.

What difference does all this make? It may be that some three hundred years ago the then existing inhabitants felt much outraged by being made French. It does not matter because that fact cannot now be altered, nor relief or compensation given, to those who actually endured suffering. It is quite certain that in 1871 the inhabitants of Alsace Lorraine (that is the self-conscious adult population) felt very much outraged by being forced under German sovereignty. Practically all of these will have passed away by the time the coming peace is concluded. We should not blindly assume that all or even a majority of the children of forty-seven years ago who are still living, and those born since (very many of which are now middle aged men and women reared under German influence) are anxious to adopt France as their political parent. It is conceivably possible that now to force these persons under French sovereignty will only duplicate unnecessarily the suffering of 1871. And again may be it will not. To take either position for granted is an evasion of the real human problem.

When we come to consider these citizens of Alsace Lorraine as human beings entitled to have their wishes consulted, and not think of them as mere inanimate real estate or mines, then a new

prospect is presented to view. Now, it is more difficult to reconcile ourselves to the thought that this generation of France and of her allies shall prolong the present war for the "right" to use these other human beings as inanimate things, by the taking of which we will fine and punish the present generation of Germans for still approving and profiting by the misdeeds of their ancestors. When we remember the human factors of this problem, and that the inhabitants of Alsace Lorraine are not mere slave property, then we will see that they should be given a chance to express their own wishes, these being now regarded as more important to an intelligent conception of justice than legalistic real estate arguments, which intellectualize only the vanity or lust for power and for pelf of those whose concern is at best only secondary to the human factor located in the disputed territory. Therefore, it seems to me that a more intelligent conception of justice requires a plebiscite to determine the fate of Alsace Lorraine, just as much as to determine intelligently the fate of other peoples.

If we are to consider the real interests of these people in their relation to each other and to ourselves and future wars, we must also think seriously of their remaining an independent buffer State. If a majority of a few hundred were to determine their fate as German or French subjects, then prolonged wrangle and disturbance might result in bringing on new wars. From the viewpoint of the still larger human interests involved it might be much more conducive to human happiness and the world's peace, if it were decreed that Alsace Lorraine must remain an independent State with its peace guaranteed by all nations, unless two-thirds of its adults (men and women) vote for alliance with either Germany, France, or perhaps even Switzerland. This possible independent nationality may then be considered as their contribution of a bare majority to the general welfare and peace.

Such a termination of the controversy is almost inevitable if we bear in mind the essential difference between considering Alsace Lorraine as a problem of human beings, instead of a problem of property titles, and at the same time remember that their own human destiny is inseparably interwoven with the passions, the destiny and the peace of the rest of the world.

RELATED THINGS

The Teachers' Outlook

Statement of principles of the American Federation of Teachers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Believing that explicit statements of position on national and international problems will make for the unity of national purpose which is essential both for winning the war, and for the reconstruction of a new world after the war; and aroused by the disquieting symptoms of the threatening cross-currents of purpose, even among those equally determined to win the war, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers sets forth the following:

1. Undivided support is pledged to Woodrow Wilson, not alone as the constitutional national leader during a national crisis, but as the proved spokesman and interpreter of American spirit and thoughtful opinion.

2. Without discussing the immediate causes of the World War, it is clear that the world is being remade, that more democratic forms of society are to replace the old. Powerful constructive forces are at work throughout the war's grim tragedy. Peace when it comes will witness a readjustment of every form of human activity to conform to a higher standard of justice and freedom. In all this Woodrow Wilson stands pre-eminently as the prophet in high places.

3. The campaign for Universal Military Service seems to us a peculiarly dangerous attack on the policy of the Administration. If universal military service proves necessary to win the war, it will be another question, but that is not the contention of its present advocates.

If the power and desire of Germany for military aggression are not broken, then indeed the world becomes an armed camp, and America must adopt drastic militaristic measures. But we are confidently and grimly determined to win, and to establish a league of nations which will free all peoples from the waste and burden of competitive armaments. We must even then take measures to supply our full quota of an international police force, but the necessary strength of that force cannot be prejudged before the terms of peace, the temper of peoples, and the degree of responsibility of governments to peoples after the war are known. To adopt universal military

service now is to discredit our President's demands for disarmament, anti-imperialism, and a League of Nations, and we fear that reactionary hostility to our President's liberal policy is the real motive actuating many of the powerful interests behind the campaign for universal military service. Let us utilize our cantonments for universal training for civic service after the war so that we may permanently achieve a sense of social solidarity. But let us prepare for the reconstruction of a new world after victory, and not deliberately offer America a foretaste of the bitter fruits of defeat before she has begun to fight.

4. Democracy is the goal. There must be no diversion from its pathway. All who believe in it, every organization favoring it, every forward-looking person must rally in the campaign for its attainment. Enemies there are, even in our very midst who would betray us,—those who seek Privilege, or would conserve everything of the past, those who would derive gain in the midst of immeasurable sacrifice, those who oppose the advance of Democracy anywhere, those who would bring confusion by setting up class, racial or religious prejudices, those who inject doubt and fear into the public mind,—all for personal advantage, not as alien enemies, but as Americans, not those desirous of American military defeat, but of the defeat of American and world democracy.

5. In Labor's hands rest both the decisiveness of our victory, and the kind of world we shall live in and the kind of life we shall live, after the war. The line between producer and parasite is daily being drawn more definitely, and those who work with hand and brain are in all democracies aligning themselves with Labor. The British Labor Party has met the challenge of leadership in the reconstruction with a carefully formulated program that reassures by its sanity as much as by its radicalism. For in these days of the passing and birth of civilizations, while all radicals are not sane, all sane men must perforce be radicals. And American Labor, even now handicapped as British Labor has not been for fifty years, is proving the most effective democratic force in our national life.

