

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1915.

No. 904.

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE THACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.
STOUGHTON COOLEY, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, }
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
LLEWELLYN JONES, Illinois
MRS. LONA INGRAM ROBINSON, Calif.
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM F. HILL, Missouri
LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York
HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
GRACE ISABEL COLBORN, New York
W. G. EGGLESTON, California
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
R. F. FETTERBREW, South Dakota
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOHN PAUL, England
ERNEST BRAY, Australia
GEORGE FOWLER, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Ellsworth Building, 337 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents
Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago,
Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Peace, Not War.....	729
What Might Have Been.....	739
The Wrong Man for an Emergency.....	730
Lo, the Poor Indian.....	730
Suppression or Expression?.....	731
Boss Barnes and Privilege.....	731
Roosevelt the Unfit.....	731
A Substitute for the Primary.....	732
One Possible Good from the War.....	732
Neutrality and War Supplies.....	733
Explaining His Merit.....	734
Let the Shipbuilders Explain.....	734
Scott Nearing's Taking Off—James H. Dillard.....	734

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Vacant Land Cultivation in Germany.....	735
Australian Politics—Ernest Bray.....	735

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

Halfhearted Home Rule—Ernest H. Batten.....	736
Diplomacy Over the Lusitania—Erving Winslow.....	736
A Word About Wedgwood—Ethel Wedgwood.....	736

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Eastland Disaster.....	737
The Labor War.....	737
Employment Conference.....	738
Manufacturers May Refuse to Sell.....	738
I. and R. in Mississippi.....	738
National Defense Program.....	738
European War.....	738
Mexico.....	740
News Notes.....	740
Press Opinions.....	741

RELATED THINGS:

Chicago, July 24—Wiley Wright Mills.....	742
De Massa Ob De Sheepfol.....	742
Getting It to the Folks—Judson King.....	742
Remarks of Old Tom Harder—George V. Wells.....	743
The Governors' Opinions.....	743

BOOKS:

The Great Underpaid.....	745
Women as Office Workers.....	746
Periodicals.....	746

EDITORIAL

Peace, Not War.

President Wilson's latest note to Germany is a definite, explicit, and unmistakable statement of this country's conception of the rights of neutrals on the high seas. It is in conformity with the treaty between the two nations, and is based upon international law. It is not an ultimatum; but it is a notice that the hitherto existing friendly relations between the two countries will cease with a repetition of the trespass upon the rights of American citizens. This statement represents the overwhelming mass of American sentiment; and public opinion is brought to a point where a disregard of this notice on the part of Germany might easily precipitate war between the two countries. But the fact that armed conflict can logically follow this latest step in diplomacy does not mean that it will or must follow. Any man, clothed with the power of Chief Executive could precipitate war at this time, but a great man will find means of attaining the desired end without war. The present incumbent of the White House has shown repeatedly the grasp of a statesman; and there is every reason for believing that he will maintain the dignity of this country, and secure the rights of our citizens upon the high seas, without an appeal to arms. Peace still is the word; peace with firmness, dignity, and patience,—but peace. s. c.



What Might Have Been.

A valued correspondent asks for an expression on Henry Cabot Lodge's comment on the Wilson-Bryan peace plan. Senator Lodge said:

When the flag was fired on at Fort Sumpter should we have waited a year?

In the light of what it cost fifty-four years ago to use force instead of reason, it is hard to see why it would not have been better to have delayed a year to see if the matter could not be settled right without resort to arms. But Senator Lodge misrepresented matters in putting his question in

such a form. He well knew that the Southern Confederacy was not recognized as an independent nation and consequently no treaty of delay and arbitration in its case was possible. However, if practical difficulties had not existed and there had been such a treaty between the sections Fort Sumpter could not have been fired on without violation of its provisions. It is only fair to assume that it would not under the circumstances have been fired upon. The year for discussion would not have been about the firing on the fort, but on the issues which lead thereto. Either side would have shown little faith in the justice of its cause had it preferred force to reason.

S. D.



The Wrong Man for an Emergency.

The shutting down of coal mines in Ohio has put the miners on the verge of starvation, so that Governor Willis has issued a proclamation urging charitably disposed citizens to give of their surplus to the suffering ones. It is a pity that the Governor doesn't see that his duty requires much more of him than that. Nature has placed in Ohio great deposits of coal, which many people would like to use. The miners are willing to dig it out. Nevertheless a deplorable situation exists which makes objects of charity out of willing workers and the Governor does not see that, as head of the Commonwealth, he might and should call attention to the fundamental wrong which permits great natural resources to be withheld from use. There is no work he might be doing more urgent than application of effort to the Legislature and the voters to remove the legalized obstructions which keep labor from obtaining access to natural opportunities. That is what the right kind of a Governor would be doing. But unfortunately Ohio does not seem to have that kind of a Governor.

S. D.



Lo, the Poor Indian.

One of the strangest ironies of fate is to be found in the situation of the present-day American Indian. Victim for centuries of the white man's greed; oppressed, robbed, and driven from point to point, as suited the caprice of the stronger race, he is today one of the richest of the human family. This amazing situation contains a lesson for our statesmen. It is commonly said that the white man stole the country from the Indian, but that is not quite the truth. That individual white men did steal land from individual Indians is unfortunately true; and the unbroken truce that obtained between the Quakers and the Indians would

indicate that had other white men treated the Indians with the fairness of the Quakers, the bloody racial conflicts could have been avoided. But in reality the Indian owned the land of this country only in the sense that white men now own it. He had a right to its use; but that right did not exclude the equal right of others. A few Indians had no right to shut out the white race from a million square miles of rich land in order to maintain a hunting preserve. Nor did the fact of their having been here first add to their right. Mere priority of birth or discovery does not limit the rights of those who come after.



The limited rights of the Indians were recognized in a dim way by the statesmen of the earlier days; and when an Indian tribe was transferred from hunting grounds needed by the settlers, it was given another reservation more remote. When these reservations had become too small and too barren to support the tribe, the Federal Government supplimented the fruits of the chase with beef and blankets. These remote reservations are now found to contain valuable minerals, oils, and timber; and the long-abused, much-buffed original American appears as among the richest of the sons of men. According to data furnished by Frederick J. Haskin, the Osage Indians of Oklahoma enjoy an income of five million dollars a year from their oil land. That means two thousand, five hundred dollars for each man, woman and child in the tribe, making them the richest race in the world. Tribes in various parts of the country own timber and mineral lands worth fabulous sums, and aggregating a billion and a quarter of dollars.



These stupendous riches of the Indians are practically all land values, for the Indian has made few improvements. They are the result of the civilization that the white man has brought to the country, to the discoveries and inventions, to the subdivision of labor. The timber is as nature produced it. Its only value to the Indian is to shelter game. The oils and minerals in the ground are of no value at all to him. He knew not even that they were there till the white men discovered them. And he would have been unable to extract them had he known their presence. The white man, having discovered the oil in the ground, pumped it out, refined it, and made it useful to mankind, must pay the Indian for the privilege of doing it. Why? Why should this little tribe of two thousand souls be paid five million dollars a

year for the privilege of pumping oil out of their land? But it may be said in justification of the Indian that he is at least as much entitled to this toll as the white men who own oil lands in other places. If it seems illogical and unjust that those who work should pay for the privilege to those who own the earth, it should be remembered that the quality of ownership is not altered by the color of the owner's skin. s. c.



Suppression or Expression.

Dr. E. H. Pratt, in his address before the International Purity Congress at San Francisco, said, regarding the repressive measures advocated by the Congress:

Suppression is like choking a boiler filled with steam. When it gets full enough, pop goes your boiler. You people have got to use some common sense. You all lose sight of the fact that the physical condition can dominate the intellectual state.

These plain, blunt words bring to an issue the question as to whether the vital principle underlying human development tends toward evil, and calls for suppression; or tends toward good, and is to be sympathetically encouraged. And those self-sacrificing, well-meaning men and women who are devoting their lives to the various movements for the uplifting of mankind will render their efforts vastly more effective by pondering these words of Dr. Pratt.



If the narrow, pessimistic view of the Puritans be correct, that man is prone to evil, then let us return to the old-time severity. Let us stamp anew the scarlet letter on the breast of the girl who loves not wisely but too well; let us duck the scold, whip the sacriligious, set the beggar in the stocks, and make free use of the hangman. But if the ideals of sociologists are based upon reason, let us remove the needless restraints upon human activities, give the children a chance to play, the men a chance to work, and the women a chance to become wives, mothers, and home-keepers. It is not punishment of wrong doing that is to regenerate mankind, but encouragement and opportunity for right doing. s. c.



Boss Barnes and Privilege.

Boss William Barnes would pose as an enemy of privilege before the New York State Constitutional Convention. He has declared his opposition thereto and the committee on legislative powers, of which he is head, would prevent the grant of some privileges hereafter. But he does not propose to

forbid a grant to a private corporation of the exclusive privilege to operate trolley cars on public streets, nor to forbid farming out of the right to furnish a city with lighting or telephone service. He would not abolish the privilege conferred on land owners to appropriate socially created values. Barnes intends only to abolish the pitiful palliatives designed to slightly lessen the harmful effects of the big privileges which he would conserve. Workmen's compensations, old age pensions, mothers' pensions and minimum wage acts are to him pernicious privileges which he would render unconstitutional. He would leave alone the big predatory privileges which are responsible for the poverty and helplessness that create demand for the palliatives he would destroy. It would be a splendid thing if the constitutional convention were to take Boss Barnes at his word and wipe out all privileges, big as well as little. That is exactly what the State of New York needs. It is the real remedial measure that would abolish the need of palliative legislation. It would bring true prosperity to the wealth producers of the State. But unfortunately that happens to be the very thing that the constitutional convention can not be induced to do. s. d.



