



BANCROFT LIBRARY

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

15t. Felixien \$3,00



THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

BY MARY AUSTIN

AUTHOR OF "THE LAND OF LITTLE RAIN," ETC.



THE WOMANS PRESS

NEW YORK

1913

F787 A869

COPYRIGHT, 1918, BY
THE NATIONAL BOARD, YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NEW YORK

78404 111 3/1/08/08 118/8/8Y

DEDICATED

TO THE

YOUNG WOMEN OF AMERICA

WHO FIRST ASSUMED AT THE CRISIS OF THEIR COUNTRY'S HISTORY
THEIR SHARE OF POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY,
IN THE HOPE THAT IT MAY AID THEM IN CARRYING THEIR CITIZENSHIP
SUCCESSFULLY, WITH AS HIGH A SENSE OF PRIVILEGE AND OBLIGATION

AS SUPPORTED THE WOMEN OF AN EARLIER GENERATION
WHOSE LABORS WON THEM THEIR OPPORTUNITY

THE BANCROFF LIBRARY

FOREWORD

THE significance of this book is its insistence upon conscious preparation for citizenship as wide as the world itself. The writer does not dictate what the young woman citizen must do to build into the world democracy to which America is so surely committed; she has chosen rather to set up certain guide-posts for a working philosophy of citizenship. Although the book is addressed to young women it will appeal to all world citizens. for the fundamental conviction on which the book is built is that the new day in world politics will come only through the combined efforts of men and women who have faith in each other and who are willing to pay the costs of social awareness. It is hoped by the publishers that this book can give direction to the thinking of those who are to bear the heavy burdens of readjustment which face young people of to-day.

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2007 with funding from Microsoft Corporation

CONTENTS

Chapter I

The significance of the enfranchised woman's position—the relation of woman's citizen resources to group activity—women as well as men are committed to solving the problem of world democracy—the importance of Americanization—relating young people and nationalized citizens to political trends.

Chapter II

Correct estimate of women by women essential to full citizenship—civilization the result of manitarian not humanitarian methods—women's instinct for social direction—introduction and application of new civic consciousness to methods of administration—women use privileges of democracy to escape its experience—language an indication of American democracy.

Chapter III

Social philosophies result of experience—politics the technique of togetherness—practice the basis of political theory—history and the press vital contributors in moulding political system—importance of understanding women as well as men leaders.

Chapter IV

Art may contribute to citizenship—another aspect of free speech—about censorship—freedom of impression.

Chapter V

Social awareness—political common denominator—the young citizen draft—its substitutes—the novel as an epitome of social awareness—guides to political affiliations—significance of social movements good and bad—spiritual perceptions.

Chapter VI

Admission of women to party politics involves changes in political life—bosses and bossism—American women's organizational experience an asset—what the public has a right to ask of a political leader—influence on political parties—government expressive of social consent—artificial State boundaries.

Chapter VII

Nationalism—trends of internationalism—individuality a causus belli—communism as a new element in nationality in Mexico and Russia—Mexican problem—expansion of Germany and Japan in Europe and Asia—United States, Japan, and Africa—demands of small nations.

Chapter VIII

Evolution vs. revolution—social revolution the yeast of the world—its totemic pattern—the new social democracy and the new internationalism—labor's rôle—women workers still unrelated to mass decisions.

Chapter IX

Business and politics interrelated—change from industrialism to commercialism—advertising—women as simplifiers of financial methods—the Social Stream—waste of woman power—the war government's job.

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

Ι

THE art of living together is the first of all the arts. It came to consciousness out of a group life in which the group alone was thought of as an entity. All the interests of its members were so identified that no word for the individual had been invented, nothing discriminated between I and we, mine and ours.

Between that and the time in which we name as citizen any inhabitant of a country who determines for himself what contribution he will make to group activities, there has been a wide range of experimentation. We have tried living together as chief and tribesman, as master and slave, as lord and serf. We have experimented in class and caste, aristocrats and commoners, the senate, the citizens and the Roman people. Last of all to yield to the instinctive struggle of

the individual to regain his self-determined place within the social whole, is the system of discrimination based on sex. It is now finally established in the practice of the American commonwealth that women may become citizens.

The whole progress of the race is up a spiral stair. Always society is seen re-naming the points of the social compass, but always with a wider prospect at each return of the spiral, a little nearer to the stars. And when we look for a single item to measure the up-sweep of the curve, we find it in the degree of voluntary participation by the members of the group, in group affairs.

Before our prospect widened to take in the citizenship of women, we had to reorganize our whole way of looking at political organization. We had to recover from a concept of government as something applied, something buckled about the unprivileged classes to keep the world from falling apart.

Out of the very constitution of man as a social animal comes this strange fear of dissolution, the source and excuse of centuries of social tyranny. People must be held down or they will not hold together: women, if uncompelled, will somehow cease to be women. How many times the field of social consent had to be enlarged by war and revolution before we discovered that men can no more

fall out of relation to one another than they can fall off the earth!

All the cruel history of taboo, ostracism, excommunication and penal codes are but slow steps to understanding that the outlander, the heretic and the criminal are still members of society, and cannot be excised out of our social reckoning. Even the generation not yet born is part of us, and compels us somehow to take its consent into account. The extraordinary thing is that we wish to take it into account, that we have in the exercise of voluntary social participation, something of the fine youthful plunge into clear water, the buoying power of it, the satisfying fatigue of our own stroke. We are disposed to deny that the stream is dirty, as is commonly reported; we have that large confidence in our ability to make way in it which all creatures have for their native element.

If group activity is not the natural element of women we shall make poor work of it, for we come to it without any well thought out preparation. Up to a certain day in our lives politics is no more to us than the sea on which the pleasant craft of school and home is floated. Suddenly we are tossed overboard. And we are not tossed alone. Weltering around us are the wrecks of all our pleasant certainties, and the voices of our captains calling on God out of the storm. Before we have

tried out the relation of the woman-nature to democracy, we are called upon to establish newer and higher forms of it than we have ever known.

America is committed to a World Democracy. We are committed to an entente of nations in which neither size nor form of government nor geographical location shall establish a privilege. We are committed to it as unequivocally as to war, and we are even more unprepared.

We have bound ourselves to produce a world politics and we have not even the habit of world thinking out of which to conceive it. If an adequate answer to the world question comes from America, it must come out of the soul of the people rather than out of their politics. It must come as evidence of the enormous creative force there is in even our limited experience of Democracy. And it must come, as much as from any other source, from the American woman. Quite literally and explicitly, the new instrument must be shaped and smoothed by woman-thought.

There is a sense in which every man who takes arms in this war is taking arms for women against man-thought running amuck, against all the worst features of the man-mind: ferocity, egotism, combativeness, as expressed in the conduct of war. That is why there is so much less of the romantic in the attitude of women everywhere toward this

war, so much more of the maternal. Women have come down out of the balcony. But they might just as well have stayed there, waving their hand-kerchiefs, unless they have prepared themselves to render first aid to world politics.

The idea of World Democracy is so completely accepted in America that we forget how new it is among the nations and how shallowly it is still conceived. Latent in the world's thought for the past hundred years, it waked first in England with the thunder of German guns against the forts of Belgium. And even then we were able to think of what followed in the next two years as none of our business! Without this war we might have spent another hundred years moving comfortably from vague good will toward creative conviction. We must think of that as offsetting the waste of battle. All the lives that go out violently are perhaps not so many as would have passed uncounted in the slow accomplishments of peace. Among the Conservatives of the neutral nations, where nothing has been paid down on the counters of the world for this new promise of World Democracy, the idea is scarcely current, or, if at all, only as a beautiful ideal. Even here at home there are people refusing to accept the ideal for us, because, as they carefully point out, there were times in the past when neither we nor our Allies entertained these ideals.

This is the sort of argument which makes war inevitable by making consistency a matter of being faithful to the past. But the only consistency which is worth bothering about, keeps us faithful to the future. Whatever we did in the Philippines, in Haiti and Santo Domingo, whatever England did in South Africa, and Belgium in the Congo, we are still committed irretrievably to the new order. We have caught fire from the spark kindled by the clashing of forest boughs in a high wind, the wind of the world's desire to live together as members of a whole. This is the wish that is trying to get itself stated in this war; and the finish of the fighting will come to take its place in history as no more than the first period to that statement.

8

If you go to Washington you will find few men able to take their minds off the immediate business of winning the war to discuss the politics of reconstruction. And whenever peace comes at the front, it will come without giving our men time to rearrange their experience and shape it to definite measures. Something must be thought out, brought together from all political sources, for the men to work with when they come home with their new convictions fresh upon them. We must be very sure of our facts, very clear as to their import, and able to state them in world terms.

We saw how ready the response of American men can be to world stimuli in the success of woman suffrage in the State of New York. Their attention being fixed on the larger struggle of the nations, their whole political outlook took on a larger sweep, and men found themselves voting for suffrage who had never before thought of themselves as doing anything of the kind. But the measure lay ready to their hands, beaten out of the thoughts and convictions of American women.

Many an American woman is today holding her husband's place in the shop or factory. What we women must also hold is the pace America has set in the first line of democratic thinking.

First of all, we have to make American Democracy something more than the rule of the majority. Enough people think about alike in America to give a definite color to our idealism. Certain sorts of ideas are easily recognized by the rest of the world as "made in America." But we ourselves are only beginning to realize that not all the people called Americans have had a part in making them; nor are they the only kinds of ideas made here.

Millions of people have come to the United States with a fixed idea that any obligation that may be in the situation is owed from America to them. They bring us nothing but their necessities, old grudges against society and vague dreams; they offer us not

even the gift of understanding, nor the courtesy of learning to speak our language. For millions of these people the first American ideal which has pierced their isolation has been the opportunity to fight for World Democracy. They understand what is being fought over there better than they have ever understood the fight the rest of us had to make for the republicanism that could produce an ideal of World Democracy. This state of things has grown up very largely out of our handling of Americanization as a matter of sentiment, an emotional reaction, which follows naturally as measles on the exposure of the foreign-born to American influences. We have not yet thought of Americanization as something to be demonstrated by social practice.

The first question we have to ask ourselves is, whether an immigrant can be said to be exposed to American influences who never is required to speak the American tongue, or read American ideas as they are circulated in the press. Attempts were recently made in New York City to interest the foreign-born women in their new privilege of the ballot, on the ground of what the United States had done for them. But they did not know, very many of them, what the United States had done. Swathed hundreds of years deep in ignorance and prejudice, they had never heard of the Workmen's Compensation Act, of mothers' allowances, and other civil and industrial

advantages which American-born citizens have won for them at great pains. We are shocked and indignant sometimes at the unwillingness of these women to give their men to fight, or to enter with us into the local struggle against political corruption and industrial oppression. But the neglect of these citizen obligations would not be so widespread if there had not been an earlier, more general neglect on their part, of the obligation of being citizenly informed.

Nothing is so certain as that all the world democracy we are ever going to have will be only so much as we can use. We cannot hope to establish it on a very high plane until we have taken the measure, by use, of what we have on hand. Before we are able to put our ideas into world form, we must explore the American ideal as it has already expressed itself in our laws and industries; we must test every political privilege for its power of increasing human welfare; we must use every political advantage as fast as it is secured. And we must lay this obligation, so far as is consistent with our institutions, equally on every citizen.

8

Politics is the progressive practice of social relations. It ought to present a progressive distribution of responsibilities, beginning with the earliest rela-

tions that an individual establishes. It should begin, as it did in the ancient tribe, at fifteen years or thereabout, at the point when youth begins to choose its own relationships. Wise parents give their children some little duties in the home as soon as the children are old enough to realize the home. The moment the child is admitted to the world outside the home, the world of the school and the street, a sense of responsibility toward that new world should be developed.

Youths old enough to spend a part of their time unattended in the parks and playgrounds are old enough to take their share of the upkeep of all places of public recreation. As a matter of fact, youth is enormously interested in what goes on in the streets. It would make a hero of the Policeman if permitted, and finds that the Garbage Man is a figure of romance. And as for a fire-! We shall never know just how much the practice of clubbing boys away from the really important happenings of the street has to do with their easy surrender of the police department and the departments of street-cleaning and fire protection to the political ring. But it has its share in educating our youth in general to think of himself as an uninterested bystander in the business of his town. Principles of traffic management can best be taught at the age when the street is still an exciting pageant. Markets are as fascinating as foreign travel if you come to them in the same spirit.

A similar progression of citizen obligations should be laid on every adult woman becoming American through naturalization. There is no good reason why these women, who are often wise in their own way of life, should be allowed to retire into an isolation of speech and domestic habit. To have thousands of them living in the ideas and prejudices of the European proletariat pulls down the whole American average. It makes social slackers of them, whereas they might contribute much. For every one of these women has her own experience to draw from, if it is only an experience of the lack of democracy, an experience of oppression and unbearable poverty. She owes it to the country of her adoption to add her experience and her point of view to the general sum. It should be paid as conscientiously as taxes.

Not having any such practical apprenticeship to citizen experience to fall back upon, the young woman citizen of today must begin at that point in the feminist procession which reinstates her in group activities on an equal footing with men. The precise point I have in mind is that discovery which she had to make for herself, that the world does not necessarily fall apart because of a change in the fashion of our living together. Before woman could

bring her demand for the franchise to the crisis, she had to feel out for herself the pasteboard and calico composition of that Mumbo Jumbo of social dissolution which is shaken in the face of every advancing movement. Beyond everything else, she had to feel out the heavens, in case, as everybody predicted, they should really fall in the breaking of that most ancient political taboo.

And yet the heavens have not fallen! Once for all in the launching of a democratizing movement of the magnitude of half the population, without sensible inconvenience to the other half, political decisions are established as something that can be taken back. This, for another hundred years, is of more significance than that women have achieved the use of the ballot.

Government is the frame and form by which we function citizenly, the furniture of our social house, which we can arrange at our convenience; nor should we expect anything world-shaking to happen should a piece by accident be overturned. We have only to consider whether any furniture which shows a disposition to top-heaviness should be retained in a well-lived house.

Men have had time to forget their struggle for the vote and what it cost them. But we who are midway in it still have it fresh in our minds that the worst obstacle to political progress is not anything

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

material. It is not anything actually upsetting and incommoding. It is, nine times out of ten, a pasteboard and calico bogey, and its name is prejudice. Coming at a time when war is compelling us to things that we never before thought of doing, this is reassuring. If we can vote without bringing the skies down upon us, we can no doubt open other doors upon unknown prospects. We shall probably find that there are no bogies at all on the other side, but more sun and fresher air.

IF the young woman citizen is to begin where A she is, at the turn of the spiral that admits her to be statistically equally important with men, she must also begin precisely with what she is. The long necessity for proving our fitness for citizenship in men's terms has given to women a certain distrust of the woman's way of doing things. For so many centuries man's intelligence was the only kind of intelligence that was heard from that we are still inclined to judge any intelligence that shows itself, by the masculine standard. So absolutely has humanitarian meant manitarian that it is not so very long ago that the first case for the protection of children from cruelty was tried in the United States courts under the law for the prevention of cruelty to animals, for the child had no standing in court except as an animal. Unconsciously this age-long habit so colors all our thinking, that the first thing that the woman citizen must ask herself is whether she is coming to her new obligation as another, less experienced man, or whether she has anything to contribute as a woman.

The potency of the ballot was never so great as now, a potency derived not from numbers, but from its increasing intimacy with the will and the desires of human kind. The political decision which gives to women the vote is rather in the nature of an affirmation than an achievement. It is a way of saying that the art of social living cannot be acquired by the one half of society, to be by them imposed upon the other. It says a great deal besides; of the substitution of growth for combat as the major occupation of nations; of the establishment in social theory, whether it is in the practice or not, of the creative element. But reinforcement of the franchise by the woman vote can only be in the degree that women bring new lights out of their especial experience to illuminate the problem of the whole.

Civilization as we have it now is one-eyed and one-handed. It is kept going by man's way of seeing things, and man's way of dealing with the things that he sees. It is true that the most civilized men have thrown off the old imperialistic manthought, and are dying unafraid for their new vision. But it is also true that the greatest obstacle to disarmament at this moment is the necessity we are still under of approaching the problems involved by a man-method.

Man's method in approaching a new issue is

to throw out an hypothesis, a general supposition of what seems likely or desirable to prove true. Then he sets about proving the hypothesis, or as it may turn out, disproving it. Democracy was such an hypothesis; Socialism is another, and so is the League of Nations.

But whatever men think, they have to go on living. By the time a particular hypothesis is shown to be mistaken, society finds itself involved in habits of living not easily broken. Having committed itself to a theory of the future, there is always a certain flavor of disloyalty and backsliding about even an improving change. Before we are able to get out of a given social predicament, a new theory of the case must be formulated. Thus the human concern goes zigzagging on its course instead of proceeding to its goal with the instinct of a homing pigeon. The demand for a statement of peace terms in advance is part of man's habit of hypothesis. The reluctance to state those terms is a recognition of the likelihood of such a statement not proving satisfactory. Thus the fighting goes on until an hypothesis appears which has the stripe of authority, or until a military decision is reached which renders an hypothesis unnecessary.

During the past fifty years, what is called the scientific method has done much to rid the world

of the burden of the hypothesis. This has been done by combining it with the method of intuitive approach. Now if there is any such thing as an instinct for social direction, it must, since it has not appeared anywhere else, be vested in women. It must be in a very rudimentary state, because it has never been called upon or exercised. At any rate, it is the woman habit to think the next thing which enables women to keep their opinions in a continuous state of mobilization without any suspicion of inconsistency. They are faithful to the ideal rather than to the method. Women trust life more than men do. They are much less troubled with the fear of the world falling apart if they do not keep their eye upon it.

This capacity for intuitive judgment is the best thing women have to bring to their new undertaking, this and the things that grow out of it. This is what women have to stand on squarely; not their ability to see the world in the way men see it, but the importance and validity of their seeing it some other way.

8

Trying to produce civilization as we have been doing it, is like attempting to put together a picture puzzle with the most important piece lost. The piece that is lost is the one that would enable us to see the connection between what is called practical and what is called spiritual. We think of these two as divided by a great gap. We think of one of them as being base, but necessary, and the other as lovely, but unattainable. We think of passing from one to the other in some far future when we shall all have undergone a great change, an emotional regeneration. Always we think that it is we who will have to change, because we think of spirituality as something that we must feel.

The piece that is lost is the one upon which it is written that spirituality is something to do. It is lost somewhere in the experience of the average woman, hidden under the rubbish of domesticity and overlaid with false idealism, so that she herself scarcely knows that it is there. But as soon as it is uncovered, the least educated immigrant woman can recognize it as the most familiar item of her experience.

Things that are called practical become spiritual, not through a process of emotion, but through a process of administration. Every day of their lives women are taking such common and material things as bread and meat and sex, wounds and old clothes, and rendering them spiritual by administering them in the interests of religion, family affection, humanity.

That is the secret of this precious, unexplored

treasure of woman's experience. The whole difference between the practical and the ideal is a matter of administration, of the way the thing is done. The difference between a trained nurse and a pitying female is a difference of training; mastery over the conditions of sickness takes the place of an emotion about it. It would be just as simple to administer a meat market or a city milk supply in the interests of common health and common comfort. It would not require any change of emotions or any different sort of people. But it would require a different method. That is the whole secret of ideal politics, of the ideal State.

Milk in our large cities is managed on what is called a "practical" basis. That does not mean that it is so managed that every child in the city gets all the milk he needs. What it does mean is that every man who handles milk gets something out of it for himself, and the children get as much as is left. That every man should get something for himself, and that every child should at the same time get what he needs, is looked upon as millennial, a beautiful, "impractical" dream. It is only impractical in so far as the city has no mastery over milk. We have no intelligent sure way of producing milk and distributing it. We are as much at the mercy of milk as though it fell

from heaven like manna, or spouted out of the earth in infrequent geysers.

The effort that is being made in cities to have milk administered in the interests of the children is not a fight for "humanitarianism"; it is not even a fight against milk dealers. Milk dealers are not in any sense monstrous and inhuman. The worst that you can say about them is that they are men, and are thinking about milk, man-fashion, as a commodity.

The difference between man-thinking and womanthinking on these points is the difference between the ideal and the "practical." It is a difference in the appreciation of values from which the thinking starts. Woman-thinking begins with the nearest thing at hand, with the child. Her values are life values. Left to herself, woman would not think of milk as a means of making a living; she would think of it as a means of giving a living. This is her second great gift to politics,—her habit of centering the administration of her affairs around the production and nourishment of life. It is just as easy, just as "practical" as any other way if you start with it. No great change of emotion is necessary, any more than emotion is necessary in going from Boston to New York, and in turning around and going back again from New York to Boston.

8

Woman must not relinquish these two great advantages in an effort to match her political achievement with man's. She must not even make them an excuse for the one great lack which women have as a class, in not having yet experienced democracy as an impersonal instinct.

Men invented democracy. Just because it is a communal experience, there is something in it not easily communicable, something that may easily evade the understanding of woman. There is no more subtle danger confronting the woman citizen than this, that she may make use of the privilege of democracy to escape its experience, and so create a profounder isolation than man ever made for her.

Every good woman is at heart a matriarch. Naturally the organizing center of the family group, she has not so much experienced democracy, as seized upon it as a means of making everybody more comfortable. It is for this chiefly that men fear her, not for the things she may by the ballot do with society, but for her ancient maternal instinct to do something to it. It is a danger we all stand in unless woman will consent to learn for her first lesson in citizenship a little of the man's quality of togetherness.

It is in the nature of men that every now and then they should run together shouting the same word. All that is necessary to remove the performance from ridicule is that they should run toward something and that the word should be a word of power. The root of democracy is a joyous, objectiveless sense of allness. There is no reason whatever to suppose that men got together in the beginning for advantage, but rather because they liked togetherness. It is written in history that before industry was suffused with the consciousness of mass interest, men turned from its isolating routine and marched out to fight for the sheer joy of the common impulse, shoulder touching shoulder. "Comrade" was the soldier word they learned, and the whole face of world politics was changed when they first ran, not to fight, but to work together, shouting it aloud.

To be able to enter into the crowd and the shout without any undercurrent of a wish to turn it in your particular direction is the true preface to politics. For women to snatch at the franchise to make a soft place in the world for women is never to have had it. Politics can be taken back, but democracy cannot and still be enjoyed as democracy.

8

But sure of the need of woman-thought in politics as women have a right to be, and possessed of the instinct of the crowd, there is still a lack peculiar to American Democracy which, if not remedied, will make a teapot adventure of our world policies. It is the lack of a popular language as a medium in which those policies may be clarified for our own use. I do not mean that we lack a universal language like Esperanto or Volapük, to supersede French and German and English as an international medium. I mean that we have no American vocabulary which can carry all the meanings that we shall have to exchange with other nations.

We shall have no success in establishing World Democracy unless the impulse toward it gushes out of the very center of our spiritual and intellectual life. We cannot sell it to the world as we sell cotton and tractors. Or if we manage to dispose of it by our superior sales efficiency, it will be a terrible thing for us all if it turns out simply to be something made to sell, fine flimsy sentiment about internationalism.