6. This has been called a schoolmaster's war. And certainly the super-patriotism and "regimented docility" of the German people could have been developed only by the German school

system, carefully designed to make unthinking obedience implicit in the ninety per cent, and to train the remaining ten per cent in a quasi-leadership instinctively subordinated to authority. Without this subversion of childhood and youth, even Prussian universal military training could not have transformed the German masses into brutalized automata.

The German object lesson should force America to focus her attention on her schools. To make the world safe for democracy, our schools are secondary only to the winning of the war, if they are not primary in that. Even now many leaders of national influence urge the teaching of a strident nationalism as opposed to internationalism, rather than of a sane nationalism as the basis of the internationalism which is the hope of the world. The generations may grow up actuated by a sympathetic understanding of other peoples, or by an embittered hatred—the schools will decide, and on their decision hangs future peace or war.

The schools must also consciously specialize in training for that most complex and difficult of all human activities, self-government. One need only to look at the spectacle of misgoverned American cities to realize how lamentably we have failed in the past. We are failing largely because we are starving our schools financially, and almost ignoring them as communities. Surely one of the compensations for the sacrifices of this righteous war, must be a quickened sense of social values finding its most important outlet in an educational revolution which will establish in America's schools, "Democracy in Education: Education for Democracy."

CHAS. B. STILLMAN,
President.

C. C. WILLARD,
Secretary.

CORRESPONDENCE

Labor and Education

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The article, "Labor and Education," by Arthur E. Holden, a member of the new Federal Board of Vocational Training, in your issue of the 2d, illustrates the fact that our educational system is being carefully reviewed by the thoughtful people of the world, while our own people are beginning to call upon our schools for results. A remarkable call comes from Franklin

K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, for help to form and organize the United States Garden Army, to be made up of five millions of our school children. The plan is approved by President Wilson; the work will be under the direct supervision of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture cooperating in the work for the farm districts of the country. Mrs. Charles Bonfils (as San Francisco's "Annie Laurie," an editor on the *San Francisco Call*) has responded to Secretary Lane's call and is now on her way to the front at Washington. There can be no doubt that the response to the call will be so great that Secretary Lane, through his Bureau of Education, will be called upon to provide ways and means for allowing the balance of the school children of the United States (some seventeen millions), who are not included in the first call of five millions, to be allowed to do "their bit" in the world work and in making the world safe for democracy. With an army of twenty-three million children at real work we will have started a movement, and the only one that can convince the enemies of democracy that it is possible, as suggested by Secretary of the Navy Daniels, to make democracy safe for the world.

To the cry of protest that will come up from the Academy and the intellectuals that we must not interrupt the orthodox system of the intellectual training of the young, we are fortunate in being able to show by actual accomplishment in a California school that the intellectual training of the children has been and is still being accomplished in a three-and-a-half hour school day with no home studies, thus leaving half of the day for productive labor of any kind. This greatest accomplishment in intellectual education has been established in the San Francisco State Normal School by Dr. Frederic Burk and his staff. Mr. Holden feels called upon in his article to excuse and seemingly to approve of the very poor showing made by the pupils of vocational schools; the product of the boys' labor is valued at \$30 per year, and of the girls less than \$15; and he further states that the cost exceeds the value of the normal output of such schools. The contrast between such a statement and the following by Dr. Burk is most striking. Speaking of individual instruction as compared with class instruction he says in effect: The result obtained shows that the pupils will all graduate—the fastest in five years, the slowest in seven years, doing all of the school work from the primary to and including that of the grammar grades.

G. McM. Ross.

Stockton, Cal.

Russia

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I want to express my warm appreciation of the first three editorials in your issue of March 9. I spent last summer in Russia as a member of the American Red Cross Mission, and like almost all other open-minded Americans who have seen Russia in revolution, I was impressed with the deepest sympathy for her aspirations and with a firm confidence in her ultimate re-

organization. The attitude that you take in the matter is the only one that will help Russia and will maintain among our own people the ideals of justice which will ultimately win the war. The same reactionary forces which have manifested themselves in *Collier's* and the *Saturday Evening Post* are precisely the forces that are doing all they can to destroy the good feeling between America and Russia, and your rebuke to them is well deserved.

New Haven, Conn.

C. E. A. WINSLOW.

Any Emergency

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The *Plain Dealer* of March 11 quotes Mayor Davis, of Cleveland, as follows, and says the language used is none too strong: "If we hope to continue as a peaceful nation after the war we must be prepared to meet any emergency. The only way to meet such an emergency is to have our men trained and ready."

It is easy to see just what this would mean. It means that we must become the greatest military power on earth "if we are to continue as a peaceful nation," according to Mr. Davis. There could be no security, as Mr. Davis sees it, short of that, and the full measure of security which he advocates would necessitate not only our becoming the most powerful nation, but more powerful than all other nations combined, and this that we might "be prepared to meet any emergency," for "any emergency" is so broad and elastic in its scope of possible apprehension and meaning in the sense in which it is used here as not to be even approximately defined. If we are to believe that Mr. Davis is right, and are to follow his advice, we must proceed to become (at least) the greatest fighting strength nation in the world. Then, once more powerful as a nation than either Germany or England, what assurance have we that we will be powerful enough "to meet any emergency"? Will either Germany or England, or any of the other nations be idle along the same lines while we are busy building up the most powerful fighting machine in the world? No, and the inevitable result must be that every nation will "arm to the teeth." No other outcome is conceivable. Then will the result of this be that all nations will thenceforth be and "continue peaceful"? While our own country was "preparing to meet any emergency" all other countries would be doing likewise—does anyone doubt? Does all this spell "Peace on earth, to men good will"? Mr. Davis may be right, but if so it would seem inevitable that all must bid hope from the Saviour's humane admonition a long "adieu."

