

The Public

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

Vol. XVIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1915.

No. 916.

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

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

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT B. BIGNLOW, Ohio
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
FRANK WESTLOCK, Ohio
JOHN E. WELLS, Illinois
LAWRELLYN JONES, Illinois
MRS. LONA INGRAM ROBINSON, Conn.
L. F. G. GARVIN, Rhode Island
S. A. STROCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. 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. FETTERBERG, South Dakota
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOHN PAUL, England
ERNEST BEAT, Australia
GEORGE FOWLES, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
515 North 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:

The New Jersey Incident.....	1017
Anti-Suffragists Discredit Their Cause.....	1017
Geographical Liberty.....	1017
New York's Proposed Reactionary Constitution.....	1018
Suffrage and the Liquor Interests.....	1019
Anti-Democratic Anti-Saloon Men.....	1019
Walsh as a Newspaper Publisher.....	1019
Getting Rich Quick.....	1019
Unequal Punishment.....	1020
Mexico.....	1020
War Debts and Slavery.....	1021
Tribute and Defense.....	1022
War's Evil Rival.....	1022
Militarists Insatiable.....	1022
Comedy or Tragedy.....	1022
"Japan's Plans to Invade America"—K. K. Kaka- wami.....	1022

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

California's Special Election—J. P. Cadman.....	1023
Canadian Rural Conditions—George W. Atkinson.....	1024

NEWS NARRATIVE:

New Jersey's Suffrage Election.....	1025
Nearing Goes to Toledo University.....	1025
Chicago School Affairs.....	1025
The Labor War.....	1025
Tax Reform News.....	1025
Joseph F. Darling.....	1026
Emma Goldman Dismissed.....	1026
Reactionaries Refuse to Debate.....	1026
Army and Navy Increase Planned.....	1027
Panama Canal.....	1027
Mexico.....	1028
European War.....	1028
News Notes.....	1029
Press Opinions.....	1030

RELATED THINGS:

Song of the Working Girls—Harriet Munroe.....	1031
Investigating the Antis—Floyd Dell.....	1031
The Sex of Distinguished Americans—Scott Near- ing.....	1031
A Workingman's Reply—Celia Baldwin Whitehead.....	1033

BOOKS:

The Rural Problem.....	1033
Books Received.....	1034
Periodicals.....	1034

EDITORIAL

The New Jersey Incident.

The set back to suffrage in New Jersey is but an incident in the fight for democracy. It delays final victory, but does no more. A new battle began the following day. "No question is ever settled until it is settled right." S. D.



Anti-Suffragists Discredit Their Cause.

It is a poor cause whose advocates feel that they must resort to dishonest tricks at the eleventh hour. New Jersey's anti-suffragists circulated on the Saturday before election a "warning against woman suffrage," falsely made to appear as emanating from the Colorado State Federation of Labor. Such methods would surely not have been resorted to had there been available any facts damaging to the suffrage cause. The trick probably fooled some New Jersey voters, but it will count against opposition to suffrage at future elections in all States. S. D.



Geographical Liberty.

The approaching election in three Eastern States has particular interest for the student of human affairs because those States are to pass upon the question of whether or not women are to have the same political rights as men. It is not a new question in those States; nor is it an untried theory in this country. The question of woman suffrage has been discussed for several generations; in some of the Western States it has been in practice for more than one generation. That there should still linger in any man's mind a doubt as to the justice of this cause well serves as a measure of that man's mind. There can be no further argument. Every possible objection has been met again and again, and from every point of view. Nor can any opponent fortify himself by citing the failure of the suffrage where it has been in operation. The few men and women who still oppose the right of women to vote are actuated, not by any sense of justice, logic or con-

sistency, but hold their position merely because of a state of mind. As some are color blind, and are unable to distinguish between certain shades of color, so others are unable to distinguish between certain ideas. A few of them will gradually outgrow this condition; the others in time will die; and their children will wonder at their strange affliction.



Some opponents of woman suffrage, of whom Mr. Taft is a type, admit the justice of the question in the abstract, but oppose its application at the present time. Theoretically, they say, woman is entitled to the same rights as man; practically, her past environment, training and experience have been such as to leave her unqualified for the exercise of the right. And as proof of this contention they offer the unfortunate experience that followed the enfranchisement of the Negro. This is another illustration of the danger of reasoning by analogy. These two cases are not analogous. The great mass of the Negroes not only had had no experience in self-government, but they were separate and apart from those who had had such experience. When the ballot was given to them they were at a loss to know what to do with it. Their natural impulse was to turn to their former masters; but unscrupulous adventurers played upon their fears and counseled them to evil courses that led to the political wreck.



There is nothing in the experiment of the enfranchised slaves comparable with the enfranchisement of women. They are not a separate part of the community, to be victimized by adventurers from without. They are part and parcel of the community. They are in daily association with those who already have the suffrage. And those to whom they would naturally turn for advice and counsel are the very persons who would be most interested in giving them assistance. The giving of the ballot to women will not be as radical a step today as was the various enfranchisements of men that have already taken place. For it sometimes happened that great numbers of citizens were given political power who were as much separated from the ruling class as the Negroes were. But in this case every woman who receives the vote will be more or less intimately associated with a citizen who already has the ballot. So that, as experience in the various States already enjoying equal suffrage has shown, the result will not differ radically from what it was before.



