

Kolehak has stated quite distinctly and on various occasions that he is going to lead the Russian people to the convocation of a National Assembly; he took an oath, and as a man of honor he will uphold it, that he would merely consider himself as a temporary ruler, and that he would lead the nation to the polls. . . . Anarchy must be crushed in order to give the people the opportunity to work out a national policy of their own and such a political status as would best fit their historical traditions and national aspirations.

It is for those who hate Bolshevism and all it implies to give their sympathy and support to every sound effort to unite the Russian people in a campaign for self-government rather than to deal with the Moscow gang as if they represented in any large or true sense the Russian people.

THE INVASION OF HUNGARY

Pressure from without as well as dissension within has caused the downfall of the Communist Government in Hungary headed by Bela Kun. Indeed, in the first days in May it was reported that King Ferdinand of Rumania was about to enter Budapest, Hungary's capital. Bela Kun's rule has never been firmly established, and the Red Army raised by his followers has been far from formidable. The threat of the Russian Bolsheviks to send forces to the aid of the Reds in Hungary, which included an ultimatum to Rumania demanding the evacuation of Bessarabia, has proved to be an absurd piece of boastfulness, and the fall of the Communist Government in Hungary is the best reply to the Bolshevik bragadocio.

However much one may approve of the downfall of the Reds in Hungary, the whole warlike episode is a reproach to weakness of purpose among the Great Powers. It was their duty, during the period between the signing of the armistice and the completion of peace terms with Germany and Austria, to see that peace was kept in Central Europe. It is not necessary to pass an opinion as to the justice of the claims of Rumania and of the Czechoslovaks. It was not for those countries to decide where the line of territorial demarkation between Hungary and neighboring countries should lie. That was the duty of the Powers, and if military action was necessary as against Hungary, it should have been taken by the Powers themselves. At one time the Council of the Allies in Paris positively forbade such action as the Rumanians and Czechoslovaks have taken in attacking Hungary, but their decree, for it was in that form, received little or no attention. At all events, hostilities ceased only when the Hungarians offered territorial concessions both to Rumania and the Czechoslovaks. If Hungary is to be dis-

membered or diminished in territory (and the misgovernment in that country certainly makes her deserve drastic terms), the decision should come, not through little wars waged by newly formed countries, but through a serious decision reached by the Powers really responsible for the peace of the future.

The incident illustrates, as does the Allies' attitude toward the Russian situation, the fact that there have been lacking at Paris the clear decision and vigor which should have been the controlling element during this intermediate period.

THE GALLANT SEVENTY-SEVENTH

New York City last week honored and welcomed its Seventy-seventh Division no less enthusiastically than it did before the equally famous Twenty-seventh (which in its make-up was more a State and less a city division than the Seventy-seventh) or its favorite "Irish Sixty-ninth," or than New England welcomed its gallant Twenty-sixth Division the other day. If the Twenty-seventh helped break the Hindenburg line, the Seventy-seventh cleared up the Argonne Forest and played its part bravely and victoriously in the great Argonne offensive—the one big offensive carried on by an all-American army on a large scale; in it over 600,000 American soldiers were engaged and some of the many divisions employed suffered the heaviest casualties of the war.

The Seventy-seventh, made up of selective service men, was surely a melting-pot division. One newspaper writer says of its men:

Eighteen months ago they were a conglomerate mob of tailors, scions of the colonial Dutch "square heads," college men, stevedores, subway diggers, millionaires, bankers, crap-shooters, stuss-players, and gunmen. To-day, surviving veterans of some of the fiercest battles of the greatest war in history, they are returning conscious of a clean fighting record that gives strength to their claims of glory.

Among the things for which the Seventy-seventh will always be remembered is the glorious incident of Lieutenant-Colonel Whittlesey's "Lost Battalion." General Alexander, the division commander, has declared that the battalion, although cut off and surrounded by the Germans, was neither "lost" nor "rescued," but that Lieutenant-Colonel Whittlesey, having been ordered to take a certain objective, took it, and advanced more rapidly than troops on his flanks and troops behind him.