Lakewood, O.

L. K. COFFINBERRY.

The Free Trade League

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In your issue of February 23, under the heading of "Notes" (15th note), in speaking of steps taken for the formation of a so-called International Free Trade League, this statement occurs, "The organiza-

tion differs from the present American Free Trade League inasmuch as it will stand for absolute free trade whereas the executive committee of the former organization has declared for a tariff for revenue only." No responsible person who is acquainted with the facts could possibly have made this statement. The executive committee of the American Free Trade League has not declared for a tariff for revenue only. The revised Constitution as adopted at the last annual meeting of the League states that the object of the League is as shown near the head of the first column of its quarterly publication enclosed herewith. It is safe to say that every official of the League, from the President down, is an out and out free trader.

We are frankly surprised that such a paper as THE PUBLIC should have printed such a statement as appeared in this issue of February 23, without taking some pains to verify it.

Will you kindly give the same prominence to this denial that you gave to the above referred to misstatement, printing the statement of the object of the League so that people may judge for themselves where it stands.

The writer brought this matter to the attention of the executive committee, at a recent meeting and was authorized, by a unanimous vote, to call your attention to the matter and request a correction in your columns.

EDMUND J. BURKE,

For the Executive Committee of the American Free Trade League, Boston, Mass.

[Article II.—The object of the American Free Trade League shall be to free the trade industries and the people of the United States from any tariff except those imposed for revenue only. *And to hasten the time of free exchanges between all nations.*]

BOOKS

Food and the War

The Food Problem. By Vernon Kellogg and Alonzo E. Taylor. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York, 1917. Price \$1.25.

No department of our national enterprise, during the past year, has had so varying a fortune as the Food Administration. At its initiation, labeled as a food dictatorship—and thus meriting eternal condemnation—its beginning delayed until the middle of summer by Congressional stupidity, provided in the end with inadequate powers, encountering the prejudice of the whole population and the determined opposition of organized exploiters, it has made its way to a position of universal respect and effectiveness through an accumulation of minor successes. European experience had pronounced any attempt to control the food supply only a very qualified success. The method was, therefore, to a large extent, still in the experimental stage. Mr. Hoover faced a task primarily of public education, supplemented by restrictive measures, and the effective exercise of his limited powers depended upon public support. His work was, therefore, chiefly one in engineering opinion—that of a social psychologist rather than executive.

In the end, it may be said that the American people, after six months of food administration, have learned more about food, its production, distribution, values, and general bearing upon the world situation, than they knew altogether before. The conservation of food has become a mode of national and patriotic action, a personal participation in the universal effort. The food exploiter finds his part one of increasing difficulty. We understand clearly that the war will be won by food, that to avert famine from ourselves and force it upon our enemies is a major policy, coordinate with the action of armies. Blockades, submarine activities, relations with neutrals, are all matters of food supply.

Here is a book written by Mr. Hoover's two chief lieutenants, within a few weeks of the beginning of the Food Administration, intended to set forth the conditions of the problem, past experience in meeting it, and the program for the future. It is a pity that our Government failed to place a copy of this book in the hands of every agency of opinion on the day it appeared. There would have been infinitely greater confidence, and infinitely less obstruction on the part of the public; for the authors show a sure grasp of the problem, a complete acquaintance with all the methods and experiments tried in Europe, and they are entirely conscious of the hungry future to which the world is moving. The question is not only physiological and economic, it is psychological as well. Hunger is the one effective agent of social disintegration, the sure path to revolution. It is in this field that men most acutely realize social differences. Unfair distribution results always in explosive resentment.

In the main, it may be said that the American people take the food question seriously. The classes economically able to live well have held themselves to a rigid regime. There is indeed a greater amount of voluntary sacrifice in America than seems to be the case in England. We have been well taught that we must limit consumption, or our Allies will suffer famine. It may be confidently expected, in spite of the feud maintained by certain Senators, that if Mr. Hoover requires additional powers and proceeds to stronger measures of restriction, he will have the unanimous support of the people.

A Fresh-Air School in England

The Camp School. By Margaret McMillan. Published by George Allen and Unwin, 40 Museum Street, W. C., London, 1917. Price \$1.25.

The heart-break, the baffling struggle against those economic forces that are both the reason and the ruin of such undertakings as hers, are seldom more touchingly—and half unintentionally—confessed than in Margaret McMillan's eloquent little story of the Camp School. Not the war, nor her comrade sister's death, nor even the immediate lack of funds, has been the actual power retarding her enterprise. Huge Poverty loomed up as her opponent at every turn and by its very immensity overwhelmed each progressive attempt of hers to rescue its individual victims. Miss

McMillan is not the woman to be satisfied with Sammy's physical and moral improvement, or Teddy's speech victory, or Marigold's "one new summer of happiness." Her heart continually puts to her mind: If so much can be done in three years, why can we not keep these children up to sixteen? If these few children handicapped by disease and starvation can develop so wonderfully, why does not the British nation rescue all?