Why, then, bother at all with the suffrage?

some ask. Many women do not want it; and if its exercise by those who seek it does not materially change the result, why cumber the election machinery with added expense and confusion? That question might have been asked at every step, back to the time the first man demanded of his monarch a voice in governing himself. The answer at each stage would have been, as it is to-day, that it was not for the few who hold the power to say what was or was not good for the many. The unbroken course of history shows that where one man has held power over another he has sooner or later used it to benefit himself, to the disadvantage of that other. And as character grows only under liberty and with responsibility, so each extension of the right of self-government has led to a higher general citizenship. It is a strange course of reasoning that prompts the anti-suffragist to object to woman's voting because of her lack of understanding, and yet permits her to teach the children during their most impressionable age. The immediate and all-embracing reason for giving woman the ballot is not that she will at once transform the state, but that this responsibility will awaken in her a spirit that will be seen in the next and succeeding generations. It will be interesting to note in this election how the Eastern male voters measure up with the Western male voters.

s. c.



New York's Proposed Reactionary Constitution.

The personnel of the late New York Constitutional Convention was such as alone to justify suspicion of its work, and the more its work is studied the stronger must grow the impression that the convention was little more than a cunning conspiracy against democracy. To begin with there is the taxation clause, so drawn as to make it possible for one-third of the members of either legislative branch to block any change in the tax system. The object of this is clear. It is to perpetuate the system that is mainly responsible for land monopoly and all its attendant evils. In the interest of land monopolists, immediate prospects of bettering social conditions are to be sacrificed. To be sure, this iniquitous clause is to be voted on separately, but the work of a body capable of submitting so harmful a proposition should be cautiously examined before any of it be accepted.



The convention has been praised for providing the Short Ballot. At first glance that provision would seem as though it were actually a step in

advance. The Short Ballot means more efficient government, provided the officials to be elected thereon are to have power. In that event it not only makes easier intelligent selection of officials, but makes it possible to fix responsibility for whatever takes place. To be of greatest use it needs the Initiative and Referendum and Recall in addition, but even without these aids, good can be accomplished by means of it. But such benefit depends entirely on the assumption that the elected officials have full control of the government. Otherwise nothing but a sham reform will have been established. The convention would give the Governor power over many State departments, but in the important matter of controlling public service monopolies it would make him nearly helpless. He may appoint a public service commission. But he can not remove a member after appointment, and this commission, as well as others which he is supposed to control, are to hold office for much longer terms than the Governor. So the people will be helpless against corporation-controlled commissions, even should they elect a progressive Governor. And it was in behalf of such a short ballot and such a Constitution that Elihu Root made his widely heralded speech against "invisible government"!

The Constitution provides for a number of superficial reforms. But unless advocates of these reforms want to see them discredited, they should oppose the Constitution for all that. On the plea of efficiency certain power is given the Governor, and he is made, to a considerable extent, independent of control even by the Legislature. There is great danger in this proceeding which could have been avoided through provisions for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. That would have retained all the advantages of concentrated responsibility, without its dangerous possibilities. But the convention contemptuously rejected all propositions for direct legislation.

Still more dangerous is the elimination from the Bill of Rights of the clause prohibiting military tribunals from exercising jurisdiction over civilians while the civil courts are open. This makes it possible to legally perpetrate such outrages in New York as have been inflicted by military courts in West Virginia upon citizens of that state.

Fortunately the convention did not meddle with the woman suffrage amendment submitted by the Legislature. Possibly the leading spirits of that body felt that since the voters were to be

restricted in their power by the new Constitution, it mattered little who should have the right to vote. But there they committed a tactical blunder. The voters can reject the reactionary constitution and the reactionary taxation clause, and at the same time endorse the woman suffrage amendment. That would not only be an advance toward free democracy, but would doubly rebuke the plutocratic schemes of the convention. With a democratized electorate it may be possible to change the Constitution in an enlightened way.

S. D.



Suffrage and the Liquor Interests.

The Illinois liquor interest has better luck than it deserves. With folly, that seems characteristic, it has opposed equal suffrage, and only recently strove to secure a re-opening before the Supreme court of the question of constitutionality of the suffrage law. Fortunately for the business, the Supreme court refused its foolish and unjust request. Had the effort to kill the law actually succeeded, thousands of democrats who believe prohibition wrong in principle, would have become supporters of it as a matter of political expediency. All suffragists are by no means prohibitionists, but the liquor men will have only themselves to blame, should they become so.

S. D.



Anti-Democratic Anti-Saloon Men.

Missouri's anti-saloon league seems to resemble the liquor interest of Illinois in hostility to democracy. Reedy's Mirror of October 15 tells of action taken by the Board of Trustees of that body to secure from the next legislature a prohibition law with an emergency clause attached to prevent its submission to a popular referendum. Such methods can only hurt the anti-saloon cause. But perhaps these trustees hold that cause secondary to the interests of Privilege.

