

The
Public
A Journal of Democracy

FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT

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

A. S. BURLISON, Postmaster-General.

Japanese Intervention

**Anglo - American Labor
Relations**

Teachers and Democracy

Published Weekly
New York, N. Y.

March 9, 1918

Ten Cents a Copy
Two Dollars a Year



UPTON SINCLAIR'S

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE: FOR A CLEAN PEACE AND THE INTERNATION

Price 10 cents a copy \$1 a year 10 yearly subscriptions for \$5

¶ Because this is the greatest crisis in human history, and because I have something of importance to say about it, I have begun the publication of a magazine.

¶ If in the past anything that I have written has brought pleasure or enlightenment to you, I ask you now to read what I have to say in this magazine.

¶ If you can't risk a subscription, drop me a card for a sample copy free.

UPTON SINCLAIR, 1503 Sunset Avenue, Pasadena, Cal.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

Volume XXI

New York, N. Y., March 9, 1918

Number 1040

Contents

Editorial Notes	291
Is Democracy Advancing.....	293
Labor's New Policy Committee.....	294
Anglo-American Labor Relations.....	295
Progressive Republicans	297
Shipyards Labor	297
Real Estate Income.....	298
Who Shall Pay for Shells?.....	299
A Call for Democracy, David Starr Jordan.....	301
Efficient Water-Power Development, Simon Barr.....	302
Teachers and Democracy, Benjamin Glassberg.....	305
Monarchs as Reformers.....	307
Correspondence	309
Books	311
News	313

German imperialism has reached the first stage of realized ambition. The new peace treaty forced upon Russia detaches still other provinces, and condemns Russia to a still greater degree of economic poverty and isolation. It is, however, not merely territorial gain that provides the motive; it is the destruction of the revolution. To the far seeing it has been clear for a year that free Russia and autocratic Germany could not exist side by side. Every consideration of expediency and self-protection dictated to the Russians a continuance of war to the bitter end. Instead of that, their ignorant idealism made them believe that they had only to display their precious acquisition of liberty to induce the Germans to follow their example. They foolishly believed that even in Germany moral forces would triumph. The fanatics, who were allowed to maintain control, bared Russia's breast and dared Germany to strike. The knife has been driven in to the hilt. Germany knows that there is a point in successful aggression at which she can safely abandon any moral gesture and rely upon German greed. Self-defense as her motive is supplanted by the desire of booty and rule. Naturally, the Germans fail to see all the consequences. There have been many in the western

nations who have persistently believed, in spite of Belgium and the submarine, that at bottom and in ultimate test the German soul contained some slight flicker of nobility; that circumstances might arise in which the German people would prove their capacity to live in a world justly and decently ordered. The events in Russia have made all this a thing of the past. There can now remain no one with so feeble a grasp of realities as not to know that this is a fight not to the bitter end, but to the death. It is useful to be free of delusions. It is clear that the political offensive to make the German people allies of the western democracies is an offensive efficacious only in weakening Allied morale. Germany's conduct is doing more to strengthen our determination and hasten the only possible conclusion of the war, than can be accomplished by all the propagandist efforts combined. The only propaganda that will undermine German militarism is an intensification of suffering on the part of the people. It is clear at last that Germany has cast every moral consideration overboard.

* * *

But the success for the moment of German ambition is no good reason why the Allies should be seized with panic, or allow themselves to take shortsighted and hasty action in the Far East. The latest reports seem to indicate that Great Britain, France and Italy are giving their assent to Japanese intervention in Siberia. The situation is, of course, delicate and difficult, which is all the more reason that it should be honestly faced. Japan will, no doubt, give assurances that her intentions do not include aggrandizement, and these assurances may at present be entirely sincere. The formula is, of course, the protection of vital interests. To safeguard the stores at Vladivostock from German seizure is the merest nonsense. That the Germans will

cross Siberia to the Pacific Coast is a contingency sufficiently remote to allow time to meet it. If the occupation is carried out, the expansive policy of Japan is most likely to assert itself. It may be that this policy has justification, that there are Siberian regions that can well be settled by Japanese, but this does not appear to be the moment to act on that principle, and the Allies should express the grave doubts that they feel. The cynic may say that this is the moment for which Japan has been waiting, that her imperial policy dictates three steps: to secure a free hand in China; to fix her grip upon the Pacific Islands to the south; and to occupy Eastern Siberia. The cynic may further assert that Japanese imperialism is a natural ally of German imperialism, and that when the two meet they will meet as allies to divide a helpless Russian empire. But the cynic, especially if he be Japanese or German, is proceeding upon the false assumption that the Russian Empire is another Ottoman Empire, broken, decaying, and ready to be devoured. On the contrary, Russia is so vitally youthful that she does not know how to vent her energy. No greater mistake could be made than to suppose that the giant is dead or has suffered more than a moment's disablement. If it is the intention of Japan to act in good faith with her western Allies, it is surely possible to secure the assent and cooperation of the Russian people. This is not a matter of this month or this year. Up to the present there is evidence that our Government does not intend to be a party to the Siberian occupation. If it must be done, let those who believe it necessary take the responsibility. Let us at any rate preserve a channel of friendly intercourse with the Russia that is to be.

* * *

Probably five millions of Americans read each week one or both of the two great popular five-cent weeklies. How many of them have time or thought to realize that, in so far as their views are colored by these periodicals, they are being colored in the interests of that species of American business enterprise which is synonymous with privilege? Americans of democratic bent have become alarmed by the increasing amount of space in these periodicals given to writers who, conscientiously enough, act as press agents for the enterprises and the points of view of small groups of men whose interests conflict

with the welfare of the American people. The Wilson Administration is assaulted in wholesale fashion in *Collier's*. The shipyard labor question and the labor question as a whole are handled in both periodicals always from the tory employers' point of view. Anything that might offend the influential business community is scrupulously omitted. Julian Street in a flippant article in the *Saturday Evening Post* on Washington repeats the silly lies of railroad press agents as to the causes of transportation breakdown, dragging them in by the heels to please someone. Undoubtedly he believes them. Do the editors? More important, do the readers?

* * *

The refusal of the California Supreme Court to grant Thomas Mooney a new trial is an amazing instance of judicial incompetence. The Court refuses to consider disclosures that destroy the credibility of the State's witnesses because these disclosures came after the verdict had been rendered and when the court record was complete. The least the Court could do was to indicate some method by which the new facts in the case could be brought to its attention in such form as to permit them to act without violating their worship of technicalities. By failing either to consider the facts or to indicate how the facts can be brought before it, the Court has brought the whole judicial process into contempt. The public everywhere is puzzled, and labor is fortified in its distrust of the courts. Surely California's statutes must contain some provision by which an honest Court could deal with the Mooney case on its merits. In any event, the execution of Mooney must be prevented by further pressure from public opinion and the Federal Government.

* * *

The veneer of civilization is none too thick in a commonwealth where a judge is required by law to sentence a sixteen-year-old boy to death. New York must endure the disgrace of such an occurrence, but the same thing could have occurred in any other State not sufficiently advanced to abolish capital punishment. The victim in this case is Paul Chapman, sentenced by Justice Kapper of New York City. It may be said that no governor will permit such a sentence to be carried out. Let us hope that it is true, and

that Governor Whitman will not wait to be flooded with petitions before seeing his duty in the matter. In the meantime, no stronger or fitter comment can be offered than that of an honored correspondent:

It seems to me that the motherhood of New York State, now powerful with the ballot, cannot stand for such an intolerable outrage against childhood.

It is monstrous that a child—five years too young to vote—should have the horror of standing up to receive a capital sentence, burned into his life. I am confining myself to the iniquity of the pronouncement of the sentence, for I cannot conceive that it will be consummated.

The proceedings themselves, up to this point, constitute an atrocity. I have the utmost faith that the voting women of New York will have the power to prevent their going further; and that an agitation will be created that will wipe the infamy of any capital punishment off the statute books of the State.

Is Democracy Advancing?

This is to be frankly a pessimistic editorial, a gloomy reaction from the chorus of ululations and rejoicings, in which we too have joined, over the rise of labor to power and the prospect of a thorough-going economic reconstruction. **THE PUBLIC** would, for the moment, play the rôle of kill-joy. It would reach up and seize the coat collar (or the ankle), of the exulting democrat who has just read the economic program of the British Labor Party or the latest prophecy by Mr. Schwab, and yank him back to the earth, which, in his enthusiasm, he is in danger of leaving for a habitation in the clouds. For we are in danger of taking too much for granted, and of expending our thought and energy on questions of just how victory is to be organized, instead of starting a drive on the first-line positions of the enemy.

The point to remember is that these first-line trenches are securely held at this moment, and that the enemy has even advanced his lines into our territory since we began to herald the coming of victory. In England, at this moment, while the Labor Party talks of opening the land and taxing great fortunes out of existence, Bonar Law and Lord Milner are still firmly in the saddle. Real land-reform is no nearer accomplishment than it was in 1906. Monopoly is as strong as ever it was. Labor's material advantages are high wages and steady employment, both due directly to the war and sure to be lost the moment war ceases. Its moral advantage is

the emergence of the Labor Party as a dominant factor. But it has yet to win its first victory, and, more serious, a large part of labor's new moral and political power can be traced directly to the same temporary economic advantages that will be lost when peace comes. The demobilization, military and industrial, will create unprecedented unemployment regardless of precautions against it. We are told that the returning soldiers and the released munitions workers are in no mood to permit the agencies in control of production to curtail it, but will demand that the same agency which in war mobilized them for slaughter shall in peace mobilize them for production. But the theory that men facing starvation are in a demanding mood has been pretty well disproved. Whence, in days when there are two applicants for every job, will come their power to demand?

Labor's power is today the talk of the world. But it is a power born of society's war-time necessities, and with peace it will dissolve as quickly as it came unless in the meantime labor leaders do something more than talk of an economic reconstruction "after the war." They must "dig themselves in." If they cannot do it now, what reason is there for believing that they can do it then? If labor cannot or will not now destroy privilege, change the rules of the game, place unearned incomes under legal as well as moral proscription, what hope is there that such a program can be carried out when their cooperation is no longer needed? The anonymous industrial expert quoted in **THE PUBLIC** last week opens a door onto the intentions, the calculated determination, of reactionary American employers. When the war stops they will make an end of what to them is a Government debauch in the stews of socialism and unionism. All the resentment now being suppressed by the necessity of offering a patriotic front is being stored away, and, make no doubt, they say, this so-called industrial democracy, these socialistic innovations, will get what is coming to them after the war. In the meantime, why really should they worry? Mr. McAdoo's war financing program could not be better. The people are paying once for the war in high prices, created by bond issues, and after the war they will pay again, with interest, to that privileged ten per cent who are now investing their excessive profits in the bonds. There is considerable danger of public ownership of rail-

roads, it is true, but Prussian junkers have survived that and fattened on it for a generation.

It is when we turn to the spiritual side that democracy's gain appears substantial enough. The war has shaken nearly everyone out of his mental rut, and new conceptions of fairness are accepted where once they were dismissed as visionary. Not Mr. Schwab alone, but millions of others, regard it as accepted that radical changes are due. Labor's power and labor's demands in Russia and England square with new conceptions of what is rational and just that have long been lurking just beneath the surface of our social consciousness.

How to cash the demand for change, while yet there is power behind the demand, and acquiescence among the neutrals, and at least lessened resistance from those who must give up something? British Labor's program of economic reconstruction is the first step. But history has forgotten scores of equally noble programs because they never passed the stage of intention. British reformers of today who revisited the earth in 2018 to find it substantially unchanged would be no more amazed and disheartened than Godwin and Shelley had they revisited England in 1914. And not until British Labor comes to a test of strength on the field of action can we throw our hats in the air with any real assurance.