The school clinic in London, begun first at Bow with Mr. Fels to finance it and merged later into the "Health Centre" at Deptford, "became a real centre of joy and hope, the only 'home' that many desolate little patients ever knew." But "as the days went by and the work became organized, it began to dawn on us that the Day of Rejoicing was far off, not only for us, but for the nation. . . . Our patients were drawn from a very large area and children of every degree came. . . . The well-dressed boys and neatly shod girls . . . made splendid cures, while the poorer children made little or no progress. . . . They had so little vitality that they could not respond to the most skilful treatment."

So the clinic was supplemented in 1911 by the Girls' Camp, "Evelyn Home," in the heart of London, for sickly girls of grade school age, who came late each afternoon to live out of doors until school-time next day. A little later was established the Boys' Camp, located despite all objections in the old graveyard in St. Nicholas parish! Here was a day-school as well as an airy sleeping room, equipped for sunshine and boys' fun, with devoted teachers and health-guardians.

Physical development was made the point of departure for mental training. Lessons in deep breathing and control of speech-organs led up to reading and rhetoric and foreign languages. The author's chapter on education is epitomized in one sub-heading: "School Subjects and how they Emerged." Naturally when the only pupils chosen for a school are those handicapped by disease and poverty, intellectual "emergence" is tardy. But individual attention from a devoted teacher—each child his own school—can do marvelous things. Interesting as Miss McMillan's pedagogical experiment is, it is unique only as each child in the world is unique. And in one respect it is universal—poverty prevents its consummation. "But their science training stopped short here," writes Miss McMillan. "We could not find teachers. We could not raise money. There was a great deal of money in England at that time—and with a very small portion of it the education that would wipe slums off the face of the earth could have been given. But no. Our hasty scouting among possibilities was checked here."

Sketchy the little book is, almost chaotic—to a stranger, at least—surely most "informal," as the author remarks herself; but somehow full of the fascination that originality and enthusiasm, a heart full of pity and a head full of democracy, lend to any true cause. That the democracy of Rachel and Margaret McMillan rings true needs no other proof than their school motto: "Educate every child as if he were your own."

ANGELINE L. GRAVES.

National Psychology

Present-Day Europe: Its National States of Mind. By T. Lothrop Stoddard. Published by the Century Co., New York. Price \$2.00.

Everybody has an acquaintance more or less detailed, with the events of the war. Everybody is acquainted with the official pronouncements through which each nation stated its case and announced its intention. But a systematic presentment of evanescent public opinion has hitherto been lacking. In the last analysis, what counts is not so much what a nation is doing or saying, but what in its inmost soul it is feeling and thinking. The author undertakes to supply this deficiency in our knowledge with respect to all European countries. The chapters are separate studies of the states of mind of all the belligerents and the neutrals as well. In each case natives are taken as spokesmen. The sources are the periodical utterances in which nationals are speaking to themselves. Just enough of the historical background is given to show the permanent tendencies that canalize the flow of opinion. The feverish and eruptive condition of Europe in the months preceding the war, is appreciated: the civil struggle impending in England, revolt in Russia and Italy, the universal internal disorder; behind all this, the more permanent sympathies and antipathies. As the author says: "We remember the varied setting of the historic background: the rivalry of Briton and Teuton, the feud of Teuton and Slav, the vendetta of Gaul and German, the Roman dream of Italy, the Balkan bear-garden, the awakening East. This book is not a story of current events. It is a study of Europe's state of mind. The point here emphasized is Europe's incredibly volcanic psychology when the cataclysm began. The reactions of the various European peoples to that cataclysm will be the subject of the succeeding pages." Unfortunately, the title of the book is a misnomer. The record of national psychology can only be complete to the moment of writing, and these chapters cover the war-period to the beginning of 1917. It is greatly to be hoped that the author is carrying forward his studies and documentation, and will speedily bring this volume up-to-date, for much water has flown under the bridge in the past year. European psychology has undergone profound alteration. A subsequent study must take account of the Russian Revolution, the entry of America, the democratization of purpose, the changed bases of alliances, the strain upon morale, and the eternal gnawing of war-weariness.

As it is impossible here to state the results of the author's study in connection with each country, only comparative results can be indicated. While each of the great belligerents reacted in characteristic ways to the outbreak of the war, there were many common features. Each passed through a rather dazed period. Each believed that the struggle would be violent but short, and each entered without great accentuation of antipathy. But in a short time resentment and hatred came to their own, with German atrocities on land and sea, and, in Germany, because the participation of England meant defeat of the German plan. There succeeded in each country some months of unbridled

chauvinism. The enemy was belittled in respect to his civilization, and deserved nothing more than complete destruction, or rule at the hands of his conquerors. This was a period of general demoralization and unleashing of national ambitions. But with the military deadlock that supervened, the realization that conquest and dismemberment would be difficult, if not impossible, worked upon national psychology in each country to temper its outlook, if at the same time, to confirm its determination and reconcile it to sacrifices. It is interesting to see how the forces of reaction kept their ascendancy during the first year, and how liberalism gradually emerged with a new consciousness of its function in the world. Since the close of the author's account, reaction has returned to the saddle in Germany, while on the part of the Allies democratic forces seem to be gaining and consolidating themselves. Liberals are facing the future with confident hope.

The President's Words

In *Our First Year of War*. By Woodrow Wilson. Published by Harper and Bros., New York. Price \$1.00 net.