This version adds rather than detracts from the heroism of the achievement, for it shows that there was no rash, reckless advance beyond orders or against orders—a serious military fault which in more

than one instance in this war resulted in tragic, purposeless loss of life.

Whatever their racial descent or social history—and every grade, high and low, was represented—these men were Americans through and through. Their valor and their patriotism were of the highest. They will take back to their homes the spirit of common American effort and sacrifice for the common safety and honor. And this influence may go far to counteract pernicious theories preached by anti-American Anarchists.

MAY DAY VIOLENCE

By a lamentable custom of agitators and "demonstrators," May Day, once devoted to outdoor rejoicing, has become the rallying-point of industrial warfare and anarchistic violence—and in some instances of anti-anarchistic but no less lawless violence.

Such rioting as took place on May 1 in Cleveland, New York, Paris, and elsewhere was not on a large scale, although lives were lost and injuries were numerous, but is deplorable because it indicates ignorant lack of faith in legitimate methods of presenting reasonable claims or political purposes. Charges of disloyalty and Bolshevism, on one side, and of brutality by police or mobs of discharged soldiers, on the other, intensify bad feeling.

The remedy in the future is in stronger and clearer laws defining or limiting the rights of public speaking and "demonstrating," and the rigid enforcement of law against any overt attempt to incite revolution or preach disloyalty. Terrorism may be advocated in Moscow, but it ought not to be conceivable in Paris or New York. Socialism is not to be brought about by street fighting, nor is it to be defeated by beating up even offensive agitators. If there are centers of objectionable agitation (as is alleged of the Rand School in New York), there must be law to deal with the pests, not angry mobs.

In line with this commonplace principle, Senator New proposes to reintroduce his bill forbidding the publishing or selling of books or papers which advise "the overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property or by general cessation of industry of the Government of the United States or of all government." Equally stringently the bill forbids the display of any flag or emblem intended "to symbolize a purpose to overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property, or by the general cessation of industry, the Government of the United States." This may or may not precisely meet the situation, but that some measures should be taken is proven by the perfectly senseless violence of last May Day.

The atrocious attempt to murder, by

deadly bombs sent through the mail, men who have been prominently identified with trying Anarchists or who are assumed to be anti-radical or capitalistic in their sympathies, also suggests the need of new legislation; for it is stated that bomb manufacture is more prevalent in America than elsewhere simply because our laws are lax as to the manufacture and sale of explosives. Only the quick intelligence of a post-office employee prevented a series of horrible murders, and while clues seemed at first to be abundant, the scoundrel who planned the crime remains, as we write, undetected. Whether the criminal was an anarchistic agitator or not, he certainly was moved by hatred against the exponents of law and order. The theory of the Reds that the crime was a "frame-up" by their enemies is baseless and silly.

STREET RAILWAY FARES.

Various cities throughout the country have been struggling with the question of street railway fares. The companies operating such railways have claimed that the standard fare of five cents is not sufficient to pay the wages and other costs of operation and maintenance, and bonded interest, to say nothing of dividends. In more than one instance the fares have been increased fifty per cent with the consent of municipal or other officials.

In *The Outlook* of April 30 Mr. Theodore H. Price published an article with a chart entitled "The Index Number Wage," which showed at a glance how the price of foodstuffs and other necessary commodities has risen during the last twenty years. At that time we said: "It is perfectly clear that the wages of employees must go up with the cost of living. It is equally a mathematical deduction that railway rates must go up also to meet this necessary rise in wages or else the railways will be bankrupt." This mathematical deduction is just as applicable to the street railways as it is to the steam railways. Either the street railways must be taken over by the various municipalities in which they run and must be operated as public utilities, the taxpayer bearing the deficits; or, if private management is desired, the private owners must receive sufficient return to warrant them in maintaining proper service.

There are a good many reasons for thinking that the public sentiment in this country favors private operation under some kind of fair governmental regulation of its steam railways. The same, we think, is true in most communities at present of street railways. The question is, What is fair regulation?

