

estate speculator's) efforts to defeat the exemption on improvement legislation being fought for so stubbornly for three years now? If so, how very careless of the Sun to let the real conditions be known.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.



## PLUTOCRACY'S BLINDNESS.

Boston, August 17.

In its distortion of fact, perversion of history and stagnant misconception of social forces, the widely circulated Newark address of Mr. Vanderlip, President of the City Bank at New York, was a notable illustration of the argument by Mr. Brooks Adams in "The Theory of Social Revolution"—from which Mr. Vanderlip ventures quotations, misleading by vital omissions—that, "unless capital sets its house in order and submits to [not creates] law, it will suffer a cataclysmic disaster."

The banker asserts that his class, "business men of the whole nation, should see the need of such organization [as that of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce]. There is necessity for the association of these business organizations into effective forums for the discussion of current affairs." "Effective" forums, let it be noted—not fair and free forums—which would imply the "muck-raking" so vigorously howled down by "big business."

Mr. Vanderlip has actually discovered that "the foundations of the present order are threatened," but he is blind to the fact that they are so threatened that they must be relaid. He can only recommend that they be still farther weakened by more of that rubble which has been substituted for the solid stones able to bear the structure, concerning which alone it may be said: "The floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

Mr. Vanderlip can not reckon upon such incredible ignorance among his readers as to seriously anticipate the acceptance of his assertion that business men in the past have failed in the most practical manner to exhibit their full appreciation of "the effects of political tendencies upon business, upon property and upon property rights,"—and the inverse effects; by every form of corruption known to the lobby in what he calls "comparatively rare examples of greed, of blindness to social obligations, of unfairness, and even of dishonesty." Have they been rare? Have they not been so frequent, so flagrant and so disastrous that the community dreads even the advisory employment of business and financial "experts"? The suggested remedy for the pernicious influence which partially has been unearthed, with so much difficulty and with such a paralyzing effect, is more influence! The spokesman for his group exhorts its members to "band themselves together, first in small associations, and then to see that these associations are united in a common effort to impress upon the country those views which are the best results of your [their] experience, judgment and righteousness." Not by the use of money, he says. Oh, no! When he demands a ninety days' submission of purposed remedial legislation for attack by these associations, it is to be made by giving [without cost?] correct "infor-

mation" to the people throughout the United States, especially to the constituents of Congressmen! As to the regular organs of information, this precious advice is given: "If a newspaper is ill-informed, see to it first that it has every facility for correct information, and then, if it is still unfair, publish its unfairness in a way which will make unfairness unprofitable, and you will have no more of it." No use of money is suggested in thus stifling the press!

The patriotic course is to imply we are told a temporary "submergence of self-interest"—later to "bob up serenely"—for the sake of powerful teamwork by the body which Mr. Vanderlip represents, concerning whose attitude he is forced to acknowledge that "the opinions which come to me may be highly colored by prejudice; they may come from a single class, and they may fall entirely to represent the true situation."

Mr. Vanderlip condescends to a silly verbal fling at the new forces which he dreads with so little comprehension as "Cubists" and "Futurists." His most audacious misappliance of historical authority is his appeal to the example of Patrick Henry, James Otis, Samuel Adams and the Revolutionary committees of correspondence for consolidation of the movement among the states for freedom and equality as a logical precedent for the enslaving propaganda of his financial quasi conspiracy! It is not forgotten that the City Bank not long since issued a circular in the interest of the investor, vigorously protesting against the acquisition of those rights by a subjugated people, for which the fathers pledged their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

It is not to the working of law, however, the often delayed and inadequate expression of the popular will, that we refer the Vanderlips, but to that unmistakably settled will itself which can achieve and will achieve the elimination of the opportunity, intrinsically fatal, for capitalistic control, even if it involve the destruction of the present régime. Cooperation in brotherhood is the demand of the time. To the old order the word has gone forth:

"Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting."

"God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it."

ERVING WINSLOW.



## THE HOUSEHOLD SERVICE PROBLEM

Further consideration must, it seems to me, convince the writer in *The Public* of May 29 at page 521 that no single remedy, even the Singletax, will cure so complicated a disease as the household problem. All hail the power of Singletax! but household service will continue a vexed and vexing question until some way is found to make housework a reputable business, just as the carpenter's, the banker's, the laundryman's, is a reputable business.

If it is a part of this "business" "to live in a home of refining influences with a comfortable room, etc.," what if the room is "somewhere up the back stairs"? The lady of the house is often thankful for the rescue of the back stairs and the carpenter who built them ate his lunch cheerfully regardless of where the family dined. It is sometimes desirable that maid and family dine together, but