This little volume preserves in handy form the utterances of President Wilson from his second inaugural to his "Terms of Peace" address before Congress, January 8, 1918. It thus embraces the words of the world's chief spokesman during the greatest historical crisis. It is interesting to note the gradual change in the thought of a man who had clung so tenaciously to peace, but who was compelled against his utmost will to take up the gage of battle. The second inaugural accepts the grave responsibility of power at a time of international upheaval, March 5, 1917. Then follow in rapid succession, "We must accept War," April 2; "A State of War," the President's proclamation April 6; the message to the American people, calling upon them to speak, act and serve together, April 15; the conscription proclamation, May 18; conserving the nation's food, May 19; an answer to critics, May 22; Memorial Day address, May 30; the statement to Russia, June 9; Flag Day address, June 14; the appeal to business interests, July 11; the reply to the Pope, August 27; the message to teachers and school officers, September 30; woman suffrage, October 25; Thanksgiving Day Proclamation, November 7; labor must bear its part, November 12; address to Congress, December 4; proclamation of war against Austria-Hungary, December 12; taking over the railroads, December 26; address to Congress on the railroads, January 4; and the terms of peace, January 8. Rarely, if ever, have such momentous words been compressed within such a brief interval of space and time: It touches the very heart of this world struggle, and in those magic words with which the President is wont to clothe his thought.

The publishers state in a brief note of introduction, that the royalties of the author, like those from his other book, "Why We Are at War," go to the American Red Cross.

* *

The Fetishism of Liberty. By Harry Waton. Published by the Marxian Philosophical Society.

The purpose of this essay is to explain the relation

between liberty and socialism, and to prove a natural connection between socialism and the law of evolution. Portions of Spencer's "First Principles" are quoted to show how monarchical rule was gradually limited and the people acquired more individual rights, until the old idea, that the people were in duty bound to serve the ruler, swung to the very opposite extreme. And now, the duty of the governing body is to interfere with the freedom of the individual only to the extent that that freedom limits the freedom of his fellows. The theory that the individual is bound to gain greater freedom, is denied by the author as contrary to the law of evolution. The external world passes through a process of change, and the order of that change is evolution and dissolution. Evolution is the assembling of disintegrated and insensible matter into an integrated and sensible whole. Dissolution is the reverse of this process. The author proceeds to make the deduction that the same process of integration applies to the organic and human world as well. It is, therefore, an impossibility for individuals to reign supreme. The author contends that since socialism has adopted this scientific fact as its basis, it is a practicable and natural social philosophy. Concrete examples and interesting argument are set forth to illustrate that the tendency of society is toward the constraint of the individual in greater degree for the general welfare. Spencer, in spite of his unvarying belief in the sovereignty of the individual, is quoted as saying: "For among associated men the progress is ever towards a merging of individual actions in the actions of corporate bodies."

The idea of liberty is indefinite and changeable. The liberty of the civilized man, after centuries of training and taming, would be considered by the barbarian an intolerable imposition. This is because society has reached a compact and highly elaborated form, and liberty is consequently a function of groups.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending March 19

Congressional Doings

The Senate by unanimous vote on the 12th passed the Urgent Deficiency bill carrying an appropriation of \$761,265,355 for immediate war uses, and a further authorization of \$419,000,000 for projects to be taken up later, making a total of \$1,180,265,355. The bill also authorizes the Alien Property Custodian to dispose of all German-owned or controlled property in the United States, approximating in value \$1,000,000,000. The bill now goes to the Senate and House conferees. The conference report on the Railroad bill was adopted by the Senate on the 13th by a vote of 47 to 8; and by the House on the 14th, by a large majority. The bill leaves State power to tax carriers undisturbed and makes the Interstate Commerce Commission the final arbiter of rates. Government control is not to continue more than twenty-one months after the war. The bill carries an appropriation of \$500,000,000 for a revolving fund, places the short lines within the Federal system, and compensates the railroads on the basis of their net income for three years

ending June 30, 1917. This guarantees the roads about \$945,000,000 annually. The House passed on the 15th the Daylight Saving bill, under which the nation's clocks are to be turned ahead an hour in the spring and back an hour in the fall. The Senate passed this bill last June, and on the 16th concurred in the House amendment adding two months to the time covered.

War Department and Congress

A plan has been agreed upon for keeping the Administration and Congress in closer touch with regard to the conduct of the war. Members of the War Department will meet with the Senate Military Committee every Saturday morning. A similar arrangement will be made for meetings of the War Department and the House Committee. This will enable members of the House and Senate to get first-hand information without delay.

Naval Efficiency

The United States Navy Department received a cordial endorsement in the report of the special committee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, which has just completed an investigation of its activities during the war. Within this one year the number of men in the Navy has been increased from 55,000 to 300,000, and the number of ships from 300 to 1,100, yet the greater navy, the committee finds, has been handled as well as the smaller; and the Department is meeting all demands.

Opposition to New Tax Limit

The New York Tax Reform Association has issued a vigorous protest against the Boylan bill pending in the New York Legislature limiting the tax rate on real property to 17½ mills on the dollar. The Association's protest, prepared by A. C. Pleydell as secretary, shows that as the tax rate in Greater New York varies from \$2.36 to \$2.46 per hundred dollars, the reduction to \$1.75 would reduce the realty tax from \$200,000,000 to \$145,000,000. This would leave a shortage of \$55,000,000 to be made up by taxes on personal property. The Boylan bill in attempting to shift this large sum from realty to personalty, the Association charges, throws the whole tax law into confusion, and upsets a system of taxing intangible property that has worked fairly well. Such a change would cause hardship and injustice to business enterprises, and would be a distinct step backward.