World Democracy is not a thing that we can test in advance with free samples. We must commit ourselves to it as to a faith, made evident by spiritual perception, and made possible by fine, discriminating words. Ideas cannot live and grow without words any more than trees without leaves.

Language, to express the soul of a nation, has to come out of the heart. But with millions of our population it comes only from the lips. Millions of them are still thinking in German or Yiddish or Italian. We have made the matter worse by yield-

ing precious hours of their school time to learning to speak—very inadequately, it is true—other languages than ours.

If some woman should rise among us with a prophetic gift, some woman with power to see the present and divine the future of world politics, we should probably not be able to understand her. She would be a woman very widely acquainted with conditions in every part of the world. She would have a knowledge of human history obtained from books on sociology, biology, anthropology and psychology. She would be able to state world politics in terms of history and science. She would have new and different words to express new ideas, and subtle distinctions of old ones. And the majority of people would not know these words. Editors would object to their being used in magazine articles; they would insist on narrower, more commonplace words which would squeeze most of the meaning out of what she had to They would do that because we have been willing that they should. We have been too lazy to enrich ourselves with new words, and, lest we should feel inferior by the loss, we have cultivated a sort of contempt for the skill and precision which make distinction in language. So when our great men and women rise, they are not able to speak to us as mouth-pieces of American thought, with the clear call of the American spirit. They speak as lonely

"intellectuals," and Europe is never quite sure that they belong to us.

Europe has the advantage of us in this. Language in England is not all spoken alike, but it is all thought alike. The French take care of their language; they prize its beauty and explicitness. Even now, in the midst of war, they have agents over here to inquire into the teaching of French in our universities and to make sure that we have only the best. Germany has held on to her language as the body and bones of her propaganda. She manipulated our local politics to get her language taught in our schools, because Germany knows that the language in which the secret thoughts of the heart are shaped is the language that prevails. But we, we have gone out to fight for a unified ideal of democracy with troops that cannot so much as understand the commands of their officers! We are full of the experience of a hundred years of the mistakes and triumphs of democracy, and we have no way of saying it finely and penetratingly even to one another.

The work of producing a precise, flexible language in America will have to be done very largely by the young women of America. It must be a young, fresh language, and our young men just now have other things to do. The whole world of young women takes its leadership from America. Young women in India, looking out from latticed windows, young women in China where there are still bound feet, where it is a very daring and radical thing to belong to the Young Women's Christian Association, have not as yet much to contribute to the cause of human liberty. But you will find that the few of them that get out into the world have a better speech, express themselves more clearly and forcibly than the average young American woman. You will find, too, that girls out of shirt-waist shops and factories, who lead the front ranks of labor, girls without any educational advantages over their fellow-workers, have no lack of correct, easy language. Clear, high thinking runs to keen precise words just as good steel takes a fine edge. You yourself do not respect your thought very much, nor can you expect the world to respect it, if you send it out clothed in the scraps and rags of slang and slovenly phrases. It is not too much to say that the extent to which woman-thought will enter into the negotiations of the world's peace will depend all together on the English-speaking woman's ability to get that thought adequately expressed.

IN America great things are attempted by way of educating the public on particular issues. But for citizenship in general there is no absolute preparation because there is no absolute criterion of social welfare.

From Plato to the Fabians, men have looked for a social philosophy which could be clamped down on humanity to save us, forever after, the trouble of thinking about it. Almost overnight we have discovered that the chief of man's interests is to think about this social philosophy, and that social experiment is the most worth while of his adventures. There can be no system that will fit all the facts of a social situation, since at no given instant can it be said that the facts are all there. At the very moment that we may be spacing the items of national industry in an acceptable pattern, there may be ticking in the brain of some fellow-citizen the device that pushes them all off the board. A spinning jenny, new motor power, require new fashions of being lived with.

This is comparatively simple when the new element lies within the field in which we have

already accepted the principle of expert authority. It is easy to think citizenly of garbage. Any one who will read a few reports of the Board of Health or attend a lecture or two on the theory and practice of sanitation, will find his private activity falling conveniently upon the side of public health. Observances of public safety, such as not standing between the cars or dropping lighted matches about, soon become automatic. Some of our profoundest instincts are being slowly brought under the direction of authority by the spread of knowledge about inheritable disease. If life were all lived within this field of knowledgeability, complete socialization would become as easy for us as for the bees. The element which differentiates the human group from all others is the necessity for living with, for taking into account, the unknowable.

The world is comparatively a new place. Who can say what principle of nationality may arise out of the mixed Latin and aboriginal peoples of South America, or what confronts us at the next turn of the stair in the awakening to racial consciousness of our incorporated African strain!

Politics is the technique of living together. The search of today is not for a fixed frame of living, but for the principle of elasticity. To attain this, some attention to private character is indispensable. Rather, an end must be made to the idea that

there is such a thing as private character, as distinguished from the sort of character we are expected to exhibit in public affairs. There is only character functioning in a private capacity.

And yet our whole political life is based on the assumption that a man can fill his private life with practices opposed to everything that would be demanded of him in a public career, and still be eligible for public office. This does not necessarily mean that his private character is "bad," in the sense of being opposed to a set of behaviors called "good." The difference is rather in the point of view from which behavior arises.

Democracy is charged with the weakness of calling men to office who have not learned the trade: merchants and artisans, unfamiliar with the methods of public administration. But modern business demonstrates that the element of incompetence is not in the kind of material men have handled. It lies rather in the kind of thinking to which they are accustomed. We have a phrase, "public-spirited," which we apply to occasional acts, such as the endowment of a hospital, or the bestowal on a museum of an art collection for which the owner himself has only a limited use. But we permit the wealth which makes this possible to be acquired by a private spirit of taking every advantage that the law does not expressly forbid.

True public-spiritedness is a state of continuous awareness of the extent to which other people are involved in everything we do, and of their right to be considered. It cannot be arrived at through an occasional indulgence in the vanity of giving, or an occasional perception of the property interest of the people in every beautiful and useful thing. The impulse of even habitually self-interested men toward public service is unquestioned in times like these. It rests on a very profound human instinct, but it cannot rise to any considerable heights out of a daily practice of charging all the traffic will bear, or taking up more seats in the car than are necessary. Great public crises occasionally call men out of profiteering careers, and enable them to conduct themselves successfully on the social plane without previous practice. All the lesser activities of the individual will arrange themselves around the spirit which has become electrified by a great humanitarian idea.

One cannot imagine Walt Whitman, once he had given his soul to democracy, gulping back prejudices of class or race in his intercourse with men, or stiffening his knees if he happened to meet a king. Privileged as a girl to know something of that morning star of American feminism, Frances Willard, I find that the most lasting impression of her is the star-like course she took. She was not troubled,

ever, by the niceties of social adjustment that distract women in general, by what she should think or determine. All her personality fell into simplicity and order behind her single flaming purpose. But between the great souls and the great occasions there are long plain places that have to be filled by the average ability of people to behave citizenly, on no compulsion but appreciation of its worth-whileness. A nation that has to pull its officials into an unfamiliar frame of mind every time it requires a public service is not likely to be very well served.

When we try to assume that a man's stake in the nation, the world and the future, is any different in kind, or can be handled in any other manner than his stake in his street, his town, or in the industry by which he makes his living, then we open the way to make politics a posture. The public stage becomes crowded with pasteboard figures, precepts that are not practiced, and social aims that resolve into vague, altruistic flourishes.

To youth with its passion for sincerity, an unpracticed political profession is as empty as a last year's nest. A bomb is likely to seem a more effective thing because a more genuine thing. But a bomb may just as quickly become the gesture of social impotence, unless it proceeds out of a practical capacity for social living. The whole quest

for new political faiths is for faiths that shall be livable.

It is one of the necessities of political insight that it must lead on to political practice, otherwise the fine edge of discrimination is dulled. The prophet of the people who cannot from time to time put his vision to the test of fulfillment begins presently to follow wandering lights. nations could surround themselves with a Chinese Wall of natural or acquired limitation, so that no other social state could be thought of, they would probably, like the bees and the Chinese, be able to exist indefinitely in a fairly stable condition. But the moment that we begin to think of society as a state of becoming, we are involved in the continuous mobilization of social behavior. Not to be able to live on good terms with discoverable political tendencies is to become the victim of them. That was how Manuel of Portugal lost his kingdom, and Nicholas of Russia his throne.

Ş

One of the best aids to political elasticity is the proper reading of history. There is, however, a very practical difficulty in getting proper history to read. Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, history was little more than a record of the sequence of events in time. All the research of the historian was for validity of date and episode.

The chief inducement offered to the young person to read history is the story interest, the flavor of personality, both of which confuse the real use of history, which is to inform and advise. The immediate concern of youth is not to know what emperors died or made die, but whether there is a soul in life.

In the story of human development is there any evidence of a suprahuman goal? Is there any best way of relating people to the land? Has the community been better served by communal or by private holdings? Are the evils of industrialism due to intrinsic defects in the system, or a bad way of handling a sound method? How did polygamy begin? What happened to the nations that institutionalized it? Is monogamy a modern invention, or is it instinctive in human nature? Is the choice between an elective chief and a hereditary monarch a matter of racial temperament, or of political expedience?

These are the sort of questions that youth imperatively asks of history, questions that cannot be answered by a chronological arrangement of dynasties. The answers to many of them are not in history at all, but in the sciences of biology and anthropology, which are rendered nearly useless by the patter of professional scholarship. It is possible to find a dozen books dealing with the wives of Henry

the Eighth, or the favorites of the Grand Monarch, and two or three that treat of sex degeneracy, where you will find but one sound, readable history of human marriage. Immense pains have been taken to preserve for us the pageantry and ritual of feudalism, but I know of no simple unbiased book about the problem of land ownership, studied with a view to getting society housed and fed.

Nevertheless, the material for valid political conclusions does lie within the scope of past experience, enough of it, if rightly understood, to put up definite, invincible bars against the "things no nation will do." The science of history is too new to have yielded all the aid to politics that may yet be expected of it. But in the parallel development of modern psychology and the history of ideas, we are beginning to find a key to the social expression of private character.

For when we come to such expression, it is impossible to take ourselves, as women, exactly as the granting of the franchise finds us. The private mind as well as the political organization is crowded with old fears, old repressions and still more ancient repulsions. Every propagandist knows how long a new idea may drift footless after its acceptance in reason and intelligence, in this backwater of the public mind.

Men and women both are disposed to give to the

age-long continuance of custom the finality of natural law, and to warm up their political left-overs under fine names of consistency and loyalty. But woman, because of the freshness of her experience in sluicing out the accumulated sex prejudice of centuries, is under a special obligation to impose on political progress no drag out of her own past. First and freely, she must give herself to acquiring the power to express herself in social affairs. For this there is no better help than history, not only the history of woman and her place in the great procession, but history suffused with the meaning and the purpose of the hour.

Some kind of community of thinking is necessary to valid social consent. Probably in the original human group, ideas flashed directly from mind to mind. One was scared; they all ran. One scented food; the rest followed. But now we have to find one another through the loose inadequacies of speech. Classes, debates, public forums, are all important, not only for the classification of ideas, but for the discrimination of political definitions. Social ideals take their vitality in the warmth of the passage from mind to mind.

8

But to say that politics must be discussed in the common speech is only another way of saying that it must be discussed in terms of the concrete instance. If it is a policy of public ownership, it must take its start from known lands, mines and waters; if a question of revenue, for what use and how applied. Democracy could never be much more than a theory until society had furnished itself with a reliable medium for the free circulation of facts.

If this seems to you equivalent to saying that democracy is impracticable without the newspaper, it is quite possibly the case. One might go even further and trace some of the most regrettable failures of democracy to obvious weakness in our system of disseminating news. But one would still have to say that, bad as it is, the Press is indispensable to any social order which attempts to match the technique of living with the facts of living as they arise. The ability to use the newspaper as an aid to the making of political decisions is as necessary as the knowledge of how to use the railroad guide is indispensable to travel.

One thinks of the ideal news sheet as an impersonal medium by which information of world events is delivered at the door. But as a matter of fact, newspapers never are impersonal. The right to establish a point of view is the toll taken by the proprietors as part of their profit on the business of collecting and transmitting news. This makes it indispensable, in order to read a paper intelligently, to know what its viewpoint is, and to read more than one

paper. But it is a mistake to assume that the personalization of news is invariably a violation of the reader's right to formulate his own opinion. Point of view is inseparable from individualism, just as community of view is the natural basis of group association. So, if you read an honest Socialist paper, or a Republican paper, you can reasonably say that you have come into touch with the way the Socialists or the Republicans look at the matter in hand. Thus group bias in a newspaper becomes an aid to social understanding. The truth is somewhere at the intersection of all the lines of vision drawn from the known centers of political conviction.

The two greatest evils of the American news system divide equally between the press and the reader. One of them is the liability of prejudice in the citizen who reads only one paper, and the other is the coloring of the news in the interest of private profit.

The remedy for the first lies in the broadening of the individual intention. Newspapers are not to be read solely for diversion, nor for the confirmation of the personal view. Their chief claim upon our attention is in the diversity of views that they represent, and the assault they are able to make on our prejudices. For the second, the remedy may possibly be in taking the newspapers as seriously as we take, for example, the milk system, making the adulteration of news for profit a punishable offense. But the clamor for an uncontaminated stream of information must extend itself equally to the propaganda of the soap-box and the rostrum. The whole problem of propaganda is bound up with consideration of private initiative in the philosophy of living, and the particular problem of free speech, to which we shall presently come. Propaganda as a preparation for citizenship is, like the transmission of news, not to be disassociated from the use we are able to make of great men.

It is important that we use great men rather than be used by them. Use, not capacity, is the measure of the difference between such historic figures as Jesus and Napoleon; for that which makes of Napoleon at once the most absorbing and pathetic figure in history is his enormous capability, and the fact that the only use that we can now make of him is as an historic warning. Jesus we have not fully known nor understood, but he is still the Tree up which we run the colors of our ever changing, ever fresh idealism. Great men are the catalyzers of social experience. By them potentiality is released from the raw and lumpy actualities of the day. Political insight, the art of relating facts to social exigencies as they occur, is rare. For most of us, before they can be handled at all, facts must be fused in the glow of a great personality. Socialism is associated with Karl

Marx, and World Democracy glows in our minds with the fires struck out of it by Woodrow Wilson. The demand of people in all parts of the country to have their great men visit them is an expression of our continuous need to have the issues of society revitalized, valued afresh.

If you have been thinking of Democracy as a state in which acute accents of individualism do not occur, then you do not yet know the dynamics of human society. Democracy is no place for the timid soul who cannot bear the high discriminations of genius. The whole theory of a democratized society is that it gives increasing room for the multiplication of these natural energizing centers.

Some knowledge of the nature and use of greatness is indispensable to efficient citizenship. It should make also for what we have never yet had, a proper use and understanding of great women. Even among women there has been a disposition to regard our great ones as a mere peacock tail to the movement of emancipation, valued for their creditability to their sex and the consequent advancement of its interests. We do not even speak of them as we speak of great men, as epitomizing the time in which they lived, but as though they themselves were the performance, fire-works rather than true centers of illumination.

The first gift of woman to society was order, some

kind of regularity of eating and coming home to sleep. A genius for organization is so likely a thing to come from woman that it should need no miracle to have it accepted. Yet who remembers that Joan of Arc invented three notable modern features of military organization and attack? Our whole attention is taken up with the circumstance that she heard Voices and was burnt. Perhaps she invented the Voices, too, but if she did, she was justified. How else would she have forced her military genius upon France?

Great women must be more than wondered at, more than admired. But first of all they must be understood as women, higher-powered, deeper-breathing, neither mimics nor angels. The Amazons were not born breastless.

Is not the detachment from the social background which notable women seem to exhibit chiefly our failure to see them as part of the social fabric? Is it not we who are out of touch, and is not all this rather pitiful show of reputations, in an effort to match with the notability of men, evidence that we lack the criterion for any but male kinds of greatness? What we want of woman is the beam from her own orb of spiritual perception, the definite light thrown on our general problem from her high specialization.

THIS demand, that the young citizen, before she begins to exercise her right to political decision, shall at least have been exposed to possibilities of illumination from every quarter of our many-sided social life, will hardly be denied. Yet it is singular that to very few has it occurred that there is a fine quality of illumination to be had for the asking in contemporary art.

The old idea of political science as a process of denaturing government, by removing it as far as possible from the business of making a living, had no use for art, since art is, of all man's modes of expression, closest to the heart of life. The modern intimacy between the ballot and the bread and meat you can buy, and the rent you have to pay, introduces politics to strange company. It obliges us not only to know what laws are being enacted at the capitol, but what dreams are being dreamed in the garret.

But when we speak of contemporary art as an aid to citizenship, we mean something quite different from the cataloguing acquaintance with it which is learned at schools; something much

more than the common phrase of "knowing what you like" is implied. Merely to be pleased with an arrangement of tones and colors is to be no nearer to art than a waltzing mouse might go, or a bower-bird. Something in a picture or a song must move and stir you to a realization of what it was that moved and stirred the maker. This is all there is to an understanding of art; the rest is concerned with appreciations of artistry.

There is no doubt a cultural value in liking the best art without being able to read it, but the social value of art is in our being able to make it a medium of communication. This means that one must be sufficiently detached from the sensuous pleasure of seeing and hearing, to appreciate painting and poetry and music as a method of communication. It is a language out of the inner life of man, of which everyone may stammer a word or two in a verse to your lady's eyebrow, a whittled fancy or an embroidered doily. It is spoken by the paper on the wall, by the lines of a public building, by the tunes of the street organ, for every tune or design or architectural style that persists and keeps itself in modern use is a part of modern art expression. It will be dropped like an obsolete word when it ceases to mean anything to the modern mind.

The recent success of American youth in creating

a Little Theater for itself is a modern episode in the search of youth for social participation. Art is a surer test than logic for ideas of life and society. No good drama can be made with insincere thinking, and without truth no drama achieves greatness. The uniformly steady improvement in the product of the young theater is an indication of more than a practiced technique; it marks the steady approach of the young playwright to that high veracity about life which is the basis of sound citizenship.

Of the use of art which is communal in its method, chorus, dance and pageant, much can be said. Modern armies have song masters—and if armies, how much more the civilian forces—to promote by a social method the unity of aim which music always invokes. But hardly anybody remembers now that poetry was originally a communal art, and that in the beginning there was but one word for poet and prophet. Out of such roots grows the use of contemporary art as an aid to social prophecy. It is the index of progress and change, the foaming, rainbow-bright crest of the incoming tide.

In the summer of 1914 millions of plain people found themselves astounded at the sudden crash of nations along the coasts of civilization. But all of ten years earlier, riffles of this tide began to break on the moving tip of the world's art. There was a renaissance of community drama, and a whole new method for its presentation. Painting broke down like the husk of the living seed from which a new shoot begins to sprout. Poetry sought and found another rhythm. In Russian literature there was the heaving of crude strength about to wake.

Nothing with the power to affect the political constitution of a country ever arises suddenly; it only appears suddenly within the average field of vision. Half of the statesman's genius consists in being able to discern clearly what appears to the majority as a pale blur on the horizon. But in America, when any man may be called to State service, it is important to cultivate rather widely the prophetic quality. The education of this faculty is only possible where a great number of citizens are able to enter into the history, the news and the art of that country as a part of the experience of democracy.

8

But we cannot escape in citizenship, any more than in personal life, the question, what is the limit of profitable experience. There probably would be no question of this sort in a society that distributed citizen duty along the line of natural development. If we began at twelve years of age to have obligations to our neighborhood, and extended those obligations every three years or so, as our actual contact with the street, the town, and the State is extended, then we could easily say that there are some obligations that would better be deferred until our moral experience is fully matured. But our habit of taking our citizenship all in a lump at the age of twenty-one raises the question of what to do about the problems of which, in the nature of things, at twenty-one we can know very little.

At twenty-one, no one can know much about vice and crime. Even a criminal life does not teach, to the one who leads it, the perspective of vice and crime in society.

I think that we must make a distinction here between the personal and the political judgment. At twenty-one and before it, one may easily be subjected to hazards of vice and crime and as much knowledge of these things as is necessary for personal safety is indispensable. How far, then, is the young citizen justified in recording a political opinion on these subjects? How far shall she give herself to books, lectures and propaganda dealing with what is vicious and criminal?

The right to have the world in which you move made safe for the normal human life is one that should be insisted on. After arriving at the age of citizenship, no one should accept safety as a gift at the hands of others. If you happen to be so situated that your parents can keep you safe without your thinking about it, it is still obligatory on
you to think with and for those who must make
their own safety. If it is advantageous for you
to have a chaperone, an older woman with whom
to consult and advise, it is equally advantageous
to the girl in the factory. This is a service which
every adult woman who is able to offer it, owes
to every young woman who needs it, just as physical
protection is owed by every man to every woman.
Young working women make a mistake when they
do not demand this social service for themselves,
as freely and officially as city people demand police
protection.

We have come recently to have quite a new idea of policemen. We do not think of them as the "arm of the law," but as guides to the intricacies of city life. So we have developed the "big brother" and "big sister" ideas as guides to the intricacies of personal life. And we have the same right and necessity to go to literature and art for this kind of guidance.

But when we come to those phases of vice and crime which are not personal but social, we have to approach them in a different spirit. The only object in our approaching them at all would be to cure them. For vice and crime, in our modern social science, are treated as sickness. They are

departures from the healthy and normal. As such, they require the attention of specialists. As they affect the whole of society they must be dealt with by specialists not only in that particular type of abnormality, but by specialists in the constitution of society. Expertness in these things takes years to acquire. The contribution of the young citizen can hardly be of much value and should be offered with modesty. Citizen service in this field, as in the field of public health and sanitation, is rather in the way of selecting specialists, than in arriving at decisions.

8

But the question of what we shall read and hear along these lines opens up the other question of free speech. The difficulty about most free speech arguments is that they begin by assuming that freedom of expression is the only sort of freedom that can be violated by an unrestricted platform and press. They leave out of account the equally important item of freedom of *impression*. Most of the "free speech" cases which came into court in the United States before the war were not for the freedom to say what the speaker thought, but for freedom to say it anywhere and to anybody. They took no account of the fact that an envenomed point of view, an indecent picture, can live on in the mind and fester there, as poisonous and fatal

as a bullet in the body. No society in which the impressionability of the young is at the mercy of the ignorant or vicious can in any sense be said to be "free." The right to arrive at reasonable years with an unviolated mind is as fundamental as any human right can ever be.

Nor is there anything undemocratic in the idea of censorship. Any stranger to democracy, visiting our planet, might easily conclude that a democracy is a form of government in which the individual suffers the greatest amount of restriction for the good of the whole. In cities of the United States he would not be permitted to cross the street without being censored by the traffic officer; he could not spit, nor smoke, nor dispose of his garbage as he pleased. He could not beat his children or abuse his wife—much less his horse—or manage his own illness if it happened to be from a contagious disease. And he would find the people of the United States not only submitting themselves to this kind of censorship, but priding themselves upon it.