As for America, we have not reached even the planning stage. A discouraging number of our labor leaders are still dazzled by the fact of mere government recognition. Occupying seats on boards and commissions, they tell each other and their followers that Labor has come into its own, strong in that conviction for no better reason than that they are writing on government embossed stationery with franked envelopes and receiving respectful mention on the editorial page of the *New York Times*. That, we must admit, is enough to turn their heads after the bitter fight labor has had in America. But it is time they were getting over it. It is time they were realizing that precious months are drifting by pregnant with such opportunities for remaking the world as neither we nor our children shall ever see again.

Let us remember the history of popular political government. More than a century ago we installed "the people" as the sovereign power. That change was as radical for its day as would be the victory of the British Labor

Party in England now. Ever since then, no politician so corrupt, so scornful of democracy, so faithful to the interests of privilege, but has talked reverently of "the people." Let us realize that we shall not necessarily gain merely by substituting "labor" for "the people." "The people" have been content with lip-service for over a century. Will labor be as easily satisfied?

Labor's New Policy Committee

The choosing of Mr. Frank P. Walsh as one of the two members to represent "the general public" on the board of twelve men who are to formulate a labor policy for the period of the war is one of the most heartening and promising events of recent months. Mr. Walsh is the choice of the five workers' representatives, and as such will be in effect chairman of one section of the Board, just as Mr. Taft, chosen by the five employers' representatives, will help to coordinate their interests.

What the country expects of the Board as its immediate contribution is the working out of adjustments and accommodations that will eliminate friction and insure continuous production with maximum efficiency in all the essential war industries. This will require an agreement on certain broad principles for the period of the war, and a spirit of concession and conciliation on both sides. Experience has pretty well demonstrated that labor will go fully half way in these matters, and that the chief danger will lie in the attitude of open-shop employers of the sort who guide the policy of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Taft will need to use all his powers as a conciliator, and we venture to predict that most of his labors will be with his friends on the employers' side. For, whatever his failures of understanding in this field, he has recently shown a quality of big-mindedness that is as far as possible from the attitude of those anti-union employers who are determined to cling to their prerogatives though the heavens fall.

As for Mr. Walsh, his influence in working out a temporary working agreement will be the least important part of his service. For he will be virtually the official adviser and mentor of a committee of five trades unionists who can and should become a policy committee for the American labor movement. They cannot perform their immediate function, they cannot formulate a war

program for labor, without giving thought to a program that will guide the economic reconstruction that is coming to be universally recognized as an inevitable by-product of the war. Mr. Walsh is an ardent friend of the trades union movement. He recognizes the importance of the day-by-day process of attrition by which the unions through their economic power have been nibbling at special privilege and economic autocracy. He realizes that labor organizations formed for the specific business-like purpose of immediate advantage in the mine and work-shop are the necessary first step in mobilizing the workers for an attack on the fundamental causes of poverty and oppression. But he realizes also that the next step must be taken, and we can be sure that he is not blind to the promise of the new political program of the British labor movement. Secretary Wilson has chosen as labor's representatives on the Board men who are equally alert to the new opportunities that are opening for labor in the political field. Labor could not be better represented than by Mr. Frank J. Hayes, President of the United Mine Workers; Mr. Victor Olander, secretary of the Seamen, and Mr. William Johnson, president of the Machinists, to mention only three.

Here we have what may easily become that for which every democrat has prayed,—an agency for the adequate expression of the needs of the American democracy, speaking with all the authority and power of the largest group of tried and true democrats in the land. That Mr. Walsh is a singletaxer, an advocate of public ownership, a prophet of industrial democracy, a foe of economic imperialism, a proponent of radical income and inheritance taxation, is not so important as that he acts continuously and effectually as each of these things, and knows how to fire others with his faith. His chief element of strength as a rallying point for democratic forces during his work as Chairman of the Commission on Industrial Relations was not only this, but his freedom from doctrinairism, his ability to work with any body of men and women going in his direction—his success in stripping the democratic movement of nonessential points of friction and reducing it to a simple program of action for things that are plainly and simply just. And he has all the enthusiasm of a boy in attempting what others might regard as impossible. The curse of the American labor movement today is

the skepticism of its leaders with regard to the willingness of the rank and file to rally to a fundamental program. Too many of these leaders have a profound contempt for the rank and file and their apathy, not realizing, what we believe to be the fact, that this apathy has been bred into them by years of autocratic machine rule from the top—a rule so reactionary and so absolute that it has paralyzed not only progressive action, but even progressive thinking. It is an apathy that will give place to enthusiastic participation in any movement that promises to achieve a program of fundamental reforms.

Anglo-American Labor Relations

Mr. Paul Kellogg, editor of *The Survey*, a journalist who cannot be accused either of pacifism or undue radicalism, has brought back from England the serious charge that the British Labor Delegation now in this country "has been selected without reference to or consultation with the British Labor Party, and are not in any true sense representative." Mr. Kellogg's statement purports merely to repeat what he was told by responsible representatives of the Party during a two weeks' stay in England, during which he visited the Nottingham Conference, listened to the discussions there and interviewed several of the outstanding leaders. In substance, Mr. Kellogg's statement raises the question of whether some influence in America or England is endeavoring to prevent communication and understanding between American labor and the real British labor movement—the movement that formulated those notable peace terms which Lloyd George in substance indorsed, and that is emerging as a dominant political force in support of a comprehensive program of economic reconstruction. Mr. Kellogg has furnished THE PUBLIC with a memorandum of the substance of statements made to him in England, as follows:

At the office of the British Labor Party, which is made up of constituent organizations with a membership of two and a half millions, and is the political organization of British labor, I was told that the delegation of British labor men sent over by the English Government had been selected without reference to or consultation with the British Labor Party, and were not in any true sense representative.

The British labor unions are organized industrially in the British Trades Union Congress with 2,500,000 members. They are organized politically into a Labor Party

with 2,500,000 members. Together, these two organizations include about 4,000,000 members, and they are working shoulder to shoulder in the matter of war aims, etc.

There is a third organization known as the General Federation of Trades Unions, which was primarily a strike insurance fund, with 800,000 members. The textile workers and the mine workers, for example, two of the strongest national unions, do not belong to it, and the labor men I talked with said it had no right to speak for organized labor as a whole in England. Somehow or other—possibly because of the similarity of names, the American Federation of Labor has recognized this third body as trades union authority in England. Its President, W. A. Appleton, is continually airing his views on all sorts of things in the papers, trying to pose as a representative of the trade union group. His action became so obnoxious that the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive of the Labor Party broke up a joint committee representing those two organizations and the General Federation of Trades Unions in 1917, and reformed the joint committee, excluding the Federation.

THE PUBLIC presents this very serious charge without comment, and with request for further enlightenment from any who can give it. The opposition of the little group of men in control of the American labor movement to any comprehensive program of economic reconstruction is well known. So is their unfriendliness to measures looking toward more democracy within the movement, to more direct participation of the rank and file in formulating policies and choosing national leaders. It is as certain as anything can be that they will over reach themselves if they endeavor to keep American labor quarantined against the infection of that magnificent war-born spirit of democracy which today drives British labor forward toward the goal of freedom and justice.

The British Labor Party has announced its intention of sending delegates to America to ask the co-operation of American labor. Men like the Belgian Vandervelde and the Frenchman Thomas cannot be discredited as pacifists, nor can those British delegates who voted overwhelmingly against an inconclusive peace. Any labor leader in America had better think twice before decreeing that these men shall not be welcomed in America.

Antagonism from reactionary elements of the labor movement is not the only thing to be guarded against in this connection. We can be sure that our discredited pro-German Socialists

will undertake to exploit the visit of a British Labor Party delegation in their own interest. It is for anti-German Socialists like John Spargo to see to it that the visitors make no mistake about the so-called majority Socialist faction in America. These spokesmen for peoples who have pledged their all for the struggle against Prussianism must understand that in meeting Hillquit and Berger they will be meeting men who in effect have palliated and made light of every German offense against humanity—men who still withhold their support and sneer at the Allied cause in the face of the German assault on helpless Russia. If the visiting delegates fail to realize the contemptible part played by the Socialists, if they permit their visit to be capitalized in the interest of this sort of Socialism, then they will receive and deserve the suspicion of the American democracy. The pleas of Mr. Gompers and of Mr. William English Walling, a Socialist who links the British Labor Party with the Bolsheviki, have failed to convince us. But the final answer to them must be given by the delegation on its arrival. We must have proof that the British Labor Party and the corresponding political groups of France and Belgium can be counted upon to wage their war against imperialism and toryism at home without weakening their determination that Prussianism shall be defeated and discredited before there can be thought of laying down arms. The difference between Messrs. Gompers and Walling and those who welcome the visit of the British delegates is the difference between confidence in the people and a profound contempt for them. Because the simple Russian peasant naively embraced the theory of non-resistance to the undoing of his country is no reason why the workers of either America or England should be expected to do likewise. Both our racial inheritance and our practical matter-of-fact training in the machine process of modern industrialism have given us a vastly better grip on realities, and THE PUBLIC is not prepared to admit that any leaders or propaganda or doctrine could sweep the English and American workers off their feet and into submission to a German victory. So far from weakening Allied morale, there is abundant evidence that the recent activities of the British Labor movement have supplemented President Wilson's policy and strengthened it tremendously. By stripping the Allied cause of non-essentials and

purging it of imperialistic designs, these activities have disarmed pacifist agitation of the dangerous kind. Lloyd George thought well enough of the British Labor Party to address its conference and to give an indorsement to the spirit and substance, at least, of its war aims. Its program undoubtedly commands the wholehearted support of the British workers. At its conference with workers' representatives of the Allied countries a pacifist resolution was voted down decisively. We have had one example of the effect of Mr. Gompers' policy, when that policy is carried out by Governments. We lost Russia on account of it. If we wish to preserve our influence and to guard against the spread of spineless pacifism in England, the way to do it is not to rebuff and insult the British workers by insinuating that they are craven and pro-German. We tried that when Kerensky was struggling to hold Russia in line against the Kaiser and such a peace as has now befallen his country.

Progressive Republicans

It is easy to appreciate the plight of sincerely progressive Republicans who are also politicians with ambitions to serve, now that the Party has been "reorganized" by Messrs. Penrose, Perkins and Hays. Their principles and sympathies are much nearer those of President Wilson. Yet there is the traditional partisan antagonism to bar the way to an understanding. And the Administration at Washington has had to go slow in recognizing Republicans of this sort because of the survival of the feeling that led Mr. Bryan to write his "deserving Democrats" letter. At no time has Mr. Wilson seen his way clear to winning the Republican progressives at the cost of losing the narrowly partisan Democrats. Yet many Republicans have made the break without loss either of prestige or integrity but rather with a substantial gain in both. There are Mr. William Kent, Mr. Francis J. Heney, Mr. Rublee, and many more. A very considerable number of their friends would like to see this group enlarged by Senators Johnson of California and Borah of Idaho. And they will be puzzled by the newspaper reports of Mr. Johnson's meeting in New York with Chairman Hays of the Republican National Committee. Fresh from conferences with Penrose, Barnes, Perkins, Munsey, Lodge, and sundry similar, Mr. Hays called upon

the Californian at a hotel where the latter was stopping. They emerged after an hour, and Senator Johnson, placing his arm on Mr. Hays' shoulder, said:

"We have the utmost confidence in this young man, and absolute faith in what he is going to do. We are all one and we are all with him."

