

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. BURLISON, Postmaster-General.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

United for Democracy

What Is Happening In Ireland

Social Darwinism

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

March 30, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year

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 equitable 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	35c	50c	15c	25c
Bankrupting a Great City	40c	75c	25c	50c

Mailed to any address.

Address: Tribune Building, New York City.

BY LAJPAT RAI ENGLAND'S DEBT TO INDIA

An important work on Britain's fiscal policy in India. Valuable to students of colonial government. \$2.00 net

B. W. HUEBSCH *Publisher* NEW YORK

Read "THE FLAMINGO'S NEST" "A Lively Narrative"—*Cleveland Plain Dealer* **A HONOLULU NOVEL**

360 pages. Express paid, \$1.35
R. SPRAGUE, 2112 Durant Avenue, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA



OSCAR H. GEIGER WHOLESALE FURRIER

6 WEST 37 TH STREET
NEAR 5TH AVENUE

TELEPHONE
GEELEY 2870

NEW YORK

LEARN Suggestive Therapeutics

A course of essentials which may be completed at home in 180 hours. Concise, definite and practical. Well adapted for use of physicians. For full particulars, address, Dept. M.30 Walker Institute, Nevada, Me.

Cerotype Printing

—a method of producing high grade engraved stationery at low cost.

No Charge for Engraving

Write for samples of and prices on letterheads, bill-heads, checks or any other stationery.

Quality
Economy
Speed

**FRANK McLEES
& BROTHERS**
2 DUANE ST., NEW YORK

Our Work
Goes Round
the World

The Birth Control Review

The health and efficiency of the future generation depend upon your knowledge and understanding of eugenics.

Advanced thought along these lines will be presented during the coming year by such renowned and able writers as Havelock Ellis, Dr. Alice Vickery, Dr. C. V. Drysdale of London, as well as some of the best writers on the subject in America.

Published Monthly—\$1.50 a Year

Editor, **MARGARET H. SANGER**
104 Fifth Avenue, 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.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI

New York, N. Y., March 30, 1918

Number 1043

Contents

Editorial Notes.....	387
America In It.....	388
United for Democracy.....	389
An Unpopular Policy.....	392
The New Liberty Loan.....	393
Promoting Home Ownership.....	394
What is Happening in Ireland.....	396
The Removal of Economic Barriers, Lucia Ames Mead.....	398
Social Darwinism, David Starr Jordan.....	400
Alsace-Lorraine, William E. McKenna.....	401
The Brest Litovsk Conference.....	403
The New Dayspring.....	405
Correspondence.....	406
Books.....	409
Salute to the Coal-Driver, Leonora Pease.....	410
Good Friday on the Battle Front, Carroll Peabody.....	411
News.....	411

There is this week only one interest, one focus of attention. Everything else, when measured against the battle, raging unceasingly, is dwarfed to a little thing. This is the final concentration of effort, the meaning of these years of preparation and preliminary skirmishing. When the clouds rise from this battlefield, we shall be able to read the fate of Europe, and know whether its immediate future will be ruled by despots or peoples. Before this grim arbitration, the whole race is waiting in a balance of hope and apprehension. From the crest of this effort, Germany will move down to defeat, or to a temporary triumph while her foes prepare to fight anew.

* * *

There is already, as we go to press, a general sense of relief, and the stock exchange, where men translate the fate of nations into their mean little interests, shows a return of confidence. That the British are losing ground is a matter of lesser consequence compared with the fact that their line remains intact and their organization undisturbed. The German effort shows signs of spending its first vigor under terrible losses and

fatigue, the difficulty of carrying forward supplies and the increasing resistance of the British armies. Only in case the German command has resources to repeat the onslaught of the past week, is there probability of gaining any decisive advantage. Otherwise, the tide will turn, and we will know that the supreme moment for the Allied arms is at hand.

* * *

For us in America, the drama in France can be seen only with mingled feelings. **THE PUBLIC** has no competence to judge the military situation, but it has proceeded on the assumption that this is a war of peoples and not merely of armies; that the test involves a great complex of factors—economic, racial, social and psychological. It has therefore urged that our preparation contemplate this year as the crisis of the struggle, and that the nation make short shift with those who wanted it to be a leisurely and profitable game. Now the moment has arrived, and while we can depend upon the little army of our lads in France to do all that men can do, we must, in view of the work now to be accomplished, look on in impotence. The counter-offensive that the Allies will launch may break the German power, in which case we will not be needed. We can hardly pride ourselves on a victory that has cost them practically the whole of their manhood. On the other hand, it may be necessary for us to shoulder most of the burden in the coming years. But the prospect of fighting this evil thing for a long continued period is one of dismay. Our government has done all that was humanly possible against obstructionists and profiteers. It was probably inevitable that the nation should awaken slowly to the size and urgency of the problem. This week can leave no vestige of complacency, and the future will be faced with clear understanding and increased determination.

There died in New York the other day one James Stillman, chairman of the board of the National City Bank. To his five children, including two daughters married to members of the Rockefeller family, he left an estate of \$45,000,000. Of this the Nation will take about \$10,000,000 as inheritance tax, and the State of New York something less than \$2,000,000. Instead of giving the remaining \$33,000,000 outright, the will creates five trust funds, to be administered by executors who will presumably continue the process by which a fortune of this size is made to grow in geometric progression. Nearly three years ago the report of a Government Commission on Industrial Relations recommended to Congress that inheritances be limited to \$1,000,000. That was before we entered the war, and the Commission's purpose was the breaking up of dangerous concentration of economic power in private hands and the forestalling of Bolshevism, rather than the raising of revenue. Mr. Carnegie has argued for years in favor of an inheritance tax of 50 per cent. Needless to say, Mr. Stillman did not earn this \$45,000,000, and it belonged to him only by virtue of an economic system that permits ruthless men to seize control of public property,—public in every sense but the legal one,—and levy enormous tribute on the community. Stillman's most notorious exploits were the organization of Amalgamated Copper and his part in the Alton deal, engineered by E. H. Harriman. Mr. Harriman lived to be sorry and to do what he could in atonement by constructive work for the western territory served by his lines. Stillman got away to Paris just before the investigating committees began to issue subpoenas. Americans like to close an era whenever they write an obituary. Stillman's exploits probably will never be repeated in this country, because the cow has been milked nearly dry. But his bank has taken the lead in exploring new fields for conquest,—new natural resources in undeveloped and weakly-governed foreign lands that can be used to levy toll on a people's necessities. One cheerful thing there is to record,—Stillman's death called forth no florid obituaries,—no advice to young men to go and do likewise. It marks a growing feeling that this sort of career is something less than fine. The day is coming when it will be disreputable.

The sudden death from pneumonia of Dr. Carleton H. Parker, Professor of Economics at the University of Washington, is a heavy loss to the cause of economic justice in this country. Again, as in the death of Prof. Hoxie, we lose a man just at the beginning of his life work who promised to do much to rescue the teaching of economics from compromise and subserviency and to bring science to the aid of popular agitation. Dr. Parker knew more about the migratory labor problem and the I. W. W. than any man whose voice could carry across class lines. He organized the work of the California Housing and Immigration Commission and co-operated with the I. W. W. in revolutionizing the conditions of life and labor for the West's great army of migratory workmen. At the time of his death he was working for the War Department in the adjustment of disputes in the lumber country of Washington, and it was overwork that brought on grippe and pneumonia. One of his last tasks was to endeavor to bring about a better understanding of the I. W. W. problem and to mitigate the policy of the Department of Justice. He did this through personal contact, an article in the Atlantic Monthly, and a contribution to a pamphlet on the I. W. W. cases, soon to be issued.

America In It

We can take it for granted that the German offensive and the participation of American troops have produced a profound change in the spirit of America during these past few days. When we remember that a British army was cut to pieces in the first month of the war, and then measure the change in our own feeling produced by relatively trifling participation, we can understand why America has been slow in coming to a full realization of the task in hand. The new spirit is reflected in the atmosphere of Washington. There has been no grimness there, but rather the exhilaration and enthusiasm of a freshman class avidly learning new duties and taking on new points of view. Thousands of men and women have had more sheer fun in the past eleven months than in any similar period of their adult lives. The word seems a sacrilege, but it measures the lightness of the spirit in which we embarked on this enterprise. Washington glowed and throbbed with new life. Pleasant excitement, foreign uniforms on the streets and in

the hotel lobbies, complete novelty, a welcome outlet for wasted energies, the disappearance of boredom, the exultation of unselfish service,—all these gave Washington an almost carnival air. That is gone now. There is no longer any novelty. The center of gravity has shifted from the national capital to "over there," and today we look in the papers, not for lists of new commissions and appointments, but for casualties. The first reaction is past, too. It was one of extreme and unjustified pessimism. Germany could not be beaten. The Italian disaster and the collapse of Russia were prophetic. Our own contribution was insignificant. Ships were lacking. Our heralded plans had gone awry. The nation has shown a capacity for mercurial changes in temperament of the sort we attributed to the French before 1914. For a while there was almost a complete renunciation of that cock-sureness and contempt with which we once looked out on any prospective enemy.

Today American confidence is rising to meet the grim necessity. We can do it because we must. And we will. The two things that operated most potently to shake our self-confidence were the breakdown of transportation and the Hog Island scandal. For these failures were in a field where most of all we considered ourselves supreme. As for our military preparation, that has gone almost too well. A great army has been organized so silently, with such an almost-automatic process, that the nation as a whole has stood by and watched it happen without feeling that the accomplished thing represented our own effort, our own will. Here is the one disadvantage of the draft. We have "let George do it,"—"George" in this instance being Congress and General Crowder, and we were neither so committed to the enterprise nor so confident and proud of our contribution as we should have been if we had done it ourselves,—if every man in uniform represented a voluntary impulse sprung from that man's heart and the heart of the community. But today the impulse is there. The need of a million volunteers would bring them over-night. And because our military needs are provided for, we can look to see the same impulse, the same grim determination to do one's bit, express itself in the industrial field where the need is greatest. The most pessimistic digest of shipping figures proves that this year we shall touch the bottom, and that thereafter ship produc-

tion will outdistance the submarine. Even now our troops must be going over at the rate of 100,000 a month, and with that much encouragement we can depend on the French to hold out until our forces become irresistible. And that they will. We shall continue to pour 100,000 men into France every month for ten years, if that is necessary, and without crippling industries capable of feeding and supplying the Allied world. Let us get back to our old conception of an America invincible in courage and resources and will. Let us look with scorn or suspicion on the man who talks of Germany as unbeatable, who goes about shaking his head over German victories. Leaving Belgium, Serbia and Roumania aside, Germany's one success of the war was her drive into Italy,—a nation demoralized by popular knowledge that her Government's war aims were imperialistic and indefensible. Today there is no Allied nation of which that can be said. It can be said only of Germany, and henceforth the arm of every soldier and every worker in the Allied nations will be steeled by whole-hearted confidence in the holiness of his cause.

United for Democracy

President Wilson's success in winning the confidence and support of labor the Allied world over becomes more marked every day. A dispatch from Rome reports the collapse of anti-war Socialism in Italy, while Mr. Henderson, Secretary of the British Labor Party, now warns his followers against an inconclusive peace. In America the change has been as marked, although strangely enough our Socialists here were the last to respond to the promise of the President's leadership. That is probably because the Socialist Party of America is not a labor party, composed of working men and women with their feet on the ground and a grip on realities, but in large measure a group of doctrinaires and politicians. Of these some clung to pacifism as a churchman clings to orthodoxy, because it was part of a tight little body of doctrine which they had erected into a religion, and which, therefore, it was sacrilege to question. Others were Socialists of the reactionary German school, so in love with organization and so friendly to regimentation that they actually saw in the German system a higher stage in evolution than anything the Anglo-Saxon world has pro-

duced. These are at heart autocrats,—materialists who believe that if men are well fed they need not be free. Still others were politicians who thought they saw an opportunity to unite under one banner enough disaffected employes, indifferentists, slackers and pro-Germans to build up a formidable political group. These last alone were to be feared, and events have shown that fears were groundless. There remain the large number of sincere men and women who were neither doctrinaire nor pro-German, but who had learned by bitter experience to be suspicious of all governments, our own included, and who were unprepared for the sudden developments that forced Mr. Wilson to abandon neutrality. They were men and women absorbed in the daily struggle for bread, and their feeling about the war had crystallized into a few simple formulæ:—The war was a madness for which no one nation was wholly to blame. Mr. Wilson had sought re-election on the plea that he kept us out of it. Old racial prejudices against Russia or England or in favor of Germany helped to obscure the issues. For three years they had seen a militarist propaganda carried on in this country by men whom they recognized clearly enough as enemies of the people,—men who were profiting from the slaughter and whose sympathy with England took root in a partnership of class interests that are opposed to democracy. The declaration of war brought these men and their press into the foreground as the noisiest and most conspicuous supporters of a President they had previously damned. Worst of all, no one in authority told them the true reason why he had to go in. The people were not interested in foreign trade, and the right to travel through the submarine zone was to them an academic matter not worth the shedding of blood. What they did not then realize was the urgency of the Allied need,—the desperate straits of the Allied nations. That was our real reason for entering the war, that without us German militarism would have triumphed. In this connection there is the curious silence of the President during those early weeks and months. It was as though his jaw had at last set. His mind had gone to war, and he disdained the utterance of anything that might seem to be an explanation for a course that seemed to him,—and to most of us,—so profoundly, so obviously, right. But while he was silent, our Tories were doing their best to give the

lie to his slogan of a war for democracy. How his democratic intent slowly but surely demonstrated itself beyond any doubting is a familiar story to us all.