Roosevelt the Unfit.

Roosevelt in a speech on July 22 at San Francisco said, "A man afraid to fight is not fit to vote." What a commentary on the very men whose votes brought him whatever political success he has gained! Would he have been elected Governor of New York but for votes of men afraid to fight against the power of Boss Platt, Boss Barnes and the predatory interests back of them? Was it not through a similar fear to fight that unwilling votes secured for him the vice-presidency and a second term as President? Does he actually think that these voters should have been disfranchised? Certainly not. He did not intend to convey so logical an idea as that fear to make proper use of the ballot unfits men for suffrage. It was fear of doing wrong to which he referred. He considers a man unfit to vote who is either morally or physically afraid to shoot at a foreigner with whom he has no quarrel, who can see no reason to fight because his government could not secure such a settlement of an international dispute as it might wish. He considers men unfit to vote who show a disposition to apply rules of safety and common sense in an international emergency. Holding such views of citizenship Roosevelt is certainly not fit to be considered a statesman. s. d.

A Substitute for the Primary.

The announcement that Judson King, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., has been entrusted with the distribution of Senate document 985 containing Professor Lewis Jerome Johnson's address before the National Popular Government League, January 4, 1915, again calls attention to this excellent exposition of the preferential ballot. Professor Johnson's long and earnest study of this question in connection with the proposed new charter for Cambridge, Massachusetts, qualifies him to speak with authority. As the struggle of the people to escape from the slave pens of the single membered Congressional and legislative districts has led to the invention of Proportional Representation; so the desire to escape from the tyranny of the political boss and the party machine has brought forth the preferential ballot. The first means adopted for breaking the hold of the political boss was the substitution of the direct primary for the political convention. But experience has shown that the method of selecting candidates by means of the direct primary leads in the end to poor results. The direct primary has been found to entail the labor and expense of an election; and the people will not turn out for two elections.



By means of nominations by petitions and the use of the preferential ballot, however, a simple method is provided for securing the good results of the direct primary in one election. Professor Johnson advocates what he calls the Bucklin system of preferential voting, which is a slight modification and simplification of the plan introduced at Grand Junction, Colorado, by Hon. James W. Bucklin. The address gives not only an exposition of the system of preferential voting in detail, but the result of actual use in a number of American cities. Among the chief merits of the Bucklin system of preferential voting, Professor Johnson notes the following: It abolishes primaries, without interfering with the democratic method of nomination by a small number of petitioners; it permits the nomination of a large number of candidates with practical elimination of the danger of a split ticket; it fosters campaign methods that facilitate the getting of high grade men to stand for office; it is believed to be the safest known means of election for protecting the majority interest against machine or special interests; it greatly simplifies the problem of securing competent elective officials; it is simple, practical, attractive to voters, and an already operative institution under widely varying conditions. The

point made against the preferential ballot by some of its critics that it sometimes results in the election of the "wrong man," is seemingly not well taken. The best popular government must be that which gives freest expression to the will of the people; and the test of political machinery lies not in whether the best man has been elected, but whether the man elected represents a majority of the people. And so far as practical experience goes the preferential ballot secures that result.

S. C.



One Possible Good from the War.

A formidable movement more or less embarrassing to the ruling classes is the demand in Germany for homesteads for war veterans and their families. The specific proposition is that every soldier who has served in the present war be allowed a site for a home and garden. The Government is to secure title to lands for this purpose and give the soldiers perpetual leases to the sites. The lessees are to pay ground rent annually and be exempt from taxation. They may purchase whatever improvements may be on the land but the government is not to alienate its title to the land itself. Those needing help to secure needed improvements are to be furnished it. This movement has not only the support of the League of Bodenreformers, but of many others who hold that when a government orders men to fight for "their" country, it is in honor bound to make the possessive pronoun express a literal truth. Soldiers in the trenches are being supplied with the Berlin daily paper, *Die Deutsche Warte*, which gives them to understand that they may justly demand without securing by purchase the right to the use of the land of a country for which it orders them to risk their lives.



It is safe to say that had the ruling classes foreseen the possibility of such a development from the war there would have been no war. Though the demand is at present restricted so as to benefit none but men in active military service, it must, if granted, be soon extended to all classes. Those who have remained at home to raise food and make supplies for the men in the field can easily show that they have performed services without which the men at the front would have failed. But actual recognition of the right of the people to the land would put an end to the power of the privileged classes to exploit the workers. That must make this movement as embarrassing to the ruling classes as it is just to the men in the field.

It would seem that in other belligerent countries than Germany the war offers the same opportunity to those who would free the land from the grip of monopoly. A similar demand in England, Austria, France, Canada, Australia, Italy and other nations would be as embarrassing to their tory elements as it is in Germany. It would be as difficult to combat at a time when men are being urged to fight for "their" country. Should it succeed it will create one or more free nations whose prosperous people will not tolerate continuation of policies that lead to war. Should it temporarily fail, it will nevertheless warn the ruling classes of what demands the people may make should they again be dragged into war. In either case the cause of peace will gain. There will be one good result of this inexcusable war should the "home-steads-for-soldiers" movement be pushed, as it should be.

S. D.

Neutrality and War Supplies.

The question of placing an embargo upon war supplies shipped from this country is more comprehensive than some of its advocates appear to recognize. Those who are for peace at any price would stop the shipment of arms on the ground that we should not contribute toward the killing of fellow men with whom we have no quarrel, and that an embargo would not only keep our own hands clean, but would at the same time hasten the end of the war. If the question were to be considered from this point alone, there would be force in the plea for stopping the sale of war materials to belligerents. But that it would hasten the end of the conflict may seriously be doubted; for the amount of supplies obtained in this country is not so great that the Allies would not in time be able to supply themselves. Hence, if they, being stronger in numbers, and potentially in materials, are to win in the end, our embargo would tend to prolong, rather than to shorten, the duration of the war.

There is, however, another view to be taken of our exports of war materials. To place an embargo upon this action now would be to do what we have been protesting against Germany's doing, in destroying merchantmen without provision for the safety of non-combatants; that is, we should be guilty of changing the laws of war while the war is in progress, to the advantage of one of the belligerents. If no regard be had for established custom—which we dignify by the term, international law—no country will be able to place any

dependence upon any other country, under any given conditions in the future. When a given custom, having the force of law, prevails, a nation can gauge its course in conformity with that custom; but if that custom may be set aside at will by another nation, then all other nations must conduct themselves with a view to meeting such eventualities. If, for instance, the trade in arms is recognized as legitimate, each nation can determine for itself whether it were better to have a complete arms establishment, with stored up material sufficient to carry it through any possible war, or to buy these war materials as needed. With trade in war materials forbidden, however, it becomes necessary for each nation that arms at all to have arms plants, and reserves of materials sufficient to meet all possible requirements.

To accept this contention would be to condone an enormous economic loss; since such a course would make it necessary for each country to have an arms manufacturing plant equal to the Krupp works of Germany. Suspending the international trade in arms after a war has begun would work an additional wrong, in that it would penalize those nations that had not already made themselves independent in the production of munitions, but had depended upon buying in time of need. What, for instance, would have become of Turkey, during her recent war with Italy, had she been unable to buy arms? Or what would be the fate of Austria if she should again be at war with Germany, and be unable to get war materials from abroad? Austria now protests against the selling of arms by this country; but should the circumstances of 1866 again arise she would find herself in a sorry plight without this international trade.

This applies with peculiar force to the United States. Should it be our fate to have another international war, we would not be prepared for it; and if deprived of the right to purchase war materials abroad we should find ourselves sorely handicapped. There are those who look upon a war between this country and Germany as a possibility. If we are to prepare for such an eventuality, we must either construct in this country an arms plant equal to that of the Krupps, or insist upon the right to buy war materials abroad. The arms embargo is not a commercial question at all, but a question of international law; and this country must observe that law now, as she observed it in 1862, when she delivered up the Confederate Commissioners Mason and Slidell, taken from the Brit-

ish ship Trent by Captain Wilkes. Desirable as it was to hold those men, President Lincoln was far-sighted enough to see that this country could not for the sake of a temporary advantage, override a principle for which it had contended from the foundation of the Government. And this fact should be kept in mind by those overzealous partisans who are now seeking to set aside this same principle. It may be said, therefore, in opposition to an embargo on arms that it would not hasten the ending of the war, and would not decrease the number of killed and wounded, but that it would arbitrarily change the fortunes of war, that it would deprive one set of belligerents of a right accorded by immemorial custom, and that it would handicap our own country in the future. s. c.

Expiating His Merit.