Now, anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Senator Johnson and his record knows that he is *not* "all one" with Perkins of the Steel Corporation; with Munsey, a champion of "social justice" who is now using his newspapers to oppose child labor reform in New York as he used them in Maryland four years ago; with Penrose, whose very name is a sufficient characterization; with Barnes, the Albany boss; or even with Roosevelt, who clamors for universal military service and an imperialistic foreign policy, who condones the Mooney prosecution and the Bisbee deportations. It is as sure as anything that Senator Johnson is remaining in the Republican Party in order to give this crowd the fight of their lives when next the issue is joined,—probably at the Presidential primaries. It is futile to imagine that he can succeed without compromise far more serious than the bit of political persiflage quoted above, and none of his friends will admit the possibility of that. It is a difficult rôle to play. But after all none of us can seriously object if he prefers to kick the Republican Party to pieces from the inside. We can be sure that Senator Johnson's cordial indorsement of Hays has caused more pain and apprehension among Mr. Hays' real sponsors than it has in any other quarter.

Shipyard Labor

Certain facts about the recent strike of shipyard carpenters need to be emphasized and kept in mind because of the danger of similar difficulties in the future. The Carpenters' Union was not demanding the closed shop, regardless of widespread statements to that effect emanating from officials of the Shipping Board. It urged in effect the preferential shop—that the Government make use of the Union's well-developed employment machinery in finding skilled men, and that there be no discrimination against union men; this to be assured by placing employment in the hands of the Department of Labor. The Carpenters' officials specifically disclaimed any

demand for the closed, or union shop. In many yards its members are working side by side with non-union men, for employers who refuse to recognize unions. Some of its members had been refused employment on the ground of union membership. What Mr. Hutcheson demanded was that shipyards should *not* be closed—to union men. And until the Government should assume supervision over hiring and discharging, until it should establish uniform standards of wages, hours and conditions, he did refuse to sign an agreement forbidding local strikes. He considered, and properly, THE PUBLIC believes, that the men should not lose their strike weapon so long as they were to be at the mercy of private contractors in the matter of wages, hours and conditions. These private contractors include some of the most virulent enemies of industrial democracy in the country—men who are prepared to go the limit in destroying organization among their employes and refusing them the slightest voice in determining wages and working conditions. Mr. Hutcheson did not even demand the full preferential shop—a condition that usually involves agreement by the employer to exhaust the employment facilities of the union before going elsewhere for men. There is no good reason why he should not have demanded it—and got it. Recognition of the unions as useful and necessary agencies in mobilizing labor is one of the Government's major policies in connection with the war. If Mr. Hurley cannot subscribe to this policy he should make way for a man big enough to grasp its wisdom—a man capable of acting on the advice of the British employers who came to this country for the British Government to urge a policy of union recognition as the only feasible method of obtaining cooperation. The "crowing" of anti-union employers and newspapers over Mr. Hutcheson's rebuff is ominous. It spreads the impression that Mr. Hurley has solved the shipyard labor problem by firmness, and that everything will now go merrily forward. The fact is that labor has not too much confidence either in Mr. Hurley or his wage adjustment board.

Unless uniform standards are established and labor matters placed in the hands of an agency in which the workers have confidence, we need not be surprised to see difficulties develop fully as serious as those we have had in the past. If we avoid them, as is fervently to be hoped, some

of the credit will go to Mr. Hutcheson for his insistence that the points of friction be cleared away before they have done more serious damage.

Real Estate Income

President Lawrence McGuire of the New York Real Estate Board complains that the tax on real estate for 1918 will amount to 33 1/3 per cent of the average gross income, and "impose what is an intolerable burden." No other forms of wealth, he declares, are taken by the State to so great a degree. He further says: "There is greater need in New York City for additional housing facilities, both for individuals and for commercial and manufacturing enterprises. I believe if this bill (the Boylan bill, limiting the rate of tax on real estate to 17½ mills) can pass, new money will be immediately available for the additions so greatly needed. This, of course, means increased real estate added to the assessment rolls, and every increase of the valuation of land incidental to the erection of a new building adds to the City's credit and increases its debt borrowing capacity."

President McGuire's statement may be technically true, but it is doubtful if he has given the right interpretation. If the real estate of the City be taken at its present valuation, it is not unlikely that the tax would absorb one-third of its income. But if, as Mr. McGuire contends, a lowering of the tax will result in an "increase of the valuation of land" will it not, as far as the real estate owner is concerned, return to the old proportion of tax to income? Building, we are told, has ceased because taxes do not leave sufficient income. The formula runs after this fashion: Reduce taxes, increase building; more buildings, higher land values; higher values, lower income. Is not this entangling oneself in the vicious circle?

May not the unpleasantly large proportion of tax to income be due to other than the causes named by Mr. McGuire? And may there not be a better remedy than the one proposed by him? The tax is laid upon the total value of the property; the income is derived only from the improved part. That is to say, a vacant lot brings in no income; it is only when a house or other improvement has been erected that direct income begins. Just to the extent, therefore, that real

estate is improved will the income be a large or small percentage of the capitalized value of the land.

The Annual Record of Assessed Valuation of Real Estate in the City of New York, 1917, offers some remarkable illustrations. The lot at 1385 Broadway, between 37th and 38th Streets, for instance, is assessed at \$208,000; the lot and the building together are assessed at \$210,000, making \$2,000 for the one-story building. Nor is this such a rare exception. The two lots above it have each a two thousand dollar house. The property on the corner, 1373-83, is valued at \$1,285,000, and the two-story building is assessed at \$25,000. There are many houses in the vicinity assessed at one, two, and three thousand dollars. The lot at 442 Fifth Avenue, just north of 39th Street, in the very heart of the uptown district, is valued at \$1,075,000, and the four-story building at \$5,000. Just around the corner on 39th Street a lot valued at \$239,000 has a two-story building valued at \$1,000.

It must be apparent that property paying taxes on a valuation of \$210,000 and dependent for revenue upon a building valued at \$2,000 will show a large outgo and a small income. A tax of 2.02 cents—the rate for Manhattan in 1917—would amount to \$4,242, while an income of 10 per cent on the building would yield only \$200. Surely Mr. McGuire would not expect sufficient reduction in the taxes on such property to produce a commercial income. Yet, if the owner of the lot attempts to put up the building that Mr. McGuire says the City needs the assessor pounces upon him and raises his tax. Thus, the land occupied by the McAlpin Hotel, 207 x 123.5 feet at the corner of Sixth Avenue and 34th Street, is valued at \$4,450,000, and the building is assessed at \$5,000,000. Had the owner kept on his property an old building such as those on Broadway and Fifth Avenue, it might have been valued at \$50,000, which, with the lot, would make a valuation of \$4,500,000 and a tax of \$90,000. But instead of the Broadway style of rookery a fine twenty-five story building was put up, making the total value of the property \$9,450,000, and the tax \$190,890.

Would it not be more conducive to the erection of the buildings that the City needs, to exempt them altogether from taxes? If a reduction of a few mills will produce the effect claimed by Mr. McGuire, how much greater would be the re-

sult if taxes on improvements were abolished. If the owners of the old rookeries that are now assessed at a nominal figure knew they would pay the same tax whatever the kind of improvement, there would be a tendency to erect the best buildings in demand.

Mr. McGuire is right in saying the heavy tax on improvements discourages the erection of needed buildings, but he is in error in supposing the tax should be lightened on both lot and building. No amount of reduction in the tax on land would increase the number of lots. On the contrary, a reduction in the tax on land would increase the price of lots, and so make it more difficult for builders to buy. But a shifting of the tax from buildings to land would tend to lessen the price and so make it easier for builders. There appears to be some confusion in regard to land owners and house owners. A flat reduction of the tax on real estate would not benefit house owners or house users, for the reason that whatever reduction was made in the tax would reappear in the rent or price of the land; but a transference of the tax from the house to the land would aid owners and users of houses. Hence, to the average man the tax problem narrows itself down to a question of whether he wants more and better houses or higher priced land. If he is governed by principle, he will strive to have land owners pay into the public treasury the annual value of the service rendered to the land by the public. If he is guided by expediency, he will favor or oppose the tax on buildings according as he does or does not own land.

Who Shall Pay for Shells?

Collier's of February 23 contains a facetious editorial on public debts and taxation that is scarcely in keeping with that progressive journal's reputation. In order to discomfort Claude Kitchin and Amos Pinchot and those who would issue less bonds and raise more revenue from inheritances, excess profits, surplus incomes, and land values, the editor takes a fling at Thomas Jefferson for proposing to limit public debts to the generations in which they are incurred, and then says: "The war's expense bill is mounting up handsomely, and Messrs. Kitchin and Pinchot are worrying about the tax rate in 1967. That is to say, somewhere in the Vosges this year or next an American army may

be brought up short before the German second line of trenches because all the 5.9 shells obtainable by taxation have been shot off and the third German line cannot be attempted without heavily bonding future generations of Americans. The proper move, then, would be to retire, save up the vouchers, and explain to the future generations why we went back instead of forward. They might understand. And then again they mightn't. Perhaps, once we have done our best to meet our war bills, it is not necessary to pierce too far into the future with the flaming eye of the Excess Prophet. Perhaps our heirs will forgive us the mortgage on the old farm if the proceeds went into upkeep of the property. Perhaps they will agree that the something which men today think worth dying for is to them worth paying for."

Will *Collier's* on second thought say this is a fair presentation of the position of those who seek a more equitable distribution of the burdens of the war? Does it do justice to its reputation as a champion of human rights thus to belittle the efforts of those who are striving to curb profiteering at a time of great national sacrifice? The matter of supplying shells for the Army is entirely aside from the present discussion. All are agreed that they must go forward in any event. The question is who shall pay for them. If the revenue to meet the cost of the war be raised by taxes on excess profits and surplus incomes, one set of citizens will pay for the shells. But if the revenue be raised by bonds to be met by future taxes on industry, an entirely different set of citizens will pay for them. It is our opportunity and our duty to decide which set of citizens shall bear the burden.

Collier's must recognize the fact that war means sacrifice of life and wealth. Its keen sense of justice will prompt it to say that a national burden should be distributed as equitably as possible among all the people. It will doubtless be conceded that the men who go to the front are meeting their share of the sacrifice. Nor is there likely to be serious questioning of the fact that the great mass of wage earners are finding in the more rapid advance of prices than wages a narrowing of the margin of living. This sacrifice, or at least this lack of gain because of the war, may be extended to include many kinds of business. But there is a class of citizens who, though comparatively few in number yet repre-

sent the surplus wealth of the country, and who have suffered no real hardship from the war. A considerable part of these have, indeed, actually profited by it.

Is there then anything so really objectionable in attempting to apportion the war burdens more equitably among these classes? The soldier may well say: "I'm getting no financial gain; I'm fighting from duty." The poor can say: "It is hard on us, but we bear it from love of country." The rich may say: "Pooh, it is nothing; it took a little of my income, but I had left more than I spend." The profiteer exclaims: "War is great; it is progress; I have trebled my fortune." Shall the nation, on the return of peace, say to the soldier: "We are proud of you; you have maintained the traditions of the country; we ask you now to show the same quiet heroism in paying off the war debt?" Shall it say to the poor: "Your fortitude has been most commendable; may it sustain you through the long years of debt-paying?" And then say to the rich: "We are happy in the thought that we have caused you no suffering or hardship; we trust that your position will remain comfortable to the end?"

The factors in this problem are too well known to permit of any confusion in the minds of intelligent critics. Taxes on industry are paid by consumers. Taxes on rent, inheritances, and for the most part on surplus incomes and excess profits, are paid by the recipients. If taxes be laid upon business, including all productive enterprises, they will appear in prices, and be paid by consumers. That is to say, the men who have done the fighting, and the men and women workers who have borne the thousand and one discomforts incident to war's upheaval, will continue to bear the burden of taxation for another generation while paying off the debt; whereas, the men and women with fortunes so great that their war taxes have not deprived them of a single comfort, nor laid upon them a solitary hardship, will continue upon their self-gratified way.