It is significant that the first large group of Socialists to repudiate the St. Louis platform are the 100,000 members of the Amalgamated Workers of America, a labor union composed almost entirely of Socialists. In New York last fall the Union threw its entire support to Hillquit in the mayoralty campaign. Yet the General Executive Board now issues a formal manifesto pledging support to President Wilson and denouncing Germany in ringing terms. It says:

“Prussian militarism has thrown off all restraint and challenged civilization in the most amazing shamelessness and brutality, surpassing all of its past records of vandalism and ruthlessness in Belgium, Serbia and everywhere else. German militarism now stands as the brigand of the world, employing all the attainments of thousands of years of civilization in assassinating, crushing and plundering nations. . . .

“In the past year President Wilson has infused a new spirit in the peace discussions among the nations, proclaiming democratic terms, aiming at a general, democratic and lasting people's peace. President Wilson's recent addresses to the Congress of the United States have given force and vitality to the people's demand for a peace on the basis of no annexations, no punitive indemnities and self determination of the nations.

“President Wilson has also thrown the weight of his high authority in the scale against the establishment of militarism in this country. . . . has earned the gratitude of the American people by his firm stand. . . . President Wilson has also voiced the sentiments of the American people, particularly of the working class, by his inspiring message of cheer and hope to the Soviet Congress of the Russian nation in Moscow. The hearts of all liberty loving people of the world are with Russia. They have been yearning for an opportunity to send to Russia a word of sympathy and encouragement in her great crisis. President Wilson's heartfelt message has gratified that burning desire. It has shown isolated Russia that American democracy is ready to extend to her a helping hand and bring her closer to the democracies of the world so that she may draw strength from a cordial sisterhood of free people . . . We joyfully

take this occasion to reaffirm our attitude to the effect that we stand by President Wilson in his efforts for a democratic and durable peace, as shown by his recent addresses to Congress, by his message to Russia, and by his steadfast opposition to militarism."

And Mr. Sidney Hillman, president of the Union, supplements the manifesto by declaring:

"The German menace is so great that nothing must be overlooked at this time by the democracy of the world in order to combat it successfully. . . . The splendid leadership of President Wilson should be supported by every liberal-minded person."

Recently there have been many signs of growing recognition by the Socialist party of the stupendous folly committed by the St. Louis Convention. In all parts of the country leading Socialists, and in many cases influential local organizations, have frankly come around to President Wilson's position. A few evenings ago twelve hundred Jewish Socialists gathered in Aeolian Hall, New York City, and demanded that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party hold an early meeting and adopt a resolution formally abandoning the decision taken at the St. Louis Convention and adopting the position of the Spargo minority report. Of the twelve hundred Jewish Socialists gathered at that meeting, not less than 800 were either members of the Socialist party or had been members within a year or two. Of the remaining 400, most of them had been members of the Socialist party at some time or other. That such a resolution should be adopted with less than twenty dissentients is of itself a very remarkable indication of the manner in which the pendulum of party opinion has swung away from the extreme pacifism of the St. Louis report.

A few weeks ago Mayor Hoan of Milwaukee, a Socialist stronghold, appeared before the County Central Committee of the Socialist Party and stated that it was impossible for him to abide by the party policy and at the same time uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, as he had sworn to do in his oath of office. Mayor Hoan said that it would be quite impossible for him to live up to the St. Louis war policy and faithfully to discharge his duties as mayor of Milwaukee. He offered to resign either from the party or the mayoralty, according to the determination of the Committee. The remarkable

fact is that by an absolutely unanimous vote the Committee instructed Mayor Hoan to ignore the party declaration on the subject of war, and to carry out the duties of his office, obeying the Constitution and laws of the United States, and do whatever war service the government might call upon him to do. Mayor Hoan had been one of a few supporters of Mr. Spargo's position among the Milwaukee Socialists, so that the resolution of the Central County Committee was a sensational event. Following this action upon the part of the Committee, a demand arose in Milwaukee for the holding of a special National Convention of the party to reconsider its war policy. Ten well known men and women in the Milwaukee Socialist movement signed a joint letter to Mr. Spargo asking him to agree to come to that city to make a restatement of his position, in order that there might be an opportunity for securing its endorsement.

Within a few days the Bohemian Socialist Federation, which is a section of the Socialist party, being one of the very strongest of its foreign language divisions, issued a manifesto demanding that all the Socialists of the United States give loyal assistance and support to the United States and its allies in the war against the central powers of Europe. In the manifesto, signed by the Secretary of the Federation, members of its Executive Committee, the editors of the daily organ of the Federation, and other influential members, open revolt against the pro-German policy of the party is expressed. The manifesto says: "We consider it our duty as Socialists to urge most earnestly to take now, at least in the interest of Russia, which is being strangled, an attitude of utmost seriousness fully appreciative of the demands of this critical moment of history. . . . We have been noting for some time that the stand of the St. Louis Convention is being slowly but permanently abandoned by the most influential men of our party. It will be an act of courage if the Socialist party of America will declare its new standpoint openly in the interests of the democratic world in general. We demand that the full weight of our Socialist vote with the Socialist party of America declare in favor of war against the Central Powers and that it offer its loyal assistance and support against the outer and inner enemy everywhere—everywhere that the social and democratic interests of the country

suffer in any way whatsoever." The manifesto is in many ways a remarkable document because it expresses the revolt of practically all the subjects of Austria-Hungary included in the ranks of American Socialists. It is an open and acknowledged fact that the leaders of the Bohemian and Socialist Federation have urged their members to insist upon the resignation of Victor Berger, Seymour Stedman, Morris Hillquit and other pacifists from the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, and the return to it of the leaders of the anti-German group.

In the city of Chicago the Socialist leaders are more or less shamefacedly abandoning the party policy. Alderman Rodriguez, one of the pacifist leaders in the party, who was a strong supporter of the majority report of the St. Louis Convention, is now openly supporting the government and the prosecution of the war. It will be very interesting to watch the developments of the party in the immediate future. That there is any likelihood of the return to the party of men like Spargo, Stokes, Walling, Sinclair, Ghent and others is not believed by those who are in a position to know. Most of these men have identified themselves with the new National Party and are actively connected with it. Mr. Spargo is one of the principal leaders of the new party, and it is not believed that he will leave it to return to the Socialist party, even though his position be endorsed. The leaders of the new party claim that it already has a membership far exceeding that of the Socialist party and that it will have a membership of half a million by the end of the year. They predict the election of several congressmen in the forthcoming elections and say that the Socialist party has no earthly chance of equaling their record.

The outstanding fact is that the Socialists of America have come to realize the mistake made by their leaders and are in open revolt against the policy adopted at the St. Louis Convention. Whether this means the breaking up of the party or merely the overthrowing of its pacifist leaders remains to be seen. The greatest of its organs, "The Appeal to Reason," has abandoned its old name and under the title "The New Appeal" has come out strongly against the party policy and in support of a policy identical with that of the National Party.

This coming together of all democratic forces in support of the war and the President's policy

is to be hailed as the final proof of the rightness of our cause, and as another step in the attainment of a solidarity that will spell victory. It is an object for which THE PUBLIC has striven in every issue since the war began. We shall need the help of every lover of liberty and democracy and justice in the months ahead,—both to resist every demand for an inconclusive peace and to turn allied victory, when it comes, to democratic ends. And we cannot resist an expression of the hope that henceforth it will be possible for some of our fighters with ink and rhetoric, who heretofore have used their positions of leadership chiefly for pacifist-baiting, to turn now to the task of consolidating and still further advancing the battle lines of economic democracy. Short of taking their stand on the battlefield in France, they can perform no better service.

An Unpopular Policy

Why does Mr. McAdoo remain silent before the scandal of enormous war profits as reported day after day in the annual reports of steel and other corporations engaged in war industries? These profits mount up to 50 and 100 per cent of the capital stock, and after all deductions for taxation and depreciation leave huge surpluses to be distributed as profits. Mr. McAdoo knows, for his agents have told him, that the people are filled with resentment at his failure to make good on the announced program of 50 per cent of taxation to 50 per cent of bonds, and that this resentment will militate strongly against the sale of the next bond issue. The feeling of the country is well expressed in a telegram sent to Mr. McAdoo by Prof. S. H. Clark of the University of Chicago, himself one of the hardest workers for the success of previous bond issues. Prof. Clark telegraphed as follows:

"Honorable William McAdoo, Washington, D. C.:

"United States Steel net profits of 60 per cent, the enormous profit of the packing concerns and ammunition and arms companies, and such recent reports of over 50 per cent net each on Republic Iron and Industrial Alcohol, and these are only a few, together with the Hog Island and similar revelations, stand out in striking contrast

to your promise to make wealth pay its fair share of the war expenses. Unless the country is assured by immediate increase of surplus war profits taxation, you need not be surprised if the common man refuses to subscribe to the third Liberty Loan. I speak for hundreds of thousands.

S. H. CLARK."

The effect on subsequent bond issues is the least of it. Any failure in this field would have the compensating advantage that it would force Mr. McAdoo and a spineless Congress to do what they should have done voluntarily,—take the needed money by taxation. The real harm being inflicted by the McAdoo policy is its effect on the psychology of every man with labor or a commodity to sell. That effect is absolutely fatal to the spirit of self-sacrifice and whole-hearted striving that is requisite to the winning of the war. Knowledge that the Government is permitting profiteering on a huge scale has done more than all other factors combined to make labor demanding and restless, to turn the farmer back on his selfish interests, and in general to sanction selfishness all along the line. If Mr. McAdoo has political ambitions and thinks to foster them by this tenderness toward big money, he is a poor politician. The most amazing thing is his refusal even to discuss the subject. Does he not know that the people are wondering and resentful? If he has the shadow of an excuse for his policy, might he not at least enlighten such ignorant citizens as *THE PUBLIC* and those hundreds of thousands for whom Prof. Clark speaks?

The New Liberty Loan

The terms of the third issue of Liberty bonds, as agreed upon by Secretary McAdoo and Chairman Kitchin of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, are that they shall be limited to \$3,000,000,000 bearing four and a quarter per cent. interest. The first and second Liberty bonds may be converted into the third Liberty bonds, but the third issue will not be convertible into subsequent issues. The question of whether or not the new bonds shall be taxable appears not to have been decided.

It has long been the policy of the Federal Government to exempt its own bonds from taxation. This is accepted on the principle that it is better for the Government to have the low rate of in-

terest that tax-exempt bonds pay than a higher rate with the uncertainty and difficulty of collecting the tax. A new feature, however, has been introduced into our financial system during the present war, that of the super income tax. This tax is levied in order that persons of great incomes may pay not only more than those of lesser incomes, but more in proportion; that is, while a person with an income of one thousand dollars above the amount exempted pays a tax of one per cent, a person with an income of one million dollars pays a tax of fifty per cent. Hence the importance of the tax exemption feature in relation to the third Liberty Loan bonds.

It is now evident to the discerning mind that not only has the income tax found a place in American finance, but that the super income tax also will be used until normal economic conditions have been restored. Should the new bonds be exempt from all taxes, like those of the first Liberty Loan, they will offer a secure haven into which the very rich can retreat to escape all super income taxes. Though such bonds might be floated at one half of one per cent less interest because of such exemption, their possession would enable the man with an income of a million dollars to escape a tax of fifty per cent. This would defeat the very purpose of the super tax, since it would throw the war burden equally upon the man of small means, to whom the war is a cause of great self-denial, and upon the very rich, to whom it causes no self-denial at all. Should the new bonds, however, be exempt only up to five thousand dollars, like the second Liberty Loan, they will retain practically all the advantages of tax exemption hitherto incorporated in our financial policy, and at the same time they will not offer a means of escape from the super income tax. The five thousand dollar exemption will permit the wide distribution of the loan among small holders, thus bringing out the scattered dollars of timid persons throughout the country. At the same time, the taxable feature above that limit will prevent their accumulation in the hands of a few very rich, who may seek in that way to escape the tax that falls upon other incomes of the same amount.