In the last two or three years we have begun to censor the almost sacred right of "business" to sell anything it pleased for whatever it could get. We no longer permit patent medicines to be advertised for what they are not, and we require foods to be truthfully labeled. Doctors are obliged to have diplomas and teachers must be certificated. But

we are still very reluctant to require any certification of ideas. We have not yet accepted the idea of the expert in human behavior.

The growth of censorship in sanitation and food stuffs is the measure of our confidence in experts in these fields. Every man cannot be a food expert, but he clearly recognizes that there is such a thing as expert analysis of tinned beef or alleged apple jelly. He recognizes it as one of the things he has a right to expect of his government, that it should protect his interest in foods and drugs. But he protests against the extension of this kind of supervision over the material from which he makes up his opinions.

There are two good reasons for this: first, the danger that censorship of thought-stuff may not be disinterested; and second, the probability of its not being expert. Many people—and in particular the free speech advocates—are quite honest in believing that there is no absolute criterion of human conduct. This is very unlikely to be the case. It is impossible to think of a hole in the universe, and if human conduct does not proceed by law as the rest of the universe does, then there is a flaw in the structure of things which will one day bring it all crashing about us.

The probabilities are that morality and success are as solid and realizable as anything else; the

difficulty lies in our not understanding just what morality and success really are. Because we have not agreed as to what they are, we must leave open every avenue, miss no possible rightness even at the expense of including things that turn out finally to be wrong. Free speech is not a right; it is a precaution. You have really no more right to turn loose a bad idea in the world than you have to leave an open cess-pool; but until expertness in ideas is established, you have the privilege of speech, subject to other people's freedom of impression.

8

The question of war censorship has two aspects, neither one of which has anything to do with rendering aid and comfort to the enemy. Suppressing military information is not a political policy at all; it is an act of self-preservation.

The decision to enter this war was arrived at after long hesitation. It represents our highest moment of world thinking and national feeling. But people do not always live at their high moments. In a situation like this we are always more in danger of being defeated by our own drops and lapses than by the enemy. To have our worst moments always before our eyes, our mistakes emphasized, to chew always on the bitter end of war, would be to invite defeat. We must exercise over our public conduct

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

something like the same control that is necessary to secure personal poise. We expected some jolts in this war; what we must look out for is that we shall not be jolted silly.

We were also due to make mistakes which we cannot correct without discussion. These things are perfectly simple if we would consent to be simple. If we stopped talking about free speech as an abstract right, and looked upon it as a way of getting along decently with ourselves, we should have much less difficulty.

It is astonishing to find how many things that we have raised to the dignity of political theory are really only questions of good breeding. Good breeding is the sum of human experience as to the best way of handling human situations. It is the practice of the art of conducting every situation so that everybody concerned in it will get the best out of that situation.

If our political practices had not been made for us exclusively by men, we should have found this out long ago. Men think of good breeding as manners; women know it for a manner of attaining spiritual democracy. If we practiced good breeding in our speaking and writing, then no criticism of the Government would be made except by people who were expert in the matter under discussion, and every criticism would be made constructive. We should not only be told that the thing had been done wrong, but we should have some notion of how to do it right. And if it came to a difference between experts, that at least would not be a new situation!

I believe that the American people could, in the long run, have been trusted to do just that thing, except for the presence among us, not only of un-American elements, but of enemies. This un-American and enemy propaganda is so subtle that the average citizen is not always able to recognize it. Just as we need a food expert to find the adulteration in the tomato catsup, so we need expert censorship to detect the poison in our publicity. So much we might thankfully submit to.

But the moment censorship departs ever so slightly from its business of informing the people, and begins to present facts and situations only in lights which are favorable to the party in power, then no matter how competent that government is, and how much it has the confidence of the people, it begins to infringe on democracy. Because democracy does not mean that any man's opinion is just as good as another's. It means that it is just as good for one man as for another to express his opinion. Better for a man to express an honestly mistaken opinion than to have a ready-made good opinion forced upon him. Democracy may be wrong about this, but it is

founded on the faith that a better kind of man is produced by free thinking.

That is why it seems unfortunate that so much of war publicity should take the form of advertising. The necessary handling of public thinking has been approached as a business proposition. I do not mean with an idea of making money by it, but in the spirit and in the very terms of the commercial advertisers. War aims are set forth in the manner of breakfast foods; war needs are driven along the familiar track worn deep into the American mind by the spring tonic and the talking-machine. "Drives" are substituted for spontaneous movements, and the minds of the public are shepherded rather than inspired. The object of commercial advertising is to "sell the goods" without thinking very much about what happens to the buyer in the process. If commercial forms of propaganda are necessary to swing the country into war, then it is because as a people we respond more quickly to advertising than to any other stimulus.

This is a very damaging confession. It is the same as saying that the incentive to high and noble and world-embracing activities is not inside of us, but outside. But it is only fair to state this as something that met practically no opposition from the American people. The suppression of opinion thought to be unfriendly to our and Allied interests,

has been practically voluntary. Writers have ceased to write what was in their souls, and write what is asked for by Washington. For the time, at least, the soul of the American people lies limp in the hands of its Government.

The danger for us in this situation is not immediate. The high purpose and disinterestedness of the present Administration and its general agreement with the purposes and desires of the people, are notable in a world of disagreements. The danger is that in submitting ourselves too long to shepherding, we shall lose our power of spiritual initiative. That is the horrible thing that has happened to the Germans, the worst atrocity of the war. They have no freedom of impression. Their minds are blown hot or cold by the breath of their government.

That we have not reached anything like this stage in America is evident from the fact that important groups of citizens did not, until nearly a year after the declaration of war, vote to support it. These groups kept their liberty of impression, kept it all the clearer, perhaps, for not being permitted to vex the Government with a loud noise of expression.

Free speech has its own dangers, one of them being the disposition of mankind to follow its own voice instead of its instinct. Nations have before now been carried over precipices on the torrent of

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

their own oratory. We shall do well enough in America by leaving off the habit of unlimited speech-making so long as too much is not done to affect our capacity for free thinking. So long as our official Head is the voice of the public spirit, he will be heard further by keeping smaller voices silent. The disastrous thing would be for us to become simply the bell to our official clapper.

PUBLIC spirit, the extension of social awareness to include all the members of a political group, is the purchase of time and pains. We have still among us a few of the old type of public characters who imagine public spirit to consist in a diffused sentiment of benevolence carried abroad on the wings of oratory. And on the other hand, we have young people devoting themselves to public-spiritedness as a profession, by years of social service and attendance on classes where its theory is discussed.

The practical foundation of social awareness would seem to be established by wide social contacts. But there must also be a quality of mind involved, since nowhere have we a civilized state or nation equally conscious of all its elements. When, for example, the fabric of awareness is stretched to take in on the one side the congenitally defective, it falls short on the other, of full consideration for the exceptionally gifted. We have schools for backward children and cripples but none for geniuses. In an American Indian tribe, in times of food shortage, the very old are first dropped out of the count, then the infirm and the unproductive.

These are the classes for which the American State provides well-kept institutions and asylums. But in all our great cities sound and well-born children are stunted of their growth, and even die for lack of The Indian, however, has the advantage of having all the members of his group within his He discriminates on the basis of personal knowledge. In the civilized state of today the complication of group within group, and the multiplication of modes of living is such that the average mind cannot take it in. The effective classes, those who are removed a little from the bone of hunger. provide for the contingencies within their experience. They are as likely as anybody to have infirm and defective members, and themselves to need protection from the criminal and the insane.

But strikes, fines, forced unemployment, injurious trades, continuous food shortage, are practically outside their experience. Even when in times of war or great natural disaster the two extremes of society through their mutual dependence tend to cohere, the movement is exclusive rather than inclusive, labor and capital combining against the middle classes. As if the ability to be fully aware of fashions of living different from our own were naturally limited like the mathematical faculty, and the search for a political common denominator as complicated a performance as trying to extract

the cube root of three thousand and eighty-seven in your head. Just as there are tribes who can count only ten fingers and ten toes and possible tens of these, so there are social groups that can take in nothing not related to the body of their experience.

The limitation of the social outlook by a fourthousand-year-old food prejudice, or the things a gentleman will not say in the presence of a lady, is one of the curiosities of human psychology. But the whole modern technique of social welfare has grown up out of the realization that people are more divided by these things than by any hostile intention. In this new science of welfare it is assumed that there is a rectifying principle in the human spirit. The disposition to save ourselves from political disaster is as natural as the instinct of self-preservation, and the cure of social evil is often effected simply by bringing the evil condition into the field of social awareness. If one really wishes to stop the wearing of breasts and wings on ladies' hats, it is only necessary to contrive that a few birds shall be publicly slaughtered, preferably by the ladies! To insure the best conditions for factory workers, we have to materialize for the factory owner the direct structural relation between light and air and the factory output.

It is quite possible that the entire problem of

society's never having food enough, or clothes enough, or adequate housing, is owing more to our failure to realize that this is the case, than to any inadequacy of production. The moment we begin to have enough of these things for ourselves, we move, sympathetically as well as bodily, out of the neighborhood of perpetual lack. Any reliable diagnosis of poverty depends on our being able to move, sympathetically, back. The social expert is now a feature of our political life. But even to appreciate the conclusions of experts and to discriminate between their recommendations, it is important for the private citizen to have a wide acquaintance with living conditions.

At the very least, this involves the personal exploration of some other manner of life than your own. This is not easy for women who, through the long inheritance of ladyhood, conditioned largely by the number of things they might not do, are predisposed to selected experience. Though we officially repudiate it by giving women the vote, the idea that a woman's value to society is increased by limiting her social experience to soft and pleasant phases is unconsciously a factor in the training of young women.

An ideal state would no doubt recognize the need of social experience as a part of legitimate preparation for citizenship. One can imagine such a thing

as a young citizen draft, working out its traditional three years in public service chosen to give the greatest possible range of awareness. As a substitute for citizen training, the opportunities offered by the settlement house, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Women's Trade Union League, reinforced by all manner of neighborhood associations and local welfare clubs, seems meager enough. Yet all of them are important in so far as they provide openings for entering without affectation into view-points other than our own. They have come to be recognized centers of awareness from which are drawn inescapable conclusions as to what it really means to the rest of us to have any considerable class of citizens with never quite enough to eat, and sleeping four in a bed. To be acquainted at first hand with poverty, to measure the industrial out-look with our own breast and arm, is inseparable from any well thought out preparation for citizenship.

8

It is unfortunate that in America we have generally cut ourselves off from the use of the novel as an aid to social extension, by declining to like any sort of fiction that does not take its color from our own point of view. Within a generation of Uncle Tom's Cabin, which went so far to prove that fiction is the only form of statement which carries con-

viction widely and long, we have abandoned the idea of literature as a source and expression of social vitality. It is all part of our American use of art as an anodyne rather than a tonic, a camouflage of reality. A good novel that can be entered into as an experience is worth a year of such social experiment as is open to the average private citizen. But good novels will be rare so long as what we definitely require of the novelist is to come between us and experience, a soundless, deadening drift. It is one of our literary conventions that the novel of today be occupied with the rosy gospel of cheer; but there is always the suspicion attached to deliberate cheeriness, that it is a sort of whistling to keep your courage up. One suspects, indeed, that the prevalence of the "glad" school of fiction in America is owing to an uneasy sense that if we once looked straight into the reality of contemporaneous life, we might have to do something about it. This is so likely to be the case, that the degree to which you find the rose-red glow indispensable to your enjoyment of fiction may well serve as a criterion of your social state. Whether or not you have the opportunity and the keenness of sight to look through the inadequacies of political organization into the plain human situation, it is important that you should, at least, not fear to look. If you find yourself flinching from any logical

conclusion of the policies you profess, depend upon it, either you or your conclusion is unsound.

8

Feeling out your private reaction to living conditions, by whatever method, is an indispensable preface to the choice of political affiliations. along the front of civilization innumerable tiny wavelets run up the coast of the future and are drawn back into the advancing tide. "Parties," "movements," "causes," are all rooted in the social nature of man. It is said that no astronomer is sure that he has seen a new star until it has been located by some other observer of the heavens. There is probably more in this than just the need of professional confirmation. The concentrated, electrified attention of very many minds is necessary to bring a new political ideal into the field of political action. For new ideals are like the tree of the old story, so tall that it takes two men to see to the top. No movement worthy of the unified effort of society can ever lie wholly within the range even of a single generation.

It is important to all-round citizenship that you lend yourself to other causes than those that take light from your daily life. To work only for and within the group closest to your private interests is to foster class interests and class point of view. One of the best ways of enlarging your social horizon is to give yourself heartily to some movement which is only related to you through your interest in the good of the whole. The best criterion of your choice of a cause would be the contribution you have to make to that cause rather than the personal benefit to be derived. Only the unusual individual can afford to give the whole of his life and thought to one political purpose, or to one expression of it. There is, of course, the alternative of making no choice at all, waiting to be dragged up the shore by some deep ploughing billow of revolution, along with an uncomfortable amount of weed and sand. Except that the will of youth is naturally toward self-determining activity, there would always be this danger in democracies.

The test of the validity of any political movement is in its conformity to life, to the principle of growth, and change. It must have roots. At the very first bid for our franchise, it must show a fruit-bearing stem and a growing tip which pushes aside the clod and turns every way for warmth and light. At the next, it must be able to present itself as an extension of something already in the social consciousness. It may call for an absolutely untried experiment, it may even involve the overthrow of long established modes of expression, but its fibers must be discoverable centuries deep in our psychology. With whatever change of political perspective,

the new movement must carry us, in an ascending order, to a given arc of the social spiral.

The movement of wage labor toward profitsharing, for instance, has all the marks of a genuine political progression. It is rooted in the primitive communism of the hunt: it is a re-statement of the ancient land and sea-faring foray with its equitable division of the spoil; it incorporates the best elements of the trade guilds, the dignity of trade and the pride of workmanship which our modern industrial system has so nearly lost. Finally, it represents, in all its circuitous phases, a general improvement in the rating and environment of labor. It may not be the best way of solving the problem of modern industry, it may even bring in its train other problems not less acute and disturbing, but it is at least a valid political adventure, to which the sincere soul may commit its enthusiasm without fear that time and the future will prove him foolish.

Even more could be said for the movement to endow maternity, which develops in mothers' allowances and dependent children acts, as a practical renewal of the ancient tribal rule of "women and children first," a re-statement of the preciousness of women in terms of social service. Far less charged with possibility of absurdity, it is the modern fruit of all the fine, vague things that prompted men to chivalry and mother-worship, the cult of Demeter and the Madonna.

On the other hand, the movement toward polygamy discernible in Central Europe, condemns itself on the same sort of showing. Even accepting the theory of the development of society from the formless herd, and making the family unit the second rather than the first phase of social life, the ascending progression has invariably been away from polygamy. Where it has re-entered the social scene, it has been at periods of the greatest national depletion. After war, polygamy has been accepted as an expedient by the dominant races, but never as a solution. All the forward nations have experienced it at some time in their history, only to discard it upon recovery of the equilibrium of population. Always its reappearance has been followed by the depression of human values, the lessening of the dignity of womanhood and the retention in the national organization of slavery or slave-making The nations that have institutionalized polygamy are the nations that have lost step.

8

This is what we mean by the use of history as an aid to political decision. It is in the nature of any living issue that, like life, it should possess great flexibility. Any movement which has for its objective a shape of social fixity, may be regarded with liberal distrust. Any movement which assumes that it is the "be all and end all" of social unrest advertises itself as a point beyond which no growth takes place. Though it may, in spite of all its followers say of it, be a live issue, the blind leading the blind are not more likely to fall into the ditch than the advocates of an absolute social solution.

This dream of a stabilized society is the ghost of man's ancient fear, when he woke first out of comfortable animal security, and found the future, terrible with the threat of unknowability, beside him. To get the place tidied up, everything named and rendered solid and stationary, has been, ever since, his urgent and unsuccessful business. the sheep, man has taken on from his first venture in life, associations of stability. To this day, lost sheep in the mountains will travel until they find a cliff or a boulder which quickens the old complex bred in them in the stone caves where man first domesticated them some two hundred and fifty thousand years ago, and there they will linger in the false association of security until hunger or the wolf finds them. So, to this day, little flocks of men are always splitting off from the main group into rock-hard enclosures of the absolute. All the coast of progress is lined with back-waters of political invention, sometimes under the name of religion and sometimes of social polity, mantling with the scum of oblivion at best, and at the worst, breeding noxious insects and pestilence.

But in avoiding movements that seek an impossible permanence of form, one must not fall into the error of attaching importance to mere formlessness. The tendency of natural growth is always toward form, but form without fixity, the flowing shape of a fountain, of an elm tree, infinitely variable and airy and recognizable. The beauty of the flower or the frost on the pane is the beauty of order and organization; losing that, they become mist and dust again.

The natural method of outworn social habits is to wither and drop away like last year's leaves. But in complicated civilizations like ours, custom may be so woven into the texture of law and property that skillful pruning is necessary to development. The difference between upward evolution and social disintegration is that the latter produces no form or order. The social impulse is creative, like the impulse of architecture and music; it moves always to build and rebuild. The whole art of statesmanship is in the choice of forms in advance of the national need.

8

If all or any of these things are too hard for you, there is the final resort of selecting your cause by the quality of its adherents. Not that you will not always find undesirable kinds, the fragmentary and footless, carried like weed upon the tide; but it is important that there should be some doers among them.

Political policies of national magnitude cannot be illustrated by one or two or even a hundred of their followers, and yet their practicability needs continually to be attested. Talk disassociated from accomplishment limpens the fiber of the mind. That is why professional agitators, pushed into executive positions, are so invariably disappointing, and in their private capacities not always reliable. Their very trumpet quality, sounding high and enduring things at times, lays them open to be played upon by other aims than the betterment of society. Like a public drinking-cup, it is possible for the professional agitator to carry at the same time, fresh water and contamination. Distrust any cause that does not attract doers, people with acknowledged mastery in the technique of realizing a political theory in terms of daily life. No matter who bark for or against it, there is probably some meat in any subject in which a man like Theodore Roosevelt sets the teeth of his mind.

Few things are more important than this business of finding and keeping a sense of social direction. Something a little finer than intelligence goes to its attainment, but intelligence must do its best.

Rare souls like Abraham Lincoln are born to it, fully oriented. But for the most of people it comes stealing insensibly, out of the use of history and great men and the touch-and-go of current events. When we say of national crises that they are "steadying," we mean no more than that under the pressure of disaster the needle swings instinctive to its pole. We cease to argue, for the moment, whether there is a soul of life; we feel and know.

What we know has been expressed for us with a singular unanimity of terms by many whose distinction it has been to possess this poise and sureness. They call it co-operation with God. That was how Lincoln knew it. Carlyle drew the certainty of Power and Personality, active and interested in the affairs of men, out of history, and he was a very prophet among historians. H. G. Wells, who more than any other writer has handled the furniture of modern politics, and handled it more freely, discovers an Invisible King, much as one realizes the master of the house from living in his rooms.

But it is unimportant what the thing is called; unimportant whether you like it or find it friendly to the survival of your type. The significant item is that great men and great times have always come to this sense of God standing within the shadow of the future and directing the course of events. This is not a figure of speech, but an expression of reality in human experience. The worst politics the world has ever known came at a time when we thought of God not as present in the affairs of men, but afar off in some barely attainable Heaven. It is a question if politics are ever so much concerned with things of the intelligence and what we call material considerations, as with that other most subtle class of experiences known as spiritual perceptions, the conviction of things not seen. At any rate, men have not found any finer cause to die for than politics, for the right of the people to arrange their own methods of living together.

Rereading the arguments which preceded our great civil conflict, one is astonished to see that by far the most "practical" appear to be on the side of slavery. But if the Abolitionists had fewer arguments, it is because they needed fewer, abounding as they did in conviction. The instinct of a new social order burned in them, as one of his countrymen said that the instinct of a new continent burned in Columbus. Arguments are for the people who do not see. That is why even the arguments which win a cause are often found afterward to be mistaken. What people are seeking with all their talk, is a medium of communication by which high spiritual perceptions may be transmitted to

the majority. Joan's Voices got her believed in France, because in those days Voices were an argument. It was still possible, to the general mind, for saints and angels to walk the earth and talk with men.

All these things are important because they have to do with instincts, and they tend to show that man has a very profound instinct to find purpose and tendency in the social drift. The higher the point from which the procession of human history is viewed, the more the discoverable trend is affirmed. This, if true, is at once the explanation and the consolation of our failure to find a fixed order of politics. It gives us, rather, a larger security than we dreamed, in place of the little certainty of the ant and the bee, the sureness of a planet in its course.

THOUGH we speak of politics as the technique of the social art, we are conscious of a narrower use of the word. In the language of the street, as the last stage of causes and movements on the way to becoming law, politics is the technique of political power. In this sense, as the mechanism by which party supremacy is arrived at and maintained, it is frequently spoken of as a thing unfit for women, which is probably true.

Party politics is an expression, in groups of organization, of the masculine temperament. Quite apart from any consideration of goodness or badness, it is characterized by so many exclusively masculine features that it must either continue to be exercised by men alone, or undergo a change of complexion on the admission of women to the Party.

Although it is possible to take too seriously any one or all of the existing parties as you find them, Party is as fundamental a social unit and practically as inescapable, as the family. It is the spirit of the gang, the natural cohesion of youth in formless bands, taking shape around a dominant personality. It can be traced in the totemic group through the

secret society with its rituals, grips and signs, dramatizing the relations of the group to some common concept of life and destiny. As a group expression of man's sense of Allness in an idea, it can never be clearly grasped without understanding that democracy has always meant something to men which it has yet to mean to women.

The primitive gang is the earliest attempt of man to transcend his own limitations toward the dimensions of the race. The soul of the race struggles to realize itself by means of party organization. The member of the boy gang rehearses his relation to the tribe; the tribe rehearses for the nation. After long experience of living together in nations, the world-soul is conceived. Party, therefore, is implicit in any aggregation of humans. It is naturally evoked around any live seed of social idealism, impregnating the whole body politic with its fire. Individuals become fused with the strength, the courage, the exaltation, and—on occasion—the fear of the whole. The super-personality so brought to life is objectified in the person of the party chief.

Party history has been the history of successive discoveries of the availability of the party group for political success. For a long time the party concerned itself only with establishing its leaders and platforms as a category of group ideals. Men died for a Montague or a Capulet for no reason except that they found themselves making the Montague or the Capulet gesture. The Will to Power was satisfied by the postures of power, and nothing was distinguished between what really happened and what was felt about it.

Even after the rise of democracy, party intelligence was chiefly occupied with theories and abstractions of government. The party organization depended for its vitality on party psychoses—the loud shout, the affirmation of party loyalty as a virtue, the reinforcement of conviction by vilifying the opposition. The constitution of the Party was totemic; it represented a common source for the point of view. You were a member of the Conservative or the Radical party as your temperament was conservative or radical. In early American politics, the advantage of filling public offices with party members did not at first appear. "To the party belong the spoils" was a late development.