S. D.



Walsh as a Newspaper Publisher.

In passing under the control of Frank P. Walsh the Kansas City Post becomes an important addition to the list of staunch fundamental democratic dailies. It is safe to hold that while Walsh controls, the Post will be an aggressive fighter on the right side of public issues.

S. D.



Getting Rich Quick.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, commenting upon the investment of twelve men in Oklahoma who put \$175 each in an oil well, and sold it within

two years for a million dollars, says that while such profit-making is exceptional it is by no means impossible of repetition, and adds:

Great areas of oil land remain to be developed. Other natural resources have inviting possibilities of wealth. Manufacturing and merchandising have their opportunities.

It is true doubtless that there still lies within the earth vast wealth; and from time to time we shall hear of the making of other millionaires. But getting rich by discovering minerals in the earth and by merchandising are entirely different things. The royalty exacted by the owner of an oil well, or a coal or iron mine, on what labor and capital take out of it is pure waste to industry; it is the unearned increment that goes to the owner of the earth; and is a dead loss to the productive forces of society. But the profits of industry, of agriculture, or manufacturing or of merchandising represent the return to labor and capital for actual service performed.

Considered from the point of view of the twelve Oklahoma men who received a million dollars for their oil land, their venture represents a stroke of great good fortune. But considered from the public's point of view, it is a corresponding misfortune. For the million dollars is a capitalization of what nature has supplied to man, and man must pay the interest on that million dollars before he can avail himself of nature's gift. Though this method of getting rich is legal, its moral and economic basis is identical with that of the pirates who once preyed upon commerce.

S. C.

Unequal Punishment.

Among the good points made by Henry M. Hyde, in a series of articles in the Chicago Tribune on the manufacture of criminals, is the un-wisdom of making offenders work out fines. Two men coming before a magistrate, charged with the same offense, are visited with the same apparent penalty, a fine of five dollars and costs. One pays his fine and goes free; the other, having no money, is sent to the bridewell for twenty-three days. Clearly this is a gross discrimination between citizens. To the one man this fine is no punishment at all; to the other it means deprivation of liberty, enforced labor and the stigma of a jail sentence. The difference is all due to the fact that one man can command a little money at the time of his arrest, and the other cannot.

Fines should not be levied as punishment—unless it be possible to grade them according to the ability of the culprit to pay. In making restitu-

tion, the guilty person should pay for the damage done; but as punishment the burden should be as heavy for one as for the other. If a culprit smashes a window, the law fines him for breaking the law. The householder is out the price of the window, the culprit may lie in jail for lack of money to pay his fine, and society loses the value of his labor. Mr. Hyde well says, "The greatest crime in America is the wholesale manufacture of criminals."

S. C.

Mexico.

The recommendation of Secretary Lansing and the representatives of the six South and Central American countries, that General Carranza's organization be recognized as the de facto government of Mexico, brings us to another phase of the Mexican problem. It must be confessed that the prospects of the immediate future are not altogether reassuring. General Carranza, according to the reports that have reached this country, does not appear to be the man that most Americans would wish to see in charge of Mexican affairs at this time. But it is possible that the First Chief is more deserving than his past career indicates; and, besides, it should not be forgotten that similar problems in Mexico and in the United States may require radically different treatment. Certain it is that as the representative of the dominant faction, in control of ninety per cent of the country, the General is entitled to friendly consideration.

This final action on the part of the Washington administration has been spoken of flippantly by certain critics, and the question asked: What good has come of all this watchful waiting? Why was not Huerta's recognized as the de facto government? Or, if he had to be removed, why was he not forcibly ejected and the affairs of the unhappy country set in order at once by armed intervention? In the first place, there is every reason to believe that the recognition of Huerta would have led to the very strife that did follow, with the additional evil of official toleration of assassination. Huerta would have continued the old regime of Diaz, with the Mexican people struggling doggedly for their rights. In the next place, armed intervention would have led to a long and costly war, which would have gone far toward the triumph of jingoism, with the probable annexation of territory; and would in any event have restored order with small regard for the rights of the mass of the people. By holding aloof we have permitted them to fight their own battles. The Cientif-

cos have been beaten; the old order seems to have been overthrown; and the long-suffering peon will receive some consideration.

Meantime, the people have discovered that not all adventurers are patriots. It has been slowly borne into their consciousness that fighting is not man's only or best occupation, and that the new social order cannot be made a reality in a day. But, best of all, the watchful waiting policy has enabled the United States to demonstrate not only to Mexico, but to the Central and South American countries, that there is such a thing as international honor. And this action on the part of the United States, in permitting Mexico to fight out its own battles—even though at great cost to ourselves—when it would have been so easy, and apparently so excusable, to acquire additional territory, has done more to reassure Latin America of our good faith than all other acts from the foundation of the Government. The cost to Mexico has been great in both men and property, but that could not be avoided. The Diaz government, co-operating with foreign capitalists who were none too scrupulous, exploited the Mexican people to the limit of endurance. The injury to legitimate capital and to innocent persons is the penalty they must bear from being associated with adventurers. It is to be hoped that the new government will fulfill its promise to curb predatory corporations and adventurers; and that it will institute in place of the former exploitation a condition that will give the peon an opportunity to advance. The task is fraught with enormous difficulties. Every foreign investor whose title rests upon bribery and robbery will, when dispossessed by the new government, set up a great outcry. And certain newspapers and politicians in this country and in Europe will rush to his defense. Patience and encouragement on our part will be our greatest contribution toward the regeneration of Mexico.

s. c.

