

I answered, and the next day I went to work. I was subjected to the gibes the green hand suffers, my self-esteem was constantly ruffled, my work was exhausting, and my future seemed dark. It was not a period of joy for me, and yet it taught me valuable lessons.

"Finally, a better opportunity came to me from a friend engaged in the manufacture of architectural terra cotta in Philadelphia. On the day I reported for duty as a draughtsman he conducted me through the plant. In the modeling room, as I stood watching the clay take form under deft fingers, I was fascinated, and ventured the suggestion that some time I might be allowed to try my hand there.

"Have you ever modeled?" my friend inquired. I answered that I had not, but that the possibilities it offered appealed to me. He had been a sculptor, and understood me. In his studio he put clay into my hands, and left me to copy a simple architectural design,—if I could. I became so absorbed in the work that two hours passed with no realization on my part of the flight of time. I was startled by a hand upon my shoulder.

"Why, my boy," exclaimed my friend, "you have a wonderful instinct for sculpture. I will place you immediately at modeling."

"This was my beginning. I finally opened a studio of my own in New York. I would say this to the young sculptor: Regard each piece of work you do as one of the vital things in your life. Put your best into it, and it will grow to be worthy, and you will grow with it. The secret of achievement in art is sympathy, and a conscience so exacting that it will not allow you to stop short of your highest capabilities."



## WOMAN'S RELATION TO CIVIC HOUSE-KEEPING.

A Portion of an Article by Jane Addams in the Chicago Record-Herald of April 1, 1906.

May we not say that city housekeeping has failed partly because women, the traditional housekeepers, have not been consulted as to its multiform activities? The men of the city have been carelessly indifferent to much of this civic housekeeping, as they have always been indifferent to the details of the household. They have totally disregarded a candidate's capacity to keep the streets clean, preferring to consider him in relation to the national tariff or to the necessity for increasing the national navy in a pure spirit of reversion to the traditional type of government which had to do only with enemies and outsiders.

It is difficult to see what military prowess has to do with the multiform duties which in a modern city includes the care of parks and libraries, superintendence of markets, sewers and bridges, the inspection of provisions and boilers, and the proper disposal of garbage. It has nothing to do with the building department which the city maintains that it may see to it that the basements are dry, that the bedrooms are large enough to afford the required cubic feet of air, that the plumbing is sanitary, that the gaspipes do not leak, that the tenement-house court is large enough to afford light and ventilation, that the stairways are fireproof. The ability to carry arms has

nothing to do with the health department maintained by the city which provides that children are vaccinated, that contagious diseases are isolated and placarded, that the spread of tuberculosis is curbed, that the water is free from typhoid infection. Certainly the military conception of society is remote from the functions of the school boards, whose concern it is that children are educated, that they are supplied with kindergartens and are given a decent place in which to play. The very multifariousness and complexity of a city government demands the help of minds accustomed to detail and variety of work, to a sense of obligation for the health and welfare of young children, and to a responsibility for the cleanliness and comfort of other people.

Because all these things have traditionally been in the hands of women, if they take no part in it now they are not only missing the education which the natural participation in civic life would bring to them, but they are losing what they have always had. From the beginning of tribal life they have been held responsible for the health of the community, a function which is now represented by the health department; from the days of the cave dwellers so far as the home was clean and wholesome it was due to their efforts, which are now represented by the bureau of tenement-house inspection; from the period of the primitive village the only public sweeping which was performed was what they undertook in their divers dooryards, that which is now represented by the bureau of street cleaning. Most of the departments in a modern city can be traced to woman's traditional activity, but in spite of this, so soon as these old affairs were turned over to the care of the city they slipped from woman's hands, apparently because they then became matters for collective action and implied the use of the franchise. Because the franchise had in the first instance been given to the man who could fight, because in the beginning he alone could vote who could carry a weapon, it was considered an improper thing for a woman to possess it.

Is it quite public-spirited for women to say, "We will take care of these affairs so long as they stay in our own houses, but if they go outside and concern so many people that they cannot be carried on without the mechanism of the vote we will drop them. It is true that these activities which women have always had are not at present being carried on very well by the men in most of the great American cities, but because we do not consider it 'lady-like' to vote we will let them alone?"