Spicing Jersey Politics

George L. Record and Austen Colgate have announced themselves as candidates for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate at the September primaries. Mr. Record has been advocating a law permitting localities to decide for themselves whether they wish to untax buildings, and to impose the burden on land value. His bill provided for a ten year period of readjustment, the tax on the land to increase ten per cent each year, and the tax on improvements to decrease a like amount. The purpose of the bill is to discourage land speculation, and the holding of vacant land, and to encourage improvements. Mr. Record also advocates heavier taxes on war profits,

and upon the very large incomes. Mr. Colgate, who is a wealthy soap manufacturer, opposes the untaxing of improvements, and objects to higher taxes on incomes and war profits. "I contend that the poor want to stand their share of the costs of this war," Mr. Colgate says, "because of their spirit of patriotism."

Increased Freight Rates

A general increase in commodity rates of about 15 per cent was granted on the 15th by the Interstate Commerce Commission to railroads east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers. This is to supplement a similar increase in class rates granted last June. The order applies only to articles shipped in large quantities such as coal, brick, grain, foodstuffs, oil, stone, cement, lumber, and other stable products shipped under the "commodity" classification. The new rates, which will go into effect as soon as the roads file new tariffs, are expected to add about \$58,000,000 to the revenue of the eastern roads.

Applaud American Labor Spirit

W. A. Appleton and Joshua Butterworth, two members of the visiting British Labor Commission, who have spent two months in the Eastern and Middle Western States conferring with men and employers, announce themselves as highly gratified at the spirit of American labor. Mr. Butterworth reports that in Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Scranton, Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Newark and Jersey City he found the element of pacifism so insignificant as to be negligible. On the contrary, he found the position of labor here similar to what it is in England, with a firm determination that the war shall be fought through to a conclusive peace. Mr. Butterworth is urging upon American employers the same treatment accorded British labor, in order that the early mistakes in England may not be repeated in this country.

Russia

The All-Russian Congress of Soviets meeting at Moscow on the 14th, ratified by a vote of 453 to 30, the treaty of peace with the Central Powers. The Congress formally voted to transfer the capital from Petrograd to Moscow. After electing a new Central Executive Committee consisting of 200 members, the Congress adjourned. The Moscow Soviet has decided to organize a local army to act in place of the regular army which, according to the terms of the peace treaty, must be demobilized. Great uneasiness exists over the continued advance of the German armies in Russia, and the threatened intervention of Japan in Siberia. Premier Lenine, who urged the ratification of the treaty, says the duration of peace will depend on international movements, the extent of success of Germany in Ukraine and Finland, the action of Japan, the general course of the war, and the Russian domestic situation. Clashes still occur between the Red guards in Finland and the German forces aiding the Finns. American Ambassador Francis confirms dispatches that Leon Trotzky, former Foreign Minister, had placed himself at the head of a commune of Petro-

grad, and is known as the Commissary of the Commune. [See current volume, page 346.]

* *

The American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers has cabled the Russian Congress in the name of their 10,000,000 readers not to bring shame upon them by concluding a peace with autocracy. Continuing, they say:

We ask you in the names of millions of people who depend on the news of our papers to stand with us for the honor of our adopted country and our allies, of which your nation is one, in defeating the greatest enemies of civilization in the history of the world. We pray for your success and assure you of our aid in bringing about a glorious victory at arms. At your back the entire American nation stands as a stone wall. With the termination of an honorable and lasting peace, we pledge you our assistance in building up again your unhappy nation. Do not make the mistake of accepting a peace that will destroy your country, your homes and your people.

Canadian Fisheries Agreement

Arrangements have been entered into by the International Joint Fisheries Commission by which many matters of contention between the United States and Canada have been removed. The agreement includes the complete reciprocity of port privileges for the fishing craft of the two countries, which will not only increase the amount of fish handled, but will do away with many irritating delays. Canadian vessels can thus come directly from the fishing grounds, sell their catches and secure supplies. Although fish is admitted to the United States free of duty, Canadian fishermen could not take full advantage of it for the reason that they had to go first to a Canadian port, and upon leaving the United States were obliged to return to a Canadian port before going to the fishing grounds. On the other hand, United States fishermen were not allowed to enter Canadian ports except for wood, water, shelter and repairs.

Ireland

John Dillon, who succeeded John Redmond as leader of the Irish Nationalist party, speaking at Enniskillen, declared that Ireland would to-day be a source of strength to England instead of an embarrassment, had it not been for the betrayal of her interests by false British statesmen. He expressed the hope that the Convention would come to an agreement over the Ulster question. If it failed, he said, the Irish question would assume grave proportions. He added:

Ireland is in a terrible condition at the present moment. She is invited by a numerous, clamorous body of young Irishmen to abandon her claim for home rule and set up a claim for an Irish republic. I do not think the people who advocate that view are as numerous as they imagine, but it must be recognized that they speak for a large section of the younger people.

It is futile to discuss a possible Irish republic, and

as the Sinn Fein leaders are not united or consistent as to their aims, why should they not leave aside their dangerous bluff, coalesce with their fellow countrymen and make a united demand for that which is almost within our grasp?

European War

Germany continues her advance in Russia. Odessa, the great Black Sea port, was occupied on the 13th. This is said to give Germany complete control of the Black Sea, and to supply her with a new base for naval operations. It is reported that the Russian fleet has fallen into German hands. The German forces have also occupied Nikolayev, seventy miles northeast of Odessa. Both places were taken without resistance. Nikolayev, a place of 92,000 people, has a navy yard, and like Odessa, is a grain distributing point. The Turks have seized the oil region of Baku in eastern Caucasia. In Trebizond they are reported to be practicing great atrocities on the Armenians who fall into their power. Activities on the West front are still confined to trench raiding, artillery duels, and airplane struggles. [See current volume, page 346.]