It is well that Congress should limit the bond issue to the lowest possible amount. Were ten billions authorized, with the expectation that the Secretary of the Treasury would issue only four or five billions, conditions might arise in which

the Secretary would issue the whole amount. By limiting the issue to immediate needs, with the necessity of another appeal to Congress, that body will be more impressed with its opportunity and its duty of equalizing the proportions of taxes to bonds. There is a widespread feeling that the Administration has not been as insistent as it should have been in calling for heavier taxes on war profits, inheritances, and large incomes. And this feeling has deepened into a conviction as to the duty of Congress. Great incomes will be subject to taxation after the war, but war profits, and inheritances falling due now, can be reached only in the present. If there was ever any excuse for limiting the tax on war profits to a rate level of 31 per cent, as compared with the British rate of 80 per cent, on the ground that the British began with a smaller amount, that excuse is now past. We have been in the war nearly a year; many industries have enjoyed enormous profits; these abnormal profits are due to the war, and must be paid by the country as a whole. Income taxes, and even super income taxes, can never right the injustice of this disproportion between taxes and bonds. The burden falls upon men and businesses that have suffered loss rather than gain from the war, and it falls upon the great mass of wage earners, salaried persons, and people of fixed incomes, who are losing more in high prices than they are gaining.

Let it not be forgotten that war means sacrifice of wealth as well as sacrifice of life. All classes give alike of life. But of wealth some are giving to whom the amount, small as it may be, is a positive hardship. It means less of comforts, and not infrequently, less of the actual necessities of life. Others are giving to whom the amount, no matter how large it may be, means no hardship and no discomfort whatsoever. This does not square with the dictates of justice. Those who see it have a feeling that there is far too wide a gap between our professions of equality and our practice. They are growing impatient with a Congress that permits the accumulation of great fortunes at a time of national sacrifice, and seeks to meet the cost of the war by excessive issues of bonds. An election is approaching. The men who seek to return to Washington must be made to feel that they have served too well the great financial interests, to the neglect of the people. Since they can succeed only by the votes of the masses, they should

be made to feel by increasing pressure to whom they are responsible.

Promoting Home Ownership

Professor Elwood Mead, of the University of California, is to be commended for his efforts to impress the public mind with the distinction between home owning and land owning, between possessing a permanent dwelling place and speculating in land. For it is because of the failure to make this distinction that many of our social and industrial evils have come upon us. The home owning instinct is so widely recognized as an aid to good citizenship and the development of individual character that our land policy has been shaped with that end in view. But owing to a failure to fully understand the nature of the problem the very laws that were designed to promote home ownership have been twisted into instruments to stimulate land speculation; so that in spite of our natural opportunity to become a nation of home owners, we are rapidly becoming a nation of tenants.

Professor Mead is peculiarly qualified to speak upon the land question. As student he has covered the whole field, and as a special representative of the Australian Government in its land settlement undertakings he has gathered first hand data that are invaluable in his present position as chairman of the California Land Settlement Board. This board is attempting to aid individuals in obtaining homes by lending them the credit and assistance of the State somewhat after the manner of what has been done in Ireland, Denmark, and Australia. Its first essay is the laying out of 10,000 acres in small holdings according to the most approved ideas of scientific management, including grading, irrigation, drainage, and the erection of buildings. These holdings are to be given to settlers at cost, with low interest and long time payments. The State is attempting to do, in a word, what land speculating companies and individuals are doing, but with the difference that the gain is to go to the individual home owners. The minimum amount of capital required to take advantage of this offer is \$1,500, or about one-third of what the individual would need for an independent development of the same holding.

Commendable as is this effort toward home building by California, it yet lacks some of the essentials that are necessary if it is fully to meet

all requirements. It does not provide for the man who has the skill and the will, but lacks the \$1,500. Nor does it effect a permanent settlement of the problem. For, the present generation of owners, when they have paid up on their holdings according to the easy terms provided by the State, may become petty landlords living off of tenants, after the manner of the farm owners of Iowa, Illinois, and other States who received their lands on easy terms. Professor Mead sees this. His experience in Australia, where some of the States give title after the manner of this country, and others give a perpetual lease, and his long study of our own land system has convinced him that unrestricted ownership will not accomplish the end in view, but that a perpetual leasehold based on occupancy and use will.

Thus, in discussing the Crosser bill, now pending in Congress, which gives to the Department of Labor power to do what the California Land Settlement Board is doing, but with the difference that no capital is required of the settler, and occupancy and use are to be the basis of title, Professor Mead says in the *Pacific Rural Press*:

When I first read the Crosser bill I was inclined to balk at its provisions for nationalizing the land, although I realized that abuses have grown up in this country and elsewhere out of unrestricted private ownership of land. During the last two years, however, I have been studying conditions of land tenure in America as keenly perhaps as anyone, and I have come to the conclusion that the tenure proposed in the Crosser bill is right, and that it is destined to have a large extension if we are to remain an economic democracy. I believe that farm tenantry as ordinarily accepted is fraught with serious evil. To have one man pay another for the right to earn a living out of the soil is a kind of slavery that we ought, so far as possible, aim to prevent. It is causing soil impoverishment and a decline in the quality of the people who live on farms. The title to land held by settlers under the Crosser bill is wholly different to the tenantry of privately owned land. Under the Crosser bill the individual has the right to use the land as he pleases so long as he lives on and cultivates it. Not only that, but his children and children's children inherit the right to use it.

The Crosser bill places a farm within reach of every man who wishes and knows how to farm. The farm is ready for immediate use as though he were renting. He has every right of ownership except that he must live upon and use it. He cannot rent it and live upon the tenant's labor. Should he wish to leave it he may sell such right as he has acquired in the improvements. But he

can charge no more for the land itself than he paid, which is nothing. His children inherit all his rights. In return for these rights and privileges he pays for the improvements at the rate of four per cent. a year. And in addition he pays a "tax charge" based on the assessed value of the land, exclusive of the improvements. Thus the individual becomes a home owner in every sense of the word, but he does not have the power to exploit other men who would like to become home owners. He does not buy the land, and hence cannot sell it. He does pay for the improvements, and he can sell them as any other property. He pays no taxes on his improvements, but he does make an annual payment on the value of the land that comes through the growth of the community, which payment will be expended for the use of the community. Under the California plan where the individual becomes owner of the land as well as the improvements, a rise in the value of the land may enable the owner or his descendants to rent to others and so live on their labor. But under the Crosser plan a rise in the value of the land is accompanied by a corresponding increase in the tax, so that the next generation can get a home upon the same terms as this generation, that is, by buying the improvements, and paying the annual tax on the value of the land.

It is in this feature of the Crosser bill that Professor Mead believes will be found the solution of the land problem. "If the idea that men should own the land they cultivate is desirable," he says, "then that is a privilege which should be perpetuated. I believe it is desirable, and I do not believe it should end with the disposal of the public domain. We find that under absolute private ownership it is disappearing. Forty-eight per cent. of the farming land of Iowa is now cultivated by tenants. Men who acquired the freehold title are no longer the cultivators. They got the land when it was cheap and have become rich quite largely through the unearned increment. . . . The nationalization of land as provided in the Crosser bill will keep the privilege of land freedom open for our children and children's children."

In our anxiety to promote farm owning and home owning we unwittingly adopted a land policy that is producing tenantry and landlordism. Professor Mead sees this, and he is helping others to see it. It is the vital indispensable prin-

ciple that must be recognized in all legislation looking to the opening up of public lands, the putting of returning soldiers on the land, and the housing of war industries employes. Public

credit and natural opportunity must not be given to the exploited of the present in order that they may be the exploiters of the future; they must be available alike to all generations.

What is Happening in Ireland

On account of special conditions, it is inexpedient to attach the signature of the friend who sends this communication. It represents the Ulster view, but the view of a most intelligent and judicious mind.

MARY FELS.

Ireland today is truly a land of paradoxes. In the midst of this ghastly world war it appears on the surface the most peaceful spot in Europe. But for our daily papers and an occasional man in khaki, or the passing through of the remnant of a torpedoed crew picked up on our shores, you would hardly know there was much to disturb our equanimity. Of course, food has gone up in price, and many things are hard or impossible to obtain, but compared with the state of things prevailing in Great Britain we seem to be enjoying the blessings of peace and plenty. Living in the Black North we hear of treasons, tragedies and crimes in the South and West of Ireland, but even there the casual traveller sees little of the seething unrest existing beneath the surface, and an ordinary decent people continue to go about and transact their business much as usual. But behind the scenes, of which the curtain is occasionally withdrawn, we find a great mass of people permeated with a strange spirit of enmity to the British Government, and believing themselves the victims of a gross and tyrannical despotism which they are anxious to throw off even at the risk of exchanging it for the tender mercies of the Hun.

They imagine themselves possessed of unheard of qualifications for self-government, such that they could tomorrow form a republic of Ireland and defy the very powers of Europe to violate their shores.

Sinn Fein is a plant that has been indigenous to Ireland for centuries. It is a cult that seeks to make Ireland a separate unit in the comity of nations, and above all, free from the thralldom of the hated Saxon. Of late years that insane

desire to cut the painter was dying out of the country as the elected Irish members of Parliament began to see some hope of obtaining a form of local self-government through constitutional methods. But the very prospect of success on the part of the Nationalists raised the fears of the Ulster Unionists lest the Protestant section, seriously in a minority, might find themselves outvoted and oppressed by the Catholic majority. These fears were not altogether groundless, and at any rate they were not prepared to take any risks. So knowing that the late Chief Secretary Birrell was subservient to the Nationalist party and exercised little personal control, they took the law into their own hands. With the help of that able lawyer, Sir Edward Carson, they founded, in open defiance of the law, the Ulster Volunteer Force—now known as the "U. V. F."—and supplied it with arms and ammunition to uphold their independence against all comers. It was a sort of treasonable loyalty to the traditions of the British Empire, since they conceived the British Parliament to be disloyal to its own traditions.

Nothing succeeds like success, and the bold attitude of the Ulster Party only served to reveal in all its contemptible indecision the weakness of the British executive in Ireland.

After the successful founding of the U. V. F. it was natural that the Nationalists should try their hand at the same game, so that shortly before the great war began the men of Ireland were, many of them, enlisted and drilling in one or other of two armed camps.

But as the war developed both parties nobly responded to their country's call and the common peril has seemed to draw nearer together the Unionists and the parliamentary Nationalists. Yet I think most people will admit that of the two general divisions of the population, the Protestant and the Catholic, the former has made, and is making, according to its members,

the greater sacrifice in every way. Not only has its young manhood given ungrudgingly of many of its best, but the care of the wounded has been provided for with a generosity and efficiency scarcely surpassed anywhere. There is too marked a contrast between the treatment of torpedoed seamen and passengers landed in the northern as compared with the southern ports, where Sinn Fein prevails and where the people have been in many cases secretly assisting the German pirates.

We have now good evidence of what was long suspected that German money and German spies were playing upon a section of the community that for generations has been fed upon superstitions and the memory of wrongs long since atoned for. Sir Roger Casement, who for years had been a faithful servant of the British Crown and had done notable service in the interests of oppressed and enslaved peoples, became, through some strange aberration, a willing tool of Germany, and helped to engineer the famous rebellion of Easter, 1916.

Of course, it proved abortive and many lives and much property were sacrificed in Dublin and elsewhere during that deplorable week. Some mistakes undoubtedly were made, and some needlessly lost their lives as so often happens at a rebellion, and bad blood has been generated as must always be the case amongst the defeated party.

The subsequent government of Ireland has alternated between a severity and a leniency very difficult to understand, but it is generally assumed that the executive has hoped to allay disloyalty by an almost excessive kindness to law-breakers. These are imprisoned for seditious speeches and acts, and are then released before they have worked the term of their sentence, only to resume in many cases their open tirades against the government.

Perhaps this policy may work out for the best, as there is safety in blowing off steam to relieve pressure. It may be that the people may tire of hearing the same old vapourings which lead nowhere in particular; for, so far as one can judge, there is very little constructive statesmanship in Sinn Fein. Its leaders do not approve of joining with their fellow countrymen of other parties in the convention, now sitting with the object of formulating a new working arrangement for the better government of the country.

For this reason the Sinn Feiners rightly forfeit the sympathy of most people outside their own narrow circle.

Indeed, in the opinion of many, the Nationalists themselves have been blameworthy in not throwing in their lot more closely with the coalition government. John Redmond was offered a seat in the government, and his acceptance of it would have won him many friends, but he and his party bowed to the Sinn Fein section, and so far as one can see they have gained nothing by so doing.

Irish disloyalty has been kept alive by fostering memories and history of bygone days of oppression from landlords and governments, but few people realize that the Scottish peasantry during the same period and up to the present have suffered even more grievously from landlordism than the Irish.

Discontent in Ireland seems only to grow in spite of—or is it because of?—the innumerable concessions of legislation and money that have been granted to her more than to any other part of the kingdom, with the object of giving the farmers security in the land. Of course like most things done in Ireland, the land legislation is a financial absurdity. By the latest land purchase acts the farmer may buy out his farm in a terminable number of annual payments for a smaller rent than he would pay if renting the same farm in perpetuity. It is ludicrous but true. The trick is simple. According to the act the landlord claims and gets in cash from the government, as much as, or perhaps more than the land is worth; the farmer then pays to the government annual rents for a terminable number of years that would not pay interest and sinking fund on the amount the landlord receives and then you and I, if we live in the county, have to make up the difference. The landlord and the farmer both profit at the public expense. This is typical Irish legislation for you and shows how little the British and Irish members of parliament know or care about economic problems. Indeed it is doubtful if there is more than one Irish member, who knows how to think "economically."