War Debts and Slavery.

The New York Evening Post of October 2 takes Henry Ford to task for the following statement credited to him:

If I were to live with the future generations of Europe I would urge the people to repudiate the debts that are being piled up by their governments in this war. I believe it is the duty of the people to repudiate them.

This view the Post denounces as a vicious one that "ought to excite the instinctive abhorrence of every right-thinking man." The Post's argument is based on two assumptions. One is that one

holding that view must necessarily believe war itself to be wrong, and the other that it is analogous to the views expressed by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty," concerning property in land.

It is not true that one need necessarily believe war itself to be wrong, to hold the view credited to Mr. Ford. It is strange that the Post should not know that many Americans who are firmly convinced of the righteousness of the Civil War are, nevertheless, unable to see why the whole cost of that war should not have been borne by the generation that fought it. The question is not, as the Post puts it, whether the taking up of arms was justified, but whether one generation has a right to bind its successors. Its right to bind itself may be conceded. Its right to bind others is a very different matter. War debts, contracted for destructive purposes only, must not be confused with those contracted for constructive purposes. The work of destruction once done, there is nothing tangible to show for the money expended. Whether there happen to be intangible benefits is not to the point. If these benefits do not seem worth their entire cost to the generation that acquired them, then it has no right to assume that future generations will care to pay anything.

The Post brings in Henry George's position on the land question as an analogy to Mr. Ford's on war debts. That it did this appears strange, when it could have presented an actual occurrence as analogous to what Mr. Ford proposes. It might have said this:

Our forefathers may have acted right, according to their lights; they may have thought—and it may even have been true—that to give individuals the right of permanent ownership of slaves was the best way to promote agriculture, to encourage thrift, to secure order, to stimulate enterprise and to develop some of the most fundamental of human virtues. All this was of no consequence to the abolitionists; once you discover, by a process of reasoning satisfactory to yourself, that slave ownership is criminal, the man that is a slave owner ceases to have any rights that you are bound to respect. The question of fair dealing between man and man has nothing to do with the case. The cases [war debts and slavery] are as alike as two peas. The only question is whether those who have found the doctrine of slave confiscation to their moral taste will be strengthened or weakened in their belief by seeing how easily the same scrap-of-paper view of plain human obligations can be applied in other directions.

While the Post did use an argument very much like this it darkened it somewhat by using the word "land" instead of "slaves." The abolition of chattel slavery by the method described, being

a familiar as well as an accomplished fact, would have been a clearer analogous case to present. If Mr. Ford is as wrong in his position on the war debt question and if Henry George was as wrong in his views on the land question as were William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips on slavery, the statesmen who will carry out their views must be as bad, and can be no worse, than Abraham Lincoln. The Post makes that much clear.

S. D.



Tribute and Defense.

Millions for defense against imaginary foreign dangers and millions more for tribute to real predatory interests at home, seems to be the program favored by Secretaries Garrison and Daniels. As is always the case with militarist policies, the millions to be wasted on battleships and armies are to be raised by taxation of labor. Fortunately there are some democrats in Congress who will follow the lead of Warren Worth Bailey in fighting such suggestions.

S. D.



War's Evil Rival.

In the scale of human evils the next thing to war is preparation for war. The worst of war is not the killing of men, nor the wounding and maiming, nor yet the destruction of property; it is the turning of men's thoughts from constructive to destructive work. In all the European countries now at war great ideas were struggling for expression. Progressive statesmen were outlining policies of far-reaching consequences to mankind, some of which were almost upon the point of adoption. All this was laid aside at the sound of the first shot; and there is no knowing how long it will be before the public mind again arrives at the point where it was at the breaking out of the war.



But if actual hostilities distract men's minds from constructive work, so does the preparation for war. The campaign that is now under way in this country to give our national policy a military cast, under the euphonic name of "preparedness," will take popular attention from things of far greater vital importance. Many questions are pressing for solution. Some have arrived almost at the point of action. But the Congressmen at Washington who would have considered questions looking to the betterment of social conditions will, instead, waste their time in determining whether we shall have a large or a small army and navy.

This means a loss to the people in any event. If the Militarists win their point, the country will embark upon a system of military aggrandizement that will be an enormous burden to the country and a great handicap to its moral development. Should the Pacifists succeed in defeating this program, the country still will have lost the constructive effort spent in preventing the building of dreadnaughts that otherwise would have gone to the conservation of humanity. When men begin to see red, they lose their sense of proportion, and bring great hardships upon themselves while trying to escape imaginary evils.

