

entire machinery of the Department of Labor, including the federal, State and municipal employment services will be included in the effort to curb vagrancy, uselessness and mendicancy during these times when every red-blooded citizen of our country should be doing his bit towards the successful termination of our present conflict.

A similar law has been proposed for the State of New York, and before long we may expect the like dispositions to cover every State in the Union. The nation is mobilizing to bring its full strength to bear upon the economic as well as the military problems of the war. Defects of organization which were tolerated in times of peace, will be tolerated no longer. The highest efficiency in our whole economic mechanism is the minimum service that can be exacted from our country—and by country, we mean our men and our material resources.

It is manifest that the Compulsory Work Law, even if perfect and complete in all its provisions, covers only one-half—the human half—of our duty.

What is to be done with that other half, the material resources? Are they to be made accessible for mobilized labor? Or is access to be conditioned by payment of a toll to some third entity, which is neither labor nor the nation—quite possibly some foreign interest? Are we to see labor and all its products devoted, with singleness of purpose, to the service of the nation? Or is a private interest to exercise priority over the nation and exact a heavy tribute first, thanks to a strange fiscal immunity it enjoys through an abuse of the law-making powers of Congress and the States?

If “vagrancy, uselessness and mendicancy” in the individual are to be penalized and forced to useful labor, it is surely reasonable to inquire what is to be our attitude toward idle, unused land—that potential cause of idle and useless men?

Those who live by land speculation will welcome this New Jersey law, if it comes unqualified or unaccompanied by a reversal of our fiscal policy toward land and land values.

The concentration of war industries in the State of New Jersey has already caused there an exorbitant inflation of land values. Columns could be filled with a mere list of cases of this legalized extortion. Instead of remedying this already serious scandal, which has found its echo in a Government Commission of Investigation from Washington, Governor Edge proposes to force still higher the industrial pressure, knowing well that higher still will rise the tribute that must be paid to that passive factor in the economic situation—the owner of the soil. In other words, he seems willing that the people, individually as workers and collectively as a nation, shall toil first and foremost for the increase of the landlord's gain and only in the second place for the nation's safety and honor.

Is Governor Edge, is any public man, ready to stand on record as making of the nation's emergency the land speculator's opportunity? It is puerile to argue that labor can be legislated upon, and that land cannot. The dilemma puts to the test both the sincerity and the patriotism of the New Jersey Governor.

## Landed Interests and the War-worn Battlefields of Europe

WE have seen in recent French papers announcements of the sale and transfer of landed property at present occupied by the contending armies. “No man's land” is a misnomer, a mere figure of speech, as the realty transactions already reveal, and as land speculators will teach us still more plainly when the war is over and its fruits are to be gathered.

We could wish the schemes for reconstruction of the war-wrecked Belgian and French cities, promoted here with much blare of philanthropic trumpeting, could be cleared of all slur of after-the-war profiteering. No such guarantee, however, has so far been produced.

It cannot be forgotten how our own War Charity Festivals have been exploited for private profit. Under the name of Charity, as under that of Patriotism, much unsavory work has been done. This, here, at home. Is it to be repeated by us on an international theatre? Are the blood-stained battlefields and the cities and towns that have witnessed so much tragedy and heroism to suffer the last indignity of the speculator's spoliation?

Elementary instincts of honor and prudence call for prompt and clear statements of purpose and method and the legal and legislative guarantees for the right use of the vast financial and still greater moral obligations which our American municipalities and other public authorities are now being urged to incur in the name of devastated Belgian and French cities, towns and villages. The toll-gathering privilege of the landed interests should at least have limits of decency and decorum.

The Sydney *Bulletin*, of Nov. 8, 1917, is authority for the following story. Commenting on the visit of Mr. Holman, Premier of New South Wales, to the firing line in Belgium and France, it says:

“War is a queer business; but the queerest aspect of it came under Mr. Holman's notice in the payment of rent for the ground where Billjim has his little dugout.

The Belgian and French farmers and landowners, instead of going to their own governments and making claims which would be settled with the British government, personally came to the British adjutants and other officers on the ground, and begin to haggle about the trench rents and rent for the occupied territory. So Australia pays its share to the British government. The Belgian and French peasants are sometimes grasping, and show themselves in their worst lights.

“Holman found a few things that had made him wonder whether the organizing genius he had heard about wasn't a myth; but he reckons this method of settling the rent payable for a battlefield is well able to hold its own for foolishness.”

In the sale and lease of land to our own government in the present war emergency, we have, unfortunately, many landowners who could compete successfully for the prize

of meanness with the most grasping of the Belgian and French peasants. Unfortunately, too, our land legislation permits and promotes such meanness.