The enormous preoccupation of those times with such matters as Toryism and the tariff would have to be counted as social waste, except for its being very little concerned with either Tories or tariff. It was really a self-preserving effort to keep alive the instinct of togetherness, to stamp it awake out of its long sleep under autocracy. In the history of political invention, man's desire to make himself

felt precedes the desire to make himself felt in a particular direction. What the gang primarily demanded of a leader was that he should possess the ability to make them all seem less fragmentary. United to him by admiration, by interest and even by fear, they became effectual. It is probable that the first great men had no advantage at all, except that of being able to make the detached contributions of the group members cohere and to shine at any moment with its collective brilliancy.

The process may still be seen going on, one man absorbing the ideas, the insight and aptitudes of his following, giving them back charged with personality which warms them with its ray. The pride of participation in the leader is the soul of party loyalty, and profit becomes a secondary consideration.

We cannot get at this quality by calling it names. We cannot get at it at all, I think, except by writing it down among the primary impulses, along with the Will to Live and the Will to Make Live, as the Will to Power, the desire to make something happen. It is often possible to get the illusion of power by opposition. This is the resort of social impotence. True political ascendency is attained by out-stating the earlier platform, by consolidating around the larger affirmation. The torchlight procession and the "planting" of candidatorial scandals began to

go out of American politics as labor unions and social welfare began to come in.

Though in the early stages of society no objection was made to the organization of ideistic groups among women, the pull of party instinct was never strong enough to counter the individualizing influence of the home. And if party spirit, the introactive, exclusive and inclusive impulse of the gang, was never so marked a feature of woman's psychology in the beginning, how much less now, when men have made of politics a field in which to exercise the whole range of masculine instincts.

In America, party politics has been emotional, not to say orginatic in proportion as our culture has been provincial, and our industry drab and flat. Where there is no art by which a communal idealism may be made objective, there is nothing but oratory and much running to and fro. As the business of making a living has become more straitened and monotonous, man has made of the strategies and surprises of party politics a substitute for adventure, a mimicry of the chase, a temporary recurrent release from social isolation.

None of these things are native to the genius of woman. The fear that her admission to what is called practical politics will leave it poorer for men by the elimination of their special kind of togetherness is not without foundation. One sees the sudden rise of woman suffrage in warring countries as largely accounted for by the instinctive abandonment by men of a field made to seem narrow by the more dramatic and immediate activities of battle. The extent to which women can retain in their own hands the local machinery for regulating the small business of living, is going to be directly in proportion as the returning soldiery can be released into the larger fields of creative engineering and world politics.

8

It would be a mistake for women to discard party simply because it is not instinctive in the feminine temperament. All that is necessary is to discriminate between what is democratizing in party politics, and what is merely the mode of masculine expression. We failed to do that when we imagined that politics could be made sound by putting only "good" men into office, failing to understand that the real connective tissue of Party is not ethics but psychics. Not any kind of badness or goodness, but the organization of the Will to Power around a personality, is the magnetic center of party politics, not the less magnetic and forceful when it produces those offences which go by the general name of political corruption.

This term, political corruption, is undescriptive. The politics of a country can only be base when the mass of the people live together basely, basely engrossed with personal interests, basely devoted to the rosy, the obviously complacent, basely afraid of movement and change. Plain badness, such as bribery, theft and "graft" occur in all human activities. Their excessive appearance in the field of public affairs is a symptom of deadened areas of social awareness. Cease to know how the water and lighting of your community are handled, how your milk comes in and your garbage goes out, and you very shortly hear the blue flies of political profiteering buzzing in the obscurity.

But it is not the moral lapses of individual politicians that prevent the party from its business of expressing the will and the desires of society. Nor is the cure of party evils to be effected by bringing to bear on them a superior moral character. What is wanted is a superior quality of social thinking. Otherwise the women voters will find themselves in the situation of the "muck-raked" politician of ten years ago, pathetically offering the unimpeachable conduct of their private business and their domestic virtues to offset the charge of political corruption.

The final revelation of our muck-raking episode was not ethical but methodical. It all went to show that the pattern of government is overlaid by another pattern of personality. A "boss" was

discovered to be a member of any group who possessed in an unusual degree the faculty of potentializing his following. His power is directly related to this faculty, and has nothing to do with his moral—or immoral—use of it.

Having thus provided us with the greatest possible number of defamatory phrases for politicians, and taken them away again, the movement to penetrate to the sources of political dissatisfaction dropped. And there it stands, this curiously inconclusive muck-raking episode, like one of those ancient Roman Hermes, faces looking both ways, above an unfinished pillar of wood or stone. Legless and armless, it neither points nor leads.

But to women, suddenly called upon to demonstrate their capacity for political responsibility through the party machine, the failure to finish out the figure appears as the failure of the masculine instinct. The muck-rakers, peering about the dark corners of party politics, were looking for something extra-human, something that could be described and destroyed. And all they found was man.

They found men becoming bosses by their power of consolidating the wills and the desires of their "ring," but they found no other mark by which a boss could be known. There were honest bosses and corrupt bosses, and there were bosses. Some

attention was given to establishing a criterion of what was and was not desirable in a boss, an undertaking from which the leaders of the movement early and frankly retired. Bossism was accepted as intrinsic in human nature and inseparable from human affairs.

If you read the literature of that time, you will find indications that the students of political corruption were not altogether satisfied with this conclusion. They took pains to assure the public that they did not feel themselves morally superior to the men they criticized. This was a way of stating what they felt without clearly seeing that the evils of bossism were much more in man-nature than human nature; they had not sufficient acquaintance with the political methods of women to make the distinction.

American women, though they have scarcely been officially admitted to politics, are not altogether without political experience. There are in this country nearly ten million women, federated and affiliated in various organizations for social welfare, and some of these organizations have histories of half a century of accomplishment. The principle of political leadership is well understood and successfully practiced by them. There are leaders of women, highly energized centers of uplift, and leaders who are

highly energized without being at all times wise and advantageous to the Cause. But there is no woman in high place who is neither one thing nor the other.

I suppose that I have met practically all the women who have been elected by women to positions of importance in national welfare. I do not know one who is not herself a figure of achievement, fertile and polarizing to other minds. And I know many men who have been elected by other men to positions of national importance, who are wordy, vain and sterile. This is one of the commonplaces of our political life. We have these men in Congress, in Cabinets, we have come dangerously near to having them in the Presidential chair. There is no community so small that it does not have its prototype of the professional politician, handed about from office to office, with no discoverable qualifications except his politic relations to other men. The situation is all in that word politic, which does not mean, as it should by derivation, skilled in social craft, but skilled in the art of making on other men an impression favorable to its interest. All the lanes and highways of political administration are clogged with such figures, sustained there not by anything that they have done, but by something that they have been able to make voters feel about them.

Out of man's untutored instinct and his past,

there is this mist of party emotion going up forever between his political intelligence and his political intention. For the majority of men, consciously or not, a political campaign is an indulgence, a rehearsal of suppressed gang instincts, peculiar to the male experience. Successful party campaigners are those who can best play upon the latent mob psychoses which come offering themselves gladly to his hand.

I have said that this flotation of a public character by means of his personal reaction does not occur among women. Certainly not in respect to other women. If one looked for a sweeping generalization of the difference of approach by men and women to social experiences, it could be found in the superior detachability of women, in their steadier discrimination between the social objective and the incidents of achievement. Women are rounder than men, spiritually more affirmed, never so at the mercy of the mob-mind. Oratory, which is a powerful instrument in the hands of the political entrepreneur, is not a woman gift. Women speak movingly and to the point, but among themselves "spell-binding," that swathing of the intelligence in sooth-sounding sentences, does not often occur.

Against the tendency of Party to slake itself with political postures and the spoils of power, women can with success oppose their native detachment. In local measures they have only to be true to their genius for the immediate and the specific, and they can point the index of the political dial. But it still remains to be seen whether, having emancipated themselves from sex traditionalism, they can stand out against the pooh-bah traditionalism of party politics.

It cannot be done by attributing to any one party the enfeeblement of nationa! political action by "politic" officials. Nor can we by any reconstruction of the frame of Government prevent the drift of the politically inept toward public office. Doubtless the mechanism of the Government has to be reshaped from time to time. Ours, having been organized by men exclusively for the use of men, will require some adjustment to its extended use by women. But party politics is a product not so much of men, as of man-mindedness. We can get at it at its highest point by understanding that the early phases of the gang were religious, and their ritual was the expression of the things in man's social experience which transcended his power of speech. Much of the Governmental red tape of which we complain without being able to rid ourselves is desiccated tribal ritual. It can no more be got rid of by men alone than an ear of corn can strip itself of its own husks. Here the best service of women to politics is in the maintenance of a certain aloofness.

There are several questions that one has a right to ask of a political leader, besides the question of his being seriously committed to the question in hand. We may ask what vision there is in him, whether it is solid, realizable, the veritable landscape of the future, or one of those strange mirages which float on the mind's eye, the refraction of some obscure trait of personality. We have to ask of his greatness, whether it is of that second order, which consists in seeing greatly the thing to be done, without the ability to draw around him great men to do it. But of his private character the only thing that may be justly asked is whether there is anything in it which would defeat the purpose for which he may be elected. To attempt to measure public men by the criterion of woman virtue is to repeat the enormity of man's waste of woman, his refusal to take into social consideration any of her capacities which do not appeal to his private interest in her.

Woman suffrage is woman's denial of the idea that her place and function in society is in any way or particular established by what men feel about her. It affirms, so far as it concerns her sex, that womanhood and motherhood have definite, geometric values which are obscured rather than enhanced by all this confused and cloudy sentiment. The ballot has been sought as a repudiation of the whole method of social progress by merely producing an effect. But

women have been mistaken in thinking that the demand which men make to have an effect produced on themselves is made only on women. What they have now to face is the stultification of politics through the personal influence of men on other men. Thinking to escape into politics out of the stuffy atmosphere of bed-room and kitchen, as into a cool and ordered place, women will be astonished at the rather general masculine inability to discriminate between the candidate's personality and his capacity for specific social gains.

And yet, just this situation must be met and overcome if we are to establish any criterion between the best and the not best, or, in the common phrase, between honest politics and corrupt politics. I think that the leaders of the muck-raking episode—which we have to go back to as the last one which definitely enlarged our political outlook—realized that the "invisible government" was not deliberately malign. What they did not see was that it was mannish.

Given a man-made institution, working exclusively in the stuff of the masculine temperament, I do not see what other pattern could be produced. Spinning between his tendency toward high individual variation and his gang instinct—voluntary surrender to a dominant personality, alternating with periods of violent recovery—this is the orbit which man repeats in every history key. On the

other hand, we have the experimental family type of organization which is woman's contribution. She made it out of her physical limitations and the necessities of her young. The state, the nation, is an attempt to stabilize society by combining the best features of both types. The party is man's personal instrument, and the worst thing about it is its excess of mannishness.

.8

Much of the general unsatisfactoriness of our politics is traceable to our Government's being founded on two general ideas, neither of which is now true. The first one was that the energizing centers of political life coincide with party and political offices. When we found by experience that they did not, we spent a great deal of time trying to put the men who represented the real centers of social energy into office. Most of our political reforms in the past were of just this character. But the effort has now so broken down that it is a question whether our chief political error is not in thinking that political leaders ought to be party men.

Political ideas and movements seldom do develop within a party. They originate in experience, are mobilized by a free press, and frequently come to issue without ever being adopted by any recognized party. The woman suffrage movement lived and grew for nearly forty years, and was only taken on by existing parties after its success was assured.

The introduction of a new temperamental bias into politics in the woman vote, the direct application of public opinion to public affairs by means of the initiative, referendum and recall, all indicate the decay of the party as an institution. At this hour, it is not even necessary, to be helpful, to describe the platforms of existing parties. Not that aggregations of voters may not survive the present stress, under banners nominally Democratic, or Socialist or Republican. It is written on the walls of the world's capitols, however, that they can only survive by becoming something other and more adaptive than that which any one of those names at present implies.

The other early political assumption which is being more rapidly altered by the war than any other, was the idea which, in 1776, had the force of experience, that government was something that was set over the people. It had to be watched constantly to see that it did not impose. One of the objects of the framers of the Constitution was to invent a system of checks and restrictions by which the different departments of the Government could watch one another.

The result was that they succeeded only in making it very inconvenient to get anything done. The need developed by the war for getting things done

quickly has made it necessary to revise the mechanism of the Government, to make it more harmonious with the new idea about it, the idea of government as an expression of social consent. Why should the President be restricted in doing those things that we expressly elect him to do? This is the meaning of the shifts of authority and power going on at Washington. It is all part of the growing understanding of society as something that moves and grows.

Many other of our early inventions are quite as much in need of remodelling. One of them is the separate State. The idea of federated political groups is sound. It grows out of the differences in living conditions dependent on geography, soil and climate and the procession of harvests. The difficulty about our States is that their divisions are artificial. We have too many, and with no good reason for their being in that particular place. Depend upon it, anything political which does not grow from some sound root in the earth is out of place.

All these lesser artificially divided groups are expensive to maintain and clumsy to handle. That is why the Federal Banking System ignores the State boundaries, and divides into twelve districts, each district representing what might be called a distinct culture. That is, it represents a distinct group of natural factors which call for different ways of being

lived with, the New England culture, the Ohio Valley culture, the Pacific Coast culture, and all the rest.

It would be a great saving if all our secondary politics could follow some such natural grouping. The state organizations are very much tied up with history and property interests, so that it will require all the fluency we have gained through war to regroup them. Method, however, is unimportant, it is the principle of distribution to which I wish to call attention.

Just as the center of political energy is in the person who is able to make them cohere, so the natural center of political organization can always be found in the conditions that enable people to live. States or governments of whatever kind should be arranged around the four great social causatives, food, housing, clothing and transportation. These are the things that make one society differ from another. They are the criterions of suitability in the making of constitutions for states and nations.

VII

Nationality is the expression in political form, of the temperament of a people made homogeneous by living in one place. The principle of national cohesion is very subtle. It is not the principle of race; one might say that race is the product of nationality, or that race becomes nationality by the process of living long enough in one environment. Every thousand years or so new nations are made out of combinations of races, and out of the nationality so formed a new race arises.

But a mere aggregation of people, even of the same race, is not a nation. There must be form and political consistency. It might be any of the forms we have discussed, but for a nation to have potency, that form must be the self-determined expression of the genius of the people. Nations cannot be made by conquest. Sometimes by long, forced coalitions peoples not too unlike may become so welded that it is inexpedient to divide their political interests. Still, the Roman Empire, for all its yoking of kingdoms, never made a nation, and the power of Spain in Mexico produced nothing more unified than a loose confederation of tribal states. Even by con-

quest, it is difficult to make a nation against its will. All through Europe, in the midst of other states, lie fragments of dismembered nations like Poland and Bohemia, that need only a few drops of life-giving liberty to make them rise again whole and sound.

If self-determination is the factor that gives political life to nations, it is the inter-action of land and race that gives them character. If this were not so, there would be no such thing as nationality in art. But this is the most indisputable thing about art, that it very definitely reflects not only the land from which it came, but the racial strains through which it reaches us. Negro music in Africa is one thing, and music made by negroes in America is another, just as Anglo-Saxon politics in Australia is different from Anglo-Saxon politics in England.

Where two or three races have successively occupied the same land, they will plainly show in their art and policies the influence of the land, its color and contours, winds, mountains, climates. It is even possible to guess from the songs of an unknown country whether it is open desert, or tree-covered, with sharp, heaven-climbing hills. Nationality is not a mere matter of boundaries or color on a map. It is an inescapable condition of men living on a varied and unequal earth.

No doubt the world would be a safer place to live in if it were all flat like a table, and if its waters instead of having to be bridged and sailed upon, were all gathered to one side. But it is apparently not in the nature of worlds to be flat. Neither is it in the nature of minerals, or trees, or man to be all of one quality or one kind. Differences in point of view with corresponding distinctions of political expression are the elements of which nations are built, and cannot be omitted from any sound internationalism.

So when we begin to deal with the question of nations, we have to begin not only with the fact of differences in points of view, leading to distinctions of political method, but with the possibility of change growing out of national experience. We must deal with nations as natural, and therefore likely to increase both in numbers and vitality, demanding more room in which to come to their full growth. Finally, we have to deal with that hidden urge of life which throws up from time to time new principles of nationality.

Every one of these considerations is a factor in the international situation. Every one of them must be accommodated in any satisfactory rearrangement. But the very nature of nations disposes at once of the suggestion now being made in many quarters, that international conflicts may be prevented by the simple device of consolidating all of them under one flag.

It is a common weakness of human nature to think of itself as idealistic when it is merely unimaginative. True political imagination consists in the power to select those elements of a situation which have constructive force, and project them into the future. Lacking this power, the future becomes a fog on which men throw the color of their dreams, as magic lantern pictures used to be thrown on a curtain of smoke.

That is why any vision that is thrown up out of American life, of a unified human race working in harmony for its own improvement, must be examined very closely for structural features. For the great structural forces of society are spiritual, invisible; and America is the most unimaginative of nations. Or, if imaginative at all, only in terms of material, steel and concrete, crops and engines. That is why there is such a perpetual after-dinner flavor to our world thinking. All that we have contributed thus far has been the projection on the screen of the future of the well-fed "business" mind. And this is quite as true when the vision comes from the type of mind that repudiates "business" as the core of political life, true in the sense that the world vision which goes by the name of pacifism or internationalism lacks structure.

The average man sees a League of Nations, a sort of standing committee of nations which will meet

and perhaps pass unanimous resolutions, but he does not in the least see what is to be accomplished. The Internationalist sees all the boundaries of nations dissolved in a tepid bath of brotherhood, but he does not in the least see how. Both these visions are reflections of an attitude, an approach. Of the two, the average man's is more formulated because it proceeds out of a daily habit of getting things done, while all the professional pacific-Internationalist has to offer is an emotion about internationalism.

We have already seen that the first structural fact on which we have to build a practice of international relations is the fact of nationality, the continuous and subtle readjustment between a people and their environment, which differentiates the people of one environment from the people of another. The second inescapable item is the generation of national power from within, through the sub-conscious urge of type to perpetuate itself. You can see this tendency working in our own country; streams of population are pouring in from the old world, each struggling to reproduce the environment to which it owes its vitality. You can see it in the German overflow, attempting in every country to create Germanism as the natural expression of itself. And wherever you see this, you can see the weakness of the pacifist notion that unification is a simple

matter of doing away with boundaries. It is that weakness which assumes that unification is the same thing as uniformity.

8

Practically everybody in the world is convinced that war is a very wasteful and unsatisfactory way of settling international difficulties. But we make no headway toward getting it dropped as a political method, so long as we go against nature by assuming that the indispensable condition of peace is alikeness.

The whole tendency of nature is toward variety. But variety is no more a cause of war than sameness is a guarantee of peace. Resemblances of fortune and feature do not prevent family quarrels; and civil wars and class cruelties, which have nothing to do with flags or boundaries, are not only frequent but of exceeding bitterness. The atrocities of international war are not more terrible, only more concentrated than the atrocities of political and religious persecution, which used to be inspired with the idea of producing that very sameness of view which looks so hopeful to the pacifist.

As a matter of history, civilization seems to have advanced, not by the elimination of differences, but by increasing freedom for being different. War will have to be lost out of our political consciousness as slavery and cannibalism were lost, not by our growing more alike but by growing more intelligent. Any attempt to prevent differences from becoming acute by abolishing flags of difference is a denial of the whole idea of social evolution. Resemblances between nations must grow from their generally developing mentality, since all mind appears to be of one piece, and from their common rate of progress toward truth, which is probably an expression of unity. It cannot come naturally and profitably from a conventional agreement to resemble one another, as school-girls all agree to wear the same style of graduating gown.

Looked at simply as an historic episode, this war resolves into an attempt by Germany to impose the pattern of her particular sameness on the world. Her occupation of Russia is an effort to prevent the variation of politics so recently sprung up there, from reacting on her own people to produce a departure from sameness at home. The objection to any war of conquest is not altogether an objection to the use of the war method; it is not even a question of a better or worse political pattern. The whole offense, whether it is an offense of militarism or of pacifism, is an offense against the natural and intrinsic right of peoples to be unlike.

We have to clear our minds on this point, because our personal adventure in this war is a measure of our power to assert the right to be distinct and unlike, and to do it without infringing on the right of other people to the same fundamental distinction and unlikeness. And the most outstanding problem of reconstruction after the war will be our adjustment to the new principle of nationality which is now developing in Mexico and Russia.

It is as different from ours as ours was from anything in Europe two hundred years ago, and probably as much entitled to room in which to come to its full growth. No one can yet say just what it is, but its hungry demand for land, its apparent inability to exist without a very personal relation to land, indicates that its prevailing pattern will be rural rather than industrial or commercial. It is not a coincidence that this land hunger should show itself in the revolutions of both Mexico and Russia. You will find the same general attitude toward land among the Bolsheviki on the East Side of New York, and among the intellectuals who sympathize with them. It goes with the temperament. Land-lovers are always peace-lovers, not because they have a higher, more spiritual point of view than the rest of us, but because, loving land, they dislike the disturbance and adventures of war.

There is also a strong leaning toward communism, both as to land and industry, in this new order. Their communism is not the same thing as co-operation among us, not voluntary team work for the sake of a particular goal. It is something as necessary to the type as the swarm is to the bee, something he is unhappy to be without, that makes him a buzzing, stinging nuisance in our kind of social organization. And there is a kind of mysticism which belongs to this sort of communism which our Western civilization fails to understand.

What we mean by the mystical element in a political movement is the manner in which the movement is connected with the Universal Forces that are always felt to be at work in human society. There is very little difference between political and religious movements, except in the names by which they are called. A religion begins with an idea of how men are related to God, and develops a set of rules for living in harmony with that idea. Politics, in its largest sense, begins with an idea of the way society is related to universal, everlasting things, and develops a system of social living around that relationship.

The mystical element of the political movement which goes by the name of Bolshevikism is Oriental, pagan as opposed to our Christian mysticism. It consists in thinking that peace, internationalism and universal brotherhood are to be reached by some rearrangement of the mind and emotions. Whether or not some of the Bolshevik leaders are German agents or German dupes is unimportant. There are always some weak and vicious men in

every movement. The distinguishing factor of this movement is that it thinks World Democracy is to come as the result of a soul-storm. That is where it differs from our Occidental mysticism which believes that all the worth-while things come at the price of sacrifice.

It is probable that both these ideas need modifying. Brotherhood is not wholly won by thinking about it, nor democracy by dying for it. The mind of man must come forward and permanently occupy the territory for which life has been laid down. But at least we know that we cannot get very far with either idea by calling the other bad names.

It is too early to say just what political form this new element will take. One thing is absolutely certain; neither Mexico nor Russia want our capitalistic, commercial form. It is the dread of having that system imposed upon them that makes them distrust even the help they need so much from us. Do not let your pride in American institutions blind you to this. There is nothing that Mexico or Bolshevik Russia and their prototypes in other lands hate so much as our particular pattern of living together. There is probably a natural simplicity about this new type which makes it afraid of our highly complicated system, much as a person who has no mechanical gift fears machinery.

And since we are having so much trouble to get rid of the evils of our wage and capital system at home, there does not appear to be any good reason why we should impose it on anybody else. If this new principle has vitality enough to get itself nationally accepted in Mexico and Russia, even for a short time, it is too vital for us to imagine that we can stamp it back into the earth, or that it would be a good thing for the world if we could.