S. C.



Militarists Insatiable.

Though word comes from Washington of a prospective surrender to militarist agitation, to the extent of squandering hundreds of millions, the Chicago Tribune is not satisfied. It says in its issue of October 17 that after spending all this we "will not be prepared." Nothing less than universal compulsory military service will do, it declares. Without that, five hundred millions, ever so carefully spent, will leave us unprepared. Then why make any concession whatever to militarist demands? To deal with evils at hand is a far more pressing duty of Congress than to prepare against a future danger which can be averted without resort to militarism. Before worrying about national defense, let the people demand economic justice so that they may have something worth defending.

S. D.



Comedy or Tragedy?

A prominent member of the National Security League and disciple of preparedness says Europeans look upon our army as a joke. Better the American joke than the European tragedy.

S. C.



"JAPAN'S PLANS TO INVADE AMERICA."

Under the above heading the ever-enterprising newspapers of Mr. W. R. Hearst have published articles, a condensed translation of the Japanese pamphlet, "Nichibei Kaisen Yumemonogatari," which means "The Dream Story of the American-Japanese War."

There are a few things which the public must know in order to gauge the value of this story of an imaginary war with Japan. It is stated in the Hearst papers' editorial introduction to the translation that this Japanese book was published by the National Defense Association, of which Premier Count Okuma and ex-Foreign Minister

Baron Kato are President and Vice-President, respectively, and that the society is composed of all Cabinet members and Army and Navy officers. This statement, if made knowingly, is a criminal fabrication.

The Japanese book is published with the imprint of the Kokumin-Gunji-Kiokai, meaning the National Association of Military Affairs. Its author is anonymous. To make the publication a financial success, the author invented the high-sounding name for its sponsor. It was written from purely mercenary motives. As a matter of fact, this National Association of Military Affairs is fictitious. If there is such a society, no one knows anything about it.

There is in Japan a governmental board named Kokubo-Kaigi, or the National Defense Board. It consists of seven members, and the Prime Minister is ex-officio its president. No one familiar with Japanese affairs can confound this governmental board with the fictitious National Association of Military Affairs which is the sponsor for the Japanese book translated by Mr. Hearst's papers. It must also be noted that the National Defense Board was organized only a year ago, while this book was published in June, 1913.

As far as we know, the book has sold only to the extent of some two thousand copies, although it appeared at the psychological moment when the anti-alien land bill had just been enacted in California. It has never been popular and has already been consigned to the limbo of oblivion, where it properly belongs. The book is an echo of "General" Homer Lea's "The Valor of Ignorance" and an anonymous writer's "Banzai," both stories of an American-Japanese war, published in 1909. It will also be recalled that when in 1908 Mr. Roosevelt sent a squadron of warships to the Far East a pamphlet, entitled "The War of 1908 for the Supremacy of the Pacific," was published in London. It was assumed that it was written by a German residing in New York. The "Banzai" was also written originally in German by a German writer. In view of the appearance of such English publications, it is rather surprising that enterprising Japanese publishers bent upon making money had not published similar books long before the appearance of the pamphlet translated by the Hearst papers.

The latest contribution to the English stock of American-Japanese war stories is "The United States and the Next War," written by George Lauferti and published in New York. The publication in America of this and other English books of a similar nature is about as indicative of

American determination to wage war against Japan as the publication of their Japanese counterparts is indicative of Japanese intention to fight the United States. One is just as significant as the other, no more. K. K. KAWAKAMI.*

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CALIFORNIA'S SPECIAL ELECTION.

San Diego, Calif., Oct. 12, 1915.

On October 26th a special election is to be held in this State at which eleven propositions are to be voted upon. Nine of the propositions are Constitutional amendments framed by the Legislature at its last session, and submitted by them to the electors. Two of the propositions are acts of the Legislature, signed by the Governor, which were held up by petition, and are, therefore, to be submitted to the electors. An official pamphlet of 64 pages, issued by the Secretary of State of California, is now being mailed to every elector in California, giving him or her the exact wording of each proposition to be voted upon, together with the arguments for or against the same, which have been presented. All of the propositions are accompanied by arguments favoring their adoption, and five have two such arguments, making sixteen affirmative arguments in all. Only six of the propositions have opposing arguments, and five no expressed opposition.

The greatest interest in these propositions which has thus far been manifested in the state has been in regard to the "Direct Primary Law," proposition No. 1. At present the officers of the counties, cities and municipalities, including judges, are chosen on nonpartisan tickets. The new law proposes to extend nonpartisanship to all offices except "U. S. senators, representatives in congress, party committeemen, delegates to national party conventions and presidential electors."

In the argument favoring this proposition the writer, Hon. C. C. Young, speaker of the assembly, says: "Opposing it (the proposed law) are the disgruntled remnants of the old political machine, who now fear that its enactment will prevent their retaining control of the government they so long disgraced." In the argument against this measure the writer, Hon. M. L. Schmitt, assemblyman, after arguing in general for nonpartisanship, and especially as to the expense in a state-wide campaign says:

Possibly some extremely wealthy person might aspire to state office, in the event of so-called nonpartisanship, but the man of ordinary circumstances would be forever foreclosed therefrom. . . . Party lines lead to government,—nonpartisanship leads to disorganization, then disorder, then chaos, and ultimately anarchy. Do you Californians want the red flag of anarchy to float over our fair land, or do you want the Stars and Stripes to continue to wave? The choice is with you. Be on the safe side, and vote NO.