W. G. Eggleston—may his days be long in the cause—is so widely and so favorably known, on account of his work in behalf of the Singletax movement, that persons contemplating attendance at the Singletax Conference at San Francisco—and their name is legion—have been writing him for information regarding all manner of things, from train schedules to boarding house accommodation. This is highly complimentary to Mr. Eggleston, but to relieve him from an unnecessary burden, as well as to allay the fears of prospective visitors that they may have to sleep in Dennis Kearney's Sand Lots, Mr. Eggleston sends this information:

The Travelers' Aid Society of California has an office in room 8, Ferry building, second floor. All persons arriving in San Francisco will land in that building—unless they come up the Coast Line from Southern California. Those looking for rooms should go from the ferry boats to Room 8, and tell what they want. All service is free. Strangers will be well served and will receive every possible courtesy. There are more than 2,500 registered hotels and apartment houses in San Francisco, and it is obviously impossible for any person not engaged in the business of keeping track of such things to pick out rooms a month in advance.

A word to the considerate is sufficient. s. c.

Let the Shipmasters Explain.

Judgment on the Eastland disaster should be withheld until all the facts are known. The personal responsibility for such a toll of death is so great that it should fall upon none but the guilty, and upon them only in proportion to their guilt.

It may seem unkind at this time to remind the shipmasters of their opposition to the safety pro-

visions of the Seaman's Bill, but the fact is too obtrusive to be ignored. Their objections to that law were directed largely against the requirements of efficient seamen and life boats, and particularly as these provisions apply to lake traffic. While it is true that lifeboats had little to do with the heavy toll of life taken in this disaster, the same shipmasters who object to the provisions of the Seaman's Bill are responsible for the building and the operation of this ship. And if they lacked the judgment that is clearly evident in this case, what assurance can they give the public that they are any better qualified to pass upon the lifeboat requirements, and the necessary number of efficient seamen? Here is a clear case of failure in good judgment. The men who designed and built the Eastland were at fault, and the Government inspectors who permitted her use condoned the first mistake. It is not necessary to question the motives of any of those who are responsible for the disaster. They may all have acted from the best of intentions. But among them all they have arrived at a pitiful end. This much, however, may be said: The seamen have maintained for years that the Government's inspection service has not been stringent enough, and that the law has been tempered to fit the requirements of the shipowners. Whether or not this is true will doubtless be made clear in the investigations that will follow. But this fact is evident. The shipowners stand discredited as persons qualified to pass upon the question of safety at sea; and the least they owe the public is to give the new seamen's bill an honest trial. We are still probably far from the end of disasters at sea. The practical limits of marine architecture, both as to size and shape of vessels, are yet unknown, and it ill becomes any one to be too cocksure in the matter of safety requirements. Men may dispute and wrangle over a question of wages, but in the presence of these victims they should be dumb until they know. s. c.

SCOTT NEARING'S TAKING OFF.

Readers of newspapers in America have for some time known that Dr. Scott Nearing, associate professor in the University of Pennsylvania, was notified early in June that his services were no longer desired in that institution. Professor Nearing is counted as a radical. The only words of his which I have had the opportunity of reading were contained in an open letter to the evangelist, Billy Sunday, urging him to train his guns on the political and social conditions in Philadelphia, with the prediction that should he do so,

many of his leading supporters and contributors would desert him. The professor at the head of the department in which Professor Nearing was an assistant denies, according to a newspaper interview, that the assistant was otherwise than regular and diligent and conformable in his college work. But Professor Nearing wrote much, and he has acquired, beyond question, the reputation for radicalism, and for holding opinions which are exceedingly disagreeable to such men as those who have the charge of administering and directing the University of Pennsylvania. And not only have his opinions on social and economic problems been disagreeable, they have been, it must be supposed, subversive of the best interests of the social order and the economic policies which the University authorities approve and support. Although the University of Pennsylvania receives from the people's money through the legislature large contributions for its support, it is still a private institution with a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. These trustees are responsible for the service and conduct of the University.

Up to the time of the present writing neither the trustees nor the officers of, administration have made any official public statement in regard to any special reason for Professor Nearing's dismissal. For all the distant public knows, he may have murdered his mother-in-law or married his deceased wife's sister, or he may be a kleptomaniac or a defaulter. Perhaps there is no special ground. If some special ground should be stated, most likely this might not be the real ground. The real ground is almost certainly to be found in the objectionable character of Professor Nearing's public utterances. Now I maintain that in a private institution this is a real and valid ground. The trustees and the Provost have the responsibility of directing, according to their best light, the work and the influence of the institution. If, in their opinion, any evil influences, any pernicious teachings are going forth from the university to the injury of the community or the State or the Nation, why should they not feel the responsibility of checking such injury? Surely, it would seem, if they have a vital belief in any policy of government, or in any social status, which they believe to be important for the best interests of human society, and if they further believe that an influence for which they are, to say the least, partially responsible is being directed against what they believe to be for the good of society, surely it would seem that they are right in quenching their part of such influence.

Does not the gist of the trouble lie in the fact

that men like Professor Nearing are a misfit in institutions like the University of Pennsylvania? The combination can hardly be a happy one. Is it possible to point to a single institution since the world began which has harbored or favored the propaganda of radicalism? Such instances as this now under consideration simply confirm the ancient antagonism between the conservative institution and the radical individual. It is a very old story—and a sad one. Its repetition will be inevitable until the world is educated into a higher realization of justice and brotherhood. Meantime the conflict is unavoidable. The more openly this fact is realized and the more clearly the issues are understood, the less of ill feeling and rash speech will there be. In Buckle's great work he shows that progress in the world has been due mainly to knowledge and to the enlightenment of the intellect, and that our fundamental differences are more intellectual than emotional.

JAMES H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

VACANT LAND CULTIVATION IN GERMANY.

Sternburg, near Munich, Bavaria, June 15.

Vacant lot and waste ground cultivation are being pushed vigorously. The conditions for vacant lot cultivation are particularly favorable because so many German towns have pursued the policy of buying up great tracts in their suburbs. This little town owns a tract of good soil in its center, which has been reserved for a new church, school house, parsonage and small park. This is offered in small lots free to those who will undertake to raise vegetables.

In Bavaria there are great tracts of high moorland, belonging to the communes, the general government and the military department. This high moorland only requires to be drained and treated with phosphate to produce good crops the first year, and many prisoners of war have been set at this work. It is a great boon to the prisoners. It gives them occupation and a chance to earn a few cents to buy tobacco and little comforts. Thousands of acres are reclaimed already.

A TOURIST.

* * *

AUSTRALIAN POLITICS.

Corowa. N. S. W., Australia, June 22, 1915.

General elections have been held in the States of Queensland and South Australia during the last few months, and in each case the labor party was returned with a good majority. Mr. Crawford Vaughan, a former secretary of the Singletax League of South Australia, is now Premier of that State; Mr. J. H. Vaughan and Mr. Harry Jackson are also members of the Ministry. In Queensland, Mr. H. F. Hardacre, a Singletaxer, is Minister for Education.

The only Liberal government in Australia at present is in the State of Victoria.

You have referred to the attempt to fix prices in Victoria (current volume, page 171). In New South Wales, an act was passed called the Wheat Acquisition Act, which made all wheat in the State the property of the Government at a fixed price. Any export of wheat to other States was thus prevented, and the act was challenged by the Commonwealth Government as being in contravention of a clause in the Federal Constitution which declares that trade and commerce among the States shall be absolutely free. The Federal High Court unanimously declared the act to be valid.

The establishment of inter-state freetrade was the principal reason for federation, but it now appears that a State may still set up barriers against the trade of its neighbors.

ERNEST BRAY.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

HALF-HEARTED HOME RULE.

Chicago, July 26.

Although the proposed home rule in taxation amendment to the Ohio Constitution marks an attempted Constitutional advance, it nevertheless is subject to two grave defects of like character with those which unfortunately mar so much Constitutional legislation. The first defect is its failure to give real home rule in taxation. The proposed plan provides for only two choices—the present system and the exclusive taxation of land values. No other method can be adopted. Its authors evidently have no faith in self-government as a principle of political action, but simply wish to use it as far as convenient for the introduction of a better system of taxation.

Excuses may be offered for the exercise of sovereignty by one nation over supposedly inferior peoples, such as that of the United States over the Philippines, and of England over the Hindus and Egyptians, but on no theory can equals of the same country be deprived of the power of taxation or the right of managing any of their local affairs as they desire.

The second defect is that municipalities are prevented from legislating on the subject matter of taxation except in one particular way. Whilst this is better than not being allowed to legislate at all, yet by what right should outsiders determine the methods of municipal legislation? To say that a city shall legislate through the Initiative and Referendum is in principle equally tyrannical with requiring it to elect a king. The right of every people and of every city to make their own laws and institutions is the great first principle of political liberty to which even the Singletax and the Initiative and Referendum must be subordinated.

Sometimes expediency may justify a departure from the full expression of a principle, but in this instance the opposite is true, since a Constitutional amendment devoid of these defects would doubtless receive the larger vote.

ERNEST H. BATTEN.

DIPLOMACY OVER THE LUSITANIA.

Boston, July 20, 1915.