There is little doubt that we may attribute much of the present chaos in Ireland to the defeat of Michael Davitt's land program by Parnell, as described in the life of Henry George.

Endless controversy also has raged around the

question of Ireland's rightful share in Imperial taxation, and even if the past were to be blotted out there seems no recognized basis for it amongst politicians. The singletaxer would find no difficulty in suggesting a basis, but the objection to his solution would be that it would be a *real* solution that would rob the politicians of an endless subject for dispute. It is a hard saying, but it would appear as if the professional party hacks do not want anything to be completely settled in Ireland. The Irish question offers at all times a fine diversion for the people when social unrest or other difficulties arise in the country. Equally disquieting is the evidence one sees on many sides that there can be no political rest when a large proportion of the people divide their allegiance between the secular state and an ecclesiastical authority. It is just another case of hyphenated loyalty which prevents steady progress towards democratic government. For, no matter what the people

may desire and think would be good for progress, the church may step in and say it must not be.

Whilst in no way wishing to undervalue the work of the churches of all creeds, one cannot but deplore their influence upon education in Ireland. Each sect striving to provide an "atmosphere" for its own children, has only succeeded in restraining the development of larger and better equipped schools, where all sections could meet and get to know each other better.

As to the future of Ireland after the war, it is interesting to hear the opinion frequently expressed that Ireland will probably suffer less from social disturbance than will Great Britain. Rome, they say, will use her influence in ways best known to herself to maintain the status quo.

Whether the Irish question will ever be settled or how, one can only prophesy that the unexpected is sure to happen.

The Removal of Economic Barriers

By Lucia Ames Mead

No part of the President's statement of War Aims is bound to bring more subtle hostility at home than that regarding the removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions.

That the war is primarily a trade war is daily becoming more manifest. But protectionists are failing to read the signs of the times and are eager to perpetuate what has proved to be one of the chief causes of this war. No man can speak more cogently upon this prime cause of war and the way to undermine the German power and win permanent peace than the distinguished Belgian economist, Henri Lambert, a manufacturer who has seen his business and his country ruined, yet who maintains the impartial attitude of the true scientific mind. As one reads his collection of essays in "Pax Economica," one marvels that one who keenly suffers from the bitter wrongs which he and his country have endured can write still in the spirit of the true internationalist and like President Wilson, distinguish between Prussian frightfulness and the German masses when

they shall have entered a world that has learned its economic lesson.

He points out the superior economic advantages of Great Britain with its 400,000,000 inhabitants in its vast empire capable of supporting several thousand million people; of Russia and the United States with areas and resources far beyond their needs and on the other hand, the cramped position of Germany, occupying an area smaller than Texas, with 70,000,000 people increasing at the rate of one million a year. "As far as her outlets of population and her markets are concerned, Germany," he declared, "is in an inferior and precarious condition." Had Germany had the wisdom to adopt a free trade policy by gradually reducing the barriers of her Zoll Verein and asked other countries to do likewise, she would have made friends with England and with most of her neighbors and enlisted the sympathy of the world. She backed her uneconomic policy by gigantic force, failing to see that her prosperity had come from free trade in the last fifty years between her former 29 states once

walled around with tariff barriers. The United States as well has failed to learn the lesson of a prosperity resultant largely on free trade between its federated states and exults in its high foreign tariffs.

Germany's economic folly does not excuse that of other nations which should have either helped Germany to colonial possessions of her own, says M. Lambert, or at least have thrown their own colonies open to her trade. "The plutocrats, the militarists and the war party in Germany were left in possession of an almost imperative argument in their favor, and thus the other nations helped to maintain and embitter the spirit of conquest in the German people," says this amazingly judicial Belgian who thus sums up his judgment: "Economic mistakes, political blunders and rashness, an inadequate conception of international justice on the part of all the nations and their governments, such were the real causes of the war. Is it too late or can it be too soon for a general admission of guilt? . . . Germany will be strained; she will not be crushed . . . it will be necessary to agree to mutual concessions in satisfaction of the main legitimate demands and there will have to be an effort to make the adjustment final with a view to universal and lasting peace." These adjustments, it is needless to say must include restoration and restitution for outraged Belgium.

M. Lambert holds that, unless an economic adjustment is made soon, thus bringing new propositions to the German mind, and reducing thereby its obduracy, the war will continue for years and will absorb all the available capital of Europe and result in social revolution before military victory. He is not a rabid advocate of a panacea and he does not expect the great nations to adopt free trade for a long time to come; but he urges immediate arrangement for the open door in all the colonies. This would offer the easiest avenue to reform. Even a French premier, despite the narrow protective policy of France, has claimed that the open door is needed for the good of her own colonies.

M. Lambert would summon a World Conference as soon as possible and entrust it with the task of making an agreement between all colony-holding nations, to throw open the colonies of all to the free trade of all. This Conference would further attempt to secure a pledge

from as large a number of nations as possible that they would gradually reduce the tariffs of the mother country. Agreements might be made by Germany for a reduction of tariffs to 50 per cent with Great Britain for the continuance of her free trade policy; all agreements affecting both mother country and colonies would be limited to a term of years and would affect future colonies as well. These arrangements would not abolish colonial tariffs but would involve identical economic treatment in all colonial markets. England would thus lose the preferences granted by her colonies as does Holland now, but she would gain, in turn, from access to the colonies of France and other countries, which cover an area four times as great as that of Europe. Practical internationalization of the poorer colonies by proportional cooperative support would be arranged.

The burning question of Alsace-Lorraine would practically disappear were all parties concerned in a common customs union. Most vexed territorial questions, except those affected by Mohammedan fanaticism, would vanish under free trade. *Italia Irredenta* needs free access to Austria even if she were to be transferred to Italy; Poland needs free trade with Russia, Alsace with Germany. Were free trade once established, the fortifications at Suez, Gibraltar and Panama would ultimately be seen to be antiquated superfluities.

Political boundaries need no more coincide with the economic boundaries between nations than the line of demarcation between two of our states need coincide with their trade limits. M. Lambert is in hearty accord with our own Admiral Chadwick in maintaining that the only way to universal peace is by free trade, equal economic opportunities and the removal of special privilege. Believing the world to have become an organic entity, international intercourse seems to him to have entered the plane of morals and artificial restriction of it to be classed as practically immoral. Whoever, for his own private gain, augments the cost of living for his neighbor and diverts the normal flow of trade is like one who constricts each limb and toe and finger and obstructs the flow of blood in any human body, perverting Nature's purpose and preventing life more abundant.

Protection and free trade are as antithetic as autocracy and democracy. Militarism will never

be abolished by force. The primary causes of rivalry, friction and ambition must be removed. So long as nations felt no integral relationships, no vital interdependence, tariff walls had some excuse. Today, in a world in which we have become economic members one of another, for all spiritual and material progress we must have new freedom, cooperation and equal opportunity. The nation that would save its life must withdraw special privileges from the little handful which in every land have been allowed to dominate. When in two years, our millionaires have increased in number from 14,000 to 22,000, when one-tenth of our people own more than all the rest, it is evident that the fight for democracy cannot end when a military victory is won. Out of the world's turmoil and torment is rising a stupendous social unrest, which demands the abolition of the causes of all war. Autocracy, militarism, trade barriers, special privilege, are sinister colleagues which must be unhorsed together.

Had the United States and Germany followed Great Britain's free trade policy thirty years ago, France would have joined them later, Humanity would not have followed the lead of the Empire builders back to barbarism and civilization would not have entered on self destruction. "The peoples are fighting to death for the preservation of an error, fighting to a finish for the accentuation of the very cause of their fighting," is the message of this clear-sighted Belgian to incredulous Americans who do not know the grounds of their own prosperity.

Says the New Republic, "The formula of victory as the only war aim is popular chiefly with people who consider the treaty of peace of slight importance compared with the complete justification of their resentment against Germany, and whose interest in peace terms is aroused chiefly by the chance of securing for their own country a better hand in what the President has called 'the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power.' "

Social Darwinism

By David Starr Jordan

In the last half-century, there has been developed, in Germany, a doctrine called "Social Darwinism." This dogma, based on a vicious and ignorant misinterpretation of Darwin's teachings, involves two conceptions:

1. There is a constant struggle among races and nations whereby the largest, strongest and fiercest survive, and the others go to the wall.
2. It is incumbent on the strong nations—those most populous and enjoying the most complete discipline—to subdue or to exterminate the others.

This call to duty is the justification for international war and racial oppression. And the doctrine of frightfulness points to the swiftest and most effective method of subjugation.

This "biological argument for war" has no scientific validity and no legitimate relation to the teachings of Darwin. In fact, it has been developed, as a form of special pleading, to meet the exigencies of the existing dynastic system.

"Darwinism," as properly understood, is the theory that in the course of evolution, by which

man and other organisms have been derived from preexisting forms by natural processes, a leading factor is "Natural Selection"—the elimination of the unadaptable in the "Struggle for Existence."

This struggle is not primarily a life and death rivalry between individuals, or between races. Competition with like as well as struggle against unlike organisms are both features of the larger problem of adaptation to environment.

The philosophy of "Social Darwinism" involves not merely the facts of a struggle, with the elimination of the unadapted or so-called "unfit," among humanity. It demands their destruction as a matter of national duty. Its advocates insist that the strong must "get behind" Evolution by obliteration of the weak.

It is claimed that if a strong nation succeeds in "the rigorous and ruthless struggle for existence" its right is thereby vindicated. "This struggle should occur precisely that the various types may be tested, and the best not only preserved, but put into position to impose its kind of social organization, or *Kultur*, on the others,

or alternately to destroy and displace them. The menace of this philosophy is that its adherents believe what they say, and they act on this belief, that war is necessary as a test of their portion and claim. Hence they oppose 'all mercy, all compromise with human soft-heartedness.'

This contention overlooks four vital truths.

(a) The "Struggle for Existence" is primarily not a matter of rivalry but the condition of persistence even in the face of adverse conditions.

(b) The competition involved is one of the necessity of life, not a demand for a collective or national duty of destruction. (c) The contention totally ignores the "law of mutual aid," and the established fact that Altruism is itself one of the most potent factors in natural selection. (d) The qualities of permanence and progress are not those of the forceful and merciless against whom the greater power of the altruistic and cooperative races are sure to combine. "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong," but to those who can hold together.

Altruism is mutual aid, and in its biological sense represents in general those relations of one organism to others of its own type which are most favorable to the development of both. It is the quality of "neighborliness," of combination in the midst of competition.

Altruism is, by no means, a purely human attribute. There is no part of the animal kingdom in which it is not evident, and traces appear throughout the plant kingdom as well. Wherever life exists, varied conditions of environment are found, and the progress of life consists of adaptations to these conditions. Altruistic social adjustments are powerful factors in the struggle for existence in the life of animals as well as man. Care of the young is an agency far more effective in race preservation than the "tooth and claw" of competitive struggle. The readiness of the parent to die, if need be, for its young is a guarantee of race survival.

Altruism, moreover, is a robust impulse set deep in the breast of living organisms, beyond all danger of extinction. It is as old as selfishness, and as hard to eradicate. It needs coddling no more than hunger does. It asks no external sanction, for individuals deficient in altruism pass away, leaving no descendants. There is a bounty on their heads, whether they be wolves, or hawks, or predatory men.

Altruism expresses itself in all that makes the

human life sane, joyous, effective. Science is the consummate fruit of the altruism of the ages. No man's experiences belong to himself alone, but are part of the heritage of those who follow. Human institutions grow out of the social instinct. *They are fossils of past altruism.* Art, literature, music, religion arise, and are developed, through mutual help.

In the very beginnings of life altruism appears. The conjugation of one-celled animals involves the interchange of hereditary cell structures, after which, neither the one nor the other is exactly what it was before. This change modifies the descendants by the law of heredity in accord with the law of variation whereby no organism that exists is ever an exact or slavish copy of any other, not even of parent or sister. From this simple function of the conjugation of primitive cells arises with evolution all the complex relations of love, conjugal, filial and parental. The ultimate purpose of the sex relation, so far as one may speak of ultimate purposes in nature, is to produce and promote variety among organisms.

Altruism appears in another form in the aggregation of cells. A one-celled animal or plant is an organic unit. When the new cells produced by the processes of cell division remain joined to each other, a complex organism is built up. By such means, the germ-cell in the higher animals develops into the embryo, and the embryo passes through the stages of infancy and youth into the complicated structure of maturity. Specialization, differentiation, organization, sensation, will, intellect, are all resultants of altruistic cell cooperation.

Individual men unite to form societies, as do individual cells to form the human body. But while the individual man is capable of separating himself from society, the individual cell is bound to the fate of its associates.