8

Mexico is the particular problem of the United States, though we are by no means going to be permitted to settle it without reference to other great nations. England and Germany both have claims against Mexico, arising out of damages done in the late Carranzista revolution, which they only wait until a little less occupied to press. But the danger from European nations that threatens the development of national character in Mexico, is not nearly so great as that which she fears from our friendly attempt to develop her resources. She fears that we will insist on repeating the very pattern of capital and wage labor against which our own labor class protests.

We have to go back to Mexico before Spain found her, to understand this fear and its justification. At that time Mexico was a group of loosely federated tribal states, unequally advanced, and alike only in being of the same race. They did not speak the same language, and their laws and religions differed. They had slavery and military caste, and a highly developed craftsmanship. Wage labor they did not have at all. The pattern of their social life was communal; they built huge temples, and had a symbolic communal drama connected with their religion, not unlike the religious communism of ancient Greece. But the item which, more than any other, differentiated their civilization from ours was that every man was a craftsman; every man made some useful and beautiful thing, and craft was their medium of communication.

I mean that the pattern of blankets and pots and feathered robes and chiseled stone was the Mexican's way of expressing his inner thought of things. This was the case in a much more practical and explicit sense than we are accustomed to think, and it was his only method. In the more developed tribes there was the beginning of an attempt to make patterns and pictures into a written language, but it was no more than a beginning. Four-fifths of ancient Mexico had no method of communicating the things that are deeper than ordinary speech, except in symbolic drama and the beautiful patterns with which they decorated everything they made.

Then came Spain and took away their crafts and

their drama, without giving them any better mode of communication. Four-fifths of modern Mexico Spain broke up their natural cannot read. communism and tried without success to make them over on a feudal wage system. There Mexico is today, with her original pattern of social life completely shattered, and temperamentally unable to adjust herself to the wage pattern; her original method of communication lost, and intellectually unable to adopt a better one. Under such circumstances, no country develops rapidly. Left to themselves for a hundred years or so, the Mexican people would strike root again. But the very plain difficulty is that they cannot be so left to themselves. It is the unavoidable condition of World Democracy that no people can ever be left to themselves again.

8

The problem of Mexico and the United States is very much the problem of Europe and Russia. In both countries we have a native people, more or less dislocated by oppression, struggling to take root. In both countries there is a numerically small class of advanced, ultra-modern leaders, and a great mass of people without any reliable method of communication. In both countries there are vast stores of natural wealth which the world needs, and contiguous to both countries are highly

developed modern nations, able and anxious to handle that wealth in their own interests. And in both we have new principles of nationality struggling for expression, with which we are neither temperamentally nor politically in sympathy.

The real problem in Mexico will come after the war, when England and Germany begin to collect their claims. For the moment, good will and a strict adherence to our own avowed principles of World Democracy will afford Mexico the much needed opportunity to regain her national equilibrium. But between our American gesture of good will and drowning Russia lie the needs and aims of both Germany and Japan.

8

The problem of Germany and Japan is the problem of the countries whose population and vitality have outgrown their national bounds. This excess population has to be accommodated somewhere on the earth. The question is, shall it continue to be accommodated as parts of Japan and Germany? And where shall room for such national extension be found?

We have an example in China of a nation that produced its population up to the limit of the land, without expanding. The result was three thousand years of arrested development. In England we have an illustration of racial expansion with only moder-

ate control from the racial center. Curiously, it was the United States that set the key for Anglo-Saxon expansion, by teaching England the limit of what could be enforced on her colonies. And today it is practically the United States who can, if she will, determine the world's final policy of racial expansion.

We shall make the mistake of our history if we try to decide this question without reference to that principle of nationality which was explained at the beginning of this chapter. There can be no true and progressive nationality in which the land does not speak equally with the race. In the great English-speaking nations, Australia, Canada, the United States, the land speaks. It makes strongly differentiated and profoundly similar peoples. It makes nations well-balanced between the father and mother principles of their origin, the male element of race and the mothering element of land, cradling and nourishing.

It is not without significance that Germans everywhere refer to the original home of their race as the Fatherland. The whole principle of nationalization among Germans is a denial of the mother-right of the land. It is an attempt to found states on the male principle only, to oppose the natural modifications of lands and peoples they happen to live among, and remain determinedly German Germans.

Where the Germans enter any nation, they are taught to behave toward that country's social ideal as their soldiers do to women of conquered countries; they assault or seduce it.

I believe that we must look even more closely at this principle of nationality than we have yet done, if we are to find any ground of decision in regard to the expansion of populous nations, for I do not think that we can find it in democracy. Germany might become a democracy; but if her people continued to resist the modifications of environment in favor of a Teutonic ideal of life, she would be quite as much a menace to the world. The unregenerate masculinity of the German people makes it possible for them to discard the spiritual elements of motherhood, and produce population for the sole purpose of Germanizing the world. It is probable that we make too much of the imperialistic form of government in Germany. Without a Kaiser, and with this primitive maleness of mind unaltered, we could not see Germans going into Russia without knowing that it would mean death to whatever contribution to civilization we have a right to expect from the Russian soil.

The Russian Empire, as it existed before the war, was a patchwork of nationalities and national remnants. We can never think of it coming back under one rule again. By any just, natural solution, it

would come together as a group of federated states, similar to, if not so united as the United States of America. When German imperialism is defeated, that is what will happen in European Russia. It will happen as soon as the American people learn to communicate with the Russian people. We tried to communicate with them through envoys and ministers, with tragic, irrecoverable results.

There is not a hopeless spiritual gap between the mass of Americans and the Russian masses. But before we can reach the Russian people, the whole of our thinking about them has to take a right-about turn. We have always been thinking of Russia as a place to be approached through Europe. We have to face it now across Asia. We not only have to approach Russia through what is Oriental in her thought, but through what is Asiatic in her geography and politics. And Asia is the thinnest ice in the political world.

Germany is much less of a problem. We can take the measure of Germany and eventually, if not now, overmatch it. We can safely trust what our ministers and departmental heads tell us about Germany. We cannot place any such dependence on what they tell us about Russia, not because they are not dependable, but because, being at the very top of our politics, they are furthest from the vital element, which in Russia is very close to the ground. The best thing the heads of our Government could do would be to make it possible for our people to get together with the Russians and exchange experiences.

The greatest bar to such exchanges is that the American people understand almost nothing of the country across which we have to get together. Between us there is India, China, Japan. In India and China we have old civilizations in a state of disintegration. And no one knows, at least no one has said with such authority and clearness that a self-respecting mind is obliged to accept it, whether these old peoples are crumbling into dust, or whether what is going on there is the rotting of a husk around a young new sprout. If Germany should move on, over prostrate Russia, nobody knows whether Asia would stop her, or whether Asiatic peoples would crumble and enrich the soil for Germany to take root.

About Japan we know more, enough to be sure of her vitality and her power to oppose Germany if she chose. But we do not know what she will choose. We fear an alliance between Germany and Japan. We fear an attack by Japan and Germany upon our coasts. Politically speaking, this possibility is one of the most urgent reasons for pushing the war against Germany in France.

The political reasons for fearing an alliance

between Germany and Japan are first, the similarity of their forms of government, both being imperialistic. Secondly, they are alike in being populous countries that have outgrown their territories and are looking for opportunities of expansion. If Germany and Japan should agree to expand in Asia until they meet across Russia and China, it would be a very difficult matter to stop them. If they chose to unite and cross the Pacific to the unprotected American coast it would be still more serious. Politically speaking, the most important thing for America in this war is to prevent anything of the kind happening.

8

But the United States is not trying to speak and act politically at the present time. We are trying to speak and act world-democratically. That is what is behind President Wilson's Russian policy. He is trying to get away from the old, politically centered point of view and find new terms for a new way of looking at things. There is Japan, the dominant nation on the other side of the Pacific, as we are on this. If we do not wish to drive her to Germany, we must not decide against her on account of the form of her government. There are some very significant differences between imperialism in Germany and in Japan.

The German Emperor is the over-lord of his

people, their personal leader. He is thought of, and thinks of himself, as a super-German who does everything a German would do, govern, fight and philosophize, better than any other German. He thinks Divine Power has descended on him from Heaven, and says so. That is the German idea of imperial government, a super-man attracting Divine Power as a lightning rod attracts lightning.

The Emperor of Japan is not a super-Japanese, but a symbol of the secret flame that lights the soul of Japan. He is more like what the Ark of the Covenant was to the Hebrews. He is the sign of sovereignty, very much as the King of England is, but in a more intimate and mystic way. England, with a King who is also the Emperor of India, succeeds in being intensely democratic, and Japan with an Emperor who is sacred, has something in her national make-up that is far more akin to America and England than it is to Germany.

This something is in the group consciousness of the Japanese people. Every Japanese is much more Japanese than any German is Teutonic, because the group consciousness is so much more a matter of racial spirit than of political allegiance. The allegiance of the German is toward German Kultur; he is carefully educated into it from his youth up. If you succeed in detaching a German from his Kultur, he can become a thoroughly sound

American. Germanism is much more in his mind than in his soul.

But there is always part of the soul of every Japanese which never quite emerges from the soul of his nation. That is why you can never be quite intimate with him, never completely take his soul with yours. That is why it is possible for the Japanese to adopt the manners and customs of any country, and be at home in any form of government. It is because nationality in Japan is an expression of spiritual unity that is much more absolute and democratic than anything we have achieved under a democratic form. The Japanese is easily a citizen of the world, but the German to be happy has to set up a little imitation Germany. Japan is so democratic that it can accept differences in rank and class as simply as the army accepts differences in rank and uniform, as a part of the business of becoming more completely an army. The Government of Japan is thought of as sacred because the soul of a people is sacred, which is very different from the childish Teutonic notion of a King so big and important that God confers divinity on him like a medal.

We have to get hold of simple deep-seated things like this, for it is quite impossible for the average citizen to understand the situation in the far East with ordinary political intelligence. The East, as Mr. Kipling has told us, is too old and there is too much of her. What it all comes to is this, that there is more spiritual affinity and more democracy between us and England and the Japanese, than there is between the Japanese and Germany. If, through political jealousy or lack of understanding, we drive Japan into coalition with Germany, we have only ourselves to thank for it. It is for us to say whether we shall have an ally on the other side of the Pacific, or an enemy.

As the matter stands there is but one possibility of serious disagreement between the United States and Japan, and that is the question of her expansion in either China or Siberia. That there will be expansion of Japanese influence is inevitable. Whether it shall be territorial and political, or merely cultural and commercial, depends on whether there is a valid new political life in China or in Siberia to oppose annexation successfully.

Officially, the right of any people to claim exemption from conquest is grounded on their capacity of development. Such capacity must not lie at the mercy of the greed or vanity of another nation, but must be attested in the court of the world. There are such things as sick nations, nations whose racial principle has rotted out and whose countenance is a menace to healthier peoples. The only chance such peoples have to make their

contribution is that they be grafted into sounder stock.

Whether China shall come to be recognized as "the sick man" of Asia as Turkey is of Europe, it is not possible yet to say. Her old civilization is dropping in the dust, but whether there lives in its ashes any spark is for China to prove. The development of Democracy in China will automatically determine whether we are to be in the future confronted with a Japanese empire or an Asiatic Federation of nations.

8

That is the problem in regard to the expansion of Germany and Japan in Europe and Asia. But when we begin to think of their possible expansion in some other part of the world, we are involved in the huge and costly problem of Africa.

Few Americans have thought much of Africa; even less have they thought of it as something that the United States will have to take an interest in. But Africa is interesting for two reasons. It offers the only large tracts of unsettled country not actually preempted by civilized powers. It offers also the only supply of a cheap cannon fodder. Africa has a vast native population of a very low order of mentality, but a high order of physique. Africans make good soldiers. If any militaristic nation got a footing there, a most terrible engine

of warfare could be shaped out of the negro population, and it could go on almost unobserved. White civilization does not penetrate very far inland from the coast.

Africa is the item the pacifists leave out of calcu-Everybody, with the possible exception of Germany, is hoping for disarmament by international agreement. But even with Germany agreeing, and with ostensible disarmament at Berlin, how could the world be sure of what might be going on in this huge back room of African colonies? It might go on under pretense of trade or of missionary effort, under the cover of Kultur, the garment that hides so many offenses against civilization. To put Africa in ward to a league of nations will be an expensive business, for we do not only fight German arms, but German thinking. Our one hope is to establish the claim of the land as basic and superior to political affiliations, and to insist that Germans in Africa shall become Africans as Englishmen in Australia became Australians, and in Canada, Canadians. Otherwise, those spaces that used to be black on the map of Africa are still black with menace to the peace of the world.

3

What we are going to do about the problems of the great nations, as well as the demand of small nations for self-determination, depends on two issues. It depends, first, on the degree to which Allied armies establish a military advantage in Europe. Secondly, it depends on our being able to forge a suitable instrument of internationalism to take the place of war. We have tried international banking, international trade and international religion. But war is the only instrument with which we have yet been able to force an international conclusion. Disarmament is important to a world democracy only as a release from strain and from liability to sudden disturbance. It would be quite possible to have a democracy of armed nations, but it would be unnecessarily expensive. The presence in a league of pacific nations of any one nation always thinking of war and rehearsing for war, would be a source of uneasiness. Universal disarmament is a measure of precaution, but not a necessity of world politics. Try to see this as a simple fact, rid of militaristic or anti-militaristic emotion.

Because, after the fighting is over, that is probably what we are going to have for a long time, an armed democracy. Even with Germany reduced to reasonableness, we must not hope for a swift return to the short-sighted certainties of 1914. Immediately on the cessation of hostilities there will begin to sit in some neutral city a conference of nations, in which every one now at war will be directly, and every other one indirectly, represented.

Meantime, there will be long waits of armies on inactive fronts while the nations test the quality of one another's sincerity. There will be councils begun and broken off with threatening gestures, kings recalled from peace conferences to be deposed, and delegates suddenly finding themselves representatives of divided nations. Outside there will be a ring of neutrals, most of whom have not been touched at all with the fire of the world-spirit, each grabbing at some private advantage. And as the world disturbance dies down the coasts of all the continents, who can say in what far called places our men will be called to fight for the principle for which they first went to war?

Pacifists and sentimental internationalists can do us an immense amount of harm by insisting that we are fighting to stop the fight. We are fighting to finish it. The infinitely complicated problem of the small nations is only secondarily a problem of how difficulties shall be settled when they occur. It is first of all a problem of how they shall live together in the future so that the fewest possible difficulties shall arise.

VIII

HUMAN life comes up like a great vine, the secret of whose growth is underground. It produces races like leaves, and civilization like a flower that drops off and leaves the fruit of its experience in history. It produced forgotten Babylon and Egypt, Greece, so mellow and golden, and Rome whose fruit turned acid at the last. It produces America from a broken shoot of Europe, rooted in the soil of a new continent. This is not a mere poetic fancy. It is a statement so vital to our understanding of life that it can only be made in terms of other life.

The new growth of the race is always from the ground, from hidden and incalculable forces. When it comes up on a new land as ours did, it incommodes nobody; its evolution is watched by the world as interesting and marvelous. When it comes up in a long and thickly settled country, crushed and stamped upon, its final appearance as a true vine is called revolution. You must get a firm hold on this distinction if you are to understand the social forces at work in the world today.

We had a revolution in the United States by

which we threw off the smother of European influences. After that we made no trouble for anybody but ourselves. Neither did Australia make any trouble. But the Australians were originally English, and if they had undertaken in England to set up their special conditions of democracy, votes for women, government ownership and the rest, it would have been a bloody and bitter business. Or if the signers of the Declaration of Independence had gone on living in London and insisting on a President, and representative government in place of a King, would they not all have "hanged separately," as one of them said?

We do not know a great deal about human life, but these two things seem certain: the principle of life is inexhaustible, and it continues to produce from the earth upward. We do not yet know whether it is inevitable that all high types of civilization must drop off the vine, after reaching a certain stage of development. That they have so dropped and died in the past may be due to the stoppage of their own growth at the top. But wherever they have opposed the growth from beneath, they have died violently. That is what happened recently in Mexico. There, three hundred years ago, Spanish rule was laid across the strong young tribes like a stone over a sprouting tree, which, coming up slanting and awry, lifts the stone. That there have

been venomous biting and stinging things exposed by the lift is to have been expected. That is the sort of thing that always hatches under a government pressed down on the people from above. There were basilisks under the stone of feudal France that bit off heads by baskets-full.

Pressure of growth from below and pressure of fixity from above are always going on somewhere in the world. When the upper classes of any country—and by upper classes I mean the classes that have had the greatest success in overcoming the difficulties of existence, hunger, cold and houselessness—when those classes have an elasticity about equal to the natural upthrust, then that country is in a state of prosperous evolution. But when life bubbles up against an inelastic crust, the process of adjustment is called revolution.

All the world just now is in a state of revolution; in America, as elsewhere, except that in the United States it is not yet bloody or embittered. What is taking place now in the interest of war organization, delivering mines, food and transportation to government control, is revolutionary in character. To attain this much discussed political change by ordinary peaceful evolution would have required years. Even as a war measure, it could hardly have been accomplished with so little protest, unless it had been in line with the general drift of American

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

politics. But to know how either the war or Washington are coming out, we must watch the new growth pushing up from the ground. It is the line of contact of these two pressures that is the danger line.

Every one is more or less familiar with a movement up from the very bottom of our social life. We hear it referred to in various keys of hope and anxiety as the Social Revolution. Most Americans are vaguely sympathetic, and indirectly troubled by the friction of it against their immediate interests.

If this were not so—this slow and not very intelligent spread of sympathy—labor would be much more of a problem than it is; and if it were not also recognized as a world problem, it would be, for America, the sooner settled. But being a world problem, subject to the pull of other national tides, we cannot understand even that part of it which is going on within our own national life, without penetrating a little deeper into world structure.

8

Very early in life we find human society taking a pattern which seems to lie so close to the heart of life that we have never got wholly rid of it. This is the pattern called totemic, which I shall have to define rather explicitly.

The totem pattern is a system of group organiza-

tion, in which every individual in the group, as well as the group itself, is known by its symbol, usually an animal: the great turtle, the eagle, the wolf. People who have the same totem have a relation to one another which is closer than any other known relation. It is closer than the tribe or the family. Two men of different tribes and the same totem are nearer akin than two men of the same tribe with different totems. A man and his son, having always different totems, do not tell one another totem secrets. There were other regulations and distinctions in primitive totemism, but these are of political significance.

Anthropologists agree that the totem of a group represented the life principle of that group. Eagle men were supposed to take their life from the eagle, wolf men from the wolf, and this derivation of life from the totem established kinship. This relation went even further back through the life of the individual to the totem, and through the totem to the All-life, God, the Great Spirit. By the use of his totem a man reached up to the All-life and reinforced his own.

This totem pattern seems to have prevailed pretty much all over the earth. But it is not to be thought of as referring only to savage life. It is a pattern that keeps recurring in human history, a pattern of men united by a common relationship to the All-life, a grouping more fundamental than either the family or the nation.

This is the pattern of most religions. It is the pattern of early Christianity. A man accepted Jesus as the expression of the All-life, and a source of life more abundant in himself. Immediately he was related to all other men who confessed Jesus. A Jew and a Gentile who were both Christians came closer together than two Jews or two Gentiles who were not. And this totemic pattern of kinship through an idea of Allness, which repeats itself in history—this is the pattern of the Social Revolution, the pattern of the new, swift change which is coming over all our politics.

Not everybody sees it so, perhaps because the idea which is back of the revolution is nowhere clearly expressed. It is in its best phase called Democracy, but many things are called Democracy. In calling it so, probably something very different is meant from your idea of Democracy or mine. Anarchism, Socialism and Internationalism are names descriptive of the way in which some people think the thing will work, rather than descriptive of the idea itself. Pacifism is simply one little sprig of the idea, and Bolshevikism is a name for one of its manifestations. Perhaps I. W. W. is another, or perhaps this is one of the fanged things that have hatched under the stone. Social Democracy

is the most inclusive term that has yet been invented, though when I use it for the new order, you must not confound it with any party or propaganda now in the field. Whatever its name, the things to remember about the new movement are that it comes from close to the ground and is totemic in character. It professes a more fundamental kinship than nationality or political constitutions.

Because of its totemic and sub-national character, the new movement appears as the growing tip of an entirely new concept of political life, as different from ours as ours in 1776 was different from the political life of the old world. I see it as having the same right to exist and grow, and dangerous to our society only as it is trodden upon and oppressed. Therefore I see it as better for us to encourage it to come to its normal growth in some country where it is native to the genius of the people, as in Russia or Mexico, where it will deeply root and attract its own out of all the nations. just as the United States of America drew its own from the outermost rim of the world. Its own will probably not be wholly proletariat. It will draw labor and science and art, all the components of a normal national life, and will proceed to arrange these things around its native principle of nationality in its own order. And so doing, it will draw off from our special political order elements that tend to prevent our coming to the flower and fruit of our social genius.

To think of the new movement, as many do, as Internationalism, a movement to abolish national boundaries, is to interpret its appearance in all countries very superficially. There is a certain amount of coincidence in the prevalence of revolutionary movements throughout the nations of the world, coincidence that is helped by the wide dissemination of news and sympathetic contagion. Not every outbreak is a valid one; it could only be imagined to be such by people who habitually mistake noise for power, and think every exhibition of activity a manifestation of life. As a matter of fact, death and degeneracy both register as activity. But whether by the decay of old political forms or the inventions of new, it is important to discover to what extent the American nation is involved in this struggle of a new point of view to get itself naturally expressed.

In America the force of this new movement has been generally recognized as the unrest of labor. But though the movement is expressed in the laboring classes everywhere, I think it can be shown that this is because the laboring classes are closer to the ground, and not because it is exclusively a labor movement. I am aware that this is not the usual view, but if we can even divide the movement

toward Social Democracy into the elements that are expressed in labor, and those that are expressed some other way, it will be helpful.

We speak of the Unrest of Labor. What we really mean is the unrest of wage-working men and women. There is more than the difference of words in this distinction. There is in it the story of our late discovery that labor cannot be separated from men. With the rapid development of industry and commerce, we have gone on thinking of labor as something that can be bought and sold, like salt or silk. We talk of the "labor market"; we buy cheap, and force down the market by artificial devices. When the price of labor is low, we try to buy a great deal of it, binding the sale by contract against the rise of prices. We send abroad for "cheap" labor.

If there were any such thing as an historical study of wage-working as a social invention, it would show us that most of our ways of thinking of labor, and all of our ways of speaking of it, are derived. They go back to the time when labor was the service of conquered people, people not we, but they, a class apart, living among us, but never us. We got into the way of speaking of the labor market naturally, because there was such a market. We bought and sold labor then by selling men and women. It is only in the last fifty or sixty years,

since we stopped selling men, that we have discovered that labor is not a commodity. It cannot be disassociated from men and their welfare. Handlabor is the contribution made by a certain group of men to the advancement of civilization. Wage-payment is our way of recompensing this contribution. These are the things you must start with before considering whether or not it is the best way.