It must be gratifying to many of your readers to observe the assertion in your editorial note of July 16th that the violation of neutral rights by the destruction of the Lusitania should be atoned for by Germany and the binding force of those rights recognized, under a certain penalty—the severance of diplomatic relations. It is important, as coming from a source that has aimed at the largest possible impartiality, such as may be supposed to hold that an international pledge or agreement made by Germany has any value. Of course, your statement implies an ultimatum to bring to an end the German "evasion." The continuance of this evasion is obviously the German diplomats' design. They hope to entrap the United States into making a dicker with Great Britain as Germany's ally by an offer to be made through our Executive of some voluntary concession (without in the least submitting to the principles of international law asserted by us) in exchange for the success of a demand we are to make upon the British Government for certain concessions of theirs—which is quite another matter.

It seems to the writer that your "jingo," hot for sudden war is a "man of straw," while on the other hand, peace folks absolutely deprecate the severance of diplomatic relations in any event, since it might possibly lead to a declaration of war by the German-Austrian-Turkish alliance and thus are rebuked by your excellent attitude. It is understood that they think we should do nothing but talk, if they think that the lives of Americans and the principles of international law are worth talking about, and that for anything else, we should wait until the end of the war, when the infractions of international law and the menace to American citizens upon the seas have ceased.

IRVING WINSLOW.



A WORD ABOUT WEDGWOOD.

Stone, Staffs, England, July 2, 1915.

... His wound is quite healed now, though he is not very strong yet. The wound will leave no bad effects whatever. It was a marvellous escape. He had been under heavy and continuous fire for fourteen days and nights, first landing on the ships with terrible slaughter, and without sleep for three nights, and then advancing over the broken country swept by shell fire and concealing numbers of snipers. He kept meeting parties of scattered flying men of all the allied nations, who had lost their officers. These he had to persuade, if possible, to advance with him and the maxims, to some place where they could dig themselves in. Being an officer in complete command, he had to stand up all the time. The bullet went into his leg very high up, from the inside, just missed the artery and big vein and stopped with its nose just touching the bone; so it was a hairbreadth escape. You may imagine how glad we are to have him home safe. Best of all, he has work organizing munitions, and he will probably be permanently transferred to that and not have to go out again.

ETHEL WEDGWOOD.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, July 27, 1915.

The Eastland Disaster.

The lake excursion steamer Eastland suddenly careened at its moorings in the Chicago river on Saturday morning, July 24, at half past seven, carrying down with her at least 2,500 passengers who had just embarked for Michigan City, Indiana. Fully 1,200 persons, according to latest figures, were drowned.

Those aboard were the employes of the Western Electric Company, their families and friends, men, women and hundreds of children, for whom the Indiana Transportation Company had chartered five steamers for their annual picnic, the Eastland, owned by the St. Joseph-Chicago Transportation Company, being scheduled to leave first. Just before, or just as, the boat, fully laden, left her dock on the south side of the Chicago river between Clark and La Salle streets, she listed sharply to port, that is, toward the river, and without warning, keeled over and sank until her left side rested on the river bottom, her right side (toward shore) being partly above the surface. All of the boat's 2,500 passengers—with exception of a few hundred who clung to the starboard rail and climbed over the upper side as the boat cap sized—were either thrown into the water or trapped below deck in cabins and staterooms. The catastrophe was witnessed by many hundreds of persons on the docks and nearby bridges, and frantic rescue work was instantly begun. How many were saved is not known. Up to midnight of July 27, there had been recovered from the river and from the inside of the boat 828 bodies. Besides these, it is guessed that there are yet anywhere from 75 to 650 bodies inside the ship's hull, pinned underneath it, or floating in the river. Many survivors are still piteously besieging the morgue, their lost friends not yet found, the recovered dead almost all identified.

The number of souls aboard when the boat went down is not known. The management is reported as asserting that there were exactly 2,408 passengers and 72 crew. Evidence goes to show that this is somehow a miscalculation, that many more than 2,480 individuals went aboard. Some authorities think that the babies and young children, scores of whose bodies have been recovered, were not counted at all; and that half-grown children

were counted two as one. That is to say, that the inspectors or other officers in charge of the lading of the vessel, which was certified to carry 2,500 persons, counted tickets, not individuals.

The cause of the boat's overturning is being made the subject of several separate investigations by local and Federal authorities. The lake steamboat inspection service is under the United States Department of Commerce, and Secretary Redfield has been ordered to Chicago by President Wilson to take personal charge of the Federal inquiry. A special grand jury, impanelled by Judge Landis' order, and the city council harbor committee each will conduct an investigation. That the excursion steamer Eastland was known by hundreds of persons—seamen and landsmen both—around the Great Lakes as a "cranky" boat is certain.

Labor War.

The strike at the Standard Oil, Tidewater, and Vacuum Oil companies' refineries in Bayonne, N. J., was marked by rioting on July 21 and 22, during which the Bayonne police and the oil companies' guards shot into the strikers' ranks. Three men were killed, and scores wounded. A pipe line was tapped and the oil ignited on the 22d. On the 23rd the Bayonne police made a sudden raid upon a hall used by the strikers and seized fifty rifles which they found stored inside. Sheriff Kinkead in charge of the situation, arrested on the 25th the superintendent and 32 guards of the Tidewater Oil Company, for inciting to riot. All were at once arraigned and the guards sent to jail in default of bail. [See current volume, page 717.]

John A. Moffitt and James A. Smythe were sent on the 23rd by the Secretary of Labor to act as conciliators, and went into conference with the Standard Oil officials at Bayonne. The Standard Oil company, it is reported, has refused to treat with the strikers unless they first return to work. Five hundred employes of the Tidewater announced on the 23rd that the company had offered a 15 per cent increase in wages, which they had voted not to accept but to remain on strike in sympathy until the Standard men got their demands. On the evening of July 26, in response to the Standard superintendent's promise that when they returned to work he would ask the company to increase their pay, and to Sheriff Kinkead's personal appeal, approximately 1,500 men agreed to go back.

The machinists' strike ordered at Bridgeport, Connecticut, in the Remington and other arms factories was prevented, at least temporarily, from

taking place on the 20th by the promise of the Remington manager, Major Penfield, that an eight-hour day and an increase in wages would certainly be granted for August first. Later some of the men did strike and on the 26th another settlement was supposed, by the men, to have been made. But according to press dispatches, when the men tried to return to work on that day they were told by the employers they were not wanted. Immediately 300 iron workers and millwrights, employed on the arms companies' new buildings, quit work and the machinists announced that the strike would not be settled until the twenty-two shops in Bridgeport making ammunition and war machinery have signed agreements. [See current volume, page 717.]



The Chicago street car strike arbitrators announced their decision on July 16, their award, which is to continue in effect until June 1, 1917, granted wage increases to the men and settled various other points of controversy as to hours and kinds of service. Neither employers nor employees protested the award. [See current volume, page 598.]



Longshoremen at New York employed by the Clyde Steamship Company and the Mallory Steamship Company struck on July 21 for higher wages. On the 26th the State Arbitration Board ended the strike, the men being allowed an increase in pay and better hours.



Employment Conference.

A convention to consider problems of labor distribution, employment and unemployment will open August 2 in San Francisco. Federal labor and immigration officials, State commissioners of labor, municipal employment agents and representatives of many kindred organizations will meet with the object of accomplishing efficient and harmonious nation-wide co-operation in the handling of employment problems. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, is taking an enthusiastic interest in the conference and has commanded the attendance of many officials of his Department. [See current volume, page 59.]



Manufacturers May Refuse to Sell.

The first court decision under the new Clayton law on the right of manufacturers to refuse to sell to dealers who cut prices of standard-priced articles was rendered in favor of the manufacturer by the United States District Court of New York. The Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company attempted to sell at 12 cents products put out by the Cream of Wheat Company to sell for 14 cents.

The manufacturing company refused to fill further orders, and the vendors brought suit. Judge Hough held that the refusal was not in restraint of trade. [See vol. xvii, p. 706.]



I. and R. in Mississippi.

Notwithstanding the fact that the vote on the Initiative and Referendum in Mississippi last November, as certified by the election commissioners, was 19,119 for and 8,718 against, and that 37,583 was the highest vote received by any candidate, which means the legal adoption of the act according to the State Constitution, subsequent action on the part of the Secretary of State and the election commissioners reverses the decision. A vigorous campaign is being waged by the friends of the I. and R., and an effort is being made by the People's Rule League, with headquarters at Yazoo City, to pledge all legislative candidates at the election August 3. A statement of the facts, and a call for pledges will go to each candidate.



National Defense Program.

The White House gave out on the 24th, shortly before President Wilson returned to his summer home in New Hampshire, the following official statement, as reported in press dispatches, regarding the subject of national defense:

The President has been considering every phase of this important matter, and intends, while away, to give much of his time to a full consideration of it. Upon his return from Cornish there will doubtless be conferences between him and the secretaries of the Navy and War. The purpose of these conferences will be to procure information upon which he can base a fair, reasonable and practical program of national defense.



European War.