Among men, the growth of society abridges individual human freedom by making freedom worth having. Mutual aid involves mutual dependence. It gives a security and strength forever impossible under purely individualistic conditions. Altruism can never become outworn or exhausted. No species and "no race ever became extinct through an excess of brotherly love."* "This world is not the abode of the Strong alone; it is also the home of the Loving."†

* Amos G. Warner.

† J. Arthur Thomson.

Alsace-Lorraine

By William E. McKenna

The question of Alsace-Lorraine is, indeed, as Mr. Theodore Schroeder points out, a human problem, but it is not likely that the French people regard it otherwise. It is not for mines or real estate that France has sacrificed her men by thousands nor is it likely that she considers the dollar as the climax of her sacrifice. The French people believe that Alsace and Lorraine were taken by Germany in 1871 against the wishes of the inhabitants and there is good German authority to support that view. Any one who requires evidence on this point should read Treitschke's "What we Demand from France" (1870) and an article in the Outlook, Sept. 16, 1914, "Germany's Struggle for Existence," by H. C. C. Von Jagemann, Professor of German Philology at Harvard University.

Of course it is possible that the present inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine, reared under German influences, are unwilling to be restored to French sovereignty, but, again, as Mr. Schroeder says, they may not be. And a plebiscite might determine the question, but, again, it might give us only evidence of doubtful value. Thirty-six election inspectors have just pleaded guilty in New York to the charge of counting votes for Mr. Mitchel which were cast for Mr. Bennett. If such things could happen in New York under a reform administration, what Frenchman will believe in a pro-German vote in Alsace-Lorraine? If the people hated Germany in 1870, as Treitschke says they did, what must be their feelings now?—so, at any rate, the Frenchman will reason. And that he will have some grounds for his logic any one may see who will read George Brandes' description of German methods of assimilation as experienced in Schleswig-Holstein (See "A Scandinavian View of the War," Atlantic Monthly, December, 1915).

France will take Alsace-Lorraine at the end of the war if the military situation permits; she will agree to a plebiscite if she can do no better, just as Germany will agree to it if *she* can do no better. And the result of the plebiscite is very likely to call forth the scorn and sarcasm of the loser.

Any one who favors a plebiscite should at least think the matter out to the extent of determining under what conditions a vote can be taken so that

the result will satisfy him—if no one else—that it really expresses the will of the people. Are the Allied armies to be spread over the country to preserve order and see fair play? Are the German troops to be withdrawn? Who is to decide on the qualifications of voters and what steps are to be taken to prevent colonization and so on? It will take some time to settle the preliminaries, and it is to be feared that the controversies arising out of the various questions of detail may lead to even harder feelings between the belligerents than there are at present. But if the wishes of the people of Alsace-Lorraine can be ascertained that, indeed, is what should settle the matter.

If the people want an independent state, there should be an independent state. But they may remember that Belgium was an independent state and so was Luxemburg—the latter gone, and, at times, apparently forgotten, and they may be worried over the alleged tendency of history to repeat itself. However, it must be said that a plebiscite showing a majority for an independent Alsace-Lorraine would probably call forth less scornful criticism than one taken under Allied auspices showing a marked preference for France, or one under German auspices showing ardent enthusiasm for Germany.

But the most important question for us is what is our own relation to the Alsace-Lorraine question. Before our entrance into the war it is probable that very few Americans believed that we ought to sacrifice a dollar or a man to restore Alsace-Lorraine to France or to establish an independent Alsace-Lorraine, or to intervene in any way to secure to the people of Alsace-Lorraine the determination of their own destiny. But we are now an ally of France, and President Wilson has gone so far as to include in the terms of peace which he would consider satisfactory the righting of the wrong done to France in this matter of Alsace-Lorraine. This is no pledge to fight to the last man and the last dollar—which nobody does, as a matter of fact—and as some people interpret it, it is not even a pledge to support France in her demand for the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine. In France, however, and by many if not by most people in this country, the

President's words have been understood to mean that the United States will support France in the demand for the restoration of the two provinces, and there has been no official denial of the correctness of that interpretation.

Great Britain has an agreement with France not to make a separate peace. Just how that agreement would be interpreted if either party insisted on terms which the other considered unreasonable or unjust is one of those delicate questions which, let us hope, will never become an important one. The present British Government has announced its intention to support the French democracy in its demand for the "reconsideration" of the wrong of 1871—which is not exactly the language used by the French democracy in formulating its demand.

It is generally understood that France wants the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine—not an independent Alsace-Lorraine and not a plebiscite. If either Great Britain or the United States, now or later, should be unwilling to support that demand, it is but fair that France should be so notified. In that case France might decide to accept the inevitable. She may conclude that in all probability she will never get Alsace-Lorraine. The French people may ask themselves why make further sacrifices for a plebiscite to be held under conditions still to be arranged, or for an independent state which may one day meet the fate of Belgium or Luxemburg? And if the German statesmen then offer France terms which seem as favorable as any she is likely to get, her allies will have little reason for surprise if she quits and little cause for complaint.

That we have entered into an entangling alliance can hardly be doubted, and that it involves questions even more difficult than this of Alsace-Lorraine should be apparent to any one who gives the matter even a little consideration. For example—just to glance at one or two—what is our duty in the matter of Luxemburg—or have we any? May we rightfully sign a peace that will give Luxemburg to Germany, or must we fight to prevent that? Shall we, perhaps, insist on a plebiscite to determine what the people of Luxemburg want—for it is possible, of course, that three years' experience of German efficiency have inspired them with such enthusiasm that they would weep at the prospect of being transferred from the Kaiser back to the Duchess.

We are not at war with Turkey. Have we,

then, any duties as regards the Armenians? And if Turkish troops attack our lines in Lorraine, will that impose on us duties toward the Armenians? Should we then or should we now insist on autonomy or independence or what? And how near the last man or the last dollar should we go to get it?

There is the question of the German colonies now in English hands. It has been suggested that their fate is to be decided in accordance with the wishes, or, at any rate, the interest of the inhabitants. How to do this will be a problem for the Peace Conference. We who are not going to be delegates may extend our best wishes for a just and satisfactory solution.

But whatever the entanglements, we had to enter the alliance; at any rate, there was no alternative that the average American cared to consider. And being in the alliance it will probably be to our interest as well as our honor not to quit while our allies are still willing to fight, and to support them in their rightful demands. And in deciding which demands are rightful we must base our decision on such evidence as we can get, and we must bear in mind that some decision must be reached within a reasonable time. The eternal years of God are not ours for this particular purpose. The evidence, fortunately, need not be satisfactory to Germany.

It would seem that we can, without stretching our conscience, include among the rightful demands of our allies this claim of France to Alsace-Lorraine.

RELATED THINGS

The Brest-Litovsk Conference

The following article is by the Swiss writer, William Martin, whose discussions, appearing in the *Semaine Littéraire*, of Geneva, of the problems which arise from the war, have attracted much attention in Europe. M. Martin, as a neutral, writes with exemplary temper and judgment, and he is, of course, in a particularly favorable position to judge matters accurately. Although a few of the minor deductions embodied in this article no longer hold good in the light of quite recent events, it remains an excellent and dispassionate review of the Russian-German negotiations. Apparently when he

wrote his article, in the middle of January, M. Martin did not consider the charge that Trotzky and Lenine were in the pay of the Germans worth noticing. The translation is by Vincent O'Sullivan.

Lenine, who is a pacifist to the extreme limit, will not allow that the Franco-Russian alliance might have helped the peace of the world, or that it might have been a necessary instrument in the independence of Russia. According to him, such notions are out of date. The only things that count with him are peace and the social revolution. He believes them contagious, and endeavors to bring them about at no matter what price, being convinced that if they can be realized at a single point, their conquests will not cease. What matters the momentary victory of German imperialism and of militarism, what matters the defeat of the bourgeois democracies of the West, what matters the inevitable crushing of certain peoples, if from these ruins an entirely new system shall spring, in which even words will have a different meaning, and all the present interests, and problems, and connections, shall be turned upside down?

At Brest-Litovsk the Russian and German delegates are not arguing on the same ground. This, however, is no sign that they will not come to an understanding, for they are united by one interest in common, which is the desire for immediate peace, the thought of which will afterwards cause ravages among the other peoples of the western coalition. The very diversity of their ideas may even be a help to them in finding a ground for agreement.

It is safe to believe that the Russian delegates are ready to make almost all the practical concessions which their adversaries think fit to ask for. Economic advantages, proprietary rights in capital, the independence of national wealth and labor, are in their view mere nonsense, since they condemn both capital and the national idea, and are doing their best to abolish both one and the other throughout the world by their triumphant example. So they will only stand out on points of theory and doctrine. No doubt they will insist that their propaganda shall be furthered. Just as they insisted on the fraternizing principle being written into the armistice, just as Trotzky insists that England should recognize that the

diplomats he accredits should have the right to work Maximalist propaganda outside of Russia, so the treaty of peace will no doubt contain some clauses of the same kind. The foundations of peace which the Russian delegates prepared had intentionally a theoretic and Utopian character. These men are interested only in theory, because they believe it to be all-powerful in its consequences.

The Germans, on the contrary, lean to realism. What is theory to them? One may grant everything if one knows how to manage. They have shown this clearly in the fraternizing matter, by their action in detaching twenty-five men. It is easy to imagine what would be the conversations between twenty-five Germans, carefully picked and furnished with instructions, and the unloosed Russians. According to the Germans, thought is dangerous only in so far as it is likely to get beyond control.

Between these men, of whom one group has more contempt than is justified for the force of ideas, and the other is enamored of the clouds, an agreement should be less difficult than is generally believed. The Russians can offer Germany an almost unlimited economic outlook. In Russia seventy-six per cent. of the railway engines cannot move because their tubes have frozen and burst, and only Germany can supply new tubes. Just as soon as these engines get started, and the railway stations are no longer choked, Russia will be an unlimited market for buying and selling. Germany, which was threatened by the prolonged trade war, knows that henceforth she will be able to breathe and to profit in the East by her exceptionally favorable geographical situation. This for her is salvation, and the consequences far surpass any questions of indemnities and annexations which the Russian revolution puts in the foreground.

What seems to characterize Lenine's thinking, at least in international matters (and it may be said that in this his views are very different from those of Marx) is that it takes no account of economic factors. For Lenine, peace is a question of territory, of money, of rights. For the Germans, on the contrary, it is, above all, a question of merchandise that is bought and sold, of capital to be placed, of industrial enterprises to be looked after, of lands to be made productive, of riches which bear fruit.

In exchange for handing over all that to the

Austro-Germans, the Russians only ask for guarantees of principles. Who can believe that they will not obtain them? To doubt it is to have a very poor knowledge of the successors of Bismarck. It is all the more likely, because, if the Germans should astonish the world—that part of it at least which allows itself to be astonished—by their moderation, they will reap therefrom not only immeasurable material advantages, not only will they open Russia to their undertakings, but they will also gain among the western nations and in the United States all the moral advantages which arise from generosity.

The Franco-Russian alliance was the last word of the European balance of power. To the present writer, the end of the alliance signifies the end of European equilibrium. It would seem that we are now on the eve, not exactly of an alliance—Lenine would doubtless reject the idea of such with horror—but of a German-Russian cooperation. Based as this is upon the very trembling foundations which we see at present, it is impossible to say anything about its future. In a Europe which should continue to be dominated by the anxiety of the balance of power, we may be pretty certain that an Austro-Germanic-Russian alliance would be too strong to be workable. It would even provoke reactions inside itself before very long. But nobody can say what will be the form and color of the continent in a year from now. Governed as we are by the hereditary idea of the balance of power, our minds find it difficult to picture a different order in Europe. But since we cannot tell whether Russia will continue to exist as a nation, and whether Eastern Europe will not be handed over to the triumphant anarchy of twenty little States, independent and quarrelsome, it would indeed be daring to predict at this moment the future of the new and paradoxical friendship which is now being improved at Brest-Litovsk.

The New Dayspring

(From the *London Nation*)

We see the promising youth of the world's noblest races frustrated of their promise by death. The middle-aged and the old are left to bury youth; the children are left to be trained along the highway of death so soon as their promise also is mature. Girls have no lovers,

wives are widowed, the young are fatherless. Beautiful cities are obliterated till scarcely one stone stands upon another. Fertile lands are converted into a wilderness, planted only with corpses, and forests are reduced to a bundle of sticks. Terror flies by night, and the quiet moon is transfigured into a goblin of the sky. This way and that, to and fro, across vast districts of simple country, armed hosts trample, more devastating than the locusts which eat the years. This way and that, the tormented inhabitants flee before them, in utter destitution, or snatching with them a bit of furniture, a covering, or a cradle. Peaceable men are suffering the fatal penalty of manhood; girls and women the common penalty of women. Along lines of a thousand miles, death flickers like perpetual lightning, and the thunder of death is never silent. Behind the lines, hunger and pestilence walk together, and children come to the birth bereft of reason and in monstrous shape. In hospitals or out upon open fields, thousands of rent and mutilated men writhe in torture.