Another way of speaking of labor, which dates back to the beginning of industrialism in Europe, is to estimate the cost of particular labor to a given producer, as its cost to society. We thought of labor on the Po or the Danube as being cheaper than ours because a given item of it could be bought for a smaller wage. But when we brought that labor to America, we discovered that it was only "cheap" over there, because in Italy or Poland it cost less to produce. That is, it cost less to produce and sustain a man.

Perhaps the type of laborer we thought it necessary to produce in America had something to do with his expensiveness, for we had not only to make a laboring man of him; we had to make a citizen. To find what this man cost society, we have to add to the items of his bringing-up, his schooling, and his up-keep, not only during his labor-producing period, but past it. And we have

to add to all these the mother-energy that goes to the making of a man, not only the upbringing and educating of the mother, but the cost of all the life that cannot be brought to adulthood. It is our slowly widening appreciation of the necessity of including the cost of all these things in the wage of labor that has brought up the price to the individual employer.

But even as we give expression to our sense of this necessity, we betray another of our traditional ways of thinking of wage-working people. We think of them as possessing a class stability, which establishes them as inferior in their capacity for dealing with the problems of existence. We think of them as though they were wards of society and we their guardians.

This attitude is not without some foundation in history, and the rather recent development of self-determination among the labor classes. It has some excuse in the perpetual fact that all parts of society do not move forward at the same rate. There is always an obligation on the part of the more swiftly moving not to create a gap in the procession. But the mistake is in our taking for granted that it is the wage-worker who tails the procession. We keep his welfare on the basis of patronage, by leaving it in the hands of the employer to determine the condition of light, air

and general well-being under which labor is performed. It is even possible to find people protesting against paying more than a bare living wage, on the ground that the wage-worker does not know how to spend money wisely.

All these various ways of thinking about labor are expressly denied by the Constitution of the United States, and some of them are contradicted by the laws and by general practice. Once a man gets out of the wage-working class, we do not hold it against him. The fact that so many do get out, to become artists, scientists, manufacturers, is evidence enough that we do not actually handle wage-working as an inherent handicap.

What we do is to establish by our system of wage payment an economic handicap. If a man struggles out of wage-working into something else, there is a chance for him to go on even to being a millionaire or President, but he cannot be a wage-worker and be anything else at the same time. I have emphasized this point because I believe it to be the core of the difficulty. It is the item on which we, as well as the wage-workers, "lose out."

If you will examine the great personal contributions to civilization—chloroform, for example, which was the greatest single contribution to the mastery of pain—you will be surprised to find how many of them are made in hours spared from very

commonplace occupations. Almost every man has some spark in him, but the conditions of wageworking in the United States are such that, if a working-man is to nourish the spark, he must find another occupation. We have no door leading out of the labor class by which the genius may walk to his predestined task; we compel him to scramble over the wall.

Politically, the most objectionable feature of our system of paying for hand-work with a daily or weekly wage is that it tends to establish this undesirable fixity of class. All that is necessary to create inherent class distinction is to compel each young generation, as it comes along, to walk in the steps of its parents. When this has continued for a few hundred years, we have the very thing that the Fathers of the Republic labored to avoid. To just the extent that the working-man's wages make it impossible for him to train his children for any calling for which they may be better suited, is he obliged to make wage-workers of them. Since the more intelligent of the wage-workers see this as clearly as any sociologist could set it forth, what we have finally is an un-American class consolidation and class antagonism.

On the one hand, we have the people who are born with positions which enable them to take their compensation as "profits"; and on the other, held there by the obscure pull of centuries of slaveholding, Lord-of-the-Manor thinking, those who take their pay in wages. Between them we have a common social necessity for finding some method of handling labor which will save to society the utmost worth of every individual citizen.

The labor classes, in attempting a solution, show themselves more or less conditioned in their thinking by the time clock and the whistle. They propose a universal compulsory labor day of six or four hours with an increasing demand for more wages, more wages, and then more wages; or they rest the solution on some sort of mechanical distribution of the wealth created by labor, socialism or profit-sharing.

8

Among the socalled intellectuals, there is a growing disposition to treat the labor problem as a problem in the minimizing of labor, almost to the point of its disappearance. By applying engineering intelligence to necessary processes, and by increasing the rewards of dangerous or disagreeable work, it is expected that physical labor shall come to take a secondary place in the constitution of society, just as the business of getting himself transported from his house in Brooklyn or Westchester to his office in Manhattan takes a secondary place in the life of the individual. This is in

line with the American genius for overcoming natural difficulties with machines, and in line too with our superior use of mass psychology.

It was the great American psychologist, William James, who made the most fruitful suggestion that has yet appeared, the suggestion of a citizen conscription for labor, by which the world's work should be raised to a "moral equivalent for war," with banners and music and shoulder touching shoulder. Who would not wish to be in the company of such conscripts who would build a Panama Canal or harvest a bumper crop in Iowa? And for the dangerous and difficult trades there would be super-rewards, as for the special risks of war. Such a treatment of the labor problem is not only soundly based on the nature and spirit of man, but it is already indicated in the visible trend of American labor.

The labor union, misused as it often is, and much misunderstood, is moving toward the elimination of a labor class by the identification of wage-workers with that portion of American society which is already above the line of mastery over conditions of living. The union, with its growing pride of craft and increasing sense of power, represents a movement parallel to the merging of industrial and financial combinations. It is an effort to escape from the confusions of individual competition.

There is, structurally and politically, no difference between a well organized union of skilled workmen and a commercial trust company, except that the trust company is nearer to the sources of moneypower and has a longer range of experience in manipulating it.

It was not so long ago that a highly organized and successful working-men's union agreed to wear the customary evening dress for men at its official gatherings—a small item, this, but significant of the most American disposition of wage-workers to insist on their own place in the national game, on their own basis, as engineers, shipbuilders, steel riveters, without the necessity of becoming any other sort of men. If it turns out that they cannot keep that place without some different method of distributing the wealth of the nation, such a method must be found.

Nothing has been so constantly misread as the struggle of wage-workers in America to dress like all other workers. It is the symbol of the most spiritual of their aspirations, the expression of the value and dignity of labor in the same terms that value and dignity are affirmed of all other occupations. When we talk of Americanization we must not forget that unification of our thinking implies a unity of expression. The demand that wage compensation should include the possibility of such

expression is one that women, closer always to the spiritual significance of dress, should unite in supporting. In proportion as you find it offensive or amusing—except as all modern dress is a little amusing—it is evidence of undemocratic thinking.

8

It is not the purpose of this book to point out the particular solution of the wage problem to which the young woman citizen may commit herself. All that is attempted is to define those elements of the situation which give shape and structure to the future, and to define them in terms familiar to women. For the place which it expects to occupy in the reconstructed social order after the war, labor will make its own demands. In the report of the Inter-Allied Labor Conference, at London early in 1918, there is a statement of what organized labor thinks about the war and what ought to come out of it. Whatever is thought about this statement of world aims, it is important to come to it with minds swept clean of prejudice and false impressions. There is no advantage in being a young citizen if you do not also bring freshness of view.

The relation of women to the world aspects of wage-labor is too recent for them to have developed any tradition about it. For working-women it is essentially a problem in compensation; they are only indirectly touched by the struggle between men and men for an expression of maleness, for authority and personal equity.

The relation between the woman worker and the woman employer has not yet taken on the character of a struggle; and between women workers and men employers of women, it is emphatically a struggle for compensation, unbiased by sex. At the same time, it is a struggle for working conditions which take account of the reaction of labor on the mother-energy of the workers.

During the past hundred years something has happened to women which never happened to them in the history of the world before. The freshness and vivacity of young girls has been valued as an industrial asset. The bubbling vitality of youth is set to turn machines. Natural coquetry, the love of beauty and soft enhancing fabrics, which is all part of the nest-making, mothering instinct, has been suppressed because it interfered with labor values. Engaged as the woman worker has been in a desperate struggle to get her work recognized on the same wage and time basis as men, she could make no struggle at all for her potential mothervalue. This is a battle which the non-working woman must fight for her, since mother-energy is even more a social than a personal asset. This is not a problem between workers and employers,

not properly a labor problem at all, but a problem of social conservation. It belongs with child labor, vocational training and the development of citizenship by careful gradations of personal responsibility, and has very little to do with the struggle going on between men as employers and men as workers.

8

Though they can never be treated as entirely distinct, it is impossible to come to grips with the unrest of labor without constantly keeping in mind these three separate strands. First, we have the rise of a new, totemic social order, very widely diffused throughout the world, with its most acute manifestation in Russia. Then we have the general movement toward social betterment and enlightenment, which affects the laboring classes, as being most in need of it. Finally, we have the sharp struggle of the American wage-worker for the Americanization of his relations to society.

It is probable that social unrest all over the world is three-plied like ours. Certainly it is in all English-speaking countries. In England the struggle is rather to get all castes and classes back among the workers. After the war in England every honest man will do something, as in America every honest man will have something. And in England, as in France, there is less of the totemic

movement because the French people are already more unified.

If you look closely at labor in America you will see that it is full of splits and factions caused by labor's half-conscious effort to separate itself into the two groups, one which struggles to find its proper place in the existing order, and the other which looks for a new and totally different political expression.

If we are wise, we will give to these movements every opportunity to clarify. But if we press American labor back upon the fire which smolders at the bottom of the heap, the whole mass will gradually be fused with the warmth of the new order. That glow will spread upward; it will grow white hot. And in due time America also will have a revolution.

I DO not know why it should have amazed us to discover, as we have during the past decade, that the centers of control over living conditions were not identical with the centers of politics. It was part of our Republican tradition that politics had nothing to do with making a living. To be sure that it had not, we had been careful to make official salaries a little less than a living for the men in office. Public service was conceived as something given in return for general social welfare, with only an indirect relation to private affairs. Private business was thought of by the Fathers of the Republic as an assault against Nature, proceeding best when least interrupted by the State, which meanwhile warmed us from above, the sun of our prosperity. There was a certain naïve faith that that sun was kept shining, in much the same fashion that the tribal dance makes the rain fall and the crops ripen, by the four-yearly frenzy of party politics.

After a hundred years or so, it was discovered that the national orb was pulled across the sky by men who refused to make the political gesture. They were neither politicians nor men officially connected with the Government. Back of the ward-heeler, the speculator in perquisites and "pickings," back of the party boss, was a hand from Wall Street that pushed them all about the board. They had no "principles," these men, and no policy; but they proved to us by establishing control over money, that true power resides in money. Bread and housing are much more imperative as influencing the conditions under which men live together than either policies or principles.

It was part of our two-mindedness about public and private life, that we thought of this at first as base, whereas it is merely true. There is no such separation between living and the means of living as our political philosophies implied. Bread and land, work and the tools of work are the body and sinew of liberty, without which it and justice are but poor houseless ghosts. The discovery that the money boss was stronger than politics was the most informing episode in our political development, because it taught us the direct connection between politics and living conditions. But it went much further than that.

The last, most definitive statement of the relation of politics and big business occurs in a series of articles by Lincoln Steffens in 1910. After which nothing whatever appeared to happen. What really was happening, however, was the slow interpenetration of the American consciousness by the certainty that the money boss had made his way to the centers of power under the protective coloring of his alikeness to the rest of us. His technique was the technique of our sacred competitive initiative. He was the man who had asked of every situation the test question of a competitive era: What is there in it for me? and received the superlative answer. It was the extent to which the small private citizen found his own welfare involved in that answer, that made the new point of departure for political thinking in America. And having begun there, it is unimportant whether ten years or twenty are necessary to bring it to the issue which leaps out of America to join itself to the live inquiry of all the world: Is there any business in the world which is not more or less the business of all of us?

8

It is always much easier to change a social practice than to change a way of thinking. That is why in the midst of Government ownership and control of industry, we are still, many of us, thinking back in the early days of the republic, when men were chiefly occupied with the progressive mastery of soil, minerals, waters, and with the tools and processes of such mastery.

We have not clearly stated to ourselves what it

means to have passed from that industrial phase to commercialism. We think of the charge that we Americans are commercial, as meaning that as a people we care more for money than for anything else, when, as a matter of fact, there is nothing we part from so easily. We care tremendously for sentiment in America, and for what Mr. Wells has called the normal social life-home and the family, our town against all other towns, peace and a good table. And we might even care for money without being a commercial nation; we might care as the French peasants care, hiding it in the soil they live upon; or we could care for it as a sign of social caste, as the early eighteenth century cared, and be, as we were at that time, an industrial commonwealth. The change to commercialism is made when the major social energy is applied to the manipulation and the control of commodities.

These things are always easier to understand than they are to deal with. When the peasant raises his grain, grinds and bakes it, we have a one-process industrialism. When the peasant passes the grain to the miller, who transfers it to the baker, who sells it to the consumer, it is still industrialism. Even when the number of processes is widened to include the carter and the delivery man, the character of the transaction is not changed. When a commodity, between its necessary and improving

141

contacts with labor, is subject to processes which add to its cost without increasing its value, and when a better living can be made out of manipulating a commodity than producing it, then the change from industrialism to commercialism is accomplished. Speculators who hold wheat in elevators, railroads that juggle the freight, millers who hold back the flour to increase the price, and bakers who adulterate the bread are all engaged in commercial enterprises; and all but the last one are held to be legitimate.

Something like this has been going on all over the world, and, without being able to fix a precise moment for it, in America it has been indexed by the transfer of the spell-binder from the political platform to the market-place.

Social progress is made possible by producing the special kind of intelligence demanded by the various stages of a progressive environment. An agricultural society produces the farmer mind, as the age of machinery, produces mechanics. Wherever there is a failure of intelligence, there are dislocations and monstrosities of social practice.

As the rapid development of trade and industry in America dragged the producer and consumer apart, there were whole areas of activity not covered by any sort of awareness. The increase of markets has not been met by a corresponding development of market intelligence. Between the farmer who produces your food and the grocer who sells it to you, there is a No-Man's-Land which is as unknown to the former as it is to you.

One absolute condition for successful economic organization is that in every phase of activity both its origin in human necessity and its end in human betterment must be kept simultaneously in mind. Either of these being lost to sight, there is a disposition to treat whatever is found as a natural resource, subject to the same assault of competition as mines and forests and fields. Like those fabled giants who devoured their own children, overgrown American industry began to exploit its own markets, filch from its own plate. It increased the price of bread by speculating in wheat, and then urged the high price of bread as an excuse for speculating.

But the sense of parenthood of its own economic institutions was never so far from American intelligence that all this could have come about without some obscuration of the public mind. Man's appetite for excitation is always stronger than his impulse to reasonableness. Exploitation of the industrial output would never have been possible without some manipulation of man's thinking, without, in other words, the invention of modern advertising.

Like poppies in a field of wheat, there has sprung

up lately in the field of business, a guild of men whose trade is Appeal. All the modern science of psychology, all the old tricks of the medicine man and the spell-binder are brought to bear, not in the creation of social values, but on the mere exchange of commodity for coin, as little commodity as possible for as much coin. The result is that we have no market thinking, any more than in the days of the torch-light procession we had political thinking; we have only market transactions. Neither have we among the masses any expression of personality in things purchased. What we have is a succession of surrenders to salesmanship. as surely as it was said contemptuously of the English that they had become a nation of shopkeepers, so may it be said of the Americans that they have become, absurdly, a nation of shoppers.

A vast bulk of our business is neither creative nor bettering. It is all of a piece with the idle habit of women, handling the wealth of the shops for the delight of its color and sheen, the pleasant stimulus of newness, the unprofitable supposition of ownership carried on under the pretense of legitimate buying. The only difference is that women know that they are "shopping." Men, turning over stocks, wheat, city lots, or other goods of that character, without adding a cent to their value, think that they are engaging in a serious

masculine business. And just as the price of all the goods in the shop is made to carry the cost of women's shopping, so the cost of all our common necessities is put up by the men, who, without ever producing any good or beautiful thing, spend all their lives quite happily, and for the most part innocently, repeating in the market-place the ancient complexes of war and the chase.

Much the same sort of thing has taken place in the world of finance. Money, or any commodity which is, in the common phrase, "as good as money," is thought of as floating about in our midst, as detached from any source in human work or any end in human welfare, as fish in the sea. Anybody may catch money who puts in his hook with the proper bait, or he may catch it with a drag-net or a stick of dynamite.

Do not allow yourself to be put out of touch by the simplicity of this statement. Women in particular, who have no natural aptitude for the mechanism by which high finance is carried on, are likely to be disconcerted by it. They expect any statement of finance to resemble one of those cubist pictures which looks as if it might mean something if only anybody understood it. But unless women can bring some sort of primary clarification to the modern problem, the sort of clarification which women derive from their primary necessity to produce life on the one hand and to nourish it on the other, there is not much else that they can bring.

I am obliged to confess that if understanding the details of bank management were one of the conditions of using banks, I should have to keep my money in a stocking. But I am very clear in my mind that the care of accumulated wealth and credit is too important to the community for the institution of finance to be left like an abandoned orchard where anybody may fill his pockets.

Money in banks, or bonds, or any stable equivalent, is stored human energy. The ability of man to separate himself from his own powers and lay up the surplus in some concrete form for a more necessitous moment is one of the things that makes civilization possible. A more or less orderly recurrence of periods of high energizing, accumulation and discharge, is the fundamental rhythm of society, as it is of nature. In any normally thought out society, banks, financial ganglia of whatever sort, should be the energizing centers of social welfare, the mechanism for the continuous release of social energy.

There are a great many people ready to aver that this is quite the case; they were even heard to assert just previous to the outbreak of the European war, that the international machinery of finance had been so perfected that human energy could never again escape into the wild disorder of international conflict. They point to systems of rural credits and agricultural loans as an evidence that banks are seeking to complete the circle in production. Excellent as these things are, they are as inadequate as the hope of international peace through international banking was mistaken.

For financial institutions are not really run in the interests of social creativeness. That is to say, they are not run in the interest of any of the things which finally determine the course of human society. They are run in the interest of property, in the interest of the concreteness of wealth, rather than its potentiality. They are as far from producing a sound social unity as our habit of taking our baseball from the news score and the sporting extra is from producing a healthy national recreation. Everybody is at some time dependent upon the banking system, but actually we are further from banking than from baseball. Some one at least sees the game and tells us about it, but the great operations of finance, with power to affect the condition upon which vast numbers of people live together, are not seen even by a representative of the people. They go on in private offices, in stock exchanges, in the whims, combinations and enmities of a minority of men.

We have got into this state of detachment from

our markets and our banks, by coming to them from a habit of thinking of the family as the social unit, and the making of a living as the private business of the family. We have thought of that vast area of human activity which extends beyond individual control as a sort of commons, free for all, and most of all free from any personal responsibility.

In the beginning of our commercial life, it was no more thought reprehensible to make money by manipulating the market and the banks, than it was thought political. Politics was an uncertain theory of the State, and a small practice of public administration. Banking was business. Probably no one was more surprised than the money boss to find himself in a position of political power, which on the whole he seems to have used rather clumsily and without any particular malice. He has even at times used it with rudimentary ideas of patriotism and public service. But at any rate, he has used it, and by the widening circles of private disaster we have been taught that just here, in this area of irresponsibility, at the intersection of all the invisible lines of trade and finance. is the true center of political power.

Modern politics is not something made up by a great many individuals to regulate the accident of their living together. It is an influence proceeding toward the people, out of the unavoidable unifica-

tion of social life, a crackling, dynamic energy generated at the crossing of their wires. And out of this new conception of politics as proceeding toward the individual instead of from him, has sprung the question of the hour: To what extent and on what occasions is any business to be thought of as private and subject to individual control?

8

Should the nation own and work its mines? May a public carrier be operated in the interest of private profits? Are children a sole responsibility of the parent, or an asset of the State? Do the tools and processes of trade belong to workers or to an individual? When a woman is bringing up children, has she a right to demand an allowance from the State in order to bring them up properly?

These are some of the questions existing before the war that war has brought to a focus. All of them relate to the problem of stored energy expressed in terms of money. These and secondary problems springing from them will have to be taken up by one or another existing political party, or by new parties with new programs of solutions. At this moment it is impossible to say that even the Socialist party, which has always answered these questions in the affirmative for the State, will not take another note from the experience of war

For the war has offered us unexpectedly an opportunity to observe the experiment of national control in operation. Under the stimulus of a fine feeling of national unity, all the centers of power have shifted to Washington. For the duration of the war at least, a man's business is not his own business, but ours.

Even when we make allowance for the haste with which this centralized control has been accomplished, there are several things that distinguish it from any system which might have been worked out by the American people as an expression of the national genius. The types of men demanded to meet the character of the emergency, the large industrial manager and the business engineer, have given to the war organization a "business" color.

This means that our war-time business is being handled chiefly by men who are accustomed to high individualism in the management of affairs, unaccustomed to confer, or to give reasons for what they do. They know how to direct other men but are unable to lead them. Their notion of co-operation is for everybody to get together and do just as they are told. They have no experience with, and very little aptitude for the more democratic idea of co-operation as it is established by equal contributive effort

The closer one gets to Washington, the more one

feels that what is going on there is a sincere attempt to apply to the national problem what is so often appealed to as the "business sense of the community."

For women, business has meant the home and the children, the right sort of home and the right thing done in it to bring up children happily and well. And for women as a class, business-private, competition and exploitation—has not fulfilled its promise. It may as well be faced, the whole woman movement is in some sort an admission that American "business" has not "worked." All the men have not kept all the women and children well fed and housed. To the clear, immediate sense of women, business, as men conduct it, is a series of sallies against the difficulties of existence, sometimes sordid, often brilliant and romantic, full of high courage and invention, but impractical—never really practical enough to keep the world fed and housed and at peace.

This is what women want most. They want much more for themselves and the race, but first of all they understand that womanhood is not wholly valued, or the dignity of motherhood affirmed so long as great numbers of children are born and brought up in misery and poverty.

The early theory of business in America has been that it gave every man an opportunity which, if taken, would make it possible for him to care competently for his own. And the practice has been that only men with certain characteristics of initiative and competitiveness succeed in doing so. Either we must get another scheme of living together in America, or we must make this special capacity, which is so extraordinarily developed in some men, serve the whole community.

Although we did not recognize it as such, there has been a drift in the last direction going on for some years. As business has grown more and more constructive, big men have shown a disposition to escape from the handicap of perpetual small competition. They invented both the trust and the merger.

Partly because it worked an immediate hardship on small business, and partly because it contradicted the tradition of individualism, this tendency was discouraged. We called it all manner of names, not realizing it as an unconscious attempt of big business to socialize itself. The trouble with the trust and the merger is that in them, interested men combine only with their own kind, for the interest of that kind. If they did not combine against the rest of us so deliberately as many imagined, they at least did not combine with the people. Nor has that yet been done. They have combined for the masses and the integrity of the country

as a whole. What we have at Washington is an incomplete merger of business intelligence, in favor of the national interest. Making allowance for the haste with which it has been assembled, what we have at Washington is a Government of coordinated industries, conducted by experts in business engineering. If the American system of industrial and economic organization is sound, this arrangement will work perfectly. Wherever that system is weak, the weakness will come to the surface.

There are three things this war government has to handle. It has to handle material: coal, wheat, iron, lumber, transportation, machines. This it will probably do very well. We have always been wasteful in our handling of material because we have so much of it, but we are not unskillful.