The interest of the week has centered in the Eastern campaign, where the Germans have continued their advance on Warsaw, and in the Baltic provinces. The Austrian wing has been halted south of Lublin in its advance on Ivangorod. The advance north of Warsaw has continued, however, and the German forces have crossed the Narew River. They are now within twenty-four miles of Warsaw, but face a roadless swamp and the River Bug, which is larger than the Narew. West of Warsaw the German forces are within twelve miles. The Russian forces offer stubborn resistance, but military critics are assuming that the Polish capital will be abandoned within a fortnight. The advance on Riga continues, but with less force. The main activities are in the immediate vicinity of Warsaw. The Western campaign is comparatively quiet. Fighting continues at various points along the entire front, but small results are obtained. The French have made gains

in the Vosges mountains near Munster that tighten their hold on that place, and threaten Colmar. The Italian campaign against Austria is meeting with greater success. Goritz is on the point of surrender, which will open the way for the advance on Trieste, and northward. Very heavy losses on both sides are reported in this campaign. No definite news of importance comes from the Dardanelles, other than hard fighting, heavy losses of men, and small gains on the part of the Allies. [See current volume, page 714.]



The American reply to the German note of July 8 was dispatched from Washington on the 21st and given to the press on the 24th. The American note is friendly in tone, but firm in repetition of the claims of the former notes. It says:

The note of the imperial German government dated the 8th of July, 1915, has received the careful consideration of the government of the United States, and it regrets to be obliged to say that it found it very unsatisfactory, because it fails to meet the real differences between the two governments and indicates no way in which the accepted principles of law and humanity may be applied in the grave matter in controversy, but proposes, on the contrary, arrangements for a partial suspension of those principles which virtually sets them aside.

The government of the United States notes with satisfaction that the imperial German government recognizes without reservation the validity of the principles insisted upon in the several communications which this government has addressed to the imperial government with regard to its announcement of a war zone and the use of submarines against merchantmen on the high seas—the principle that the high seas are free, that the character and cargo of a merchantman must first be ascertained before it can lawfully be seized or destroyed, and that the lives of non-combatants may in no case be put in jeopardy unless the vessel resists or seeks to escape after being summoned to submit to examination; for a belligerent act of retaliation is per se an act beyond the law, and the defense of an act as retaliatory is an admission that it is illegal.

The government of the United States is, however, keenly disappointed to find that the imperial German government regards itself as in large degree exempt from the obligation to observe these principles, even where neutral vessels are concerned, by what it believes the policy and practice of the government of Great Britain to be in the present war with regard to neutral commerce.

The imperial German government will readily understand that the government of the United States cannot discuss the policy of the government of Great Britain with regard to neutral trade, except with that government itself, and that it must regard the conduct of other belligerent governments as irrelevant to any discussion with the imperial government of what this government regards as grave and unjustifiable violations of the rights of American citizens by German naval commanders.

Illegal and inhuman acts, however justifiable they may be thought to be against an enemy who is be-

lieved to have acted in contravention of law and humanity, are manifestly indefensible when they deprive neutrals of their acknowledged rights, particularly when they violate the right to life itself.

If a belligerent cannot retaliate against an enemy without injuring the lives of neutrals, as well as their property, humanity, as well as justice and a due regard for the dignity of neutral powers, should dictate that the practice be discontinued.

If persisted in it would in such circumstances constitute an unpardonable offense against the sovereignty of the neutral nation affected.

The government of the United States is not unmindful of the extraordinary conditions created by this war or of the radical alterations of circumstance and method of attack produced by the use of instrumentalities of naval warfare which the nations of the world cannot have had in view when the existing rules of international law were formulated, and it is ready to make every reasonable allowance for these novel and unexpected aspects of war at sea; but it cannot consent to abate any essential or fundamental right of its people because of a mere alteration of circumstance.

The rights of neutrals in time of war are based upon principle, not upon expediency, and the principles are immutable. It is the duty and obligation of belligerents to find a way to adapt the new circumstances to them.

The events of the last two months have clearly indicated that it is possible and practicable to conduct such submarine operations as have characterized the activity of the imperial German navy within the so-called war zone in substantial accord with the accepted practices of regulated warfare.

The whole world has looked with interest and increasing satisfaction at the demonstration of that possibility by German naval commanders. It is manifestly possible, therefore, to lift the whole practice of submarine attack above the criticism which it has aroused and remove the chief causes of offense.

In view of the admission of illegality made by the imperial government when it pleaded the right of retaliation in defense of its acts, and in view of the manifest possibility of conforming to the established rules of naval warfare, the government of the United States cannot believe that the imperial government will longer refrain from disavowing the wanton act of its naval commander in sinking the *Lusitania* or from offering reparation of the American lives lost, so far as reparation can be made for a needless destruction of human life by an illegal act.

The government of the United States while not indifferent to the friendly spirit in which it is made, cannot accept the suggestion of the imperial German government that certain vessels be designated and agreed upon which shall be free on the seas now illegally proscribed.

The very agreement would, by implication, subject other vessels to illegal attack and would be a curtailment and therefore an abandonment of the principles for which this government contends and which in times of calmer counsels every nation would concede as of course.

The government of the United States and the imperial German government are contending for the same great object, have long stood together in urging the very principles upon which the government

of the United States now so solemnly insists. They are both contending for the freedom of the seas.

The government of the United States will continue to contend for that freedom, from whatever quarter violated, without compromise and at any cost.

It invites the practical co-operation of the imperial German government at this time when co-operation may accomplish most and this great common object be most strikingly and effectively achieved.

The imperial German government expresses the hope that this object may be in some measure accomplished even before the present war ends. It can be.

The government of the United States not only feels obliged to insist upon it, by whomsoever violated or ignored, in the protection of its own citizens, but also deeply interested in seeing it made practicable between the belligerents themselves, and holds itself ready at any time to act as the common friend who may be privileged to suggest a way.

In the meantime the very value which this government sets upon the long and unbroken friendship between the people and government of the United States and the people and government of the German nation impels it to press very solemnly upon the imperial German government the necessity for scrupulous observance of neutral rights in this critical matter.

Friendship itself prompts it to say to the imperial government that repetition by the commanders of German naval vessels of acts in contravention of those rights must be regarded by the government of the United States, when they affect American citizens, as deliberately unfriendly. LANSING.



A note from the British government, in reply to the American note of March 30, protesting against certain British Orders in Council, was made public on the 26th. In defense of its practices in attempting to stop German trade the British government contends:

That its acts are consistent with the principles of international law for which the United States is contending; that these principles merely have been given a new application to suit changed conditions on the seas and the geographical situation respecting Germany, and that precedent for the acts under the orders in council to which the United States has taken exception is found in the record of the United States government during the civil war and sustained by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which decisions were accepted by Great Britain.

As to reparation for damages to American shipping, the note sets forth:

That if American citizens feel they have been deprived of their rights by the British government's interferences with trade, they have first the prize courts in which to present their cases, and should the prize court rulings be unsatisfactory, the British privy council or supreme court, and, finally, the diplomatic support of the United States government, with which arbitration of such claims might be arranged as in previous instances, and particularly in accord with existing arbitration treaties between the two governments.

The British government has apologized to Norway for invading its waters. The Norwegian press is now demanding that Germany apologize for sinking Norwegian vessels, and destroying the lives of citizens of Norway.



Mexico.

Confusion and uncertainty still attend all reports from Mexico. The flying column that General Villa sent south to cut off Mexico City is reported to be retreating northward from Pachuca without giving battle, and General Gonzales, who went out to meet him, is returning to the city. Mexico City was without telegraphic communication with the outside world for several days, but messages by carriers report great suffering among the people for want of food and water. Rioting among the starving is said to be frequent. President Wilson has been in personal consultation with representatives of the Red Cross direct from Mexico, and is reported to have decided upon further steps toward ending the disorder; but definite plans have not been made public. [See current volume, page 715.]

NEWS NOTES

—Panama Canal earnings for the eleven months ending May 1, 1915, amount to \$3,883,074.93; the cost of operation was \$3,705,275.43; leaving a net profit of \$177,799.50. Interest and depreciation are not included in the expenditures.

—Radium, which has been selling for \$120,000 to \$160,000 a gram, is now produced from the Colorado carnotite ores by the United States Bureau of Mines at a cost of \$36,050 a gram. A bulletin giving details will be issued in the fall.

—The Province of Alberta, Canada, has adopted a liquor prohibition act to go into effect July 1, 1916. The vote was taken under the new direct legislation law and showed a majority of nearly two to one for the act, which prohibits the sale of liquor throughout the Province.

—The National Education Association will hold its 53d annual meeting at Oakland, Cal., August 16-25. The program this year takes the form of an International Congress of Education, and the topic, Peace, is recognized in the advance announcement. [See vol. xvii, p. 682.]

—The resignation of James M. Sullivan, American Minister to the Dominican Republic, was tendered to President Wilson and accepted, as a consequence of the decision by a State Department investigating committee that his financial interests made him unfit for that office. [See current volume, page 86.]

—An express rate increase was granted to the express companies by the Interstate Commerce Commission on July 22, which it is estimated will add nearly 4 per cent to their gross revenues. The Commission's report shows that the net operating revenues of the four big companies have decreased to a deficit of \$1,132,811 in the year 1914-1915 and in the

same period operating income decreased \$2,449,863. [See current volume, page 311.]

—Russian savings deposits to the beginning of July are \$900,000,000 more than the preceding year, and almost the same as the amount lost by the government through the prohibition of the sale of alcohol. The Finance Minister seeks authority to issue securities amounting to \$600,000,000 over the present limit, in order to care for the great savings. [See vol. xvii, p. 1144.]