* *

Japan is still undecided on the question of intervention in Siberia. Leaders in England, France and Italy urge action, but there is some opposition. Opinion in the United States is nearly a unit in opposing intervention. Some radical papers in Germany think a mistake has been made in dividing Russia. Others are alarmed at the possibility of meeting Japanese moving westward. General von Ludendorff says the German offensive must go on; and General Hindenburg predicts success on the west. It is reported in official circles that Lithuania, which was to have been an independent state, will be annexed to Prussia. Germans declare this step to be necessary as an "economic guarantee to Germany."

* *

The Supreme War Council of the Allies, composed of the prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the Entente assembled in London, issued a statement on the 18th, condemning German political crimes against the Russian and Roumanian peoples, and refusing to acknowledge Germany's peace treaties with them, and also declaring: "We are fighting and mean to continue fighting, in order to finish once for all with this policy of plunder and establish in its place the peaceful reign of organized justice."

* *

Fifteen British vessels over 1,600 tons were sunk by mine or torpedoes during the week, and three under that tonnage. Two Norwegian ships were sunk, but no French vessels were lost during the week. Further air raids have been made on Paris and London. Zeppelins again appeared in the raid on England, but they flew about aimlessly in the dark and did little damage. The attack on Paris was made by nine squadrons, only a few of which reached the city. Four German machines were brought down, and fifteen men were captured or killed. British airplanes dropped nearly

ten tons of bombs on the munition factories at Freiburg, and three tons on docks at Bruges.

* * *

America's part in the war assumes ever increasing proportions. The men at the front have suffered heavy attacks from the German forces, and have themselves made spirited raids. Men and supplies are going forward, but details are withheld from the public. Airplane production is assuming such dimensions that General Pershing is promised all he needs by July. Reports from Secretary Baker, who has been visiting all points in the war zone, are to the effect that he is well pleased with conditions. The newly created construction division of the War Department is in charge of a building program involving the expenditure of \$1,084,000,000. It will include storage terminals at Boston, Philadelphia, Charleston, S. C., and twenty-eight other points, with cantonments, aviation fields, powder-loading plants, hospitals, housing for workers and many other things involved in war preparations.

NOTES

—Mrs. Lucretia Rudolph Garfield, widow of James A. Garfield, twentieth President of the United States, died in South Pasadena, California, on the 13th, at the age of 85.

—British subjects born in Ireland and living in the United States will be exempt from the operation of the agreement by which the United States is to draft British citizens living here.

—Charles Page Bryan, United States Ambassador to Japan under President Taft, died at Washington on the 12th, at the age of 61. Mr. Bryan served also as Minister to China, Brazil, Switzerland, Belgium and Portugal.

—The war savings fund has passed the \$100,000,000 mark, and is growing at the rate of \$700,000,000 a year. It is estimated that 5,000,000 persons are now enlisted in the war savings army. It is hoped to raise this number to 40,000,000, of whom 10,000,000 may be school children.

—Consumption of intoxicating liquors in Great Britain, owing to Governmental restrictions, is only one-third what it was four years ago. No spirits at all are being manufactured, and should there be a shortage of bread, brewing too will be stopped, according to the Premier, Lloyd George.

—Will H. Hays, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, declares himself in favor of the Federal amendment granting woman suffrage. He is urging that two of the nine Republican Senators opposing the bill give it their support, in order to insure its passage.

—President Wilson has set aside the week beginning March 18 as National Enrollment Week for the United States Boys' Working Reserve. The purpose is to call the attention of the boys and young men to the importance of increasing the food supply by working on

farms. Students, and all others who can, of ten years of age or over, are urged to join the Reserve.

—Crime in Germany, according to the German press, is increasing at an alarming rate. One Berlin insurance firm reports that it averages 300 cases daily of burglary and housebreaking. Refugees from outlying provinces and men in uniform appear to be the chief offenders. The police forces are mainly old men, who are easily overpowered.

—Scandals of profiteering in Germany, according to *Vorwärts*, have caused an enormous shrinkage on the Berlin Stock Exchange. Stock of the Daimler Motor factories, now under investigation by the Budget Commission of the Reichstag, fell two-thirds. There is a widespread feeling that war factories have been grafting.

—The lower house of the New York legislature on the 12th voted 84 to 64 to refer the ratification of the Federal prohibition amendment to a direct vote of the people of the state. The Delaware Senate ratified the amendment on the 18th by a vote of 13 to 3. As the House had already taken action this makes Delaware the ninth state to adopt the amendment.

—A message to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets at Moscow, on the 13th, expressing America's sympathy with the Russian people, was signed by twenty-eight distinguished Americans, among whom were Cardinal Gibbons, Samuel Gompers, Carrie Chapman Catt, Frank Morrison, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Henry Morgenthau, Otto H. Kahn, William English Walling, and John H. Finley.

—"Stories circulated at home that our soldiers abroad are succumbing to disease, liquor and dejection," says James A. Whitmore, agent of the National War Work Council, who has lived for weeks among the men, "are part of the subtle pro-German propaganda which is spread in this country . . . to alarm the parents of our boys and to discourage more Americans from going to France." Mr. Whitmore declares the men are in the finest condition, and receive all possible care.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

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

EDITORS:

MRS. JOSEPH FELS JOHN WILLIS SLAUGHTER
GEORGE P. WEST STOUTON 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, \$5.00

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



B.F.G.

LOUIS F. POST
Assistant Secretary of Labor

The Ethics of Democracy

By Louis F. Post

Third Edition: New Introduction

THE "Ethics of Democracy" is Mr. Post's greatest book. It is a series of optimistic essays on the natural laws of human society, which should be read and recommended widely.