Because women consider the government men's affair and something which concerns itself with elections and alarms, they have become so confused in regard to their traditional business in life, the rearing of children, that they hear with complacency a statement made by the Nestor of sanitary reformers that one-half of the tiny lives which make up the city's death rate each year might be saved by a more thorough application of sanitary science. Because it implies the use of the suffrage they do not consider it woman's business to save these lives. Are we going to lose ourselves in the old circle of convention and add to that sum of wrongdoing which is continually committed in the world because we do not look at things as they really are? Old-fashioned ways which no longer apply to changed conditions are a snare in which the feet of women have always

become readily entangled. It is so easy to be stupid and to believe that things that used to exist still go on long after they are past; to commit irreparable blunders because we fail to correct our theories by our changing experience. So many of the stumbling blocks against which we fall are the opportunities to which we have not adjusted ourselves. We keep hold of a convention which no longer squares with our genuine insight into life and we are slow to follow a clew which might enable us to solace and improve the life about us because it shocks an obsolete ideal.

Why is it that women do not vote upon those matters which concern them so intimately? Why do they not follow these vital affairs and feel responsible for their proper administration even although they have become municipalized? What would the result have been could women have regarded the suffrage not as a right or a privilege but as a mere piece of governmental machinery, without which they could not perform their traditional functions under the changed conditions of city life? Could we view the whole situation as a matter of obligation and normal development it would be much simplified. We are at the beginning of a prolonged effort to incorporate a progressive developing city life, founded upon a response to the needs of all the people, into the requisite legal enactments and civic institutions. To be in any measure successful this effort will require all the intelligent powers of observation, all the sympathy, all the common sense which may be gained from the whole adult population.



## RAILROADS DISCRIMINATION.

### THE EVIL.

#### For The Public.

In spite of the old saying that "there is nothing new under the sun," the railroad problem of the last fifty years is something absolutely new in industrial and political society. In civilized communities, and some barbarous ones, too, the establishment and maintenance of highways has always been a function of government. Government exists to protect life and property; but the right to travel to any part of the land on equality with other citizens is an important adjunct to the right of life, and the right of the citizen to take property from place to place as readily as others may take their property, is a most important element of the right of property.

In Anglo Saxon and English history the roads were called the "King's highways". All subjects of the king had equal rights there. The Anglo Saxon system was transplanted in America, and the providing of channels of transportation was always a matter for the action of either local or general government, until the coming of the railway. The highways on land and water were for the most part established and maintained at the public charge, leaving all citizens free to use them without discrimination and without price. The only apparent exception to this rule, the so-called toll roads, was an exception in name rather than in fact, the gathering of toll from travelers being really another way of collecting the road tax.

The wagon roads, still necessary for local transportation, cannot compete with the railroad for any

considerable distance; and with the exception of a limited opportunity for water transportation, the internal commerce of the country is entirely dependent upon the railroads. The placing of the transportation facilities of the country in private hands, was contrary to Anglo Saxon traditions; but there were certain conditions tending to this result when the railroad came into use.

(1) The railroad displaced other means of transportation gradually at first, and the people did not realize the far-reaching consequences of the change.

(2) Previous transportation facilities consisted only of the way or road on which all might pass with privately owned vehicles; but with the railroad there must be a specially prepared track on which only one vehicle can pass; there must be specially designed cars and engines, which it was impossible to expect individual citizens to possess; the railroad must be operated with great care and system by a large number of employes. The situation was something new, requiring the government either to abandon one of its functions recognized from time immemorial or to launch out in a new and extensive enterprise. If it chose the latter course, government must at least build and maintain the roadbed, and possibly undertake the entire operation of the road.

(3) The people looked at first upon the railway as a business enterprise only, not seeing the important functions of government which it was likely to absorb.

Although the government was prevented by the very nature of this invention from pursuing its former policy of merely providing the road and allowing individuals to use it at their pleasure, yet the government undoubtedly might have undertaken the building and maintenance, or even the operation, of the railroad. The general government, however, was one of limited powers; many of the States were new and without financial ability and were unable to cope with the problem. There was, moreover, alongside of the recognized principle that highways should be free to all alike, this other dogma, that the government should leave industry to private hands. As a result of these conditions, the early railroads, excepting a few feeble and unsuccessful attempts at State building, were allowed to become private enterprises. The private proprietors have ever since opposed all suggestions of change to government ownership or operation, thus far with success, in spite of the most serious evils which are now seen to go with private control. Railway partisans are still fond of repeating the maxim of the "laissez faire" economists, that government should not interfere with business; and many still apply that doctrine to railroads because they do not see, what was universally recognized before the dust of the railroad train had filled the air, that the assuring of equal and fair transportation rights to all citizens is one of the most important functions of government. If we are to accept the doctrine that government should not interfere with business, we must accept the correlative principle that business must leave government free to do the governing. The danger now is that the railroads and their allied interests will themselves become the government.

From the standpoint of experience, what are the evils resulting from private control of railroads?