One of the propositions (No. 3), is to extend the terms of the superior judges from six to twelve years. Another (No. 7), claims to safeguard direct legislation by allowing the legislature to pass laws to prevent fraud in securing signatures to petitions;

*Author of "American-Japanese Relations," "Asia at the Door," etc.

and it also requires a two-thirds majority in creating a bonded indebtedness by state initiative.

Most of the other propositions are of less general interest.



Related Things.

This county of San Diego has 173 voting precincts, 91 in the city and 82 in the county. The election boards have from four to six members, depending on the number of registered voters in the precinct. In the city the number of women on the boards is about equal to the number of men. In some of the residence sections of the city the number of women who have been appointed to serve at the coming election is often greater than the number of men. In my own precinct 5 women, all of whom have served on previous boards, and one man have been appointed to have charge of the polls at the coming election. At the elections of next year, when the number of candidates will be large and will give much added work to the board, the number of women appointed will probably be less than at this time.

Almost as many women as men, who are eligible to vote, have registered in the city. Women, in their clubs and public meetings, are manifesting about as much interest in the discussions as are the men.

JAMES P. CADMAN.



CANADIAN RURAL CONDITIONS.

Ceylon, Sask., Oct. 9, 1915.

The homestead system of the United States and Canada is doubtless a vast improvement on the system of land purchase which it displaced, but that it has largely failed in its purpose to establish a peasant proprietorship is widely evidenced under a variety of conditions. I had occasion recently to visit a section of country that might be termed second and third class land. Most of this was homesteaded eight or ten years ago. Seven years ago I was through this same district and found it dotted with shacks and populous with hopeful settlers. Today, for miles at a stretch, these shacks are deserted or moved away and the fields gone back to sod. The land is owned by loan companies, implement companies and speculators.

Some of these farms would not support a family even under favorable conditions. Others would support a family, but could not bear the additional burden of heavy indebtedness, with the handicap in many cases of slipshod management. Today the land is held by owners who admit they have been stung, but who are hanging on, hoping later to retrieve their loss by a rise in value when conditions become more settled.

Last winter I was through one of the most fertile agricultural districts I ever saw or expect to see. Crops there on newly broken land have often produced \$30 and \$40 per acre. Settlers starting with a four-horse outfit have in ten years and less found themselves proprietors of one, two, and even three-section farms. The settlers there—the provident ones—have become well-to-do, some of them rich, but there has been a dispersion of the population only less than in the poor district.

The government's offer of 160 or 320 acres of "free" land on the completion of three or six years'

residence and certain prescribed cultivation requirements has caused thousands to serve their term of isolation and hardship, many of whom never intended to become actual farmers. The all but universal experience in homestead countries, after something like five years' settlement, is a shrinkage of 25 to 75 per cent in the population. Of the settlers remaining, one class, the bachelor farmers, deserves special mention. These, taken as a whole, are the sort of men who make good citizens. Many of them marry later and become family men. But large numbers, tied to their farms by their perfectly laudable desire to gain a competency, degenerate into chronic celibacy, a treadmill existence without enjoyment to themselves or benefit to their community.

Tenant farming is already a feature of the older and more prosperous districts, but at present, what with the high cost of machinery and other necessities and the excessive charge for transporting our staple product to its ultimate market, an owning farmer is hard pressed; a tenant cannot exist.

The second stage of settlement has arrived and passed a little farther east—the real estate boom and the influx of buyers from the east and the south. This has brought many resident farmers, but a larger number of speculative buyers, or rather a larger acreage of speculative purchases; so the net result has been a further decrease in the rural population.

The land value tax, the sole revenue of rural municipalities, has nowhere been large enough to attract any organized opposition from speculative owners. Not so, however, with the provincial surtax. That is a discriminating tax on non-resident land with less than a prescribed proportion under cultivation. I fancy the outcry is not so much on account of its present amount, which is insignificant, as from the fear of its very probable increase.

More settlers and more intensive farming methods—those are the crying needs of Saskatchewan, agreed to by all hands. Free homesteads have not brought them, not to stay. The real estate men are clamoring for a chance, but their past record is against them. They have not brought one-tenth the number that the homestead law has. Besides, their method is too expensive. Of "the simple, yet sovereign method," the taking of public values for public use, leaving private production to the producer, not enough has been said. Public men announce themselves as singletaxers, and cause little comment. The revolutionary possibilities of the singletax are little thought of, either by lawmaker or citizen. Perhaps the increasing financial needs of the province will be a factor in bringing the singletax forward as an issue.

GEO. W. ATKINSON.