Let all this be granted; none the less, in this the darkest night of man's history, we may yet perceive a glimmer as of another day. In the midst of a darkness that can be felt, we discover a light that can be felt also. Wherever an assembly of ordinary, hard-working men and women is permitted to gather, the change of increasing radiance is seen. A sense of that change pervades the crowded listeners, and inspires their welcoming cheers to any promise of hope. The common misery has bound together unnoticed and isolated beings who felt no relationship before, but now are conscious of a common aim to release themselves and all mankind from the horror which some evil power has brought upon them, without their will or their knowledge. Go to one of the great meetings in London or Glasgow or any other of our cities, and observe what passages in a speaker's words are now most applauded. They are the passages which denounce the secret machinations of established diplomacy; which denounce the hypocrisy of a statecraft concealing aggressive aims under a cloak of self-defence; the ignorant or deliberate falsification of an ally's or enemy's purpose; and the jobbery which bestows appointments or titles as rewards for political or journalistic support rather than for proved capacity.

But it is, perhaps, always easy for denunciation of obvious iniquity to win applause. More significant is the greater applause now given to every sign of promised change. The speaker most welcomed throughout the country now is the man of faith—the man who, though surrounded by all the evidences of human abomination, hatred, and destruction at their worst, can yet believe in the underlying brotherhood of man, and the omnipotence of the human sympathy which, for want of a more definite word, we are still obliged to call love. He is the man who sways the crowd, though he may be free from rhetoric, and possess no art of eloquence beyond sincerity and the fullness of heart which compels the mouth to speak. Denunciations serve their high purpose, and are more easily understood. But the finest applause—the applause of death-like silence—answers the appeal to the constructive powers of community, and to the reason which rejects the overwhelming wretchedness of the present world as an unnecessary disaster due to traditional subservience and the traditional absurdities of rank, domination, and glory. The finest applause answers the assurance of faith in a nobler society wherein so many will be well-bred and well-fed that breeding, health, and beauty will be no distinction; the accidental divisions of educated and uneducated, leisured and workers will have disappeared; and men and women will think far too lightly of frontiers and territorial possessions to die or suffer for them.

CORRESPONDENCE

Signs of the Times

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

The city of Fall River, noted as America's leading city in the manufacturing of cotton cloth and as the largest city in southern Massachusetts, with a population of 125,000, boasts of the following record:

It contains 111 cotton mills, with a total of 4,000,000 spindles and employing 37,000 operatives, that weave nearly 2000 miles of cotton cloth per day, representing an investment of over \$50,000,00 and distributes, among the mill operatives \$296,000 weekly in wages. It can print 3400 miles of calico and bleach 1000 miles of cotton cloth per week.

It claims the distinction of being the eastern terminus of the famous "Fall River Line" between New York City and Boston; of having an unsurpassed natural harbor on tide water; an almost inexhaustible supply of pure water; an up-to-date motorized fire de-

partment; an adequate school system (although the school teachers have not, as yet, been able to obtain an increase of even 10 per cent to offset the 100 per cent increased cost of living); of having the first free text-books in America; and of having churches of all denominations.

In spite of this wealth, activity, and natural advantage, a most peculiar incident has taken place, to wit:

The tenants on the entire third floor of the business building that stands on the most valuable site in the city, right next to City Hall, have vacated, and the entire front and side of the building, at the third floor, have been covered with mammoth bill-boards for advertising purposes. The windows are entirely covered, of course, and the third floor interior is darker than the dark ages.

This city has reached the stage where bill-boards are a better investment than tenants with their thrift, industry, and productivity!

Inasmuch as I am at present engaged upon engineering work for the city of Fall River, I am apprehensive of City Hall being closed up and the exterior decorated with additional, competitive signs.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

A New War

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

A completely new situation has arisen in regard to the war, and we should make a grave mistake were we to consider the conflict, in its future developments, as the natural succession of what it has been so far.

The whole question in a nutshell is here: First, Germany has made war in order to create Mitteleuropa; and all the great powers have leagued themselves together, to prevent her from reaching her aim; second, in spite of the efforts of the allied nations, Germany has turned the corner. The problem, accordingly, has been settled (not definitely perhaps, but certainly for the time being, the only point of interest to us). A new problem may arise—and, as a point of fact, does arise: How shall we break the Mitteleuropa that Germany has constituted? But that second problem has nothing to do with the first; it applies to a brand-new situation; and its solution involves, to begin with, a complete reconsideration of the position of the anti-German powers. If those powers have failed—and they have failed in their first struggle against Germany and not (I insist upon it) in the *first part* of the struggle, the reasons for that failure must be discovered; the causes which led to the defeat must be thoroughly eliminated, if a *second* conflict is to be waged; and brand-new methods must be resorted to in order to make the success certain.

The main reason for the failure of the anti-German powers—that which sums up all the others—is their utter lack of sincerity. The war has been plainly, so far, a war of the governments, and *never of the peoples*, against the Teutonic autocracy; it has been

a war of sham Liberalism against paternal Despotism. And can one reasonably hope that a government, representative of privilege (as are all our governments) will heartily do its best to kill another government, also basis and prop of privilege? Let us utter the truth in plain words: if Germany be, as your Roosevelt proclaims it, the mad dog of Europe, our governments have never had the slightest wish for her total suppression as a European danger; they perhaps went so far as to dream of breaking one of her four paws, of eradicating half a dozen of her teeth; but they never harbored even the momentary thought of putting an end, once for all, to the monstrous medieval fabric of German Despotism. They would have struck at themselves, by striking their adversary! Are we not also, we who prate so complacently of right of freedom, living in the Middle Ages, in spite of labels and constitutions? Is not our bureaucracy a copy of German model? Is not our State Socialism a plagiarism of the German system? Is not our so-called democratic army traced upon the German pattern? The German government is perhaps the worst of governments; I know not; but it is a government, that is to say, according to our present comprehension of the word, the keystone of a building erected by fraud upon a basis of material force; and, as such, it has nothing serious to fear from other governments.

The events have proved it. Had this war been the fight of the peoples against despotism, two years ago despotism would have been knocked out. As matters stand now, and should the governments have their sweet will as they have had it so far, the hostilities may drag on for any length of time. The principal aim of the governments, now, is to convince the peoples that, in spite of the momentous events of these last days, it is always the same war which is going on. But this is a lie. It is a new war which we are now beginning; and, exactly, as did the first one, it will culminate in failure if it is not, this time, the war of the peoples against a government.

Since I began this letter, an air-raid upon Paris has begun; bombs are being dropped not far off.

GEORGES DARIEN.

Paris, March 8, 1918.

Watch Out

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

As I am past eighty-seven, I well remember the agony that accompanied and followed the process of resumption of the gold standard. The greenback, being only a partial legal tender, enabled gold money owners to save the gold dollar from contracting in price with the greenback dollar, from the great expansion in currency, caused by the large addition of greenback dollars to the currency.

The greenback dollar at once became the universal money for all domestic uses, and its increased supply, over the usual demand for money, greatly reduced its price in commodities. It took more of these cheap dollars to buy a house or horse or a load of corn or

wheat than it did when there were fewer dollars in circulation. Prices of commodities went up and the price of the dollar went down. But the prices of all commodities were measured by the greenback dollar. All contracts, unless otherwise specified, were made in greenback dollars.

Millions and millions of contracts were made in these dollars without this specification.

The great injustice and agony came when our Wall Street-ruled government decreed the destruction of the greenback dollar and the demonetizing of silver, which meant a great contraction in the volume of current money, and, of course, a large increase in the price or purchasing power of the dollar; or, which is the same thing, a great fall in the price of commodities with which the higher priced dollars must be bought to pay—dollar for dollar—the debts contracted in the cheaper dollars, thus robbing millions of dollars from honest debtors in the interest of the creditors.

But even worse than this injustice and agony was the suppression of the productive industries which threw great masses of laboring men out of employment and filled the whole country with hungry tramps.

All kinds of productive and commercial industries, excepting small farming, demand the constant use of money, as absolutely as they do the use of tools and machinery and wagonways and waterways.

All moneys used in producing things look to those things for return payment. But, while things are declining in price, and money is increasing in price, men who own money are not going to put it into things that must be sold for less valuable money than they put into them.

During the resumption agitation I called on an old friend, who owned large properties in Toledo. He told me that he and a few other capitalists had formed a company to build a narrow gauge railroad to Ann Arbor, but were headed off by the policy of resumption which the government was about to adopt which would increase the price of the dollars they would have to borrow (by contracting the volume of the currency) and would reduce the price of the property they build far below that of the money they would have to pay back. They did not build the road.

This cut off hundreds of prospective laborers from useful employment. And this incident illustrates thousands of similar cases, and the cause of non-employment through the country.

But the agony was protracted for many months because resumption was not adopted at once, but was postponed for several months after the decree for resumption was passed. Wise old Horace Greeley saw the evil of delay and pleaded with the less wise lawmakers that "the way to resume is to resume." He knew that a postponement of the decreed act would only prolong the agony, like cutting off a dog's head by beginning at the tip of his tail and cutting it off an inch at a time.

The very decree to contract the volume of the debt-paying dollar would begin to increase its price, and to lower the price of things which must be sold for less than they cost.

Look out for similar results from the use of the small and larger war bonds as currency. Already it is inflating the currency. This is decreasing the price of the dollar, while the price of all purchasable commodities is increasing.

Look out for the time when these bonds cease to be used as currency, as the greenbacks did, after their use had established regular prices of everything; high prices of commodities and a low price in the current dollar, or not being a partial legal tender, as greenback dollars were, their inflation of the currency will reduce the price of the gold dollar in common with all dollars.

They could and should, now, be barred from exchange use by making them non-redeemable by the government *if so used*.

But if allowed to inflate the currency they should be redeemed with full legal tender government notes.

This would save the borrowers of money, who use it in useful industries, from being forced to pay it back with higher-priced dollars to vampire creditors, and would save the useful productive industries from collapse, and the country from great armies of vicious, hungry tramps.

Watch out for the political influence of Wall Street and other captains of finance—money changers.

Toledo, Ohio.

GEORGE CANDEE.

Real Estate Income

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In THE PUBLIC of March 16 Mr. William Floyd expresses a liking for THE PUBLIC, but confesses failure to appreciate the value of the singletax. His discussion and illustrations seem to show that he has not grasped the fundamentals of the singletax. Not only that, but he has grasped something else that he thinks is the singletax theory.

This is a common failing. We may meet every day people who think they understand the singletax, and are usually opposed to it, and who can give good, sound reasons for their opposition,—not to the singletax,—but to their theory of what it is.

The reason seems to me plain enough. They have not read Progress and Poverty. THE PUBLIC does not tell what the singletax is, at least, not oftener than once in two or three years. Singletax papers are not much better in this respect. They assume that the reader knows, and usually he does not. Another reason is the imperfection of human language. I assume that I can tell what the singletax is; but my statement will not mean the same to the reader that it does to me. Probably no two singletaxers would define it in the same language. But what is worse, it is not defined often enough anywhere for the ordinary reader. Allow me to try to define it in a short sequence of sentences for the benefit of Mr. Floyd.

We assume that all men are created equal in their natural rights, the chief one of which is to live on the earth. Hence all men have an equal right in and to the earth or any part thereof. But to use the earth to the best advantage an individual must have exclusive

and undisturbed possession of a certain parcel or tract thereof. If this tract has value, the user should pay the annual value of such exclusive use to the others who are excluded (into the public treasury). This payment equalizes with the others the user's advantage. This use-value is rent, or ground rent. Ground rent is created by and belongs to the public.

To enforce this public right we might have municipal ownership or state ownership, or national ownership of land. But the easiest way to administer the public right to rental value is the best way. We think the easiest way is to leave our so-called system of titles or tenure as it is. Let men buy, sell, bequeath, devise, and convey as they will,—as they do now. But collect the annual rental value, or use-value, in the form of a tax, as we now collect a small part of it. Abolish all other taxes except those necessary for regulation, such as licenses of saloons or dogs. Collect substantially the entire annual rental or use-value.

That is about all there is to the singletax. But we think certain results would follow its adoption, a few of which are as follows: As a rule no one would care to hold more land than he could use to advantage. This would tend to release all the vast quantities of land now held speculatively, unused or under-used. It would destroy substantially all the capitalized value of land, hence land would pass for a nominal price, the improvements being sold as now for their value, more or less. Instead of paying a large price for land, the proposed user would have his capital left for buildings or other improvements. Improvements, being untaxed, would be encouraged. The vast sums now passing to landlords as annual ground rents would be saved to the public; and landlords as barnacles on the social body would be abolished.

With the basis, definition, and indicated purpose of the singletax in view, I think Mr. Floyd will see that it is entirely immaterial whether certain land in New York or Long Island has come up or down in value in the last fifteen or thirty years, so far as the merits of the singletax are concerned. Mr. Floyd asks in his last paragraph: "Is it not true that land must produce a reasonable income to make it attractive to private owners?" This is the landlords' question, and point of view. If landlords are abolished that question will not be asked. We propose to get along without "private owners," except as users; and users will be allowed no income from the land itself, only from their improvements, labor, and services.