CONTENTS: Introduction—Democracy; The Democratic Optimist; Individual Life; Business Life; Economic Tendencies; Politico-Economic Principles; Democratic Government; Patriotism; Conclusion—The Great Order of Things.

What Reviewers Say:

Mark Twain wrote of the first edition: "I prize it for its lucidity, its sanity and its moderation and because I believe its gospel."

The Globe, Boston:

A republication in a third edition of Post's *Ethics of Democracy* is a literary event worth noting.

The Citizen, Ottawa, Canada:

Louis Post's light will continue to shine for true democracy in the United States; and the rest of the world has nothing to lose by keeping in touch with the principles laid down in *The Ethics of Democracy*.

The Christian Science Monitor, Boston:

The author has written a preface bringing himself and his convictions up to date as it were. Monopolies, imperialism, protection, unearned increment pseudo-patriotism, mock-justice, get hard blows from him but not in a bitter spirit. He "speaks the truth in love."

William L. Cheney, in the Chicago Herald:

Louis F. Post's volume of *Essays in "fundamental democracy"* has now reached its third edition. The production of a clear-sighted, brilliant leader, *Ethics of Democracy*, opens a wide window for the viewing of our common life.

Price \$1.50, Postpaid

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

THE TIME For Economic Readjustment

is at hand. The people of the United States, not a few private individuals, must draw the bulk of profits from all private monopoly—industrial, utilities, land, etc. This result can be accomplished in a safe and efficient manner—by limiting private fortunes so that the surplus or excess goes back to the nation. Excessive private fortunes are a menace to the nation. Read the facts and the remedy in

Standard Oil or The People AND Bankrupting a Great City

BY
HENRY H. KLEIN

Mr. Klein is First Deputy Commissioner of Accounts, New York City, and was special investigator for several official, state and municipal bodies

	Retail		Wholesale	
	Paper	Cloth	Paper	Cloth
Standard Oil or the People	25c	50c	15c	35c
Bankrupting a Great City	40c	75c	25c	50c

Mailed to any address.

Address: Tribune Building, New York City.

A Biography for War-Time Reading

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

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

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

IF you do not receive your copy of THE PUBLIC promptly, do not assume it has been lost in the mails. Confusion and delay in the handling of second class matter is now so great that all periodical publishers are deluged with complaints, about which they are helpless. If after waiting a few days, you do not receive your copy of THE PUBLIC, we shall be glad to duplicate it.

Is the High Cost of Living a War Product?

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

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



Frederic C. Howe

Contents: Agricultural Possibilities and Problems
Gambling in Wheat
The Packers and the Cattlemen
Cold Storage and Food Speculation
The Middlemen and Distributors
The Transportation Embargo
Why There Is Not More Food

Food Control in Germany
The Embargo on Farming
Land for the Landless
Exploiting the Would-be Farmer
The Tenant Farmer
The Farmer and the Banker

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

Price \$1.50, postpaid

THE PUBLIC

**BOOK DEPARTMENT
122 E. 37th STREET**

NEW YORK

"The Public" in the College

MORE copies of **THE PUBLIC** are being used in the classrooms than ever before, usually in classes on economics and current events.

We have an *unusually low* rate of bundles of six or more copies for use in the classrooms. Orders for this purpose are not treated as regular subscriptions, and are taken care of for as few, or as many, weeks as may be desired. We shall be glad to quote prices to teachers interested.

THE PUBLIC is a very satisfactory weekly textbook in civics, economics and current events. Without exception the persons here who are taking **THE PUBLIC** speak in terms of warmest appreciation.

—From a Dean of a Western College

On the Enforcement of Law In Cities *By Brand Whitlock*

This little book throws a flood of light on the problem of the saloon, the social evil and gambling in cities. Public officials and those interested in the true solution of this problem should distribute the book widely.

50c. a Copy, postpaid; 10 copies, \$3.50.

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

LEARN Suggestive Therapeutics

A course of essentials which may be completed at home in 150 hours. Concrete, definite and practical. Well adapted for use of physicians. For full particulars, address, Dept. M.23 Weltmer Institute, Nevada, Mo.

“Over the Top With Twice 5,000”

—We
would like to do it.

Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, Editorial Chairman of the Leslie Suffrage Bureau, New York, in urging suffrage workers to encourage our campaign to put 5,000 liberal women on the subscription list of THE PUBLIC in April, expresses the hope that we will “go over the top with twice 5,000.”

Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, wishing the campaign success, says that THE PUBLIC is helping thousands of “thoughtful men and women to work for greater economic freedom.”

Hon. Wm. Kent, of the United States Tariff Commission, Washington, writes: “I am greatly pleased with the development of THE PUBLIC and with the fine ability shown in its conduct. It deserves a big boost as a really valuable contribution to current thought, in addition to its special value as an organ of liberal propaganda.”

Subscriptions, in the campaign next month, will be entered in clubs of three, at a rate which does not exceed cost of production: three subscriptions, six months each, for two dollars. The Coupon is just as good now as it will be in April.

Meantime a little artillery preparation will do a world of good! Many present readers of THE PUBLIC go gunning for new subscriptions—it’s a satisfactory, patriotic sport! Try it on *your* neighbors.

Every women’s club should receive THE PUBLIC.

To get THE PUBLIC into the hands of intelligent and right-minded American women is one of the biggest things that can be done at the present moment for the advance of American citizenship and for the development of the international mind on the lines of President Wilson’s idealism.

—Alice Thacher Post.

Washington, March 2, 1918

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

I enclose \$2. Please
send THE PUBLIC for
six months to the 3
new subscribers herewith.

Name

Address

Single Subscription, six months, \$1.