White ribbon women must be the sworn foes of monopoly, of landlordism and every other form of class legislation. For one I believe that the land belongs to the people, and that while the farmer's domain should not be interfered with, since he turns it to beneficent use, a propaganda of education should be devised whereby the Singletax and the issue of all money by the government itself should become two of the central planks in the platform of the party of the future.—Frances Willard in address to National W. C. T. U. Convention at Baltimore, October, 1895.

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, October 19, 1915.

New Jersey Suffrage Election.

Election returns from New Jersey indicate that the suffrage amendment was defeated by about 50,000 majority. [See current volume, pages 159, 197, 969.]



Nearing Goes to Toledo University.

According to an announcement by Professor R. J. Colbert of the Toledo Municipal University on October 14, Scott Nearing has accepted the position at that institution of Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Social Science. He will begin his new duties on the opening of the second university semester, at the end of January. [See current volume, page 1003.]



Chicago School Affairs.

In spite of the recent anti-labor union order of the Board of Education the Chicago Teachers Federation on October 16 voted to send delegates to the Illinois State Federation of Labor and affiliate with that body. Miss Margaret Haley and Miss Catharine Goggin were selected to head the delegation to the convention of the State Federation at Alton on October 18. At the opening of the convention Robert C. Moore, of Carlinville, county superintendent of schools, advocated a State teachers' union to be affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. [See current volume, page 1005.]



The Chicago Federation of Labor voted on October 17 to send a telegram to Governor Dunne urging him to include in a call for an extra session of the Legislature a demand for an investigation of the charges that Senate journal was illegally altered so as to provide for an investigation of Chicago schools. Evidence showing that this was done, after the Senate had adjourned, was presented in the issue of Margaret A. Haley's Bulletin of October 7.



The report of the Chicago school board committee against any further sales of school lands met with opposition in the board meeting of October 13. Trustees Holpuch and Otis openly advocated sale of the land, declaring the leasing proposition ridiculous. Trustee Sonstebly championed the report, showing that its opponents were using the same arguments as did the trustees of 80 years ago

who sold the square mile of land for \$40,000 that now constitutes the city's central business section. The report was finally ordered returned to the committee until a public hearing on the matter can be held.



The Labor War.

The committee of the Chicago City Council trying to make peace in the Garment Workers' strike were checked at least temporarily by the refusal of the manufacturers to agree to arbitration. Alderman Geiger, a member of the committee, reported at a meeting on October 15 that the manufacturers declared that they had nothing to arbitrate. Charges of police brutality, especially against women pickets, continue to be made. The most frequent police explanation, when one is secured, is that the pickets have shouted "scab" at workers. The matter has been taken up by Miss Ellen Gates Starr of Hull House and a number of club women. State Factory Inspector Oscar Nelson has commenced proceedings against some of the firms said to have been harboring strike breakers. They are charged with violating the law forbidding use of shops for sleeping quarters. [See current volume, page 981.]



Armed guards at mills of the Nashua Manufacturing Company at Nashua, N. H., shot, bayoneted and clubbed men and girl strikers on October 18. The reports give no clear explanation of the trouble other than that the company tried to run cars on a siding blocked by women with babies in arms. One man was reported killed and seven women injured.



Tax Reform News.

The Joint Congressional Committee on fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States began hearings at Washington on October 20. The committee consists of Senators Chilton of West Virginia, Saulsbury of Delaware, and Works of California, and Representatives Rainey of Illinois, Gard of Ohio and Cooper of Wisconsin. A brief was filed by the Tax Reform Association of the District, asking for (1) a progressively heavier tax on land values, and the gradual exemption of buildings and improvements from taxation until all revenue from real property is finally collected from land values; (2) a tax on local franchises and monopolies under private ownership; (3) a graduate inheritance tax. The brief is signed by the following committee: W. D. Mackenzie, chairman; B. F. Lindas, secretary; Jennie L. Munroe, Charles S. Davis, Elias J. Dakin, James Hugh Keeley, George A. Warren, and Herbert L. Adams. H. Martin Williams is president of the Association and Walter I. Swanton is secretary. [See vol. xvii, p. 253; current volume, page 186.]

In a brief filed with the Supreme Court on October 13, Attorney General Gregory says in reply to the attack on the constitutionality of the graduated features of the income tax:

The ordinary system of indirect taxation upon consumption places upon the poor person a disproportionate share of the burden of government support. At least congress has in its discretion determined that the heavier burden can be carried more easily by the larger incomes, and it is not for the courts to say that such classification is outrageous. [See current volume, page 667.]



Joseph F. Darling.

Joseph F. Darling, known in New York City as an active and militant Singletaxer, died suddenly on October 5. He was one of the enthusiastic workers in behalf of Henry George's candidacy for mayor, both in 1886 and in 1897. He had also worked for Bryan in his presidential campaigns. His work in 1908 brought him a formal expression of appreciation from the National Democratic Committee. He was also very active in free speech fights, in which he did not confine his efforts to New York City. In the course of this struggle he suffered arrest many times. In 1910 he severed relations with existing political parties and helped to found the Land Value Tax party, believing that to be the best method of propaganda. He was made national organizer and was the party's nominee for Congress in 1910 and for district attorney in 1913.