Possibly this is all a question of the point of view; but it is a matter of wonderment to THE PUBLIC how in a democracy there can be any general acceptance of a policy that lays the burden of a great national sacrifice upon the people in a way that will be crushingly heavy to some, and not be felt at all by others. Clever camouflage may quiet restive war victims under

autocratic governments; but in a country in which all authority comes from the people no amount of specious explanation will long satisfy the masses that this policy is either just or expedient.

Action may not be immediate. It takes time for the spirit of democracy to work—particularly among the beneficiaries of privilege—and it may be that in the welter of war politics the friends of special privilege will pay for the shells with bonds, while profiteers wax in wealth; but let no one mistake: When peace returns, and the fighting men rejoin the working men, there will be radical readjustments in the tax laws. It may be that great profits from war industries will have gone into private pockets, and that the great fortunes of the very rich will have become still greater, but the debt, whatever its amount, will be met by shifting the taxes from industry to those who can meet them without hardship. Statesmen and publicists in Germany and Great Britain already are discussing the proposal to confiscate wealth to meet the cost of war; and it

would be unseemly for the people of this country to wage a great war to overthrow autocracy, only to find that they had enriched plutocracy.

Is *Collier's* fully advised when it defends unnecessary issues of bonds, while war profits are taxed but a small part of what they are in Great Britain? Is its present course in keeping with its past liberal policy, when it seeks to burden industry and leave land values unscathed? Does it realize that its stand against greater taxes on inheritances, excess profits, surplus incomes, and economic rent means an increase in the taxes of the poor whose cause it has so often championed? How can it reconcile its broad sense of justice with the fact that at this time of great national sacrifice, when business, industry, and even life itself are subject to the will of Government, and all citizens are in duty bound to bear their share of the burden, private fortunes are growing greater in spite of, and even because of, the war? There can be no controversy over the supply of shells. The question is, who shall pay for them.

A Call of Democracy

By David Starr Jordan

There will never be a free and enlightened state until the state comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.—THOREAU.

Through the ages, says Barbusse, "the people are nothing; they should be everything."* This epigram of the French soldier may well be a watchword of Democracy. The modern world, as now so often paraphrased from Lincoln, "cannot endure half-slave, half-free," that is, half of it under government "of the people, by the people, for the people," half of it subject to irresponsible oligarchies, parasitic on the "divine right of kings." Wherever arbitrary power exists, it will be used in arbitrary ways. The only antidote to its abuses is to be found in government by the people. This is no instantaneous remedy applied once for all. It is the process of growth. The people must feel their way, learn-

ing from their own mistakes, building their loftier ideals on the wreckage of past hopes.

It matters little what the shortcomings of Democracy are. The essential thing is progress in enlightenment and justice; the way leads through freedom. No people ever had a government better than it deserved. It is a quality of Democracy always to deserve something better. A perfect government would be superfluous. As Goethe once observed, "the best government is that which renders itself unnecessary." The besetting sin of most governments which endeavor to be good is that they attempt too many things the people should do for themselves. The highest duty of a government is to keep the road unobstructed so that each man can make his own way for himself.

Yet it is manifest that the same principles of "Live and Let Live" apply to national and international relations alike. Conquest, monopoly and "cut-throat competition" are just as disas-

* "Les peuples, c'est rien; et ça devrait être tout; une phrase historique vieille de plus d'un siècle."

trous in economic systems as in affairs of state. In Democracy the freedom of the individual is vital, equally so its necessary limitation, non-interference with the liberty of others. The same principle should obtain in financial and commercial relations as well. The freedom for which our fathers contended was freedom of the soul, not unrestrained license to control or oppress, whether through accumulated wealth or wide-ranging combination. By some means Labor must become as free as the wealth it produces, and human life must be as highly cherished as property.

It is certain that the war will bring many changes inside and outside all the various nations. Universal revolution is ahead of us—and maybe universal collapse. Nevertheless, it is to

be hoped that the inevitable upheavals bidding fair to stir society to its depths shall be bloodless, and yet sweep away precisely those institutions which most impede social advance.

Democracy may not necessarily build up great states, but permanent greatness can rest on no other foundation. For the future the people must indeed be everything.

In prophetic words, quoting again from Barbusse: "The thirty million slaves hurled upon one another by guilt and error into the mud of war shall uplift their human faces, revealing the germ of a determining will. The future is in the hands of these slaves. The old world will be cemented some day by the alliance to be built by those whose numbers and whose misery alike are infinite."

Efficient Water Power Development

By Simon Barr

The shock and stress of the war has polarized into reasonable action a number of problems which have for years been stirred by the muddled futility of debate. It seems now that among these will be the decade-old concoction called the water-power question, to which both sides have been adding furiously their bitterest rhetoric in an effort to crystallize a favorable public opinion and favorable legislation. The Ferris bill passed the House, but not the Senate—the Shields bill passed the Senate but has not yet been considered by the House—now the administration is attempting to placate both sides with a compromise bill designed for immediate action. The "interests" will be victorious because the restriction on development implicit under the existing law will be removed and projects may be undertaken at once; the "conservationists" have won in the clause limiting the life of franchise and providing for government operation. Apparently both capital and the public interest have been thus protected.

That capital and national rights be safeguarded is vital—but at least as important is that development should be *efficient*. It affects conservation little if water-power is wasted by

private capital or by government capital—if it is wasted at all by inefficient utilization.

It has been charged by those seeking immediate development of the water resources of the country that "conservationists" have been obstructionists and demagogues whose wilfulness has retarded the growth of the country and caused waste of vast supplies of fuel. It is charged that the restrictive legislation controlling Federal lands which put the power of seizure of a developed water-power property at the whim of a non-responsible official, the Secretary of Interior—and one has exercised that power—has frightened and diverted capital. It is charged that the almost impossible special legislation requisite to a power development on a navigable stream has discouraged promotion. Protagonists of development, like Senator Shields, have predicted that the passage of favorable legislation will result in the early development of 15,000,000 water horse-power and the saving of 100,000,000 tons of coal a year.

The conservationists have warned the people that their last remaining national resource is in danger of being stolen by the financial octopus. They have insisted that the peoples' rights are

paramount—that water-power sites belong to the nation—and that it is better that the power should be lost for a few years during the fight for protective legislation than that it should be forever lost.

The people and their legislators have developed a belief that all that hydro-electric development means is simply letting the water run and collecting the dividends—and, as a New York newspaper expressed it a few weeks ago, “Enough energy to run all the nation’s industries, railroads and mines is still locked up due to differences between private interests and conservationists on the proper terms of development.” Even if this press statement were true, it would be academic because, to say the least, the population and its industries and railroads did not locate themselves for the express purpose of utilizing water-power. As for the deterrent effects of law—no congress on earth could have legislated or can ever legislate the desire for profits out of the soul of capital.

The vision of defenceless capital at the mercy of the predatory state would indeed be harrowing if it were convincing. A very important reason for the repulsion of capital from hydro-electric enterprise is the more prosaic and less dramatic fact that in most cases steam-power is more profitable than water-power. The shyness of capital may perhaps be accounted for to no slight degree by the fact that in the early days of water-power developments it was bitten frequently and severely. Some of the largest plants have never paid dividends. Hydro-electric enterprise of the past has been often a hybrid of mole engineering and wildcat financiering.

Now, however, this dream of alchemy-economics that water may be changed into gold by letting it fall a few feet has been shattered. Now water-power promoters know that hydro-electric development requires three to five times as much capital for initial construction and development as a steam plant of similar capacity. They know that no more than five streams in the whole country can be relied upon for adequate flow at all seasons—and this means the installation of a reserve steam plant. Indeed, the latest practice requires the duplication of the water-power capacity by steam-power. A hydro-electric plant must, at the very outset, be necessarily more fully developed and it must have a prosperous ready market, to defray overhead

costs, while a steam plant may start on a very small scale and grow with the market.

The power site is usually distant from the market and even within the practicable radius of transmission of two hundred miles the maintenance of transmission lines is very expensive and unreliable. Whatever advantage the steam plant has now will surely be increased within a few decades. Technical progress favors the fuel plant with very encouraging promises of greatly increased operating efficiency and greatly decreased operating costs. In the past fifteen years the steady trend to larger generating units and the development of the steam turbine to replace the reciprocating engine have resulted in almost a fifty per cent more efficient utilization of coal. And yet at the present time the best steam plant produces only about fifteen to twenty per cent of the energy available in the coal. On the other hand, the hydro-electric plant is already operating at an efficiency of about ninety per cent. Some water-power sites which were “available” twenty years ago are therefore no longer attractive to capital, and some sites which might be developed now will not be commercially profitable ten years hence.

Whatever has been the more repellent force between capital and water-power, congress or mechanics, the result has been an economic vicious circle. The high cost of promotion in the case of a hydro-electric project remains for many years one of the heaviest of overhead burdens—and unless all other factors are more than favorable, this necessitates a high rate for energy produced. Were bond interest in hydro-electric financing reduced from seven to five per cent the cost of power could, in many plants, be reduced twenty per cent. In the case of a project this may be the margin between a steam plant and a water plant and may determine against water-power. Capital refuses to invest because of difficulty of competing with steam; water-power cannot compete with steam because of the high cost of capital. The present situation is in reality a strike of capital against hydro-electric enterprise—a demand for perpetual franchises in return for a reduction in the price of money. Capital is willing to reduce its wage scale if it is permitted to obtain an unlimited contract on its job.

At the present involved and unstable condition of finance, the effect of favorable legislation in

accelerating hydro-electric development is unpredictable. At the rate of the last fifteen years, all of the less expensive projects would probably be developed by about 1930 or 1940. The passage of the administration bill may make a difference of a few years. Based on low-water flow, there is available for development about 37,000,000 horse-power. The maximum economical development based on six months' power, without the use of auxiliaries such as steam plants or storage of water, amounts to about 63,500,000 horse-power. A widely-approved estimate is 55,000,000 available horse-power. Of this energy, about two-thirds is located in the western areas, most of it on government-owned land—and at present subject to the power of the Secretary of Interior. A large proportion of the remainder is in navigable streams—and subject to the power of Congress. To transfer the power to three cabinet members may cause more rapid development—but to what degree or with what national benefit, cannot be forecast. Congress may legislate away franchises—but not even Congress, not even if it sat continuously, could make a stream flow all the year around.

It should be remembered that in 1912 about eighty per cent of the power developed for public service plants was from steam. Since then water-power plants have been constructed three times as fast as steam plants.

What benefit of conservation may be expected from development may be estimated from the fact that in 1917, of the 27,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy produced by central stations, fully one-half was produced by hydro-electric plants. The coal consumed by the steam central stations is only four per cent of the country's total output. Even if there were immediate water-power development equivalent to ten per cent of the coal production, an equal amount could very easily be saved every year by more careful operation of all furnaces burning coal.

Yet coal *must* be saved and water-power developed. Water-power reproduces itself—coal does not. It is immediate profit economy to use coal—it is national economy to use water-power.

While the West has two-thirds of the water-power possibilities, only one-third of the developed horse-power is located in those states. Yet the western water-powers are over-de-

veloped and confronted by the task of seeking or creating a market. What does the word "available" mean?

That is essentially the water-power problem. It is time that officials, lobbyists and legislators stopped estimating "available" water-power which is being wasted and found out definitely where and how much. Markets must be found and industries located and encouraged. Development must not be a muddle of competing or isolated projects but must follow a national program scientifically planned. An enormous mass of data is already in existence. The industrial and agricultural departments of the railroads, chambers of commerce, public utility companies, municipal and state bureaus—all these have material which could be collated into a program. There are the twelve hundred stream-flow gauging stations of the U. S. Geological Survey. It is time that this thirty years of work became an epic of action rather than a monument of patience.