J. H.

Canadian Taxation

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

Your reference to the "general property tax" of 5 mills on the dollar, recently passed by the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, may perhaps prove misleading to some readers of THE PUBLIC. There is no "general property tax" in Manitoba as generally understood as applying to miscellaneous chattels. The new provincial tax law imposes a tax of 5 mills on the

"rateable property" of the province. In the rural communities of the province the only "property" rated for taxation is land value. This is also true of some of the urban municipalities. In other urban municipalities, however, buildings are rated for taxation. In the City of Winnipeg, for instance, land is rated at its full value and buildings at two-thirds value. In order that this new provincial tax should work out equitably between the different municipalities it will be necessary to equalize the tax in some way, so that municipalities which rate on land and buildings will not be compelled to pay proportionately more than those which rate on land value only. This is provided for by the appointment of an "equalization board." This equalization may be accomplished in either one of two ways. First, by reducing the amount levied against municipalities which tax buildings. Secondly, by increasing the amount levied against those municipalities which tax land values only. If the latter plan should be adopted it is evident that this new provincial tax will be equivalent to a tax on land values only.

D. W. BUCHANAN,
(of Winnipeg).

Fairhope, Ala.

BOOKS

Arnold Bennett

Books and Persons. By Arnold Bennett. Published by George H. Doran Company, New York. Price \$2.00 net.

A peculiar kind of pleasure is to be found in watching the movements of a workman who can use his tools easily and effectively, whether it be the carpenter's chisel, the painter's brush, the musician's instrument or the litterateur's pen. A book bearing the name of Arnold Bennett will therefore always attract the attention of those whose first interest is in the art of expression. This is not to say, however, that all a skilled workman has ever done is worthy of preservation. It has been wisely said that the terms "good" and "bad" apply equally to ephemeral literature and to that which is for all time, *i. e.*, there is good and bad literature for the passing hour, and good and bad literature for posterity. The contents of the book before us are avowedly but a gathering together of scraps written during the period 1908-1911 for *The New Age* under the pseudonym of Jacob Tonson. Regarded as scraps for the day's amusement and intended to be forgotten (except in so far as the sub-conscious mind forgets no thought or suggestion that is ever presented to it) these scraps are good reading. But that they should be considered worthy of being done up in good red binding, with gilt lettering, excellently printed on good paper, with liberal margins, and made to claim a place on our book-shelves alongside of "Clayhanger" and "Denry the Audacious," offends one's sense of the eternal fitness of things.

To begin with, they deal as journalistic articles always do, with subjects of passing interest only,—subjects which are already going stale and will in ten years have become unintelligible. Moreover, the publi-

cation in this form does Mr. Bennett considerably less than justice, little as he himself may realize it. Instead of raising a picture in the reader's mind of a consummate artist indulging in daring flights of imagination and riots of rich humor, as in "The Grand Babylon Hotel" or "Buried Alive"; or presenting exquisite cross-section drawings of real life as it is found in the pottery towns of Staffordshire, this collection of fugitive papers gives the impression of a literary "boulder" which jars painfully upon the conception we had already formed of him. Coming as these articles did, one at a time and at intervals of a few weeks, and that just before Mr. Bennett had reached the position he now enjoys in the estimation of the reading public, they probably passed uncriticized. Now, however, that Messrs. Doran have seen fit to serve them up in this form, such immunity can no longer be claimed, and many of Mr. Bennett's admirers will ask impatiently why such a load of swept-up fragments should be dumped upon them under the semblance of a book.

The articles are all short and run mostly in the line of literary criticism, on subjects ranging from the poetry of Swinburne to the fiction of Elinor Glyn, with an occasional excursion into such cognate social questions as "censorship by the libraries" and the relations between publishers, authors, and the public. Ever since Byron in his revised edition of the New Testament made a certain passage to read "Now Barrabas was a publisher," that eminently useful and respectable member of the community has been considered fair game for the guns of sporting authors of the upper circle. But through the constant working of that tendency which gradually brings the privileges of an aristocracy within reach of the commonality, publisher-baiting has become so vulgar a form of amusement as to make one wonder why a writer of Mr. Bennett's distinction should descend to it as he does in "Letters of Queen Victoria," "Novelists and Agents" and others among the collected articles. Here again, a reader feels that the author is unfair to himself in reprinting opinions which, written doubtless under the time-pressure that usually attends the work of the journalist, were probably only half digested and do not represent his best and maturest thoughts. Some vague consciousness of this is indicated in the closing words of the preface,—"I have left the critical judgments alone, for the good reason that I stand by nearly all of them, *though perhaps with a less challenging vivacity.*" (The italics are ours.) Could anything be more suggestive of sheer boudierism than the sentences that follow the account of the relations between the publishing house of Murray and "The letters of Queen Victoria"? "It is well to remember that publishers who have made vast sums out of selling the work of creative artists are not thereby creative artists themselves. A publisher is a tradesman; infinitely less an artist than a tailor is an artist. . . . Scarcely ever will he issue a distinguished book because it is a distinguished book. And he is right, for he is only a tradesman." To all of which we unhesitatingly reply, "Fudge." Time was when economists differentiated

between "productive" and "unproductive" employments, and included in the former only farmers and makers of tangible commodities. Now, with a wider vision and a more comprehensive grasp of the laws of things, it is recognized that the railway company which transmits goods from where they are made to where they are needed, or the retail store-keeper who sells them over counters, is as much a producer as he who brings them into existence. The ordinary publisher ought to be, and the ideal publisher always is, an artist in respect of his trained instinct for good literature, and finds his true function in standing between author and public and adjusting the quality of what is offered to the intellectual development and assimilative capacity of his clientele. But if the distinction between artist and tradesman may legitimately be maintained, it will be found to run transversely through all classes. The artistic spirit may be displayed in the management of the humblest life, in the driving of a locomotive or the running of a grocery store. In the words of the saintly George Herbert, "Who sweeps a room as in God's name, makes even that action fine." The tradesman spirit, on the other hand, may be discovered in, and may even dominate the writer of books and the painter of pictures. We are all of us, with whatever tools we earn our livings, potential tradesmen and potential artists.

There are many other opinions expressed throughout this series of resuscitated articles with which, despite the literary charm in the manner of expression, readers may disagree. Some of these it is to be hoped are now held "with a less challenging vivacity." Particularly are such opinions to be found in the author's critique on H. G. Wells, in which his admiration for that illustrious writer seems to have carried him out of bounds and deprived him of the sense of perspective. The last page of that article is unfit for quotation, and its concluding few sentences contain affirmations that Mr. Bennett doubtless thinks himself justified in making, but which are simply untrue.

But let it not be thought that the reviewer, because of his disappointment in the reading of "Books and Persons" is the less loyal in his admiration of its distinguished author, or that he looks forward with less lively pleasure to the appearance of his next novel. Few of us would wish the more or less hasty utterances of former years to be brought into competition with our matured thoughts of today. If we do, the more's the pity for us. And who knows but that Mr. Bennett himself may be visited with twinges of regret now that he sees these articles (to adopt a tradesman's expression) in bulk.

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

France and America

Young France and New America. By Pierre de Lanux. Published by The Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1917. Price, \$1.25.

The intention of this book is to further understanding and cooperation between France and the United States. Its outlook includes the future as well as the present, and the mutual understanding falls in the intel-

lectual and spiritual field as well as in that of affairs. There is much of the general background of ideas dominant in France during the generation preceding the war, as expressed by French writers, and there is much concerning the reaction of the French mind upon the war itself. But here, as in other contemporary interpretations, something is lacking. While France is the scene of battle, and multitudes of every nationality are assembled in every part of the country, there is less comprehension of what the nation really thinks and intimately feels, than is the case with any of her allies. All our books on France exhibit the heroic spirit of the French people, their determination and their endurance; and they exhibit very little more. What is said by the press is a curtain of official and approved utterances directed and restricted by the rigid censorship. Occasionally, there is an eruption of subterranean feeling, usually through a scandal and a prosecution. France is, of course, fighting for her life, and until this question is settled, there must be paralysis of thought through the balance of alternatives. None the less, French intelligence is never inactive. And we may be sure that behind the wall of the censorship some outlook upon the future is taking form. This is what Americans want to know. Meanwhile, a book of this kind, sketchy, unorganized, but full of spirit, serves as a bridge to understanding and cooperation.

Salute to the Coal-Driver

(In Chicago—Winter of 1918)

I who flee out of the cold;
I who cover my head at the creaking steps of the frost;
I who shelter warmly before the stark advance of winter;
Salute you out in the storm there.

I hear your sharp goading of the horses,
Slipping and straining through the cuts in the drifted streets.

I see you 'gainst the white, swirling air of the blizzard,
Black, muffled, silhouetted on a bleak, high seat;
Intrepid; facing into the fierce flagellations of the northwester.

I, from my warm retreat,
Listen to your commands and oaths, backing the horses,
(Even in the late, dark hours after nightfall)
The grinding of the wagon on the bin's iron shutters,
The scrapings of the heavy shovel.
Where, should you fail, were my comfort and cleanliness?

But it is bitter without and the dark is thick.
This evening I saw a coal-horse down, on the ice at the crossing.

You, unsung, little rewarded, little regarded;
Bent on no high adventure, no holy quest!
When, in the final recapitulations,
You in your grime and lack and rough address,
I in my furs and trim, bright hat and ordered speech—
Which of us then shall be adjudged of worth and value?

LEONORA PEASE.

Good Friday on the Battle Front

Across the world the battle shadow falls
The fires of hell flame upward to the sky
The Prince of Evil chants allegiance high
To his own image when on Christ he calls
With those blasphemous lips that claim as thralls
Angelic powers! What can avail his cry
With Him who, as the timeless years go by,
Forgetteth not the manger and the stalls?

Unseen He comes once more the world to save,
His legions twelve their armor interpose
Against old tyranny that would enslave
Justice and truth and heav'n itself as foes!

Sooner the light of stars and suns shall fail
Than man's arch enemy with Him prevail!

CARROLL PEABODY.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending March 26

Congressional Doings

An amendment to the Agricultural Appropriation bill raising the Government guarantee price of wheat in 1918 from \$2.20, as fixed by the President, to \$2.50, was passed by the Senate by a vote of 49 to 18. The bill itself, carrying appropriations of \$28,000,000, was passed without a roll call. The annual naval appropriation bill carrying \$1,327,000,000, and increasing the navy's enlisted strength from 87,000 to 180,000 men, was reported to the House on the 19th. This sum and the last year's bill, together with the supplemental appropriations carried in the two deficiency bills of the preceding session, makes almost \$3,000,000,000 provided for the navy in a little more than twelve months. The draft treaty between the United States, Great Britain, and Canada submitted by the Administration for approval, was withdrawn by the President in order, it is said, to make minor changes in the wording. [See current volume, page 377.]

Packers and Competition

Testimony given before the Federal Trade Commission at Omaha on the 20th tended to show that the "Big Five" packers not only dominated the nation's cattle industry, but controlled banks, terminal railways, street car lines, land companies, and even amusement enterprises. At the Kansas City hearing on the 22d, Francis J. Heney, special counsel for the commission, placed L. E. Cooper, of Kansas City, on the stand to prove that the big packers secretly obtained lists of cattle shipped to other markets that were not accessible to commission men or other packers. Mr. Cooper said he was called a "train reporter." He made up lists of re-shipped stock from slips in the office of the Kansas City Stockyards Company. He obtained them with the knowledge of the man in charge of the shipping room at night. He said he usually arrived about 5.30 in the

morning to prepare his reports. [See current volume, page 314.]

Administration Co-operation

President Wilson has now an industrial cabinet with which he consults on war industries. The men representing the boards embraced in these conferences are Secretary McAdoo, acting mainly in his capacity as Director General of Railroads; Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Shipping Board; Bernard Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board; Vance C. McCormick, chairman of the War Trade Board; Food Administrator Hoover and Fuel Administrator Garfield. It is planned to hold weekly conferences for the purpose of keeping in touch on the broader aspects, while leaving the details to the several departments.

Adjusting Railroad Labor Disputes

Railroad labor disputes in the future will be settled by adjustment committees, one for the four leading brotherhoods, one for the shop men, and possibly one for the clerks and other classes of employes. The plan has been worked out by W. S. Carter, director of the railroad administration's division of labor in consultation with labor leaders and railroad executives, and has been approved by Director-General McAdoo. The committees will pass on disputed rules or contract interpretations involving questions of wages or other employment conditions and their decisions will be final. They will include representatives of both labor and railroad executives, and they will replace the Railroad Wage Commission, which will go out of existence.