## If This is Sociology Give us Tiddledywinks

WE have just received a report of 87 pages of the Sagamore Sociological Conference, which met June 27, 28 and 29, last Summer, at Sagamore Beach, Mass.

The association has an imposing list of "Members and Friends." Its platform is printed in the report. Its most startlingly radical plank is as follows:

"In particular we advocate an expert study of the waste incident to unnecessary fatigue, and the proper and effective correlation of Federal, State and local employment agencies under national supervision, to the end that men and women may easily find opportunities for work."

The platform calls for "government aid in securing co-operation between producer and consumer and the elimination of multiple profits." The removal of obstacles to the more perfect co-operation of producer and consumer is not dwelt upon, and what "multiple profits" are, and how government is to eliminate them, is left to the imagination.

The discussion took a wide range. At times it airily overleapt the bounds of sociology and playfully dallied with such subjects as advertising, standardizing of prices, trade agreements, world politics, school kitchens, suffrage, journalism, woman suffrage, and the Re-Education of Crippled Soldiers through Simultaneous Cycle Motion Charts and Motion Models. This last subject is thrillingly interesting, and we can imagine how its discussion must have enlivened the otherwise dull proceedings of a Sociological Conference. Even the most serious subjects must be relieved by occasional lighter relaxations.

The only purely sociological point which might have given rise to some really vital discussion, was the statement of one of the speakers that this re-education must be done under military regulation and not offered but insisted upon—that is, forced upon the soldiers crippled in their country's service. That these cripples might have some claim upon the country they had defended, some rights which we ought to respect, and maybe some personal preference in the matter, seem never to have occurred to speaker or hearers.

And when the speaker, Frank B. Gilbreth, announced the third and last condition of his pet reform, the necessity of reserving certain jobs for these cripples, and putting them in these jobs on a non-competitive basis so far as uncrippled workers are concerned, he indicated about the first and only sociological fact which had even been so much as hinted at. But it passed harmlessly over the heads of the audience.

Yet here lay the possibilities of really profitable discussion. How comes it that putting men to work to produce wealth threatens the profitable occupations of men similarly engaged elsewhere? Is there indeed too much wealth? Must there be a fixed quantity of things

produced, lest the livings of men, their wage-earning abilities, be diminished? Is the purchasing power of those who buy these goods so exactly fixed that it cannot be increased? And if so, why? These questions, not propounded at this Conference, open up the "undiscovered country" of the sociologist, before the boundaries of which the members of this conference sat down to discuss the insignificant little problems which bear the same relation to sociology as time does to eternity.

Here is a sample of the discussions—it is a fair sample, too. Read, if you have the patience:

MRS. FREDERICK P. BAGLEY: I was going to ask if there has been any large mobilization of women to take the places of men in industry; and if so, what the attitude of the men has been in regard to women taking their places.

MISS NESTOR: No, there has not been yet. It is not necessary yet. But when it comes I think that the one thing we want to all insist upon—and I think the men feel it—is that we want to safeguard them and see that they receive equal pay for equal work.

MISS MARY C. CRAWFORD: Has there ever been any measurement of the effect upon the nerves of women of the noises in the factory?

MISS NESTOR: Not that I know of. You see, there are so many things that contribute to the strain that it is difficult to know which thing is the most injurious.

MRS. JUMP: I was wondering if Miss Nestor had suggestions to make as to popularizing domestic service. MISS NESTOR: If this were a woman's club I know that would have been the first question instead of the last, because that is one of the questions you always expect to have asked. I think that one of the things that has to come is that you have got to standardize the work so that the girl has some time to herself, so that she is not body and soul owned by this house where she is employed. Then I think we have got to get down to a regular hourly basis. I think that people have got to adjust their household affairs to that. When we get to that, we will then begin to meet the problem, and I don't think we will meet it until we get to that.

MR. CHARLES M. COX: Do you think that the strain and rush of our modern business life is accountable in some measure for the decreased attendance and interest in churches on Sunday?

MISS NESTOR: The churches ought to take more of an interest in what is going on in the other world and help us to meet some of the problems. If there could be a closer co-operation in that way, all the way through, it might help in the attendance as well as the interest in the church. There is the feeling among a certain group, not generally, that the church doesn't care much what is going on, and that there are certain things that they are concerned about.

MR. JOHN J. SULLIVAN: Couldn't the restrictions be placed equally on the employer and on the employees, that the employee should not be allowed to work over a certain number of hours?

MISS NESTOR: Well, the object of time and a half for overtime is to so tax the overtime that it will be so expensive as to discourage it. Now, that is the whole reason for charging the extra for overtime. So