We have little further need of the conservation of the souvenir post card, the honeymooner and the poet. We have had enough, too, of the conservation of the corporation accelerator, of the national-calamity-howler and of the self-pitying oppressed industry.

Water-power conservation is no work for a licensing bureau run by three cabinet members during odd moments. It is not work for a junketing recess congressional committee or an investigating commission with unlimited powers to make headlines. It is work for a permanent commission of scientists, engineers, public-spirited industrial leaders and publicists—with an adequate scientific staff. Their work must be more than investigation—it must be scientific research, engineering surveying, national vision and vigorous execution.

While the technique of water-power development is naturally and intricately geared to that of inland water-way navigation, it is also vitally meshed into the whole question of conservation of our fuel resources—coal, lumber, oil and natural gas. The problem of hydro-electric development, while it may be incidentally considered by the commission provided for the recently-passed Newlands section of the Rivers and Harbors bill, should be left for study by a commission dealing with the entire problem of fuel conservation. Such an economic sin as the loca-

tion of a huge steam-power plant at Buffalo must not be committed again. In this country we do worse than carry coal to Newcastle—we carry it to Niagara Falls.

Only by such a commission can capital be protected and the public welfare safeguarded—and only by such a commission can the resources of the country be efficiently developed.

Teachers and Democracy

By Benjamin Glassberg

In the Middle Ages, when the craft guilds were in control of industry, they punished severely any infringement of the rules they laid down. Should a hat-maker, for instance, desire to turn out woolen hats slightly mixed with silk so as to improve the quality, his goods would be forfeited just as surely as if he had attempted to make his hats of a poorer grade of material. The punishment for any improvement or any deviation from the rigid rules laid down by the guild was bound to result in the confiscation of the innovator's stock of goods. Needless to say, no improvements or inventions in industry appeared for centuries.

Modern industry represents a totally different attitude towards change. The inventor with us is encouraged and rewarded. Our industrial processes are changing constantly. We are daily decreasing the expenditure of human effort and are producing more and more efficiently.

Our educational system, however, part and parcel of the modern world, still looks upon the innovator, the critic, the inventor, in the same light as the guilds did in the Middle Ages. At present one of the surest ways of earning promotion in the school system is to worship the existing educational machine, to swear by it as the last word in educational progress. The man who is dissatisfied with the waste and inefficiency of our schools, the man who has an improvement to suggest, a new plan to urge, will very often be penalized for his pains. Punishment for attempting to increase the efficiency of the schools may seem very strange to the layman and yet it is almost universal in the school system.

Our schools in the last fifteen years have been subjected to untold criticism and self-examination. Dissatisfaction with the courses of study has developed and very often they were found to be woefully archaic. On the other hand, many have blamed our educational ills upon the con-

trol exercised over boards of education by political bodies. But one of the vital sore spots in the schools has quite generally been overlooked, namely, the repression of criticism and of attempts at improvement on the part of those best equipped for the realization of the faults in our schools, namely, the teachers. This point must be properly understood, for as long as such a condition exists, just so long will our schools fail to make any improvement. We may modernize our curricula; we may elect the boards of education; we may give them independent financial powers but if teachers are deprived of the possibility of taking a deep personal interest in the schools, as they are at present, all attempts at reform must remain fruitless.

It is very hard to realize what a calamity the average public school teacher has become. Not that society wants him to be. But the teacher quickly realizes that unless he is working with the machine, that unless he agrees with his principal's opinions, the superintendent's theories, and the board of education's vagaries, not only is the avenue of advancement closed, but his tenure may be at stake and his entire professional life made most unhappy. In many cities, teachers' tenure is uncertain, especially where the system of annual election is employed. It was the use of this system that enabled the Chicago School Board to discharge thirty-eight teachers, all of whom had been rated "Excellent" or "Very Good" by the superintendent of schools, because the teachers insisted on remaining members of the Federation that had aroused the enmity of the school board through its deep interest in civic betterment. In the schools of New York City where the teachers' tenure is fairly secure, the teachers' annual increase in salary is practically dependent upon the principal's ratings. Although these ratings differ with each principal and so there are probably five hundred or more stand-

ards used, a powerful club is thus placed in the hands of the principals with which to secure absolute adherence to the status quo. "What will my principal say?" is the first thought that is constantly in the mind of every teacher, whether it be when desiring to protest against some unnecessary practice or to subscribe to a progressive educational journal frowned upon by the superior officials.

Is it surprising, therefore, that Professor MacMurray, a member of the Hanus Committee, which investigated the New York City schools several years ago, declared that one of the besetting evils of the public school system was the general lack of initiative among the teachers?

The teacher in a large system resembles the private in the army in many respects. He is told what to do and is rated on how well he does it. On the annual renewal blank for teachers in New York City, the ability to interpret and carry out orders heads the list of the necessary qualifications of a good teacher. Teachers "are expected to," "are required to," are even "hereby ordered to remove their hats when entering the school building." Teachers are not expected to criticize a superior. There is no machinery provided whereby a teacher may bring charges of inefficiency against a superior. A teacher protesting in the public press against a certain policy of the Board of Education was immediately fined eighteen hundred dollars. A district superintendent of schools in addressing a gathering of several hundred teachers well typified what was expected of the teacher: "When I receive an order from my superior," he said, "this is my attitude," assuming the posture of a private saluting his superior.

It is rather refreshing to note the attitude of the London School Board in this respect. In a circular issued to the teachers, there is this paragraph: "The only uniformity of practice that the Board of Education desires to see is that each teacher shall think for himself and work out for himself such methods of teaching as may employ his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and conditions of the school."

Courses of study are generally made by the superintendents. Teachers are required to teach the courses of study furnished them. They have absolutely no share in making them. There is no provision made for turning to the advantage

of the schools and of the children the experiences of the teachers, nor is any real effort made to secure their intelligent cooperation, although this is necessary to the success of an experiment. Such a system, it is clear, is wasteful and inimical to the welfare of the boys and girls, as well as to the teachers. It readily accounts for the fact that teacher after teacher coming to school with zest and enthusiasm, in a few years is saying, "What's the use?" and settling down to a dull monotonous grind.

Dr. Leonard P. Ayres of the Russell Sage Foundation, in the testimony before the Committee on Education of the Chicago City Council, pointed out the viciousness of such a system. He urged that teachers should have a direct share in the making of courses of study. He admitted that while the results may be no better than those turned out by the superintendents working alone, nevertheless, the process will be enormously favorable to the teachers. "When the work is done, they have the personal interest in the course of study and feel that it is their product. They respect it and believe in it. This is the way that team work is developed in a school system. The schools may be run efficiently by edict, but that method does not build up a progressive and virile organization."

Both Superintendents Spaulding of Cleveland and Chadsey of Detroit hold similar views. The latter maintains that it is ridiculous to assume that a superintendent is in any position whatever to prepare the course of study for the teachers to work by. "The teachers," he believes, "are in a position to contribute much more to this course of study than any supervisory officer, no matter how much of an expert he may be in theory. Teachers are day by day working with the course of study and working with the pupils and can see the limitations in a way that the officer cannot. There certainly should be a free opportunity for the teachers' experience to go to the service of the schools."

Such opinions are hopeful contrasts to the prevailing practice. If the public could only realize the enormous waste resulting from this blind refusal to make use of the teachers' experience in order to improve this most important factor in the life of our children, it would rise over night and demand instant reform.

Agitation carried on by teachers in various cities of the United States has dwelt on certain

definite demands. First and foremost, there must be permanency of tenure, based on meritorious service, following a probationary period. Tenure should not depend upon the whim of members of a school board. The system of rating professional people as if they they were children is ridiculous and should be abandoned. This would do more than anything else to revitalize our school teachers. Freed of the dreaded rating of a principal they would be able to think freely and express themselves freely. They would then be better fitted to promote a proper manhood and womanhood among our children and instill in them the virtues of independence and self-reliance. To expect teachers shorn of all feeling of independence and self-reliance to do so at present is amusing.

Teachers should be granted a direct share in the drawing up of courses of study, in the selection of principals and superintendents and in the determination of school policies. Teachers should not be treated as factory operatives, but as partners in the great work of education.

The important positions in the school system should be filled on the basis of merit instead of friendship. And finally, every effort should be made to develop initiative among the teachers by openly encouraging criticism and suggestions for improvement.

These ideas are beginning to take hold. In several cities such as Minneapolis and Boston, the realization that teachers should be encouraged to serve the schools in their fullest capacity has resulted in the formation of Teachers' Councils. Superintendent Spaulding acknowledges that the council in Minneapolis has been a definite help to the administration. Superintendent Dyer of Boston is convinced that the several grade councils are productive of good and "their work is more and more forming the basis of our educational progress." He believes that they should be definitely organized, "for these teachers' councils will form the next step in the evolution of a system which should offer opportunity for individual initiative and expression, and give to teachers a large participation in educational procedure."

The Committee on Schools of the Chicago City Council, after a thorough investigation of the schools recommended that there be established a Teachers' Council to aid in the solution of school problems.

The latest advance towards the democratization of our school system is to be found again in Minneapolis. Upon the resignation of Superintendent Spaulding, the Board of Education wrote to each teacher requesting a frank expression of opinion as to whom they thought best fitted for the city superintendency. The teachers were asked to give definite reasons for the choice they made and were not required to sign their names, so that each one would feel perfectly free to express a candid opinion. Ninety per cent of the teachers agreed on one man and the Board of Education elected him Superintendent. And so with scarcely a stir or ripple on the smooth waters of the educational world, what has been regarded as some far-distant Utopia, is a reality.

These reforms are the beacon lights pointing the way to a better day. They must cease being the exceptions, however, and become the rule. Then only will our educational system be in fact, as it now is in theory, a democratic and efficient institution for the great work of developing a corps of resourceful, self-reliant teachers and a body of fully developed, thinking boys and girls.

RELATED THINGS

Monarchs as Reformers

Leo Tolstoy said shortly after the accession of Nicholas II that if the new Czar were to ask him what policy to pursue he would tell him, first to free the land through the singletax, and then abdicate. Throughout history there have occasionally been despots who wished to carry out at least the first part of Tolstoy's advice. And they failed. They did not realize that absolute monarchy is but an instrument to advance special interests. A supposed despot who turns against these interests runs a risk similar to what would be incurred by an American political boss if he failed to do the bidding of the plunderbund which gives him power.

New examples of ancient sages are being continually discovered who realized that in land value taxation lies an easy solution of economic problems. Perhaps the most ancient of these, so far known, was the Caliph Ali, cousin and son-in-

law of Mahomet, the founder of Islam. Irving and other historians bear witness to the good qualities and progressive disposition of this ruler. He was said to be the first Caliph to encourage literature, and thus give offense to that spirit of bigotry which had led his ignorant predecessor, Omar, to decree destruction of the Alexandrian library on the ground that if the books therein contravened the Koran they were vicious, and if they did not, the Koran was enough without them. It was only natural that the spirit of reform which caused Ali to break with this superstition should have led him to progress in other fields. There is evidence of this in an Arabic work translated by Professor P. Kauri Hitti of Columbia University, under the title of "The Origin of the Islamic State." Therein we learn that Ali forbade taxation of things produced, and ordered furthermore that assessments should be made "according to the nearness and distance of the land from the markets and the drinking places in the river." That is, according to natural conditions which made the land more or less valuable. It is easy to understand why Ali's short reign of five years, from 655 to 660, was troubled by powerful rivals and that he fell a victim to a murderous religious fanatic.

In an article on "The Forerunners of Henry George," in "The Single Tax Year Book," Samuel Milliken tells of Charles III of Spain, who reigned from 1759 until 1788, and intended to apply the singletax, but was stopped before he could go as far as he wished. The privileged interests realized their danger and took action in time.