The war government will have to handle labor. This it will do not so well. It will be hindered on the one hand by the long antagonism of labor and "big business," and helped on the other by the patriotic good will of labor. Big business is by no means so powerful as it was, and labor by no means so helpless. Under a common necessity they will probably find out a workable compromise.

Finally, the war government will have to handle something for which there is no name. It has names which differ according to the department of living in which it shows itself, and since it shows itself

in so many places at once, let us begin by calling it Social. That much is certain; it is in us and among all our Allies; it is even in Germany. Because this thing is alive and stirring, we might call it the Social Movement, but immediately you begin to think of specific movements. Social Unrest is the term appropriated to labor, Feminism to women. We could call it Social Energy but it is something more shaped than that, more conscious of direction, and I know of no better term for it than the Social Stream, and no better figure than that of a great river upon which our war industry is afloat. Think of these separate industries, food, manufacture, soldiering, and the rest, as so many ships on the river. They must produce a certain amount and yet all keep about their relative positions in the stream. For suppose they lock prows and attempt to stem the current until their work is done. They may do very excellent work that way, but meantime the waters will back up and sweep them all under.

8

This Social Stream takes its rise in one of those unmapped areas of business, close to the Bank. It takes its rise in something that also for want of a better word, we have to call Social Capital.

Ordinary capital represents savings. Social capital

is the measure of group potentiality. It grows out of the capacity of men to combine. Ten men socially combined can do more than ten men working separately. This extra potentiality is the Social Capital of that group. But its value depends on the vitality of the spiritual organization of the group. Men are said to be spiritually organized when they are held together by some alikeness of aim of spirit. They are industrially organized when they are combined for work by some condition or person outside themselves.

Both of these kinds of combination can exist in the same group. Both of them have to be, when the object is, like the winning of this war, a combination of industries for world democratization.

The difficulty in America is that our great industrial managers have never learned the art of generating and using Social Capital. They think of it, on the whole, as something apart from "business," disturbing to it. They have never thought of the social potentiality of the spiritually organized group as part of our national resources. All these group potentialities flowing together make up what I have called the Social Stream, on which all our industries and institutions float.

In the past, when any industry felt itself shaken, it undertook to stop out the particular rill which fed the stream—labor union, votes for women,

eight hour laws, whatever disturbed industrial craft. When an invention is made which upsets some money interest, it is very often bought up and suppressed. Business does not attempt to keep up with invention and science. It tries to keep invention and science in its pocket, to be used as required. It has tried to do the same thing with Art. In just the same way that business will buy up and suppress a new motor which interferes with one that is already in the market, it will buy up and suppress a good play that might interfere with one not so good which is making money.

The net result of this policy is that, in general, business has no experience in generating and releasing Social Capital. We have plenty of social idealism in the United States, but we have few men who are expert in the art of turning it into ships and munitions. We have inventors of the first rank, but we have so little practice in turning inventive genius quickly into war weapons, that we are actually being fought by inventions that originated in America. To our amazement and mortification, both our Allies and our enemies prove to be far more able than we to keep pace with their own inventive genius. We are conscious of a tremendous fountain of inventiveness, both social and mechanical, springing up within us, and suddenly we begin to realize the comparative

THE YOUNG WOMAN CITIZEN

insignificance of the jet which escapes from the nozzle.

Nothing could be more unjust than to attempt to visit this condition solely on the men who happen to be the nucleus of the present crisis. Millions of Americans have comfortably believed that when such a crisis came we could simply say to our inventors: Go and invent something to win the war. Millions have imagined that our social idealism could be organized by a wave of the flag.

We have never developed men with the skill for spending our Social Capital, or for reinvesting it in world power, simply because we have never realized that such men would be needed. Or if they exist, we have not taught ourselves how to recognize them. We have never, as a people, taken the measure of our Social Capital. Least of all has this measure been taken or has this skill been developed by what is known as the business interests of the country.

8

The most remarkable evidence of the lack of what we may call a national technique, a method of handling our national resources, both social and material, among the men who are conducting our war business, is their waste of woman-power. For among American women there exists the most successful social technique, the most remarkable organization for releasing Social Capital that the world has ever known. It consists of the federated and affiliated groups of women's organizations, embracing about half the woman population of the United States, engaged wholly in social enterprises. It releases energy from women writers, women lawyers, nurses, doctors, teachers, from church-women—Protestant, Catholic, Hebrew—from trades union leagues, from Browning societies and from such widely separated groups as the Women's Institute for Laboratory Research and the society that works among the sweepings of our social gutters. Some of these organizations have a working history of fifty years and more, antedating the Civil War.

Practically the best of the work of social betterment that has been effected in the United States in that time has been done by these women, a work unique in the history of the world. But to no one at Washington has it occurred to make use of this instrument in accelerating the business of implementing the American ideal of World Democracy. They use women, yes. But they do not use the experience of women; they do not see that this energy-releasing experience of women is a great national asset, the bulk of our Social Capital.

Do not make the mistake of thinking of this neglect as a slight directed against women. The

woman-power of the United States is not used because the type of man who has logically come to undertake the management of the war, the type of man we have developed and prided ourselves upon, knows almost nothing of the nature of Social Capital, its organization and use.

But this war is, more than any war that was ever fought, a war of social expansion, a war for extending the frontiers of democracy. It is a war for the reinvestment of the Social Capital of the world. It will not be fought successfully on our side until it is so understood. We cannot come out of it as a whole and harmonious nation unless we can learn to invest our local American Social Capital in the processes of the war as we go along. Only so can we remain a "going concern" among the other national corporations. Unless we rapidly conquer the art of releasing this sort of capital, one of two things will happen; we shall inexcusably and ignominiously fail or we will blow up with the accumulation of undistributed social energy.

THIS has been kept until the last, because it is A at once the most immediate of our national interests, and the point of departure for the new politics, the politics which is sprung from the woman-thought of the world. Up to the beginning of the war, all our political tension gathered about the contact of capital and labor. It took the form of a struggle between labor and what were known as the business interests, for the distribution of profits. In the early phases of the struggle, conditions of labor played a conspicuous part. But as soon as it was discovered, and to the degree that it was made convincing that certain conditions of hours and sanitation tended to increase profits, such conditions were more easily conceded, and attention was concentrated on the division of the spoils.

All the words and phrases that developed out of that struggle, co-operation, profit sharing, syndicalism, even terms of larger import like Government ownership and Socialism, all show that we were thinking of a proper division of the spoils as the solution. We were convinced that if some plan could be hit upon which would insure an equitable division, the millennium would immediately set in. Some thinkers went so far as to believe that the only absolute solution lay in abolishing the capitalist, making the acquirement of wealth as impossible as it seemed undesirable.

We are in the habit of saying that the advantage of war is that it brings us keener appreciation of the fundamental, eternal things. We are thinking about things in relation to life and conduct when we say this, but if politics is nothing after all but group conduct, does it not seem that war might reveal some of the fundamental, eternal things of politics?

One of the first things revealed was that our most discussed solutions turned out not to be solutions at all, but expedients. There is government control of the railroads, to which many people looked forward, as a point beyond which we could sit back more comfortably in our chairs with the feeling that something was settled. But when the railroads are picked up over night, we find that it is merely a handy method of increasing our speed. This turns out to be the case with many political changes which we looked forward to as achievements, only to find them so many turns in an open road.

Another of our war surprises has been to find that we are poor among the nations, poor in ships, in guns, in aeroplanes. And we are poor in these things because we are short in the very commodity we thought we had most of, we are short in productivity. That is to say, we are poor in business ability. We have developed a class of men clever at accumulation, expert in the administration of money capital and credit capital, but inexperienced, on the whole, in the investment of Social Capital. They are trained in methods of making themselves rich by the production of ships and guns and things, but they are not trained in methods of producing these things so as to make the nations rich.

It would be stupid to think of this state of things as the fault of any particular class. If the men who have been chiefly occupied with handling the wealth of the country are not adequate to the present need, it must be because there has been something wrong in our way of thinking of wealth. We have been thinking too much of the heap. We have not been sufficiently clear in our minds that wealth piled up, grasped, arrested, is not properly wealth. The heap is not much more than a heap. Wealth is not all material; it is in large part fluidity. The richest nation is the nation whose combined capital—social and material—can most easily flow into any form that the welfare of that nation demands.

If you will attend any Liberty Loan campaign in almost any American city you will see that we do

not flow easily. We have to drum-beat and sing and shout ourselves into the necessary mobility. Something of the same stiffness is in all our processes, whether of ships or men.

Much of this immobility comes from our having concentrated too long on the problem of profits and profit sharing. We have rather the habit of thinking in America that the important, and possibly the only political problem is this one of the distribution of wealth, as expressed in the struggle between capital and labor. We have ignored the part which is played in our political life by the class for which in America we have no specific name. It is numerically the second largest group, and corresponds loosely to what is known in Europe as the bourgeoisie. We should say the middle class, except that it is in no sense an intermediary class between capital and labor, but stands somewhat apart from both of them. It has no distinct social rating, as the bourgeoisie has in Europe, but involves the widest possible range of talent and intelligence, with rather middling incomes.

In every country it is the weakness of the bourgeoisie to regard its escape from both wage labor and great wealth as an evidence of moral superiority, and to look a little condescending on one and censoriously on the other. This attitude of separateness makes it slow moving, and of the greatest political significance. In Russia, it has been the conservatism of the bourgeoisie which kept them from joining the Bolsheviki against the Germans, and it is on the moral reaction of the bourgeoisie that we must count for the future of the new republic. On the other hand, it is the spread of ideas of organization and social co-operation, made possible through the rise of a middle class in Mexico, which supported the revolution.

In America, out of the greater freedom from social tradition there has developed a new element to which we must look for the reorganization of our social life. It is the new art of the administration of social forces. Women are its chief exponents, women doctors, women lawyers, women social workers. There are several reasons why this should have come from the middle classes, the best of all reasons why it should come from women. For women have an age-long experience in the administration of social energy, the administration of the family for the family's sake.

We do not remember often enough that while men have been struggling to produce democracy in the State, women have seen the family through a similar process of democratization. They have separated it from the horde and established it as a center of social energy. They rescued it from the autocracy of the patriarchal system, with life and death powers over them and their children. They have rid the family of feudal allegiance to the male parent and re-located it in the "good of the whole." Long, long before men recognized the existence of social forces as elements of politics, women had learned that the administration of social forces is the chief, the most indispensable activity of the home. And it is in the bourgeoisie home, with its comparative freedom from drudgery, that the most intelligent methods of administration have developed.

In the United States, where the middle class woman had enjoyed great freedom of education and release from social tradition, this faculty for social administration, developed in family life, has been very generally turned to the account of the community. You can see this in operation everywhere in the work of the Church, in the Red Cross, in the selling of Liberty Bonds, in the hundred new activities set in motion by the war, requiring the administration of social energy. That it is not active in food conservation, in the commissary of the army and navy, and all the socially involved departments of war work is due to our not yet having understood these social problems. in any American town who has been most active in securing livable conditions, and you will find that it is the women. You will find the men of that

town willing to concede this, but you will seldom find them realizing that this has anything to do with the successful conduct of the war.

Millions of middle class American men of middle years are aching to get into the war, to feel themselves a part of it. They are much less a part of it than either labor or the great industrial managers. They are out of it largely because they have no experience in administering their own social contribution. They are accustomed to surrendering the management of that contribution to their women. And in this war in the United States women have been left out as is the case in no other of the warring countries.

Here is the immediate work of the woman voter. She must somehow plan and bring to pass the recognition of her gift for social administration as part of the work of winning the war. She must have it recognized as part of the work of the war, in order that it may be taken seriously as part of the business of building a new world order in which war shall have no place. It is not important in the United States for women to prove that the work of a woman in a munitions factory is as good as the work of a man. Women in France and England have already proved that. It is to us that they must look to demonstrate the power of womanthought for world betterment.

For if politics is something strange and unrelated to the common life, if it is something for which rules cannot be drawn out of the common occasions by which we live together, then democracy is a delusion. We can think of it as helped by knowledge. But if the kind of knowledge necessary for successful politics is any different in kind from the knowledge that women draw out of the experience of producing and perfecting life, then the introduction of women into politics is the most disastrous thing that ever happened to democracy.

And if the experience of being a woman does not itself establish some kind of fitness for social living, then the achievement of women in France and England is the greatest miracle that ever happened. How otherwise could so many millions of women march forward into men's places and the structure of the State not even tremble!

Now you see why I have devoted so much of this book to the process of democratizing yourself. For it does not appear from anything that has happened, or is happening in the world, that the foundations of society rest anywhere but where they have always rested, in the very center of our common life. There is no complication of national or international relations which will not yield on analysis some primary simplification such as any woman can draw out of her own lawful occasions.

The whole process of political education is a search for these simplifications. We are to find them in art and in science and in history. But if by any chance art and science and history are not open to us, or if they tend to increase our confusions, the search is still to be carried into the heart of experience.

If you find yourself unable to deal with the patter of labor unionism and the nice distinctions between Marxian and Fabian Socialism, you can at least determine that the woman who washes your clothes in a laundry shall not do so under any worse conditions than prevail in your own kitchen; or the seamstress who sews for you in a shop be any the less under your eye and protection. However political leaders may prophesy, these are things of which you can be sure.

Social systems do not fall apart because good sense is affirmed in terms of law and regulation, any more than your home comes tumbling about your ears because you insist on being wise and humane in it. You will find it a more tedious business to banish indecent pictures from the bill-boards of your town than from your home, but you will not find that you need any better or different set of reasons for doing it. Once you have accustomed yourself to the larger scale, you will find that keeping an unregenerate nation from "shooting up" the

streets of the world presents no problems of any different human import than those of keeping peace in the streets of your town, or preserving democracy in the family.

This faith in the common experience is the best thing that woman can bring to politics. The most hopeful thing that she can offer at this hour of terrific change and uncertainty is the age-long practice of family life with its hourly need of adaptation to growth and change of outlook. This is the woman's gift which she must put across into the world's thinking by every known political expedient. She must state it in terms of present fact and historic incident, in language suitable and convincing. She must embody it in laws and learn to recognize it under every national or international statement. If these are not enough she must devise new methods, but the meaning of her method is the meaning of life to women, the power of social life to sustain itself out of the common processes of living and the creative character of change.

THE END

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

Care of Criminals.

Goddard, H. H. The Criminal Imbecile. New York, Macmillan, 1915.

Healy, William. The Individual Delinquent. Boston, Little Brown, 1915.

Henderson, Charles R. The Cause and Cure of Crime. Chicago, McClurg, 1914.

Osborne, Thomas Mott. Society and Prisons. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916.

Ross, Edward A. Sin and Society. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1907.

Woman Suffrage in New York State.

Brown, Mrs. Raymond. Your Vote and How to Use It. New York, Harper, 1918.

Cothren, Marion B. The A B C of Voting. New York, Century, 1918.

Forman, S. E., and Shuler, M. Woman Voter's Manual. New York, Century, 1918.

Americanization.

Abbott, Grace. The Immigrant and the Community. New York, Century, 1917.

Addams, Jane. Democracy and Social Ethics. New York, Macmillan, 1902.

Antin, Mary. They Who Knock at Our Gate. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1914.

Brown, Mrs. Raymond. Your Vote and How to Use It. New York, Harper, 1918. Chapters 22, 23.

Commons, John R. Races and Immigrants in America. New York, Macmillan, 1907.

Jenks, J. W., and Lauck, W. J. The Immigration Problem. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1917.

Kellor, Frances A. Straight America, a Call to National Service. New York, Macmillan, 1916.

McClure, Archibald. Leadership of the New America. New York, Doran, 1916.

Riis, Jacob A. The Making of an American. New York, Outlook Co., 1901.

Steiner, Edward Alfred. From Alien to Citizen. New York, F. H. Revell Co., 1914.

Thomas, W. I. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1918.

Wald, Lillian D. The House on Henry Street. New York, H. Holt and Co., 1915.

Workmen's Compensation Act

Bruère, Robert. Compensation and Business Ethics. Harper's Magazine, July, 1915.

Commons, John R., and Andrews, John B. Principles of Labor Legis-

lation. New York, Harper, 1916.

Eastman, Crystal. Work Accidents and the Law. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1910.

Price, George M. The Modern Factory. New York, Wiley and Sons.

Rubinow, I. M. Social Insurance. New York, Holt, 1913.

Mothers' Allowances

Anthony, Katharine. Mothers Who Must Earn. New York, Survey Associates, 1914.

Laws Relating to Mothers' Pensions in the United States, Denmark, and New Zealand. Washington, U. S. Children's Bureau, 1914.

Maternity Insurance. New Republic, May 6, 1916.

Meigs, Grace L., M.D. Maternal Mortality. Washington, U. S. Children's Bureau, 1917.

New York City, Board of Child Welfare. Annual Reports. New York, Municipal Building.

New York State, Relief for Widowed Mothers Commission. Report to Legislature. Albany, Lyon, 1914.

New Zealand Society for the Health of Women and Children. Washington, U. S. Children's Bureau, 1914.

Citizen Obligations

Beard, Chas. A. and Mary R. American Citizenship. New York, Macmillan, 1914.

Bres, Rose F. Maids, Wives, and Widows. New York, Dutton, 1918. Franc, Alissa. Use Your Government: What Your Government Does for You. New York, Dutton, 1918.

Howe, Frederic C., Ph.D. The City—the Hope of Democracy. New

York, Scribner, 1905.

Howe, Frederic C., Ph.D. The Modern City and Its Problems. New York, Scribner, 1915.

CHAPTER II

League of Nations

American League to Enforce Peace. Handbook of Programs and Policies. New York, 1916.

Angell, Norman. America and the New World State. New York, Putnam, 1915.

Brailsford, H. N. A League of Nations. New York, Macmillan, 1917.

Goldsmith, Robert. A League to Enforce Peace. New York, Macmillan, 1917.

Inter-Allied War Aims, Supplement to The New Republic. March 23,

Kellogg, Paul. British Labor Offensive, The Survey, March 2; April 6, 1918.

Nation, The, Weekly, London.

Veblen, Thorstein. An Inquiry into the Nature of Peace and the

Terms of Its Perpetuation. New York, Macmillan, 1917.
Wells, H. G. A League of Nations: The Plain Necessity. New

Republic, April 6, 1918.

Wilson, Woodrow. In Our First Year of War. New York, Harper, 1918.

Woolf, L. S. The Framework of a Lasting Peace. London, Allen and Unwin, 1917.

Milk Distribution

Dodd, F. Lawson. Municipal Milk and Public Health. London, The Fabian Society, 1909.

MacNutt, Joseph S. The Modern Milk Problem in Sanitation, Eco-

nomics, and Agriculture. New York, Macmillan, 1917.

Magruder, George L. The Sanitary Betterment of Milk Production and Distribution. Washington, International Congress on Hygiene and Demography, 1913.

New York Milk Committee. Infant Mortality and Milk Stations. Special Report Dealing with Problem of Reducing Infant Mortality.

New York, The Committee, 1912. Rockwell, A. H. What Constitutes a Model Milk Ordinance. Lansing, Michigan, Health Board, 1913.

Labor Unions

Henry, Alice. The Trade Union Woman. New York, Appleton, 1915. Marot, Helen. American Labor Unions. New York, Holt, 1914.

Internationalism

Angell, Norman. Internationalism as a Condition of Allied Success. The Dial, May 9, 1918.

Balch, Emily G. Approaches to the Great Settlement. New York, Huebsch, 1918.

Buxton, Chas. Roden, and others. Towards a Lasting Settlement. London, Allen and Unwin, 1915.

Dickinson, G. Lowes. The Choice Before Us. London, Allen and Unwin, 1917.

The Road Toward Peace. Boston, Houghton Eliot, Chas. W. Mifflin, 1915.

Hobhouse, L. T. Questions of War and Peace. London, Fisher Unwin. 1916.

Hobson, John A. Towards International Government. London, Allen and Unwin, 1915.

Howe, Frederic C., Ph.D., LL.D. Why War. New York, Scribner,

1916.

Jordan, David Starr. Ways to Lasting Peace. Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrill, 1916.

Muir, Ramsay. Nationalism and Internationalism. London, Constable, 1917.

Nasmyth, George. Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory. New

York, Putnam, 1916.

Russell, Bertrand. Why Men Fight. New York, Century, 1917. Veblen, Thorstein. The Passing of National Frontiers. The Dicl, April 25, 1918.

Women's Organizations

Beard, Mary R. Women's Work in Municipalities. New York, Appleton, 1915.

Blatch, Harriot S. Mobilizing Woman Power. New York, The

Woman's Press, 1918.

Stanton, E. C., Anthony, S. B., and others. History of Woman Suffrage. New York, National Woman Suffrage Association, 1881-1910.

Wilson, Elizabeth. Fifty Years of Association Work Among Young Women. New York, National Board Young Women's Christian

Associations, 1916.

Wood, Mary I. History of the General Federation of Women's Clubs for the first twenty-two years of its organization. New York, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1912.

CHAPTER III

South America

Bryce, James. South America: Observations and Impressions. New York, Macmillan, 1912.

Clemenceau, Georges. South America Today. New York, Putnam, 1911.

Johnston, Sir Harry. Pioneers in Tropical America. London, Blackie, 1914.

Missionary Education Movement. Report of the Panama Congress, Vol. II, 1916.

Peck, Annie. The South American Tour. New York, Doran, 1913. Ross, Edward A. South of Panama. New York, Century, 1915.

Speer, Robert E. South American Problems. New York, Student Volunteer Movement, 1912.

The Negro Problem

Brawley, Benjamin Griffith. A Short History of the American Negro. New York, Macmillan, 1913.

Brawley, Benjamin Griffith. Your Negro Neighbor. New York, Macmillan, 1918. Crisis The. Monthly, New York.

Du Bois, W. E. Burgherdt. The Souls of Black Folk. Chicago. McClurg, 1904.

Hammond, Lily Hardy. In Black and White. New York, Revell. 1914.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Publications, New York.

Negro Education, Report on. Department of Education, U. S. De-

partment of the Interior.

Ovington, Mary W. Half a Man. New York, Longmans, Green, 1911. Phillips, Ulrich B. American Negro Slavery. New York, Appleton, 1918.

Washington, Booker T. The Negro in the South. Philadelphia, Jacobs, 1907.

Weatherford, Willis Duke. Negro Life in the South. New York, Association Press, 1910.

Frances Willard

Strachey, Rachel. Frances Willard, Her Life and Work. New York, Fleming Revell, 1913.

Willard, Frances. Addresses. Chicago Woman's Temperance Pub-

lication Association.

Willard, Frances. Woman in the Pulpit. Chicago Woman's Temperance Publication Association, 1889.

Marriage, Monogamy, and Polygamy

Gallichan, W. M. Women under Polygamy. London, Halden and Hardingham, 1914.

Hartley, C. Gascoigne. The Age of Mother-Power; The Position of Women in Primitive Society. New York, Dodd, Mead, 1914.