—The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has just issued its annual review of court decisions affecting labor. This report, Bulletin No. 169, summarizes 265 cases, dealing with the application and construction of the laws, and the application of the principles of the common law to the rights of the worker. The range of cases includes the famous Danbury Hatters' case, compensation laws of various States, and the power of employers' associations to enforce their own rules.

—Miss Jane Addams addressed a large audience at the Auditorium in Chicago on the evening of July 22, giving her impressions about the war, gained during her recent pilgrimage to the Governments of Europe. She is reported as saying: "We encountered the fear that if the war went on too long the military would become established in the place of civil authority. We heard in six different countries that the war is breaking down rights and safeguards that in many cases had been fought for in revolutions. We found a certain horror of war even among the soldiers. The only hope to stop the war is to get at the causes. And we are getting farther and farther away from the causes every day and more and more lost in the events of the war itself." [See current volume, page 717.]

PRESS OPINIONS

In Sackcloth and Ashes.

The (Chicago) Daily News, July 24.—Chicago stands disgraced before the world by the inexcusable destruction of hundreds of lives in its river early this morning when the overloaded Eastland heeled over in its dock and cast its 3,000 passengers into the water. Plunged into mourning by the great calamity, the city still feels upon it the brand of guilt. For excursion vessels crowded with men, women and children depart from the heart of Chicago daily and failure of the responsible officials to safeguard these throngs from the possibility of a disaster such as that which has fallen upon the pleasure seekers who in their innocence overturned the Eastland is proof of a great community's criminal heedlessness.

The persons who are directly responsible for the horror have a grave burden of offense. Here is a situation where heedlessness or "taking a chance" is a crime of vast proportions. Heavily laden excursion vessels are continually moving in and out of the river and gambling with the lives of their passengers should not be possible. The disaster to the Eastland is a perfectly comprehensible disaster, and it might readily have been foreseen. To guard against it would have been simplicity itself. Ignorance or recklessness here has borne its perfect fruit.

While we Chicagoans have been lamenting Europe's prodigal destruction of human lives our own ill regulated institutions have developed this great disgrace to shame our slovenly and slothful disregard for the elementary principles of safety. Surely it is high time for us to sweep before our own doors in humility and penitence.



Teaching Farmers Values.

Farm and Fireside.—"Reduced to its lowest terms, property, whether real or personal, gold or silver, prairie land or skyscraper, derives its value from what man's labor has put into it or can take out of it."

So said Dr. George Otis Smith, director of the United States Geological Survey at the University of Illinois recently.

Dr. Smith's geology is fortunately much more accurate than his political economy. The quoted statement is one the error in which any freshman in economics ought to be able to demonstrate.

The value of land does not come from any labor expended upon it at all, though the value of the improvements does. A quarter section of prairie land, or a quarter block in a city available for the erection of a skyscraper, depends, as to selling value, on the presence of the community. The owner of farm land in Illinois or of a lot in Chicago may have been asleep, in an insane asylum, or abroad for twenty-five years, doing nothing on the land, but the value has been running up all the same.



What a Woman Can Do.

Chicago Herald, July 17.—The decision of the Lincoln Park board to remove the "sex fence" at Diversey beach marks a conquest for a young woman of this city who thinks. About two years ago this woman physician thought it would be better and safer to hang her skirt on the Jackson Park beach and a-bathing go in bloomers.

It was a daring thought with so many of the Grundy family about and busy. The innovator suffered for her good judgment. But for all that she started a little revolution. Officials began to muse on the hard common sense to which they were exposed when the pioneer became slightly irritated at the indignities heaped upon her.

Now the South Park commissioners are giving official sanction to what was once deemed almost criminal. The special park commission gives the preference to bloomers, and now the removal of the barrier separating the sexes at Lincoln Park completes the work.

The pioneer is vindicated; as a community we have a better appreciation of a sane decency, and women swimmers are safer and more comfortable. We have also experienced the pleasure of making the innovator suffer for her courage. That leaves nothing to be desired.



"Oh, what a time I had last night, doctor. It's only by the Lord's mercy that I'm not in 'eaven to-day!"—London Standard.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

CHICAGO, JULY 24.

For The Public.

Greed is our pampered Moloch;
Graft is his great high priest;
And never comes a set of sun
Without his gorging feast.

WILEY WRIGHT MILLS.



DE MASSA OB DE SHEEPFOL'!

De massa ob de sheepfol'
Dat guards de sheepfol' bin,
Look out in de gloomerin' meadows,
Whar de long night rain begin—
So he call to de hirelin' shepa'd,
"Is my sheep, is dey all come in?"
Oh, den, says de hirelin' shepa'd:
"Dey's some, dey's black and thin,
And some dey's po' ol' wedda's;
But de res', dey's all brung in.
But de res', dey's all brung in."

Den de massa ob de sheepfol'
Dat guards de sheepfol' bin,
Goes down in de gloomerin' meadows,
Whar de long night rain begin—
So he le' down de ba's ob de sheepfol'
Callin' sof', "Come in. Come in."
Callin' sof', "Come in. Come in."

Den up t'ro' de gloomerin' meadows,
T'ro' de col' night rain and win',
And up t'ro' de gloomerin' rain-paf',
Whar de sleet fa' pie'cin' thin,
De po' los' sheep ob de sheepfol'
Dey all comes gadderin' in.
De po' los' sheep ob de sheepfol',
Dey all comes gadderin' in.

—Anonymous.



GETTING IT TO THE FOLKS.

For The Public.

"And New York City itself is the biggest pick-pocket of all . . ."

Hurrying down Broadway the other day, I ran into a meeting right across the street from the famous Woolworth Building, in the heart of business New York. A soap-boxer was at it, and I turned out to get by, without even looking at him, when I was arrested by that clear-cut phrase. There was something in the tone of voice which instantly impressed me that the speaker was not a mere ranter, but had good reason for his startling statement. I had to stop.

It was Benjamin C. Marsh, Secretary of the Lower Rent Society of New York, holding forth to a crowd of at least 300 men, composed not of

loafers and idle curiosity seekers, but of clean-cut business men, clerks and men of affairs, going to or returning from their noon-day lunch.

"The budget to run this city," continued Marsh, "amounts to \$198,000,000 in round figures. Only \$88,000,000 comes from taxes levied on the land values, and \$110,000,000 is taxed out of the pockets of the working men and the creative business of the city.

"Three-fourths of the land values of this city are owned by 5,000 people, and there are only a little over 100,000 owners of real estate in New York. On the other hand, there are 5,500,000 people in this metropolis who pay every year \$300,000,000 net profit on ground rents plus the increase of land values, to the little group who own the land.

"We are the wealthiest city in the world, and yet 3,000,000 of New York's teeming population are living in fire-trap tenement houses, and one-third of the city's children lack adequate facilities for education, to say nothing of healthful recreation."

It was hot stuff. I observed the crowd. It was driving in.

"If there's a man here who wants to pay more rent for his business house or his residence, I have no time to waste on him; but if you want lower rents and more occupation for labor, join with us in getting through this law which will throw the taxation burden where it belongs, right on the men—many of them idle, rich loafers—who are making more money out of New York than any other class, and who are spending less in proportion for its support."

More of this, and Ben took a breathing spell while his efficient helper, Miss H. B. Welsh, took the stand and in a few moments had secured a large number of signatures to a petition to the state legislature for a law which would permit the city of New York to vote on the question as to whether the increase in the city taxes should be met by a super-tax on land values. Miss Welsh has now over 47,000 signatures to that petition, which makes a fine mailing list for educational purposes as well.

Talking with Marsh the next day, and digging into his methods of agitation, I found that he had been delivering two speeches a day for the last two years, and that he estimates he has talked in that time to 300,000 people at least, whom it would be difficult to reach in any other way. It's hard work but interesting, he says. Day after day and night after night, all over Manhattan Island, Ben Marsh drives ahead getting his gospel to the people. It is at once the most difficult and the most promising field of agitation in the world. He believes that, when the folks understand, public sentiment will drive even the reactionary New York Legislature into doing the right thing; that without

the pressure of an aroused and educated public opinion, nothing permanent can be accomplished.

JUDSON KING.



REMARKS BY OLD TOM HARDER.

"Want to tell me about bein' prepared for war"? I might say that I've had my full rations o' that for the last year. Tom Jenkins that runs the telegraft machine over to the depot keeps buzzin' the thing into my ears till they ring all the time.

He says the Japs are likely to over run the country most any time an' we're so short of ammunition we couldn't make a respectable fourth o' July out o' the fight an' would have to turn California over to 'em to save the rest o' the country.

I told him I thought it wasn't no use to build any more warships than we have. They're about as good as we can make without goin' to war with somebody an' learnin' about the business in a practical sort of a way. I sed the only way to learn anything is to begin an' do it an' we'd spent about enuff money playin' war an' if the Japs come over to fight us we'd learn a good deal faster how to fight than we would tryin' to scare ourselves by imagin' things that might happen.

I sed that I thought as much fightin' come from gittin' ready to fight as come about from not bein' ready to fight. As a general thing the feller that was always gittin' ready found plenty to do from gittin' the idea into his head that the only way to keep from bein' licked was to lick somebody else. An' he generally kept at it till he got licked so bad in the end that people looked the other way when he come around.