Joseph II of Austria, who succeeded to the throne in 1780, was another monarch who tried to devote his monarchical power to the public good. He made the mistake of taking seriously his supposed authority as an autocrat. Declaring in effect that a prince must not treat his dominions as his private property, but as a trust committed to him, he began to apply radical reforms heedless of the protests and objections of the real rulers. He began by abolishing serfdom in Bohemia and Galicia. Then he abolished capital punishment throughout his dominions, except for treason, put an end to censorship of the press and repealed all laws relating to witchcraft. He established religious tolerance. Non-Catholics were allowed for the first time to maintain their own churches and schools. Pastors of all Chris-

tian sects were instructed to teach their flocks that the Jews were fellow-citizens. Furthermore, Jews were allowed to send their children to Christian schools and to enter certain trades formerly closed to them. The distinguishing dress, which they had been compelled to wear, was abolished. Among other reforms were abolition of primogeniture, making of marriage a civil contract, putting illegitimate children on an equality with legitimate and enforcing equality of ceremonies at funerals.

His greatest reform was in regard to the land. Among the largest landowners were the cloisters and monasteries. Concerning their holdings a writer, quoted by Dr. Franz Martin Mayer in his *Geschichte Oesterreichs*, says:

"The great estates swallowed the small. The labor of serfs supplanted free labor, and the farm population diminished in number and strength. The records of the time are filled with complaints concerning the impoverishment of landowners, the decay of farming, the lack of capital and labor."

Joseph closed these institutions and forbade an appeal to Rome. He ordered a survey of all land in his German dominions and abolished feudal distinctions and manorial rights. His application of the singletax, although a tremendous step forward, would not be regarded as entirely satisfactory by followers of Henry George. By arbitrary decree, rents were limited to 30 per cent. of the net product. Of this 12 2/9 per cent. was appropriated for public revenue, and the rest the landlord might retain.

Joseph's progressivism stopped short when he encountered the protective tariff, although he established free trade within his dominions. Closing all provincial customs houses, he levied prohibitive duties on foreign imports. In short, he was a protectionist with the courage of his convictions, one who would not raise public revenue by admitting foreign pauper products to compete with well-paid Austrian labor.

A tory opinion concerning his land reforms is worth quoting, since it is the galled jade that winces. An English historian, Archdeacon William Coxe, thus relieves his feelings:

"Justice must condemn the mode of proceeding because sufficient precautions were not taken to indemnify the landholders for the loss they sustained, and because the land tax was raised in some instances to the enormous amount of 60

per cent. Hence, this decree failed of producing the effects which the monarch designed, and prevented the introduction of the same regulations into Hungary and the annexed provinces." The same historian also finds fault with the decree validating civil marriages and the humane one, safeguarding the rights of illegitimate children.

If a clerical writer of a later generation and distant nation could thus find fault, it is easy to imagine the storm of indignation that arose at home. Although his reforms were upheld by the Bishop of Königgratz, the great body of prelates opposed. Among these were the Archbishop of Vienna and the Primate of Hungary. Pope Pius VI paid a personal visit to protest, in vain, against the expropriation of the religious orders. Of course, the nobility were largely disaffected, while the clergy took care of the common people. Nevertheless, Joseph determined to extend his reforms into Flanders and Hungary. The attempt ended in disaster. Open rebellion resulted, and the Emperor, sick and disheartened, no longer able to withstand opposition, reluctantly rescinded all of his reforms except the liberation of the serfs. "I know my people do not love me," is said to have been his distressed comment. He died a few weeks later. His reign had lasted less than ten years. Even if it were true that the people had been misled into dislike during his life-time, it is certain that they realized later that he was worthy of kindlier feeling. They had good cause to compare their state under his reactionary successors with what he had aimed to do for them, and conferred upon him the affectionate title of "Peasants' Emperor" (Bauernkaiser).

There is no reason why democrats should regret the failures of these benevolent despots, even though one would wish that they had been spared disappointment and pain. The benevolent despot strengthens despotic institutions, even as organized charity upholds established injustice, or the kind and humane slave-owners constituted the strongest defense of chattel slavery. The people must learn that even with a benevolent despot on the throne, despotism cannot do for them what they might do for themselves. Nor does it matter if the despot's power should be economic rather than political, and if he be nominally a plain citizen instead of a crowned monarch. It has been said in criticism of Joseph II that he tried to advance too quickly, and might

have accomplished more had he hastened less. Yet he had no assurance that his successor would continue his policy. What would not be accomplished during his life-time, under the monarchical system he knew might not be accomplished at all. Haste was absolutely necessary in spite of its dangers. Permanent reform can come through democracy only.

CORRESPONDENCE

Business Leadership

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

My attention has been called to an interesting pamphlet, "The Meaning of Business," arguing for loyalty to the Economic Law as the safe program.

While I am in sympathy with much of its purpose, some of its features call for criticism. I make them from the viewpoint of a confirmed believer in the taxation of land values as one of the most effective methods of preventing monopoly exploitation of the consumer, and relieving business from the burden of an unjust taxation; and I write as a convinced advocate of government ownership of railroads and of municipal ownership of all public utilities, as a result of my practical experience in financing and of executive relationship to the management of railroads. My convictions with reference to the injury of monopolies, therefore, make me differ from the writer in some of his assertions.

For instance, when he says: "Land is given to the individual in order to make it productive," it is not at all in accordance with the legal basis for the private ownership of land; which is given by will or purchase to individuals with no limitation as to doing what they will with it. In many cases they prevent it from being productive by either withdrawing it from the market for speculative reasons, or asking a price for its use quite beyond its productive value. When he says: "A man can become rich only by helping and not by hurting others," he ignores very much of present industrial and business life. The sweating system and opposition to unions and many other methods work, and are meant to work, to keep the laboring class under and limit their desires and pleasures, and as a result, to accumulate undue returns to capital and brain power. I recall an acquaintance of mine, a man of high standing with his associates, and of fine temper in his own general thought, and with active religious relations, once said in connection with a strike of coal miners: "Never mind, when they draw in two more holes on their belts they will come to time and accept our terms."

I am rather surprised that this pamphlet ignores the human point of view as regards payment of wages, and stresses what is called economic law to so great an extent.

I think the world is on the eve of an entirely new

adjudgment of the whole question of production of wealth and its distribution, and I believe, to be really influential at the present time, writers on business will have to get the point of view of the human need—how much does a man need for his family to eat and drink, and wear, and what schooling and pleasurable opportunity do they need, and what kind of housing and plumbing and furniture do they need to be influential citizens of a democratic republic and to grow from generation to generation into the larger stature of humanity?

I think any assumed economic law will have to be put aside by the united action of the people who are suffering, and that all laws which give privileges to individuals or corporations, particularly the laws of inheritance, will have to be modified to say the least. I am also quite clear that if the leaders of business and thought in the United States do not endeavor to work sympathetically with this newer point of view then there is more risk than we realize, that the damping up of the tide of human feeling will result in a revolution which will bring great damage before the betterment can result.

The true program for business leaders is to consider the human need, and develop the productive capacity on that basis and within the lines it will mark out.

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

A Call to Liberals

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In the article entitled, "A Call to Liberals" in THE PUBLIC for January 25, 1918, on page 102, line 8, you refer to scientific management in such a way as to make it appear one of the tools of oppression of industrial autocracy, with the inference that it must be junked along with the others. I feel that you write as you do because you do not know what scientific management is.

In the first place, we must have management. Without it no industry could operate. This seems to be axiomatic. This management may be autocratic, which it is at the present time, or it may be democratic, as our socialist friends would have it. Again you may divide management. It may be "rule of thumb," which most management is now, or it may be "scientific," as it is with some of the more advanced concerns. Are you going to deny us the enormous benefits possible by applying science to management?

You would open land to the people, unloose unnatural restrictions to trade and industry, allow the free flow of commerce, open up natural resources, and establish economic as well as political justice on earth. Fine! Wonderful! I am with you with all my heart. Production will increase. Industry will be mightily stimulated. Monopoly will no longer exact its toll. We can, therefore, earn our support in fewer hours and have more time for the higher things of life.

In regard to this the aims and accomplishments of scientific management are identical with those of the singletax. It aims at greater production per hour

for the worker, with due regard to proper health conditions, routing of materials, planning and arrangement of work, and all the dozens of details which may help or hinder the worker. A higher remuneration is paid the worker according to his increased productivity. The job of the scientific manager is not, as some would make us believe, to stand over the worker with a stop watch in one hand and a club in the other. If there are a given number of men making shirts, we can't have more shirts unless they make more. They can make more either by working longer or managing better. There are crooks in this business as there are everywhere, and they may debase their science by exploiting the worker, but don't condemn the whole thing because of the crooks.

EDWARD L. LINCOLN.

Portland, Me.

"Capital"

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

May I reply shortly to the interesting letter from Mr. W. H. Kaufman in your issue of February 22nd? The slight difference between us seems to turn on the Marxian versus the "usual" definition of capital, which I assumed in my review of Liebknecht's book. Having reached the singletax platform by way of Marxian Socialism, I may be permitted to explain that it was just the definition of capital as given in Mr. Kaufman's quotation from Marx that estranged me from the philosophy of Socialism. "Capital signifies the means of production monopolized by a certain part of society." Does there not here lurk an ambiguity in the significance of the word "means"? It seems as though intended to do duty for two incompatible things, i. e., the natural elements *in* which all work must be done, and the tools or instruments *by* which wealth is produced. The former is simply the given set of conditions, or what in economics we call land or natural resources; while the latter alone is what may properly be described as capital. It is surely just here that the theory of Socialism becomes vague and loses that sharpness of definition that is necessary to a science of economics. It can only have been through an unfortunate fusing together in thought of these two distinct and different factors in production, land and capital, that Marx fell into the strange error of affirming of capital what can only be said truly of land, that "it is not a thing, but a social relation between persons." Capital, according to the most reputable economists, and in the judgment of common-sense, is a very definite "thing"; it is "that portion of wealth that is reserved as an aid to the production of more wealth."

We are all agreed that natural resources may be and are monopolized, but the question before us is as to whether the tools or instruments of production are capable in the same way of being made the subjects of monopoly. My opinion, of course, is that such monopoly is impossible, and the immense progress made by the cooperative movement in Britain with its hundreds of thousands of wage-earning shareholders, af-

fords ample proof that even large-scale production with complex modern machinery is not conditioned upon the possession of what we erroneously call wealth, but which should be described as money. In the absence of monopoly in natural resources, capital is an aid to production, and will, I believe, always be a friend to liberty. Capital can become a menace to liberty only when it has anchored itself to land, and then only because it has identified itself with the only real monopoly, the monopoly of opportunity.

I cordially agree with the implications of Mr. Kaufman's last paragraph, that if Marx had entitled his great work "Private Monopoly" instead of "Das Kapital," Socialism and that form of liberalism that finds its expression in singletax doctrine, would long ago have discovered their common standing-ground, and have won the world. It is a matter for sincere satisfaction that the gap between them is now closing up, and that we are disposed to concentrate on our agreements rather than on our differences.

ALEX MACKENDRICK.

Boston, Mass.

Beef Trust Disclosures

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

In THE PUBLIC of February 1st there appeared an article in the editorial column entitled, "Disclosures Concerning the Beef Trust."

Mr. Lewis F. Swift, president of Swift & Company, on February 8th issued a denial, in so far as Swift & Company are concerned, that the packers were hoarding hides. Mr. Swift's statement follows:

"As a result of the recent report of the Federal Trade Commission, the impression has gone out that the packers are illegitimately hoarding hides. The packers are hoarding hides just about the way Chicago has been hoarding snow, and just as the congested freight districts around New York have been hoarding shipments.

