

ing the planting of new plantations in Brazil, it would have been unable to control the industry in Mexico, Central America, Java, or any other coffee country. The same was true of the rubber industry. Men cannot lift themselves by pulling on their boot straps, even in Brazil. S. C.



Mexico and the Philippines.

Former President Taft in endorsing President Wilson's Mexican policy gives sound reasons therefor, based altogether on considerations of expediency. It is a pity that Mr. Taft has never realized that these same reasons make immediate withdrawal from the Philippines the policy of wisdom, to say nothing of the moral principles involved. Imperialism is everywhere a bad business proposition. S. D.



A Protest Which Congress Should Heed.

A strong protest against expenditure of \$56,000,000 for four battleships has been sent to Congress by a committee of prominent women, including Lucia Ames Mead, Mary E. Woolley, Jane Addams, Ida M. Tarbell, and others. The reasons given in this protest are powerful ones and will not be without effect if Congressmen will pay some attention to the merits of the proposition under consideration. They call attention to the selfish motive of the naval officers who urge such expenditures, to the fact that the reasons they offer are only fantastic possibilities not reasonable probabilities, to the fact that we have never asked any nation to arbitrate and been refused, that our only war in 100 years with other than an American power has been the Spanish war which we ourselves started, and to the further fact that we were never attacked when we had a small navy, and we maintained the Monroe doctrine, in 1895, nevertheless. The protest shows that Japan, which is usually portrayed as the greatest menace, knows that a war with us would be national suicide. Strongest and most impressive of the reasons given is the following:

"One can never tell what the case may be a year hence," said one of the admirals. Alas, we can surely tell that a year hence another long roll of victims, numbering about as many as perished in four years of the Civil War, will have died because of our folly in putting our greatest defense where it is least needed, leaving our greatest needs unremedied. The yearly cost of our national Children's Bureau, which is trying to prevent our awful infant mortality, is less than the annual

repairs on two torpedo boat destroyers. Let us indeed 'be prepared'; but let us prepare for our certain, definite foes and call a halt on the increase of defense against the bugaboos conjured up by timid visionaries."



This protest ought not to fall on deaf ears. The Congressman must be utterly lacking in patriotism who in order to promote the building of destructive engines of war will block the taking of effective measures to prevent needless loss of life. S. D.



Who Is Responsible?

Responsibility for the mutilation, in the interest of Washington land speculators, of Congressman Henry George's bill, is attributed by the correspondent of the Philadelphia North American in the issue of March 6 to Congressman Ben Johnson of Kentucky, Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee. The charge seems unbelievable. But whether Mr. Johnson is the one responsible or not a majority of the District committee must be. Members who can not clear their record on this matter should be borne in mind by their democratic constituents this fall. S. D.



"Unfit to Be Voted On."

"Unfit to be voted on." In this way the New York Times of February 12 characterizes the proposition embodied in the Herrick-Schaap bill for a popular referendum on the question of cutting in half the tax rate on buildings. In this the Times speaks for the Allied Real Estate Interests, The Citizens' Union, and all other plutocratic interests that wish to continue reaping where others have sown. If the approval of these interests must first be obtained before the popular will on any measure may be expressed there never will be any expression that may lead to possible consequences. In this matter the New York Times openly admits—what progressives have long known to be the case—that it and the interests for whom it speaks are opposed to popular government. They have no objection to the form—in fact, they probably like it—but they do object to the substance.



Another fact is also made clear. The proposition to halve the tax on buildings is one to relieve congestion, one that will do something to remove the cause of tuberculosis, reduce the frightful percentage of infant mortality that prevails on the

crowded East Side and put better housing accommodations within reach of the poor. It is not as far-reaching a measure as should be adopted, but is a move in the right direction. But it will also affect unfavorably the profits of those who hold valuable land out of use or only put it to partial use. This clearly weighs more heavily than any question of public welfare with the Times, the Allied Real Estate Interests and the others who are moving heaven and earth to prevent even a popular expression on the matter. If their efforts at opposition succeed they cannot escape moral responsibility for the result. Every victim who this year contracts tuberculosis because forced by poverty to live in crowded, unsanitary quarters in New York City may justly attribute his misfortune to opponents of the Herrick-Schaap bill. The mother of every infant driven to a premature death will have good cause to remember what these respectable Tories have done. The poor of New York City have a valid moral claim for support this year from the individuals, organizations and newspapers that have declared as "unfit to be voted on" a slight effort to make it possible for them to help themselves.

S. D.



A Rejected Opportunity.

The National Conference on Unemployment met in New York City on February 27 and 28. Its object was supposed to be to find some solution of the unemployed problem. If so, it has failed. According to reports most of its time was taken up with discussion of the establishment of national labor exchanges or employment agencies. Such institutions are useful enough, but however efficiently conducted they may be they can not give labor access to unused opportunities. In commenting on the conference's failure a Pittsburgh correspondent remarks: "I can stand on my roof and throw stones on twenty-five good jobs. They are all in sight and they are all vacant, and I don't need anybody to find them for me. All I need is permission to use my hands on them." How such jobs could be made available to labor there were competent men ready to explain to the conference. The Manhattan Singletax Club had asked for just twenty minutes to present a constructive proposal to that effect and was refused. Why, is not evident. Surely the program might easily have been arranged to permit it. Through this denial the conference threw away an opportunity to perform a valuable service to the unemployed.

S. D.

The Masses and the Associated Press.

Whether it shall be safe for a paper—especially a small, weak one—to criticize a powerful corporation, will be determined by the outcome of proceedings brought by the Associated Press against The Masses, the illustrated Socialist weekly. For publishing a cartoon charging that corporation with coloring the news the editor and artist have been indicted for criminal libel. However unreasonable these criminal proceedings may be, to effectively fight them requires a defense fund and an appeal for help is made by The Masses. The issue is not what will become of the threatened newspapermen, but whether an attempt will succeed "to put down by force of legal procedure the few free and independent critics of the Associated Press." If it should become unsafe to criticize the principal dispenser of news in this country, then every monopoly and grafting institution will be protected against publicity.

S. D.



Which Is the Better Way?

Last week a man of great wealth passed away. He was one to whom fortune had been most generous; for, while yet a young man, he inherited a large fortune, and though he gave little attention to business that fortune had increased five-fold before his death. He was a modest man, who eschewed the follies of society, and spent his energies in the creation of a fine country estate. He acquired 100,000 acres of land in the mountains of North Carolina, spent a million dollars in leveling and grading a mountain, and erected thereon a house of 236 rooms. The house and grounds are said to be among the finest in the world. But he did more than this. He raised blooded stock on his model farms, and propagated rare plants and trees. And the newspaper obituaries contain the significant and all-embracing phrase: "He had a number of charities."



It may be said of this man that he lived according to his light. Yet how different his life from that of Joseph Fels! With a fortune many times greater he was content to accept a fabulous toll from his fellow men, and give in return—charity. A sop to charity was sufficient, as he viewed his responsibilities, to discharge his debt to that army of men, women, and children whose toil created his income. There might be long hours at nerve-racking labor, and hard fare of insufficient nutrition. Wages of grown men might be too small to keep a family, and children might be sent into