Then Tom Jenkins got real mad at me an' sed I hadn't a spark o' patriotism about my clothes, an' was nothin' but a saphead an' a mollycoddle. Then I sed that didn't settle anything.

Maybe there was as many sapheads in the military business in proportion as there was in the telegraft business, but that didn't prove that we ought to have the biggest navy in the world. An' it didn't prove that we was so totally ignorant about the business o' fightin' as the armor plate men and the arms manufacturers sed we was. I sed if them belligerent armor platers an' munition o' war fellers was right, the very best thing for us to do was to declare war on Japan an' begin fightin' right away. That was the only sensible thing to do.

Soon's we begun to fight we'd learn that the twenty years we had spent a tryin' to play war was not entirely lost but that we'd learn more in two years a fightin' than we did in twenty tryin' to git ready. Then Tom sed it wasn't no use to talk to a fool an' I sed I guessed he was right an' I wouldn't talk to him any more, an' he went off to his telegraft office.

"Real danger o' not bein' prepared for war"?

Well, I guess there is some danger. The danger's in the way some people think. We may be the very best people on the earth. Our government may be the very best one on the earth, but we don't want to go round braggin' on it. We might be a little better an' the government might be a little better. We may have a right to do all the business that's done in the world, but we won't git to do it by makin' a big spread in the military an' naval line. A little neighborly reciprocity between nations is a better thing than the strong arm.

GEORGE V. WELLS.



THE GOVERNORS' OPINIONS.

The Public recently sent to the Governor of every State and Territory the following list of questions:

1—A. To what extent does public opinion in your State favor the Short Ballot, Preferential Voting and Proportional Representation?

B. To what extent do you think these should be applied?

2. Should there be any further extension of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall beyond that to which it may be already applied in your State?

3. What measure, in your opinion, is needed for final and proper solution of transportation problems in your State?

4—A. What reforms, if any, would you consider desirable in your taxation system?

B. Has your present system worked so as to justify such comment as was made by Governor Byrne of South Dakota in his recent message, in which he said that the general property tax "stands in the way of a uniformly equitable distribution of the burden of taxation," and that "it is both inherently inequitable and impossible of enforcement"?

C. To what extent would you consider Governor Byrne's argument sound in the following:

Some classes of property should not be taxed on the same basis as others. A person should not be penalized by extreme tax exactions for improving his town or neighborhood. The farmer should not be penalized because he improves the acres he holds. Per contra we should not offer reward in the way of tax immunity to him who gives nothing of value but only holds unused land for the increased value which the thrift and industry of the community will surely add to it.

D. Would you consider as a proper step toward solution of tax problems everywhere Governor Byrne's recommendation of a constitutional provision that will "leave the people free to adopt such intelligent system of taxation as they may see fit"?

Thirty-one Governors acknowledged receipt. Some gave definite and specific answers to all questions. Others returned partial answers. Others promised to answer at a later date, and a few refused to answer at all. It is still possible that some of those not heard from may yet reply. The publication of these replies began on page 695, issue of July 16, to be continued in succeeding issues.—Editors of The Public.

Governor of Minnesota.

Replying to the questions in your letter, Minne-

sota has now a reasonably short ballot, but there is a decided tendency in favor of making certain elective officers appointive. I should say there is considerable sentiment for the short ballot.

There is very little discussion of preferential voting and proportional representation.

Minnesota has neither the Initiative, Referendum nor Recall. A constitutional provision providing for the Initiative and Referendum was defeated at the last election. Enclosed find copy of my message to the Legislature in reference to it. [Recommends submission of an amendment empowering the Legislature to enact legislation establishing the I. and R.—Editors of The Public.]

I am not prepared to offer a "final and proper solution" of transportation problems in this State.

We have a very efficient Tax Commission in Minnesota, and I would suggest that you communicate with them concerning desirable reforms.

I do not understand just what is included in the recommendation of Governor Byrne, which will, as stated in your letter, "leave the people free to adopt such intelligent system of taxation as they may see fit." It is not necessary to amend the Constitution of Minnesota, as I read it, in order that laws may be enacted establishing uniform, intelligent, and fair taxation, and I think our people as a whole complain less of the system of taxation than of the administration of that system.

W. S. HAMMOND.

 Governor of Nebraska.

Your letter of inquiry is received, and the Governor has requested me to reply to the same. In answer, will say that I do not believe that public opinion has been crystallized on the subject of the short ballot to any extent in this State. Our Legislature has been in session for the past sixty days and there has been no movement in the direction of shortening the ballot, save perhaps in counties touching the appointment of certain officers.

For a number of years, the disposition has been to get back to the people and permit public expression on all matters of public interest, and in the election of those who are to manage public affairs. That there is any general desire to place these things in the hands of the few at this time, I am inclined to doubt.

The primary election for the purpose of nominating men for public office may have been, and doubtless is responsible for a desire to shorten the ballot, and I am of the opinion that the system could be modified so that something in that direction could be used. I do not think our people are yet ready to place the making of laws in the hands of a few men, still, in a large measure, adhering to the method of selecting their representatives and continuing two distinct Houses, such as the House of Representatives and the State Senate.

In answer to the second question, "Should there be any further extension of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall beyond that to which it may be already applied in your State?" will say that I think we have in Nebraska all that can be successfully worked at the present time.

In answer to the third question, "What measure in your opinion is needed for final and proper

solution of transportation problems in your State?" Will say that matters are pending in Chicago, by a commission which has been selected from several of the western States that have in hand the investigation of the subject as to the remuneration received by the railroad companies for passenger and freight rates. Nebraska is composed of a fair-minded set of people who are willing to concede to the transportation companies of the country a reasonable remuneration as carriers of passengers and freight. We are, however, awaiting the report of that commission, or committee, that has this very important matter in hand. Our State transportation laws are quite satisfactory to the people.

Question four, "What reforms, if any, would you consider desirable in your taxation system?" There can be but one answer to this, and that is that the system should be such that all property shall pay its proportion of the State expenses. We have had a committee on taxation at work for the past two years, and they have made a report to our present Legislature. Much valuable information has been given, and the tendency is to reach that very desirable end of having all property pay its just and proportionate part of the general expense.

I will say, in this connection, that there should be such proper exemptions as will encourage improvement upon farms and lands, and yet in the matter of immunity, strict care should be taken that those who make improvements should not be rendered immune to the disadvantage of those who have property in other forms.

J. H. PRESSON,
Record Clerk to the Governor.

 Governor of New Jersey.

For Governor Fielder I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter, in which you request answers to questions you propound, for publication. The annual session of the Legislature adjourned a week ago; hence the delay in replying to your first letter. The Governor's entire time was given to his official duties, which are numerous when the Legislature is in session. He has been obliged to call the Legislature in special session, and will not have the opportunity to answer the questions prior to his departure for the West, which will be on Saturday next. He regrets his inability.

Very truly yours,
C. EDWARD HERRMANN,
Secretary to the Governor.

 Governor of Florida.

I am in receipt of your letter of the 3d inst., in which you ask for an expression from me upon several public questions. Replying, I beg to advise that the Florida Legislature is now in session and will be for the next thirty days, and for this reason I am so badly crowded with my work that I will be unable until after the Legislature is over to give you my views upon these subjects.

Very truly yours,
PARK TRAMMELL, Governor.

 Governor of Ohio.

I am in receipt of your letter making several in-

quiries concerning recent constitutional amendments. I am taking the liberty of referring your letter to Hon. C. B. Galbreath, State Librarian of Ohio, who was Secretary of the Constitutional Convention. No doubt he will write you giving his own views on the matters to which your letter refers.

FRANK B. WILLIS.

Governor of Nevada.

I have your letter of March 31st and take pleasure in complying with your request for a statement as to the trend of public opinion on various matters pertaining to governmental science in this state. Replying to your queries in order:

1—A. My primary campaign was made on a platform declaring for the commission form of government or the short ballot. The platform of the Democratic party contained as its principal plank a declaration in favor of the short ballot. In this state the Governor is a Democrat, but the session of the Legislature which just closed was conducted by two houses, each of which was Republican. The short ballot amendments were decisively defeated in the lower house where they were introduced.

1—B. Our proposal here was to provide for the election of the governor and the lieutenant governor and the appointment of all subordinate officers now elected, although we considered this simply the first step in a general reform which would ultimately lead to a straight commission form of government performing legislative and administrative functions.

2. At the present time Nevada has provisions for a referendum and recall, but no specific provisions for the initiative. Any question may be put upon the ballot at a general election, but there is no provision for referring legislation promptly to the voters. I made an earnest effort to have the law amended so as to permit any question to be referred to the voters within sixty days after its passage by the legislature, but this proposal was also badly defeated. Our recall provisions in Nevada, I believe, are satisfactory, although we have no facilities for referring questions which may serve as the basis for a recall to the people at the same time that the recall election is being held. The reform of the referendum above mentioned would have taken care of this.

3. We maintain in Nevada a Railroad Commission and Public Service Commission which have thus far handled the transportation problem in this state very satisfactorily.