The Trade Commission states that stocks of hides increased about one-half from January 31, 1916, to July 31, 1917. The number of cattle killed in inspected houses during the three months preceding the later date was 22 per cent greater than the number killed during the three months preceding the earlier date. This largely accounts for the increase in holdings.

While the supply of hides was larger than usual, the domestic demand for leather did not increase accordingly, except for heavy leathers utilized in army shoes. England's embargo also cut off a large part of our foreign trade. In spite of these facts Swift & Company sold 20 per cent more hides during 1917 than during 1916. It does not look as though Swift & Company has been unduly hoarding hides, and this undoubtedly applies to the other packers."

Hide and Leather is a recognized authoritative trade paper in the industry. Please note their opin-

ion regarding the hoarding of hides, as expressed in an editorial of February 2nd, copy enclosed.

Swift & Company were given no opportunity to furnish any evidence before the hide hoarding report was sent to Congress, and we feel, in justice to us, that you will be willing to print Mr. Swift's statement in an early issue of your paper.

L. D. H. WELD, Manager,

Commercial Research Department, Swift & Co., Chicago.

Germany and Revolution

To the Editor of THE PUBLIC:

I was much interested in the article by John Willis Slaughter entitled "Germany and Revolution" in your issue of Feb. 16, but shortly after reading it got hold of a U. S. publication, No. 3 in their War Information Series entitled "The Government of Germany," by Professor Hazen, and find the two do not agree on the powers of the Reichstag.

Mr. Slaughter states on page 204 that the Emperor's power in domestic affairs is but little and the representatives' great, while Professor Hazen, on pages 7 and 8, says the members of that body describe it as a "hall of echoes" and tells why the description is accurate.

As I have been accustomed to take statements of fact in THE PUBLIC at face value, and can't believe our government would sponsor inaccurate statements in such a series, I want to suggest that you go into the matter a little further and see who is mistaken.

J. E. JAMISON.

Burlington, Iowa.

BOOKS

A Study in Rural Sociology

Rural Sociology. By Paul L. Vogt. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1917. Price \$2.50 net.

Poets and idealists have so long treasured the idea that cities were man-made, and the country God-made, that people have been slow to realize there was a social problem in rural life. They have been so accustomed to hearing of the poverty and misery of the slum that they were slow to grasp the fact of the spiritual poverty of the farm and small village. But the facts have been slowly making their way. Investigators have left no room for doubt.

It has at last come to be realized that the slum problem is not a local question to be solved by social settlements, visiting nurses, school lunches, or any other means, however good in itself; but that it is a race question to be met only by restoring man's adjustment to natural conditions. Still the mass of people were slow to apply this to the country. It was only after trained minds had marshalled an array

of facts not to be gainsaid that rural sociology became a serious question in the public mind.

It is doubtful if any one has given a more comprehensive statement of the case than Professor Vogt. With the thoroughness of the scientist he has marshalled the factors; and with the zeal of a man filled with his subject, he tells his story in a way that is fascinating. So careful, indeed, has he been in maintaining a judicial poise, and so impartial in presenting his case, that some of his readers may regret that he was not more of an advocate, and so present them with conclusions already drawn. Others, however, those who are capable of a little independent thought, will be thankful for this restraint on the part of the author; for they will realize that by leaving such a subject, for instance, as the land question, without the positive decision of final judgment he has by that very act disarmed his opponent, and made inevitable a sound conclusion.

The book is by no means a mere treatise on the land question, but a full and unbiased presentation of country life as a whole, economically, socially, religiously, politically, morally, culturally considered. Yet to one who has grasped the obvious meaning of the chapter on "The Land Question" there is no escape from the conclusion that the whole problem of rural sociology hinges upon a correct solution of that question.

Professor Vogt shows how social life on the farm has been retarded in its development by isolation. Closer relations were prevented by lack of good roads, and by the spirit of speculation that has caused men to hold much land, rather than till a little well. Good roads in new and sparsely settled territories were impossible because of the relatively high cost per capita. As population increased, the original settlers began moving to neighboring villages and towns, and their places were taken by tenants. The increasing land values that should have gone to road building, and other public services, went to the support of petty landlords. This tended to impoverish the spiritual life of both farm and village. Tenants lacked the incentive of owners in the upbuilding of the community. Not only were the roads bad, but the schools were poor, the churches inferior, and the social advantages generally far less than they should have been.

But the problem has been recognized. The factors are being isolated, analyzed and tabulated, and the public will not rest till the solution is found, and the remedy applied. Action will be hastened because of the interest generated by the world's demand for food. Professor Vogt's contribution toward the solution of the problem comes at a time when the farmer is second only to the soldier in point of popular interest. His needs are being made articulate by the granges, and the people of the city are disposed to listen. When each comes to recognize the needs of the other both will be disposed to act.

It is now apparent that much delay in coming to a solution of the social problem has been due to the ignorance or cupidity of politicians who have played

town and country against each other. The careful and unbiased work of Professor Vogt will do much to remove this antagonism. It is to be regretted that admission to Congress or a State legislature cannot be made dependent upon a careful reading of "Rural Sociology."
S. C.

A Record of Political Progress

State Government in the United States. By Arthur N. Holcombe. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. Price \$2.25.

A survey of State governments from their foundation until the present day is presented in a thorough and impartial manner. Professor Holcombe enables us to compare political conditions of the present with those of revolutionary times, and makes clear beyond question that our State governments today, with all their shortcomings, are far more democratic than when the thirteen commonwealths joined to form the United States. Our institutions fall far short of the standards of democracy proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, but they come nearer to doing so than did the laws of the States during and immediately after the revolutionary period. There is still room for the complaint, for instance, that separation of church and state is not as complete as it should or will be until the American Secular Union's "Nine Demands of Liberalism" shall be granted. But we have nevertheless progressed since the close of the revolution, when there was an established church in Virginia, Maryland and the Carolinas, and religious tests were required for voting in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maryland, Vermont and Pennsylvania.

Professor Holcombe's review of conditions at the foundation of our Government enables us to realize that the measure of democracy we have now would have been considered then utopian and impracticable. Some States required heavy property qualifications for membership in the legislature, and to some extent for the right of suffrage. To get manhood suffrage, as we now have it, took years of post-revolutionary agitation. Delaware is the only State today which excludes the people from voting directly on proposed constitutional amendments. But originally this was not so exceptional.

That the quality of government has not suffered from removal of restrictions is apparent. Professor Holcombe finds little difference in quality between the government of New York and Ohio, where manhood suffrage prevails, and of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, where an educational and a poll tax qualification are respectively required. In regard to woman suffrage he is inclined to agree with an observer who declares it to be "a step in the direction of a better citizenship, a more effective use of the ability of women as an integral part of the race, and a closer understanding between men and women."

Professor Holcombe discusses in an equally friendly spirit all the democratic reforms which have been introduced during recent years. He speaks favorably of the

working of the initiative and referendum, the recall, recall of judicial decisions, municipal home rule, the short ballot, preferential vote, direct nominations, and other measures that make popular government efficient.

In the concluding part he discusses further reforms in State government. Three different plans are considered: The Commission plan, the Socialist plan, and the Oregon plan. He finds something worth while in each, but accepts none as a whole. As an interesting and accurate history of political progress in the United States, the book deserves high commendation. The facts it presents are such as to encourage progressive workers in any line requiring political action. It shows that the American people have not hesitated in the past to adopt sweeping reforms, and may be depended upon, if sufficiently informed, to continue the same pace.

* *

The Story Book of Science. By Jean Henri Fabre. Translated by Constance Bicknell. Published by the Century Co., New York. Price \$2.00 net.

Old Ambroisine has the care of the house; old Jacques, her husband, looks after the animals and potters around the fields. Then come the three children, Claire (twelve years old), Jules (ten) and Emile, the baby of bumps, torn fingers for sympathy, and berry smears! And Uncle Paul, who tells the wonderful stories to the other five!

This is the setting, and indicates the method Fabre has employed in "The Story Book of Science," which has run through nineteen editions in France and will, it is hoped, have the same popularity in this country.

"Compared with truth," Uncle Paul is made to say in the first chapter, "fiction is but a pitiful trifle; for the former is the work of God, the latter the dream of man." "Mother Ambroisine could not," he continues, turning to the children, "interest you with the ant that broke its leg in trying to cross the ice. Shall I be more fortunate? Who wants to hear a true story of real ants?" "I! I!" the children cry and gather round to listen about the building of the ants' city, about the ants' cows, and the ants' sheepfold. In all, there are eighty stories in the volume, stories about the metals under the earth, the plants and animals on the surface, and the planets in the sky. Taken in small doses, as all books of stories should be taken, they make fascinating reading. Maeterlinck called Fabre "the insects' Homer," and certainly in giving Uncle Paul and his stories to the young Americans he will make them his friends as he has made the children of France.

* *

Primer for Voters. New York Edition. Compiled by Martha G. Stapler. Published by National Woman Suffrage Publishing Co., New York. Price, paper, 25 cents. (Pamphlet.)

This little booklet of 50 pages gives in plain and simple language the information every voter should have before going to the polls. It is creditable to the new voters that their organization should have taken this practical step in preparing them for the exercise of the franchise. The primer can be read with profit by men as well as by women.

The Man at the Wheel

(With Respects to Senator Chamberlain)

What shall we do

When the vessel is laboring hard,
When the tempest is tearing her topsails to tatters,
When her timbers creak, every mast and yard
Strained to breaking, when the big sea batters
Sharp on her bows, snatching boat after boat,
Sweeping her decks and setting the ward-room afloat—

When the wind's at its worst and the wave,

And all depends on the crew,—

If the seamen sulk and the officers rave,
And, sinking all care for the common weal,
Curse and cumber the man at the wheel?

What shall be done,

When the ship rides out through the lanes
Where the U-boats lurk and the set-mines tug at their
chains,

When out of the steel-cold fog, any hour,

A steel-gray dreadnaught may lower,

And the great shells shatter

Turret and pilot-house and signal-tower,
Tear her sides out and over the ruins spatter

Remnants of men and the things that are dear to men,—

What shall be done, what shall be done

If then, if then

Those who are set over powder and gun,

Those whose first duty it is to be leal,

Vials of mutinous venom unseal

And curse and cumber the man at the wheel?

The yard-arm no longer! A nation's contempt be
enough,

And thank God we are most of us not of such stuff;

But resolve that this shall be done:

Every loyal mother's son

Remember the law of ships,

Set a lock on caviling lips,

But be ready with voice and hand to stand by,

Keen for service, humble or high,

Heaving the lead or hauling a guy,

And for the rest, keep out of the way

Of the officer of the day;

Pray as we will, but put our trust

As we may and must,

In him who rules from topmast to keel,—

Trust and succor the Man at the Wheel.

WILLIAM HERBERT CARRUTH.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Week Ending March 5

Congressional Doings

The House passed, by a vote of 337 to 6, on February 28, the Railroad Control bill, amended to return the roads to the corporations within two years after the war. The six opposed were Gordon of Ohio, Thomas of Kentucky, Dennis of Illinois, Chandler of Oklahoma, and Haugen and Ramseyer of Iowa. As passed, the bill confers supreme rate fixing power upon the

President. It was sent, on passage, to the Conference Committee. [See current volume page 280.]

* *

The Administration's war finance bill was amended in the Senate on March 1, so as to forbid any of its directors to be at the same time active directors of any other corporation. Another amendment adopted on March 2, allows loans to be made to individuals as well as to corporations.

* *

The President signed, on March 1, the Emergency Fleet Corporation Housing bill, appropriating \$50,000,000 to promote housing for shipyard employes. A corporation is to be formed with power to commandeer and to build houses in the neighborhood of shipyards. The first procedure will be to seize vacant houses and then boarding houses and hotels, the proprietors of which have raised prices.