We have received a communication from a reader of *The Outlook* who for some years has had active experience in

the organization and reorganization of street railway companies, in which he endeavors briefly to outline a plan of municipal regulation of street railways. From that communication we quote the following passage:

If the street railway is to be looked upon as a servant of the people, and that is what it must be, then in order to be an efficient servant it must be operated and run by trained men who must look to the excellence of their work for a continuance of their jobs, and the road must earn enough to pay interest on what it is worth as a going concern, pay its wages, and maintain its property. This means a business, not a political organization.

Hostility between the street railway and the city served must cease in the interest of both.

This can be brought about by valuing the roads of to-day as going concerns—the city and the road in question each to name one firm of engineers, and these two to select a third, the city to pass such ordinances as will permit seven per cent to be earned upon the agreed upon valuation and on the new property added from time to time, through the imposition of such fares as will raise the necessary revenue; and in consideration of such action on the city's part to protect the property at its just value, any excess earnings to be divided between the corporation and the city, the city at its annual election to elect two directors, one an engineer and the other a certified accountant, to represent it on the Railway Board.

With the city then in partnership with the street railway, its records and accounts open at all times to the city through its accredited representative on the Board, the many fruitful grounds for misunderstanding will be abolished. The election of men for this specific purpose will prevent a shifting of responsibility from one city father to another, and men so elected can be held to a strict accountability. Both the railway officials and the city's officials will be only too anxious to stand well with the public, and the Public Service Commission will still exist as an umpire.

This kind of partnership between the city authorities and street railway experts is well worth consideration, and we commend it to those who are struggling with these problems.

DEMOCRATIC FACTORY MANAGEMENT

Many years ago *The Outlook* published a series of articles under the general title of "Industrial Democracy." It is our impression that the term "industrial democracy" was framed and first used in these columns. At all events, we employed it to express our belief that in the slow but steady process of social revolution in which man first struggled for and established religious democracy, then political democracy, then educational democracy, he is now seeking perfectly logically to obtain democracy in industry.

We have defined industrial democracy

as that system in which the hand-worker or employee shall have a voice in the management of the business and a participation in the profits. It is our conviction that only in this way can an efficient partnership between so-called labor and so-called capital be established. For laborers and capitalists are not enemies nor are their interests conflicting. They are really partners.

There have recently come to our attention three or four interesting instances in which there has been an earnest attempt made by corporations to give their workers a share in the profits and a representation in the management. This is due, we think, to the changes produced by the war in the economic theories of the world. We have asked Mr. Theodore H. Price, a valued contributor to *The Outlook* on economic and industrial problems, to give us an article on this subject. In preparing it he desires the co-operation of our readers and asks us to print the following letter, which we gladly do:

May 1, 1919.

To the Readers of The Outlook:

At the suggestion of the editors of *The Outlook*, I am planning to write an article upon "Profit Sharing and Democratic Factory Management." In this article I shall endeavor to include a comparative digest of the various profit-sharing plans that have been introduced in the conduct of many American industrial and commercial establishments.

That this digest may be inclusive and intelligent, I am taking this method of requesting that all those to whose eye this letter may come should send me in detail or in outline a description of any profit-sharing plan of which they may have knowledge as in actual operation.

I shall also appreciate any suggestions drawn from the experience or observation of my correspondents that will be helpful.

My address is 15 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

THEODORE H. PRICE.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

It has long been a dream of the writer of this paragraph—probably never to be realized, alas!—that it would be delightful to spend a winter in the old French university town of Montpellier. Montpellier lies practically on the Mediterranean near Marseilles, and is the seat of one of the oldest and perhaps it may also be said one of the most old-fashioned universities in France. It has a special place in academic history because one of the great classical scholars of the Renaissance period, Isaac Casaubon, lectured there.

What could be more pleasant for an American who hates the cold and who loves the sunshine of the Mediterranean than to spend a winter at Montpellier, straightening out and polishing up his