

do don't know and don't care. Our teachers, ministers, lawyers, politicians, writers having grown up under these conditions and having always been told that they were beneficial, take for granted that they are and even assist in maintaining them. Indeed, the very language used in reference to them helps to keep everyone in ignorance. We say "our" country, for instance, when we don't own a square inch of it and live here only by permission of landowners. We say "our merchant marine" when we don't own the value of a nail in any ship afloat or ashore. We say "our" crops are good or bad, bumper or otherwise, yet we know they belong to individuals, are strictly their private property and not a grain is ours. Yet, in our village the poorest and most destitute forget momentarily even the pangs of hunger in the patriotic thrill they feel when our subsidized express wagon carrying an American flag and manned by an American crew dashes "proudly" by. Truly the dust it raises blinds the mental as well as the physical vision.

CHARLES F. SHANDREW.



### CASES INSTEAD OF CAUSES.

Address of Bolton Hall at Conference of Charities and Correction, May 20, 1914, United Charities Building, New York.

I have in my hand the last report of the Department of Labor at Albany, upon "Unemployment." On page 4 we find that the average proportion of unemployed in organized labor during last year was more than one-quarter. (In the month of February it was one-third out of work, and in December 40 per cent, largely owing to seasonal idleness.) Think of that—over twenty-five per cent of the most intelligent and best organized and most skilled workers unemployed! I leave you to imagine how many unemployed among the unorganized and inefficient working that represents. But we hardly need this report. Professor Warner estimates in "American Charities" that insufficient employment is the cause of one-third of all cases of poverty; your own statistics show that this is an under-estimate, and publication of these statistics has generally been discontinued. I saw some hundreds of these disemployed cowering in the storm last Wednesday midnight, waiting in line for a loaf of bread.

I attended the other evening a conference upon the Unemployed called by Miss Roberts at the Hotel McAlpin, and we had an excellent assemblage of charitable people and economists, and after a warning had been given that we did not want to consider trifling palliatives, the most vital suggestion that came from any economist or charity worker was an employment agency—a new, socialistic, government-sustained, city bureau-managed employment agency, though the trade unions have better and more efficient employment agen-

cies run at their own expense than you could get in twenty years.

And this was their only remedy and the Mayor's only remedy in the face of 25 per cent of organized labor out of a job: 25 per cent of men would not go hungry if a little employment society could find jobs for them. The Salvation Army representative said that he was sick over the fact that there *are* no jobs for these men. All that you really do with your employment societies recalls Theodore Hook's story:

The boy was somewhat wild and his father said to him, "John, it is time you were settling down and taking a wife."

"Why, so it is, father," answered the lad, "whose wife shall I take?"

You get a man a job—you do not make a job—you cannot make a job! Whose job do you get for him? And having gotten that man a job, you then have the displaced one—a little less efficient, or a little higher waged, for whom you have to get somebody else's job.

Why cannot you make a job? Why—because all jobs consist in labor applied to land or to the products of land, and none of your plans tend to open the land to the people; all that you advocate increases the value of land and speculation in land and makes it harder for the poor to get at it, yet you discuss recreation. Carlyle's "making sofa cushions against the day of judgment" is wisdom compared to that.

I spent some time the other day in re-examining "Misery and Its Causes," by Edward T. Devine; "Poverty," by Robert Hunter; "Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy," by Joseph Lee; "Charity and Social Life," by C. H. Loch; "Social Pathology," by Dr. Sam. George Smith—which are perhaps the leading books upon modern charity. I looked through the indexes of these and others for "land," "farming," "gardening," "vacant lot cultivation," "taxation," "monopoly," "speculation in land," not one paragraph in those excellent books on any of those subjects, nor in your own nice harmless program. Overcrowding was discussed—but, absurd as it is, there was no word about building sites withheld for a rise in price. And for a good reason. You charity people, we charity people (for I have worked with many of those here and I work with them still, and many of them I respect and like, as I do Dr. Devine and Robert Hunter) know that it is not safe to bring up the land question; that that thing is loaded! That Monopoly does not want it discussed—that many here are uneasy now because I speak of it, because we cannot forever blink at it.