The Stockyards Investigation

At the examination before Judge Alschuler, on February 26, John E. O'Hern, general superintendent for Armour & Co., said that an eight-hour day would not reduce the output, but his concern objected to it on account of the extra pay for overtime that it would entail. Francis J. Heney of the Federal Trade Commission stated that the packers are represented in the Food Administration by W. F. Priebe of Chicago, reputed to be an independent butter and egg dealer, but in fact, he alleged, his business is owned by Swift & Co. J. F. Hoban of Carrollton, Mo., a former business partner of Priebe, corroborated Mr. Heney and declared in addition that unless protected by the Government, his business would now be wrecked by the packers in revenge for his testimony. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, made an appeal on February 28 to the arbitrator for the eight-hour day declaring that it will help the war by increasing production and mobilizing the good will of the men. On March 1, Mr. Heney had read into the records letters taken from the files of the packing companies, which he claimed, showed that the National Food Administration, through Mark L. Requa, assistant to Mr. Hoover, had proposed giving the packers a regulated monopoly, and that the packers had urged instead a system of licensing retail dealers through which many retailers might be eliminated. The letter also showed that when inexperienced government inspectors rejected meat it was sent through a second time and usually passed. Another letter claimed that J. P. Cotton of the Food Administration had given advance information of the intention of the Allied governments to buy in the United States instead of in Argentina, and that this enabled the packers to buy in the open market and hold for a higher price.

* *

An appeal to Congress for a special act to lay bare the files of the meat packers, was made by Francis J. Heney, on February 28. He charged that Henry Veeder, counsel for the packers, is still custodian of papers

"which have been used as instrumentalities in the commission of felonies." The appeal is made because the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals has forbidden the making of a search authorized by Judge Landis.

Nevada Woman for the Senate

Miss Anne Martin, vice-chairman of the National Woman's party, publicly announced on March 3 her candidacy for the United States senatorship from Nevada to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Newlands. Miss Martin, in her announcement, declares this a time when the nation should attest its faith in democracy, and that justice demands that women have a voice in solving the crucial problems facing us. She then states:

Concretely, there are among others four problems which I have long studied in Nevada, and through which I believe I could at this time serve my State and nation.

They are the development of the land in the interests of the people, the conservation of water, the elimination of long established railway discrimination against Nevada in freight rates, and the protection by Federal agencies of seasonal farm labor and its transfer from region to region in the interest of both the farmer and the laborer. . . .

The next step forward is to win for women a place in our highest legislative body. If I win that place I will do all I can to guard and further the interests of women. I will try to make good my claim that women in government will benefit all groups of citizens, and I shall endeavor to voice and effectively realize the deep desire of women to give their best service toward the successful ending of the war and the establishment of a final, just, and liberal peace.

Mooney Sentence Affirmed

The Supreme Court of California upheld on March 1 the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney of murder in the first degree on the charge of complicity in bomb-throwing at the preparedness parade in San Francisco. The Court held that it could not act on questions relating to evidence, but only on legal points. It therefore ignored the evidence of a frameup and the report of the Federal Labor Commission recommending a new trial. Attorneys for Mooney announced that they would apply for a rehearing. If denied then only Governor Stephens can prevent execution of the sentence. The Governor said that he had received a telegram concerning the matter from President Wilson, but refused to disclose its contents. [See vol. xx, p. 917.]

Russia

More confusing and perplexing than ever before are the dispatches from Petrograd. Reports that the German ultimatum as to peace terms will be signed by the Russians, that peace will be restored, and that the nation will fight to the death come from various sources at the same time. The announcement in Petrograd that a peace treaty had been signed at Brest-

Litovsk on the 3d is said to have stupefied the people. Members of the Government denounced the treaty signed under duress as a "scrap of paper." The Petrograd Pan-Soviet Executive Council has called an extraordinary session of soldiers, peasants and Cossacks to meet in Moscow on March 12 to decide whether to accept or reject the peace. It appears to be recognized that Russia cannot carry on open warfare against Germany, but Bolshevik leaders declare they will conduct a guerilla warfare. All news is so confused and indefinite that little is known of the real situation. [See current volume, page 281.]

Belgium

Baron de Broqueville, Belgian Foreign Minister, says in response to Chancellor Hertling's speech that Belgium will make peace only upon the terms announced December 24:

The integrity of the metropolitan and colonial territory; political, economic and military independence, without condition or restriction; reparation for damages and guarantees against repetition of the aggression of 1914 are the indispensable conditions for a just peace as far as Belgium is concerned.

The Belgian Government has already declared and repeated that it will not discuss peace except in concert with the Powers who guaranteed its independence and who have fulfilled their obligations toward Belgium.

* *

The local authorities in Flemish towns and the principal Flemish associations are protesting to the German Chancellor against the action of the "Council of Flanders" in proclaiming the independence of Flanders. They deny the right of the Council, which is under German dictation, to speak for the Flemings. And they protest against this German attempt to divide Belgium.

European War

The German advance in Russia continued until the signing of the peace treaty on the 3d. Troops have also been sent to Finland to aid its government against the Russians. Occupation of the Aland Islands by the German forces has caused a protest from Sweden. The advance in Russia is likely to continue as long as the Bolshevik leaders talk of repudiating the peace treaty. Action on the western front is growing more frequent and appears to be increasing in importance. Particularly is this true on the American front northwest of Toul, where the Germans have attacked in force, and where they have done heavy shelling by artillery. In the east the Turks have captured Trebizond, on the Black Sea, taken by the Russians earlier in the war. Secretary Baker's weekly review notes the increasing magnitude of war operations as a possible forerunner of a grand attack. [See current volume, page 282.]

* *

Much concern is felt over the large amount of munitions in eastern Siberia. Japan has expressed a willingness to take possession and police such terri-

tory as may be necessary. The matter is now under advisement by the Allies and the United States. This country favors action that will best conserve Russian liberties.

* *

Eighteen British merchantmen were sunk last week, fourteen over 1,600 tons, and four under that tonnage. The British hospital ship Glenart Castle was torpedoed in the English Channel. Of the 200 persons on board, 144 are missing. Norway lost in February from German submarine operations twelve vessels, aggregating 16,238 tons, and valued at \$3,000,000. Nineteen men lost their lives, while twenty are missing.

* *

A peace treaty was signed at Brest-Litovsk the evening of the 3d, according to dispatches from Berlin. The terms of the treaty have not been announced, but a dispatch from the Russian delegates to the Petrograd Government on the 2d mentioned additions to the original German demands, and said the delegates intended to sign the treaty before the terms were made still more onerous. The Russian districts of Ervin, Kars and Batoum, in the Transcaucasian region, are ceded to Turkey. Kaiser Wilhelm wired Chancellor Hertling, according to Amsterdam dispatches: "The German sword, wielded by our great army, has brought peace in Russia. We feel deep gratitude to God who has been with us. The proudest deeds of my army and the tenacious perseverance of my people are sources of special satisfaction. German blood and German Kultur have been saved." Berlin dispatches say Roumania has accepted the German peace terms.

* *

The American forces have taken over a complete sector of the battle line northwest of Toul, where almost constant raiding takes place. A heavy German attack was repulsed on the 1st. The American losses were ten killed and twenty-three wounded. The German losses were said to be much greater.

* *

American preparations include a request of the War Department of an additional \$450,000,000 for airplanes. This will raise the appropriations for that purpose to \$1,000,000,000. Planes and parts fabricated on the plan of the liberty motor are now going forward. The Browning machine gun, about which much ado was made by a Congressional Committee, is also coming from the factories. Recent demonstrations prove it to be equal to all requirements. The fabrication of submarine chasers is now well under way, and the boats are going abroad with increasing speed. Plans are laid for the building of a \$25,000,000 munitions base in France. The money cost of the war to the United States is running about \$1,000,000,000 a month.

* *

The French Foreign Minister publishes translations of dispatches from Bethmann-Hollweg, German Imperial Chancellor, at the beginning of the war, to the German Ambassador at Paris, July 31, 1914. The Ambassa-

dor was directed to notify the French Government of a state of danger of war with Russia, and to ask France to remain neutral. The instructions to the Ambassador then added:

If the French Government declares it will remain neutral your Excellency will be good enough to declare that we must, as a guarantee of its neutrality, require the handing over of the fortresses of Toul and Verdun; that we will occupy them and will restore them after the end of the war with Russia. A reply to this last question must reach here before Saturday afternoon at 4 o'clock.

The Berlin *Tageblatt* and the "*Lokal Anzeiger*" acknowledge the correctness of the French statement.

NOTES

—The receipts of the Treasury Department from the sale of war savings and thrift stamps, up to February 26, amount to \$70,000,000.

—W. E. Brokaw, editor of the *Singletax Courier* during the early 90's, has begun the publication at Long Branch, Washington, of *The Equitist*, a weekly paper devoted to the abolition of privilege.

—The South African diamond output last year is reported to be 2,902,416 carats, valued at \$38,565,090. The production for 1917 exceeded that of 1916 by 556,086 carats.

—The Ferro-Concrete Shipbuilding Corporation will construct, at Redondo Beach, California, a concrete ship 300 feet in length, and having a capacity of 3,500 tons.

—The referendum vote taken by the National Chamber of Commerce on resolutions favoring an economic boycott of Germany after the war, unless she reduces her armaments, resulted in 1,204 in favor to 154 against.

—The Merchants' Association of New York City on February 22 voted unanimously against the proposal of the National Chamber of Commerce to institute a trade boycott of Germany after the war unless she abandons her present military system.

—Porto Rico went "dry" at midnight of the 2nd, as a result of a popular vote in July. The act prohibits the importation, manufacture, sale, or gift of intoxicating liquors or drugs. A local law permits the manufacture and sale of beer containing not more than 2½ per cent. of alcohol.

—The French Government has undertaken to protect American troops from extortionate charges of local tradesmen by issuing drastic orders against such profiteering. Prices of commodities in French and English are to be posted in public places for the guidance of the strangers.

—During the year 1917 the number of men killed in American coal mines numbered 2,695, an increase of 470 over the preceding year. The increase in fatalities is attributed in part to the general disturbance in the mining

business, and to the number of new men introduced to replace enlistments.

—As a means of stimulating the movement of farm products to the consumer, the Post Office Department has increased allowable weight of parcel post packages. The limit of packages mailed in the first and second zones for delivery in first, second or third zones, after March 15, has been raised from 50 to 70 pounds. The limit for other zones has been raised from 20 to 50 pounds.

—Ex-President William H. Taft was selected, on February 26, as one of two representatives of the general public on the Federal Board of Labor Policy. He was chosen by the five representatives of employers. The labor representatives chose, on February 27, Frank P. Walsh, formerly chairman of the Commission on Industrial Relations, as the other representative of the general public [See current volume, page 251.]

—Governor Edge of New Jersey signed and made a law on March 2, the bill compelling all able-bodied males between the ages of 18 and 50, to work at some occupation. If unable to find employment the individual must register with the State Commissioner of Labor who has power to assign him to proper work. Compensation is to be the ordinary rate for the work to which he will be assigned. Similar laws have been passed in Maryland and West Virginia.

—After two years of effort the Interstate Commerce Commission finally secured, on February 26, from Milton H. Smith, president of the L. and N. Railroad, an affidavit answering questions concerning mysterious entries on the books which he has refused to explain since 1916. His answer makes clear that the road expended many thousands of dollars between 1907 and 1914 on newspapers and in political campaigns. On May 5, 1907, \$15,000 was spent to aid a newspaper, not named, which was advocating views with which the L. and N. was concerned. In 1910, \$20,715 was distributed among political agents. In 1914, \$34,600 was expended in Oklahoma, in a campaign against rate reduction.

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.