4. Article ten of our Constitution prescribes the uniform rule of assessment and the ad valorem tax on all property excepting mines, which are not taxed as real property but are taxed upon their output. The net proceeds tax on mines which exists in this State is unsatisfactory, and I heartily concur with Governor Byrne of South Dakota in the proposal that the people should be permitted to legislate on the subject of class assessment. His views, however, lean a little too strongly to the single tax idea to entirely meet my own on the subject as far as our own particular problem here is concerned. Where land is exceedingly valuable the single tax idea may work advantageously, but we are left here in Nevada to the practical expedient of taxing

industry and development as they do in most of the civilized communities of the world.

I proposed an amendment to article ten of the Constitution which would have left the Legislature free to provide a rule of taxation for each class of property, but while this resolution passed the Senate it was smothered in committee in the lower house, largely through the activities of the mining interests, which felt that it might open a way to a more severe tax on mineral output than is possible under our present constitutional provisions on the subject. . . .

If the foregoing is insufficient to satisfy your purpose I will be glad to have you call on me for further information.

Very truly yours,

EMMET D. BOYLE, Governor.

BOOKS

THE GREAT UNDERPAID.

Income: An Examination of the Returns for Services Rendered and from Property Owned in the United States. By Scott Nearing. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York. 1915. Price, \$1.25 net.

Sydney Smith in one of his clever jabs said there was one rule to which no exception could be found: "That in this world the salary or reward is always in inverse ratio to the duties performed." Professor Scott Nearing, in his latest book, makes it plain that so far as the producers of this country are concerned, this is true, and every year is accentuated by conditions new and sinister.

He quotes from other authoritative investigations which show beyond dispute that a considerable proportion of the wage earners' families lives below a standard of decency. Then he essays to answer the question, "Do these low standards of living exist among the workers because they do not get a fair share of the products of industry or because there is not a sufficient amount of industrial products to maintain them on a decent living basis?"

To answer this question it is necessary to know what proportion of the gross income from the railroads and large representative industries for which figures are available is paid in wages and salaries and what goes in interest and dividends. Take one illustration, the Calumet and Hecla Company, which won its recent bloody struggle with its striking workers. In 1912 this company paid to its share and stock holders more than half its gross income—the men who carried on the work did not get even half of what they produced!

Not referring to the Calumet and Hecla Company which from a property-income point of view is a particularly desirable concern, though in reality a social blight, but drawing conclusions from the whole range of his study, Professor Nearing

says: "Almost the entire male wage-earning population receives less than \$1,500 per year; most of it receives less than \$1,000; and nearly half of it falls under \$600. The incomes of women fall far below those of men. At the same time, the owners of property receive more than six billions of property income—a sum sufficient to support the 12 million poorest families in the United States on the present level of existence, or to add \$300 per year to the income of every family in the United States."

In other words, producers live for the most part in straitened circumstances; those who have never lifted a finger for the production of wealth, are found in fine family hotels and luxurious apartments, at summer and winter resorts. Professor Nearing thinks that one who has watched the developments of the past few years and given ear to the undercurrents of socialistic thought and syndicalistic agitation, cannot help feeling that the United States is moving toward the crisis at breathless speed.

In several chapters his analysis indicates that constantly rising land values is a direct charge on industry, and a powerful economic force driving the population into the cities and shutting off the way of escape from intolerable labor conditions. The method of adjusting this fundamental wrong does not come within the scope of this inquiry. Labor, it is shown, does not get a square deal and the most effective protest labor—the producer—can make "will be based on a clear recognition of the distinction between service income and the income which comes from property." With this distinction so convincingly and eloquently drawn, the protestants are left to choose whether they will work, as a first step, for the freeing of their mother earth, or align themselves with other more elaborate programs.

STANLEY BOWMAR.



WOMEN AS OFFICE WORKERS.

Commercial Work and Training for Girls. By Jeanette Eaton and Bertha M. Stevens. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.50 net.

Office work for women, its requirements fair and unfair, the training and general education necessary and obtainable for it, and the successes and failures in it, are discussed on the basis of a thorough investigation of the situation in Cleveland in a book recently published. The private business college which is conducted primarily and often solely for its own money-making, and the public's indifference to such harmful commercialization of education, must both, in the author's emphatic opinion, somehow soon be swept away, if efficiency is to come. Increasing opportunities for office work for women can only be improved if girls and adult citizens learn the extreme impor-

tance, if not the absolute need, of at least a high school education in all worth-while commercial positions.

That is really the lesson of the book, for girl-worker, parent, employer and citizen. See to it that a good general education underlies whatever special training is taken. For even the simpler tasks in an office—and possibly in other places, too—require an informed and reasoning mind, and this useful tool can not be picked up in a "six months' business course."

Incidentally a distant, untrained observer might remark the slight discrepancy between \$10 a week wages—or even the munificent \$15 sometimes mentioned—and the expensive intellectual cravings of even the most reasonable and disciplined mind.

A. L. G.

PERIODICALS

Industrial Arbitration.

George Creel has an article in the July Century Magazine (New York) on a Way to Industrial Peace. The article deals mainly with the particular case of a Chicago garment-making firm, and tells the means for future peace which grew out of a strike. Mr. Creel says that Mr. Schaffner, the head of the firm, came to the conclusion that "he and his partners had been remote, aloof, almost unknown, and the real bosses were shop foremen grown into petty tyrants." Out of this realization grew a disposition to fairness which resulted in a seemingly complex system of adjustment of troubles, which the writer claims has so far worked admirably. There has been established a labor department, with an outsider at its head, and also a trade court, and, as a supreme tribunal, a board of arbitration. At the present stage of the economic game such suggestions are valuable and the article is worth reading.

JAMES H. DILLARD.



Jane Addams' Report on the War.

"This is Miss Addams' first message—of a great tidal change against war in the hearts and minds of Europe—a change bound up with the new generation, with the coming of women into public affairs, with the insurgent labor movements and with internationalism in a hundred phases. The second message is kindred to the first. . . . The statesmen of Europe are much readier for advances from us than American diplomacy or the people of America have dreamed of." Thus the editor of *The Survey* (New York), sums up Jane Addams' address before the great New York audience that welcomed her home on July 9; and in the same number of *The Survey*, July 19, is printed her speech in full, a most valuable contribution to the literature of constructive peace.

A. L. G.



No country has ever suffered from an overproduction of peace.—San Francisco Star.

August 26, 1915

The City of New York

will sell

Tax Liens

on

MANHATTAN REAL ESTATE

(exempt from Federal Income Tax)

— 7% —

We will invest for your account at this sale and guarantee *seven per cent* per annum on funds received on or before August 25th, 1915. New York exchange.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Write or Telegraph

The Tax Lien Company of New York

68 William Street

New York City

"Well," said the lawyer, having listened carefully to his client's statement, "you've got about the best case I ever heard. My dear sir, you can't help winning it, whatever court you take it to. I shall be only too glad to assist you in the matter."

"Thanks," said the prospective client. "Thanks very much!" Then, grabbing his hat, he made a speedy exit from the office.

"What?" exclaimed the astonished lawyer. "Are you going?"

"Yes," replied the other. "I'm just going to try to settle this case out of court."

"But, my dear sir, why waste money? As I have already told you, that's one of the best cases I've ever heard."

"Maybe it is," said the fickle client, as he hastened down the stairs, "but not for me. I told you the other fellow's story."



A little boy was once overheard saying to his pet rabbit:

"How much is seven times seven?"

There being no response from the rabbit, the boy said:

"How much is four times four?"

Still there was no response.

La Follette



believes in the American people. He believes that YOU should know the TRUTH about the inside workings of YOUR government and the records of your representatives at Washington.

So with the help and approval of a score of other fighters for the common good, Senator LaFollette established

La Follette's Magazine

devoted to fearless discussion of the most important public questions, and has departments for the home, special articles, stories, a Farm Department, fiction, humor, important news of the world.

Published monthly. Regular price \$1.00 per year. To permit you to get acquainted with the magazine we will send it to you on trial

3 Months for 25c.

Simply send a quarter with your name and address to

LA FOLLETTE'S, Box 35, Madison, Wis.

"Now I will give you an easy one. How much is two times two?"

Still the rabbit refused to respond.

"Well," said the boy, "I knew father was fibbing when he said rabbits are the greatest multipliers in the world!"—Sacred Heart Review.



"What did Rastus git married for?"

"Lawd only knows, chlle. He keeps right on workin'."—Boston Transcript.



Truth has rough flavors if we bite it through.—George Elliot.

Reasons Why Professor Scott Nearing Lost His Job

1. **Financing the Wage-Earner's Family.** By Scott Nearing. \$1.25.
2. **Reducing the Cost of Living.** By Scott Nearing. \$1.25.
3. **Solution of Child Labor Problems.** By Scott Nearing. \$1.00.
4. **Social Adjustment.** By Scott Nearing.
"A clear, sane gathering together of the sociological dicta of today." \$1.50.
5. **Wages in the United States.**
This work represents an examination of statistics offered by various states and industries in an effort to determine the average wage in the United States. By Scott Nearing. \$1.25.
6. **Income.**
An examination of the returns for services rendered and from property owned in the United States. By Scott Nearing. \$1.25.
7. **Social Religion.** By Scott Nearing.
In this book Professor Nearing takes up the more deplorable elements in the modern social and industrial world, analyzing them in the light of a practical Christianity. \$1.00.

All prices postpaid. Order from Book Dept.

The Public, Ellsworth Building, Chicago