I hold in my hand here the reports for one year of the cultivation of vacant lots by the unemployed in twenty cities. Philadelphia alone employs yearly about one thousand persons at an expense of about seven thousand dollars (\$7,000) and the workers produce about sixty thousand dollars

(\$60,000) worth of truck. This report shows 8,590 persons employed for the season at a cost of \$9,234—say \$1.10 per person. We had to discontinue similar work in New York because we could not get the use of even one acre of land, yet there are three vacant lots on Fifth avenue between 37th street and 47th street. And yet in all these valuable books I have been able to find only one little paragraph, sneeringly dismissing the whole thing from consideration; dismissing that practical form of relief which in various cities employs more people than all your charity devices, laundries, leather work, wood yards and so on, put together.

But I have yet to hear of a committee of charity folks appointed to inquire why we cannot get the use of the land; or to investigate the relation to unemployment of speculative holdings of coal and oil and farming lands as well as suburban and city lands.

There is no reason on earth why every one who wants work in New York should not be employed upon the lands that are now vacant and unused in and immediately around the city of New York itself: there is no reason, except that we "have added field to field until there is no room on the face of the earth" for the worker.

Why is this land question ignored? This is a question I mean to have answered, and I know how to force the discussion—I mean to have it answered by the charity people. And pending a reply I am sorry to have to think that the question of "the people back to the land" is too near to the question of the land back to the people to be comfortable for those who, through monopoly and the consequent legal power of godless extortion, are able to grind the faces of the poor while they sop their consciences by contributing to charities which they know to be ineffective.

Now I have a "constructive program": but it is not new, nor does it appeal to charity people; nor have I time to state it here.



### THE COST OF WAR.

By Harry Kemp.

I sing the song of the great clean guns that belch forth death at will.

Ah, but the wailing mothers, the lifeless forms and still!

I sing the song of the billowing flags,  
The bugles that cry before.

Ah, but the skeletons flapping rags, the lips that speak no more!

I sing the clash of bayonets, of sabers that flash and cleave.

And wilt thou sing the maimed ones, too, that go with pinned-up sleeve?

I sing acclaimed generals that bring the victory home.

Ah, but the broken bodies that drip like honeycomb!

I sing of hosts triumphant, long ranks of marching men.

And wilt thou sing the shadowy hosts that never march again?

## BOOKS

### GERMANY'S PREPARATIONS.

**Pan-Germanism: A Critical Study of the German Schemes for the Conquest of the World.** By Roland G. Usher. Houghton, Mifflin Co. Boston. 1914.

Much light will be thrown on the present European situation for him who reads Dr. Usher's pages. And it will be a light that is hardly favorable to—Germany, we were about to say, but the German autocracy would be the more correct expression. The very opening of the book is illuminating:

"For some years those at all familiar with current international affairs have known that it was the custom in the German navy to drink a toast 'To the day.' Many people have hugged to themselves with glee the 'secret' information that the officers were drinking to the day when war should be declared against England, but few, indeed, seem to have realized the splendor of the vision now before German eyes, or the ideas of the international situation which makes victory seem so near as to send German blood coursing swiftly in the anticipation of triumph."

Germany wishes to dominate the world, according to this book, and she does not rely for that domination on her own strength entirely, but on the weakness of others. In the eyes of Bismarck England was not decadent, but simply never had been as strong as was the general opinion. A contest with an approximately as great power, would be, Bismarck thought—and he thought English statesmen knew this—England's own undoing. France, on the other hand, Germany considers "a strong man who has run his race," and is now decadent, while Russia is a giant, as yet unconscious of his strength and therefore incapable of using it.

Meanwhile both of these nations press on Germany in a very uncomfortable and menacing way, being able only, as they are, to expand at her expense. So the actual situation is such as to fan Germany's self-confidence into the determination to have what she wants at all costs.

And her self-confidence is not in her physical strength alone. She has already gone into the fight, but silently, with money as weapon instead of bullets:

"Germany freely admits the great economic strength of England and France, so long as peace