Conscientious Objectors

After April 1, and each month thereafter, division, camp and post commanders are to report to the Secretary of War the names of conscientious objectors, with a statement of their objection. Each objector is to be given a full explanation of the law by a "tactful and considerate officer," and as far as possible, given the choice of a wide range of activities, including almost everything except actual fighting. Objectors who have no preference will be assigned to the Medical Corps; but they may serve in any branch of the Quartermaster's Department, in engineering work, or in the rear of zone operations abroad. Men who are unwilling to accept non-combatant services provided in the draft law, will in extreme cases be confined in disciplinary barracks.

Jews to Serve in Palestine

A Jewish regiment recruited in Great Britain and the United States for service in Palestine is nearing its full quota of men. Three hundred and fifty Jews not subject to the draft have been sworn in in New York. The announcement of the British Government that the regiment will fight in Palestine is considered as additional evidence of the Government's determination to restore Palestine to the Jews. The first contingent of the Jewish regiment has reached Cairo, Egypt. A large number of men are still in training for the regiment in

England. Mr. Balfour, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said in Parliament that a Zionist Commission would go to Palestine at an early date to investigate the present condition of Jewish colonies in Palestine, to organize relief work, and supervise reparation of damage done to Zionist colonies during the war.

Increasing American Shipping

Failure of the Dutch Government to come to an agreement with the Entente Allies and the United States regarding the use of Dutch ships in Allied ports, the shipping was commandeered on the 20th. It is estimated that the Dutch shipping in American ports amounts to 500,000 tons, with about the same amount in Great Britain and France. Negotiations for this shipping were begun July 17, 1917, and resulted at one time in an agreement whereby the United States was to use the Dutch shipping under certain conditions. This agreement was revoked by Holland under threats of reprisal by Germany. Attempts at a new agreement were made, but the Dutch Government, under fear of Germany, insisted upon impossible conditions. The food stuffs offered Holland in exchange for the use of the ships will be placed at her disposal the same as though an agreement had been signed. Wheat, or its equivalent in flour, to the amount of 50,000 tons in a North American port and 50,000 tons in a South American port is subject to order of the Dutch Government.

* *

Japan has agreed to turn over to the United States 150,000 tons of merchant shipping in exchange for American steel. The negotiations between Washington and Tokio have consumed much time, but cabled reports from Japan state that the transfer of ships to the American flag will take place within a very short time.

* *

The War Trade Board on the 22d placed restrictions on the importation of non-essential commodities. Exceptions are made where such goods come in ships that would not otherwise be loaded on their return to this country. It is estimated that this ruling will add 300,000 tons to the fleet now employed in carrying troops and supplies to Europe.

Russia

The Bolshevik Government, having ratified the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, is attempting to create a new army. Leon Trotzky, who resigned or was deposed as Foreign Minister because of opposition to Lenine's policy of accepting the German peace terms, is now Minister of War. His immediate plans are for an army of 300,000 to 500,000. It is to be an army, he says, not to fight in behalf of one imperialism against another imperialism, but to aid the European proletariat when it rises against its oppressors. Nothing definite or reliable is heard from South Russia or from Finland. It is reported that the Baltic Russian fleet at Helsingfors, the Finnish Capital, escaped to Kronstadt. Panicky sailors have asked Admiral Rozvozov to resume command of the fleet. The Black Sea fleet is now reported to have made its escape from Odessa when that city fell into German hands, and to have made its way to

Sebastopol. American Ambassador David R. Francis, when asked if the American Embassy would leave in view of the ratification of the German treaty, said:

I shall not leave Russia until compelled by force. The American Government and people are too deeply interested in the prosperity of the Russian people for them to abandon Russia to the Germans. America is sincerely interested in the liberty of the Russian people and will do everything possible to safeguard the real interests of the country.

* *

Evacuation of Petrograd continues. Transportation is very inadequate, which makes the movement of people and supplies very difficult. A shortage of money also handicaps trade. Menjinsky, Minister of Finance, attempted paying workmen with checks, but the men would not accept them. The Soviets in some cities are reported to be compelling merchants to deposit their receipts in the Government banks. It is reported that the Germans are opening up the various industries in the places they occupy and compelling the Russians to work. They are also restoring the land to the former owners.

* *

Polish discontent appears to be growing. The people still complain of the act of Germany in handing over to Ukraina the district of Cholm. They are also disturbed by the rumor that Germany will take what is necessary of Poland for strategic purposes, and "leave the rest to its fate." The German press accuses the Poles of ingratitude toward their liberators.

European War

The German forces began a general attack on the British front on the 21st. A heavy bombardment opened before dawn, and the infantry moved forward at eight o'clock on a fifty-mile front, extending from the Scarpe River to La Fere. During the succeeding six days the British have fallen back in good order. At no point has the line been broken, but it is still yielding with a slowing pace before the German onset. The present advance is over part of the territory abandoned by the Germans in their retreat to the "Hindenberg line," and the ground won by the British in the battles of Cambrai and the Somme. Berlin claims the capture of 45,000 prisoners, 600 guns, and "thousands" of machine guns. General Haig, commanding the British forces, has given no detailed losses. It is estimated that the Germans are employing 1,164,000 men in this battle, which is far in excess of the number of British engaged. The advance of masses of Germans against artillery and machine guns is reported to have resulted in enormous casualties among them. The sixth day of the battle of Picardy, as it is called, closes with the Germans throwing fresh troops into the assault, and the British, re-enforced by the French on the lower end of the line, maintaining an unbroken front. Confidence is everywhere expressed among the Allies that the Germans will fail in this greatest battle of history. [See current volume, page 379.]

* *

The German advance in Russia continues at intervals along the whole eastern front, but definite details are

lacking. It is expected that Petrograd, which is now undefended and largely evacuated, may be occupied at any time. The German armies are still a long way from Moscow, but are advancing toward the new capital from the northwest, the west and the southwest. German and Austrian forces are still advancing in eastern Ukrania. The British in Palestine have crossed the Jordan River, and are advancing northward and eastward in the direction of Essaft.

* *

A spectacular feature of the present German drive is the bombardment of Paris from a distance of more than seventy miles. The gun is supposed to be in the Forest of St. Gobain, west of Laon, and approximately 76 miles from Paris. The shell is 9.5 inches in diameter, and is fired at intervals of twenty minutes. Little or no damage is reported thus far. The people of Paris do not take to cover, as they do when airplanes attack. Nothing definite is yet known of the mysterious weapon.

* *

American casualties from the beginning of the war to date, as reported by the War Department, are: Killed in action, 207; killed by accident, 154; died of disease, 730; lost at sea, 254; died of other causes, 43; total deaths, 1,388; wounded, 696; captured, 22; missing, 54; total casualties, 2,160.

* *

Full reports of submarine losses up to January 1, were given to the press by the British Admiralty on the 21st. The need of secrecy is no longer necessary, the officials say, and a detailed statement is made. The total Allied and neutral shipping loss amounts to 11,827,572, while the shipyards outside of the Central Powers have turned out 6,606,275 tons. Enemy shipping to the amount of 2,589,000 tons has been added to the Allies' fleets, leaving a net loss to them of 2,632,297 tons. The maximum losses were in the second quarter of 1917, when 2,236,934 tons were sunk. The losses of the fourth quarter were only 1,272,843 tons. As the losses have fallen the production has increased. Losses for the past week, as given by the British Admiralty, were 11 ships over 1,600 tons, and 6 under that tonnage. Three French ships, one of them over 1,600 tons, were sunk. Two Spanish ships were sunk. In a battle off Dunkirk two German destroyers and two torpedo boats were sunk by the British. Two German submarines are reported sunk, one by the merchant ship *Floridian*, and one by a destroyer, both American. An American cruiser captured off the Mexican port of Mazatlan on the west coast a small vessel heavily armed and manned by five Germans.

* *

The Russo-German peace treaty was declared by Chancellor von Hertling to be a just and honorable treaty. During the Reichstag debate on the treaty some members commended its terms. Others thought it too mild. Dr. Stresemann, National Liberal, regretted the renunciation of a Russian indemnity. Count von Westarp, Conservative, said such leniency should not appear in future treaties, and demanded a heavy war indemnity from Roumania. Germany demands of Roumania that she surrender to the Central Powers all her own

war munitions and those left by the Allied troops. The leaders of the International Zionist Organization have published a demand that in the peace negotiations between Roumania and the Central Powers the Roumanian Jews shall have the right to determine their national political organization.

NOTES

—When the action on the Western front began on the morning of the 21st it was distinctly heard at Dover and other towns on the east coast of England.

—Red Cross nurses and other New York women serving abroad are to be given the right to vote along with the men, according to Francis M. Hugo, Secretary of State.

—Governor Hobby, of Texas, signed the State Prohibition bill on the 21st. The act becomes effective ninety days after the adjournment of the special session, or June 26.

—The Federal Prohibition Amendment was passed by the South Dakota Senate on the 19th, and by the House on the 20th. This is the tenth State to ratify the amendment.

—The New York Catholic War Fund aided by Protestants and Jews, which was designed to reach a total of \$2,500,000, closed in the time allotted with \$3,128,489, and may reach \$3,500,000. The largest single subscription was \$100,000, from the Rockefeller Foundation.

—A ten-day drive for funds to send American women doctors abroad to establish hospitals in the afflicted districts of France and Serbia, will begin March 26. It is hoped to send 2,000 women trained in the care of the sick.

—The aid of 736 daily papers, situated in cities of over 20,000 inhabitants, has been asked by Secretary of Labor Wilson in mobilizing farm labor. They will be made branches of the Federal Employment Service, and a member of the staff of each paper will become a Federal agent.

—The Irish Convention met again in Dublin on the 22d to discuss the statement of the Grand Committee. Decision having been reached on all material points, the Convention directed the chairman, Sir Horace Plunkett, to prepare a report for consideration. The Convention will meet again on April 4.

—James Stillman, financier and chairman of the Board of Directors of the National City Bank of New York, who died on the 15th, left an estate estimated at \$50,000,000. On that basis the Federal inheritance tax will amount to \$11,722,000, and the New York State transfer tax to \$2,014,000.

—After months of experimenting with 600 German patents for manufacturing dyestuffs, the proper combination for commercial production of dyes has been determined, and the Federal Trade Commission has issued thirty licenses for the use of these patents under the Trading with the Enemy Act.

—The curfew hour for London and the southern counties of England has been fixed at 10:30 o'clock. At that hour all places of amusement must be closed, and must remain closed till 1 o'clock the following afternoon. There must be no lights in shop windows. Hotels, clubs and restaurants must not serve hot meals between 9:30 at night and 5 o'clock in the morning.

—The necessity for fuel conservation has led to the adoption of coal zoning whereby 300,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, or 60 per cent of the country's output, will be shipped from the nearest mines. It is expected that the saving will amount to 160,000,000 car miles, which means that the same number of cars would otherwise have to make 300,000 additional trips.

—Mrs. Rena Mooney, wife of Thomas J. Mooney, who is under sentence of death for murder in connection with the Preparedness Day bomb explosion in San Francisco in July, 1916, was arraigned in the California Supreme Court on the 25th on one of the several murder charges against her. She was acquitted on a charge of murder, but seven of the eight original counts of the indictment remain against her.

—Wisconsin Senatorial primaries on the 18th resulted as follows: Lenroot, Republican, 69,316; Thompson, Republican, 66,997; Davies, Democrat, 54,866; McCarthy, Democrat, 13,104; Berger, Socialist, 36,562. Thompson was backed by Senator LaFollette. Berger and Thompson are supposed to have received the pro-German vote. Efforts have been made to unite on one loyal candidate, but neither Davies nor Lenroot has thus far signified a willingness to withdraw.

—Speaking of the unrest in Ireland ex-Premier Asquith, in an address on the 22d, said: "We hear disquieting reports, but one thing is most urgent, not only in the interests of Britain, Ireland and the British Empire, but in the interests of the Allied cause and the future of the world—reconciliation in Ireland. I refuse to believe that at this supreme moment British and Irish statesmanship is so bankrupt that it cannot find an honorable solution."



Israel Zangwill on "The Dilemmas of the Diaspora"—Jacob H. Schiff on "At the Gate of the Promised Land"—Justice Irving Lehman on "Our Duty as Americans"—President Emeritus Eliot of Harvard on "Three Lines of Action for American Jews"—Jacob Billikopf on "The Treasure-Chest of American Jewry"—Prof. M. M. Kaplan on "Where does Jewry Really Stand Today?"—a stirring poem by the Menorah poet Martin Feinstein: "From a Zionist in the Trenches"—and the literary sensation of the year, "Pomegranates," a series of "acid" comments on Jewish topics by a brilliant anonymous writer,—all in the current number of THE MENORAH JOURNAL. This number *FREE* to you with a trial \$1.00 subscription for six months (published bi-monthly), beginning with April number, if subscription is mailed promptly to Menorah Journal, 600 Madison Ave., New York. **WRITE TODAY.** *If the supply is not yet exhausted, we will also send you free with this offer a Miniature MENORAH JOURNAL reproducing the best features of three years.*

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 STOUGHTON COOLEY
BUSINESS MANAGER: STANLEY BOWMAR

Published Weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

122 East Thirty-Seventh Street, New York City

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

“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 3, 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.