Key, Ellen. Love and Marriage. New York, Putnam, 1911. Meissel-Hess, Grete. The Sexual Crisis. New York, Mount Morris

Publishing Company, 1917.
Parsons, Elsie Clews. The Family. New York, Putnam, 1906.
Royden, A. Maude. Women and the Sovereign State. London,

Headley Brothers, 1917.

Westermarck, Edward. The History of Human Marriage. New York, Macmillan, 1894.

Anthropology

Boas, Franz; Dixon, Roland, and others. Anthropology in North

America. New York, Stechert, 1915.
Grant, Madison. The Passing of the Great Race; or the Racial Basis of European History. New York. Scribner, 1916.
Jennings, H. S., and others. Suggestions of Modern Science Concern-

ing Education. New York, Macmillan, 1917.

Marett, R. R. Anthropology. London, Williams and Norgate, 1911. Montessori, Maria. Pedagogical Anthropology. New York, Stokes, 1913.

Osborn, Henry F. The Origin and Evolution of Life. New York, Scribner, 1917.

Tylor, Edward B. Anthropology. New York, Appleton, 1893. Windle, Bertram C. A. A Century of Scientific Thought and Other

Essays. London, Burns and Oates, 1915.

Joan of Arc

France, Anatole. The Life of Joan of Arc. New York, Lane, 1909.

Public Forums

Coleman, George William. Democracy in the Making. Boston, Little Brown, 1915.

Forum, The. Monthly, New York.

Grant, Percy S.; De Jarnette, A. Syle. The International Forum Department of Current Opinion, beginning March, 1918. Literature of the International Forum Association, Inc. 10 W. 11th

St., New York.

Karl Marx

Capital; a critique of political economy. Chicago, Kerr, 1907-09. Revolution and Counter-Revolution. London, Sonnenschein, 1896. Value, Price and Profit. Chicago, Kerr, 1908.

Social Thinking

Bergson, Henri. Introduction to a New Philosophy. Boston, Luce-

Coit, Stanton. Soul of America. New York, Macmillan, 1914. McDougall, William. Social Psychology. London, Methuen, 1908. Ross, Edward A. Social Control. New York, Macmillan, 1901. Sumner, Wm. G. Folkways. Boston, Ginn, 1907.

Fahians

Fabian New, Monthly. London. Pease, Edward R. History of the Fabian Society. London, Fifield, 1916.

CHAPTER IV

Communal Art

Archer, Wm., and Barker, Granville. A National Theatre: Schemes and Estimates. London, Duckworth, 1907.

Beegle, Mary P., and Crawford, J. R. Community Drama and Pageantry. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916.

Burleigh, Louise. The Community Theatre in Theory and Practice.

Boston, Little Brown, 1917.

Langdon, Wm. C., and Farwell, H. The Celebration of the Fourth of July by Means of Pageantry. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1912.

MacKaye, Percy. The Civic Theatre in Relation to the Redemption

of Leisure. New York, Kennerly, 1912.

Shaw, Bernard. The Cinema as a Moral Leveller, Supplement to the New Statesman, June 27, 1914.

Torrence, Ridgley. Granny Maumee. Plays for a Negro Theatre. New York, Macmillan, 1917.

Public Health

Beers, Clifford W. Purposes, Plans, and Work of State Societies for Mental Hygiene. New York, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1915.

Biggs, H. M., and Bolduan, C. F. The Tuberculosis Campaign: Its Influence on the Methods of Public Health Work. New York,

City Health Department, 1913.

Brend, Wm. A. Health and the State. London, Constable, 1917. Devine Edward T. Misery and Its Causes. New York, Macmillan, 1909. Hill, Hibbert Winslow. The New Public Health. New York, Macmillan, 1916.

Hunt Caroline L. Life of Ellen Richards. Boston, Whitcomb &

Barrows, 1912.

Hutchinson, Woods. Community Hygiene. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

International Council of Women. The Health of Nations. London, Constable, 1910.

Knopf, S. Adolphus. The Modern Warfare Against Tuberculosis as a Disease of the Masses. New York, Elliott, 1914. Morrow, Prince A. Social Diseases and Marriage; Social Prophylaxis.

New York, Lea Brothers, 1904.

National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis. Publications, New York, 105 E. 22nd Street. Newman, George. The Health of the State. London, Headley

Brothers, 1913.

New York Social Hygiene Society. Publications. New York.

Nightingale, Florence. Notes on Nursing. New York, Appleton, 1908. Nutting, M. Adelaide, and Dock, L. L. History of Nursing. New York, Putnam, 1912.

Social Morality Committee, National Board Young Women's Christian Association. Publications, New York, 600 Lexington Avenue. Wald, Lillian D. The House on Henry Street. New York, Holt, 1915. Waters, Ysabella. Visiting Nursing in the United States. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1909.

Sanitation

Bacon, Albion Fellows. Beauty for Ashes. New York, Dodd, Mead, 1914.

Gorgas, Wm. C. Sanitation in Panama. New York, Appleton, 1915. Price, George M. Handbook on Sanitation. New York, Wiley, 1915. Richards, Ellen. Conservation by Sanitation; Air and Water Supply, Disposal of Waste. New York, Wiley, 1911.

Richards, Ellen. Cost of Cleanliness. New York, Wiley, 1908.

Sanitation in Daily Life. Boston, Whitcomb and Richards, Ellen. Barrows, 1907.

Wood, Harold B. Sanitation Practically Applied. New York, Wiley, 1917.

CHAPTER V

Education of Defective and Crippled Children

Binet, A., and Simon, Th. Mentally Defective Children. New York,

Longmans, Green, 1914.

Irwin, Elisabeth A. Truancy, A Study of the Mental, Physical and Social Factors of the Problem of Non-attendance at School. New York, Public Education Association, 1915.

Reeves, Edith G. Care and Education of Crippled Children in the

U. S. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1914.

Shuttleworth, G. E., and Potts, W. A. Mentally Deficient Children: Their Treatment and Training. London, Lewis, 1916.

Terman, Lewis M. Measurement of Intelligence. Boston, Houghton

Mifflin, 1916. Tredgold, Alfred F. Mental Deficiency. New York, Wood, 1914. Young, Meredith. The Mentally Defective Child. New York, Hoeber, 1916.

Unemployment

Andrews, Irene Osgood. Relation of Irregular Employment to the Living Wage for Women (in New York State Factory Investigating Commission Fourth Report, 1915), Albany, 1915.

Andrews, John B. American Cities and the Prevention of Unem-

ployment. New York, Civic Press, 1916.

Barnes, Charles B. The Longshoreman. New York, Russell Sage

Foundation, 1915.

British Association for the Advancement of Science: Replacement of Men by Women in Industry. (Part I in Credit, Industry, and the War. London, Pitman, 1915. Part II in Labour, Finance, and the War. London, Pitman, 1916.)

Fabian Women's Group. The War, Women, and Unemployment. London, Fabian Society, 1915.

Solenberger, Alice W. One Thousand Homeless Men. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1911.

Van Kleeck, Mary. A Seasonal Industry; A Study of the Millinery Trade in New York City. New York, Russell Sage Foundation,

1917.

Injurious Trades

Goldmark, Josephine. Fatigue and Efficiency. New York, Survey Associates, Inc., 1913.

Kelley, Florence. Modern Industry in Relation to the Family, Health, Education, Morality. New York, Longmans, Green, 1914.

Kober, George M. Diseases of Occupation and Vocational Hygiene. Philadelphia, P. Blackiston, 1916.

New York State Factory Investigating Commission. Reports (1912-1915), Albany.

Oliver, Sir Thomas. Occupations from the Social, Hygienic, and Medical Points of View. Cambridge, University Press, 1916.

Tolman, Wm. H., and Kendall, L. B. Safety; Methods for Preventing Occupational and Other Accidents and Diseases. New York, Harper,

Webb, Beatrice. Health of Working Girls. London, Blackie, 1917.

Communism

Ameringer, Oscar. Communism, Socialism, and the Church. Milwaukee, Milwaukee Social Democratic Publishing Co., 1913.

Kropotkin, Peter. The Conquest of Bread. London, Chapman and Hall, 1906.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. Manifesto of the Communist Party. Chicago, Kerr, 1912.

Morris, William. Communism: A Lecture. London, Fabian Society, 1903.

Tolstov, Leo. The Great Iniquity. London, The Free Age Press, 1906.

Trade Guilds

Cole, C. D. H. Self-Government in Industry. London, G. Bell, 1917. Hobson, S. G. Guild Principles in War and Peace. London, G. Bell, 1917.

New Age, The. Weekly, London.

Orage, A. R. National Guilds. London, G. Bell, 1914.

Penty, A. J. Old Worlds for New. New York, Sunwise Turn, 1917.

Dependent Children

Breckenridge, S. P., and Abbott, E. The Delinquent Child and the Home. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1912.

Dependent Children in the State of New York. State Charities Aid Association. Publication No. 126, New York.

Folks, Homer. Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Chil-

dren. New York, Macmillan, 1902. Gorst, Sir John E. The Children of the Nation. New York, Dutton, 1907.

Heath, H. Llewellyn. The Infant, the Parent, and the State. London, P. S. King, 1907.

Missouri Children's Code Commission. Report. St. Louis, 1917.

Norwegian Laws Concerning Illegitimate Children. No. 31.

Payne, Geo. H. The Child in Human Progress. New York, Putnam, 1916.

Sellers, Edith. The State Children of Hungary. Contemporary Review, March, 1907. Slingerland, Wm. H. Child Welfare in California. New York, Russell

Sage Foundation, 1915.

Slingerland, Wm. H. Child Welfare Work in Pennsylvania. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1915.

Spargo, John. The Bitter Cry of the Children. New York, Macmillan, 1906.

Summary of Child Welfare Laws Passed in 1916. No. 21.

United States Children's Bureau Publications:—Care of Dependents of Enlisted Men in Canada. No. 25. Government Provisions in U. S. and Foreign Countries for Members of Military Forces and Their Dependents. No. 28. Laws Relating to Mothers' Pensions in U. S., Denmark, and New Zealand. No. 7.

Abraham Lincoln

Lincoln, Abraham: Speeches, Letters, State Papers, and Miscellaneous Writings. New York, Century Co., 1894.

Tarbell, Ida M. Life of Abraham Lincoln. New York, Macmillan. 1917. -

Thomas Carlyle

Critical and Miscellaneous Essays. New York, Collier, 1897. Heroes and Hero Worship. New York, Collier, 1897. Sartor Resartus. New York, Collier, 1897. The French Revolution. New York, Collier, 1897.

H. G. Wells

Discovery of the Future, The. New York, Huebsch, 1914. End of the Armament Rings, The. Boston, World Peace Foundation. 1914.

First and Last Things. New York, Putnam, 1908. Future in America, The. New York, Harper, 1906. Mankind in the Making. New York, Scribner, 1904. New Worlds for Old. London, Constable, 1908.

Social Forces in England and America. New York, Harper, 1914.

This Misery of Boots. Boston, Ball, 1908.

What Is Coming: A European Forecast. New York, Macmillan, 1916.

CHAPTER VI

Political Parties

Croly, Herbert. The Promise of American Life. New York, Macmillan, 1907.

Hillquit, Morris. History of Socialism in the United States. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1910.

Orth, Samuel P. Five American Politicians: A Study in the Evolution

of American Politics. Cleveland, Burrows Bros., 1906. Rogers, Henry Wade. The Democratic Party. New Haven, Yale Review, New Series, vol. 2, 1912.

Sloane, William M. Party Government in the United States of

America. New York, Harper, 1914. Tweedy, John. A History of the Republican National Conventions from 1856 to 1908. Danbury, Conn., Tweedy, 1910.

Watkins, A. S. Why I Am a Prohibitionist. Chicago, 1912.

Totem Pattern

Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, a Study in Religious Sociology. New York, Macmillan, 1915.

Frazer, James G. Totemism and Exogamy. London, Macmillan, 1910.

Freud, Sigmund. Totem and Taboo. New York, Moffat, Yard, 1918.

Woman Suffrage Movement

Blease, W. Lyon. The Emancipation of English Women. London, Nutt, 1913.

Metcalfe, A. E. Women's Effort. Oxford, Blackwell, 1917.

Stanton, E. C., Anthony, S. B., Gage, M. J., Harper, I. H. History of Woman Suffrage. New York, National American Woman Suffrage Association, 1881–1910.

Initiative, Referendum and Recall

Barnett, James D. The Operation of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall in Oregon. New York, Macmillan, 1915.

Beard, Chas. A., and Schultz, B. E. Documents on the State-wide Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. New York, Macmillan, 1912. Munro, William Bennett. The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. New York, Appleton, 1912.

Wilcox, Delos F. Government by All the People, or, the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall as Instruments of Democracy. New York,

Macmillan, 1912.

CHAPTER VII

Mexico

Atl. The Mexican Revolution and the Nationalization of the Land. New York, Mexican Bureau of Information, 1915.

Hagar, George J. Plain Facts about Mexico. New York, Harper, 1916.

Jordan, David Starr. What of Mexico? New York, Mexican-American League, 1916.

Lawrence, David. The Truth about Mexico. New York, Evening Post Co., 1917.

MacHugh, R. J. Modern Mexico. London, Methuen, 1914.

O'Shaughnessy, Edith. Diplomat's Wife in Mexico. New York. Harper, 1916.

Starr, Frederick. In Indian Mexico. Chicago, Forbes, 1908. Starr, Frederick. Readings from Modern Mexican Authors. Chicago, Open Court Pub. Co., 1904.

Australia

Australian Commonwealth, The. Its Resources and Production. Melbourne, McCarron Bird, 1915.

Reeves, Wm. Pember. State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand. London, Richards, 1907.

Japan

Bacon, Alice Mabel. Japanese Girls and Women. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1902.

Gulick, Sydney L. The American Japanese Problem. New York, Scribner, 1914.

Iyenaga, Toyokichi. Japan's Real Attitude Toward America. New York and London, Putnam, 1916.

Niotobe, Inazo Ota. The Japanese Nation. New York and London, Putnam, 1912.

Porter, Robert Percival. The Full Recognition of Japan. London, Oxford University Press, 1911.

China

Blakeslee, George Hubbard. China and the Far East. New York. Crowell, 1910.

Blakeslee, George Hubbard. Recent Developments in China. New York, Stechert, 1913.

Bland, John, Otway, Percy, and Blackhouse, E. China under the Empress Dowager. London, W. Heinemann, 1910.

Groot, J. J. Maria de. The Religion of the Chinese. New York, Macmillan, 1910.

Reinsch, Paul Samuel. Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1911.

Ross, Edward A. The Changing Chinese. New York, Century, 1911.

India

Collier, Price. The West in the East from an American Point of View. New York, Scribner, 1911.

Cooper, Elizabeth. The Harim and the Purdah. London, Unwin,

Cowan, Minna J. The Education of the Women of India. Edinburgh, Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1912.

Eddy, Sherwood. India Awakening. New York, 1911.

Chimnabai, Maharani of Baroda, and Nutra, S. M. The Position of Women in Indian Life. London, Longmans, Green, 1911.

Africa

Alston, Madeline. From the Heart of the Veld. New York, John Lane, 1916.

Burton, Sir Richard F. First Footsteps in East Africa. London,

Tylston and Edwards, 1894.

Johnston, Sir Harry. A History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races. Cambridge, University Press, 1905.

Morel, Edmund D. Nigeria, Its People and Its Problems. London,

Smith Elder, 1912.

Rhodes, Cecil. His Political Life and Speeches. London, Chapman and Hall, 1900.

Schreiner, Olive. Story of an African Farm. London, Hutchinson, 1910.

CHAPTER VIII

Socialism

Dickinson, G. Lowes. Justice and Liberty. New York, McClure,

Ensor, Robert C. K. Modern Socialism as Set Forth in Their Speeches, Writings, and Programmes. London, Harper, 1910. Fabian Society. Essays and Tracts. London.

Hillquit, Morris. Socialism in Theory and Practice. New York, Macmillan, 1909.

Popp, Adelheid. Autobiography of a Workingman. Chicago, Browne, 1913.

Vandervelde, Emile. Collectivism and the Industrial Revolution. Chicago, Kerr, 1906.

Vandervelde, Emile, and others. Together at Last: The International Reconciliation of Labor and Religion. London, Johnson, 1915. Wells, H. G. New Worlds for Old. London, Constable, 1908.

Labor Problem

Addams, Jane. Newer Ideals of Peace. New York, Macmillan, 1907, Brooks, John Graham. The Social Unrest. New York, Macmillan, 1911.

Hobson, John A. Work and Wealth: A Human Valuation. New

York, Macmillan, 1914.

Hollander, Jacob H. The Abolition of Poverty. Boston, Houghton

Mifflin, 1914.

Labor and the New Social Order. Report on Reconstruction by Sub-Committee of the British Labor Party. Supplement to the New Republic, Feb. 16, 1918.

Liberator, The. Monthly, New York. New Republic, The. Weekly, New York.

New Statesman, The. Weekly, London.

Patton, Simon N. The New Basis of Civilization. New York, Macmillan, 1908.

Survey, The. Weekly, New York.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. Problems of Modern Industry. London, Longmans, Green, 1898.

182

William James

James, William. The Moral Equivalent of War (in Memories and Studies). New York, Longmans, Green, 1911.

Wage Problem

Bosworth, Louise M. The Living Wage of Women Workers. New York, Longmans, Green, 1911.

Frankfurter, Felix, and Goldmark, Josephine. Oregon Minimum Wage Cases, U. S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1916. New

York, National Consumers' League.

Lectures on the Industrial Unrest and the Living Wage given at the Inter-Denominational Summer School at Swanwick. London, King, 1913.

Inter-Allied Labor Conference

Inter-Allied War Aims. Supplement to the New Republic, March 23, 1918.

Labor Conditions

American Association for Labor Legislation. Publications, New York. 131 E. 23d Street.

Brandeis, Louis D., and Goldmark, Josephine. Brief on Night Work of Women, Court of Special Sessions. New York, National Consumers' League, 1915.

Brooklyn Consumers' League. Handbook of Labor Laws of New

York, 1917.

Commons, J. R., and Andrews, J. B. Principles of Labor Legislation. New York, Harper, 1916.

New York State, Factory Investigating Commission Reports (1912-1915). Lyon, Albany.

Survey, The. Weekly, New York.

Women Workers

Abbott, Edith. Women in Industry. New York, Appleton, 1910. Burton, Margaret E. Women Workers of the Orient. New York,

Cadbury, Edward, Matheson, M. Cecile, and Shann, George, Women's Work and Wages. London, Unwin, 1909.

Gulick, Sidney L. Working Women of Japan. New York, Missionary Education Movement, 1915.

Hutchins, B. L. Women in Modern Industry. London, Bell, 1915. Life and Labor. Monthly, Chicago.

Woman's Industrial News. Monthly, London.

Child Labor

Clopper, Edward N. Child Labor in City Streets. New York, Macmillan, 1912.

Freeman, Arnold. Boy Life and Labour: the Manufacture of Inefficiency. London, King, 1914.

Greenwood, Arthur. Juvenile Labour Exchanges and After Care. London, King, 1911.

Keeling, Frederic. The Labour Exchange in Relation to Boy and Girl

Labour. London, King, 1910.

National Child Labor Committee. Publications. New York, 105 E. 22nd Street.

Nearing, Scott. The Solution of the Child Labor Problem. New York, Moffat Yard, 1911.

Spargo, John. The Bitter Cry of the Children. New York, Mac-

millan, 1909.

U. S. Children Bureau Publications:-Sumner and Merritt, Child Labor Legislation in the United States. Sumner and Hanks, Administration of Child Labor Laws. Rochester, Anna, Child Labor in Warring Countries.

Vocational Training

Cleveland Educational Survey Sectional Reports. 1915-1916. Boughten, A. C. Household Arts and School Lunches.

Bryner, E., Dressmaking and Millinery. The Garment Trades.

O'Leary, I. P. Department Store Occupations. Shaw, F. L. The Building Trades.—The Printing Trades. Stevens, B. M. Boys and Girls in Commercial Work.

Lutz, R. R. The Metal Trades.

Kerschensteiner, George. The Schools and the Nation. London. Macmillan, 1914.

Lapp, J. A., and Mote, C. H. Learning to Earn. Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrill, 1915.

Leake, Albert H. The Vocational Education of Girls and Women. New York, Macmillan, 1918. Mactavish, J. M. What Labor Wants from Education. London,

Workers' Educational Association, 1916.

Marot, Helen. Creative Impulse in Industry. New York, Dutton, 1918.

National Society for the Promotion of Vocational Education. Publications. New York, 140 W. 42nd Street.

Parsons, Frank. Choosing a Vocation. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1909.

Woods, Robert A., and Kennedy, A. J. Young Working Girls. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1913.

CHAPTER IX

Lincoln Steffens

Steffens, Lincoln. The Shame of the Cities. New York, McClure Phillips, 1904.

The Struggle for Self-Government. New York, Steffens, Lincoln. McClure Phillips, 1906.

Government Control

Cole, G. D. H. The State and Industry. London, Headley Bros., 1917.

Davies, Emil. The Nationalization of Railways. London, A. & C. Black, 1911.

Fabian, Society. How to Pay for the War. Edited by Sidney Webb. London, Fabian Society, 1916.

Haines, Henry S. Problems in Railway Regulation. New York, Macmillan, 1911.

Holcombe, A. N. Public Ownership of Telephones on the Continent

of Europe. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1911. Holmes, Frederick L. Regulation of Railroads and Public Utilities in Wisconsin. New York, Appleton, 1915.

Orth, Samuel P. Readings on the Relation of Government to Property and Industry. Boston, Ginn, 1915.

Triden, André The New Unionism. New York, Huebsch, 1917.

Woman Movement

Addams, Jane. The Long Road of Woman's Memory. New York, Macmillan, 1916.

Anthony, Katharine, Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, New York, 1915.

Gilman, Charlotte P. Women and Economics. Boston, Small Maynard, 1898.

Nearing, Scott, and N. M. Woman and Social Progress. New York, Macmillan, 1912.

Schreiner, Olive. Woman and Labor. New York, Stokes, 1911.

Eight Hour Laws

Frankfurter, Felix, and Goldmark, Josephine. The Case for the Shorter Work Day. U. S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1916. New York, National Consumers' League.

Goldmark, Josephine. Fatigue and Efficiency. New York, Survey

Associates, 1913.

Women in Professions

Bennett, Helen M. Women and Work. New York, London, Appleton, 1917.

Morley, Edith J. Women Workers in Seven Professions. London.

George Routledge, 1914. Robinson, Mabel Louise. The Curriculum of the Woman's College. U. S. Bureau of Education, Washington, 1918.

CHAPTER X

Profit-Sharing

Emmet, Boris. Profit-Sharing in the United States. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1917.

Ford, Henry. Report of Testimony of Henry Ford Before the Fed-

eral Commission. New York, Anderson Co., 1915.
Gay, Edwin F., and others. Profit-Sharing. New York, Harper, 1918.
Harris, Emerson P. Cooperation, the Hope of the Consumer. New York, Macmillan, 1918.
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. Cooperative Production and Profit-

Sharing. Supplement to the *New Statesman*, Feb. 14, 1914. Williams, Aneurin. Copartnership and Profit-Sharing. New York,

Holt, 1913.