Emma Goldman Dismissed.

Emma Goldman and Ben Reitman, who had been arrested and fined \$100 each at Portland, Oregon, on September 22 for distributing Margaret Sanger's pamphlet on birth control, were released on appeal by Judge W. N. Gatens. In dismissing the case Judge Gatens said:

It seems to me that the trouble with our people today is that there is too much prudery. Ignorance and prudery are the millstones about the necks of progress. We are all shocked by many things publicly stated that we know privately ourselves, but we haven't got the nerve to get up and admit it, and when some person brings to our attention something we already know, we feign modesty and we feel that the public has been outraged and decency has been shocked when as a matter of fact we know all these things ourselves.

[See current volume, pages 263, 906.]



Reactionaries Refuse to Debate.

Under date of September 28 the National Association for Constitutional Government, in a letter to the National Popular Government League, declined to debate the proposed Gateway Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The letter was signed by Charles Ray Dean, Secretary. The essential parts of it follow:

It is . . . a source of regret that you find it

desirable to oppose the distinction between a fundamental law, as a guarantee of certain inalienable rights and liberties, and mere legislative experiments the scope of which such a fundamental law is designed to limit. If we rightly understand your intentions, they are to render the Federal Constitution changeable at will by a majority of popular votes cast for or against any suggested alteration; which would remove all obstructions to mere majority legislation regardless of its character. Further, you propose to substitute for deliberate examination and discussion by competent persons a popular plebiscite, by which any law might be imposed upon the community, or defeated, by a majority of "Yes" or "No" votes cast without regard to the amount of consideration given to the question at issue by the individual voter.

You are quite right in your inference that our Association opposes both of these proposals. We oppose the first on the ground that there are certain inherent and inalienable personal rights and liberties which governments may not justly take away, either by the armed force of a prince or by the preponderant votes of the people; for mere numbers are, after all, only a form of arbitrary power, and mere power is not a rightful basis of government. Unlimited power of legislation leaves the minority wholly without defense.

We oppose the substitution of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall for the present constitutional methods of legislation for the reason that such a system would not only make the judgment of the competent and the incompetent of equal value when applied to questions of national importance, but through the inattention of citizens preoccupied with their private affairs and the persistent and sometimes personally interested efforts of others would permit legislation of an injurious character to be passed by a mere majority of votes actually cast, although, as has frequently proved to be the case, they might be only a small percentage of the qualified voters.

We oppose the combination of your two proposals on the ground that private enterprise of every kind would be intimidated if not paralyzed by the uncertainty of what to expect from a flood of purely experimental legislation by which not only all business but the very foundations of society might be affected. This calamity would not be felt so much by the very rich, who always have means of caring for themselves, as by the young men and men of middle age, who would be discouraged from new enterprises by the uncertainty of the future, and by the wage-earners of the country, who are dependent upon a healthy tone in the business world for the advancement of their interests and even for an opportunity to find employment.

We trust, gentlemen, that you will credit our Association with a sincerity of purpose and a vital interest in the welfare of all classes of our citizens at least equal to your own, and that you will not consider us as in any sense representing the "elective oligarchies" and "invisible influences" to which you refer in your letter, and to which we are equally opposed with yourselves.

With regard to your proposal that a formal debate be organized between representatives of the two societies, . . . the aim of the Association being

educational and not controversial, we cannot undertake to arrange for a debate of the kind you seem to have in mind. We think it preferable to state our position in our own way, and you are of course at perfect liberty to do the same.

In conclusion, permit us to say that in our efforts to sustain the cause we have espoused we do not intend to deal in personalities, or permit our convictions to be influenced by the attitude on other matters of some of those who share them with us. We regret to be compelled to think from the tone of your letter that you have not the same intention of confining yourselves to the discussion of principles, but are inclined to overcloud the subject with merely personal prejudices. If it were needed, this would be a conclusive reason why we could not consent to arrange such a debate as you propose. We could not submit to any reflections upon our Association because of prejudice against those by whom it is or is not "approved"; and, on the other hand, we could not consent to put ourselves in the position of retorting to such insinuations by reference to the avowed purposes of some of the organizations that support your League.

[See current volume, pages 924, 954.]



The answer of the Popular Government League, signed by Executive Secretary Judson King, was in part as follows:

We regret that you do not consider a public debate between able and distinguished men upon the subjects in question of educational value. We regard it quite otherwise.

It is surprising to us that our mention of Hon. Elihu Root, Prof. William H. Taft, Hon. Alton B. Parker and Hon. Julius C. Burrows as supporters of your organization should be interpreted by you as an attempt on our part to "overcloud the subject with merely personal prejudices." You go on to say, "We could not submit to any reflections upon our Association because of the prejudice against those by whom it is or is not 'approved'; and, on the other hand, we could not consent to put ourselves in the position of retorting to such insinuations by reference to the avowed purpose of some of the organizations that support your League."

Permit us to assure you that we will not regard as a reflection upon our League any mention you may make of the purposes of the American Federation of Labor, the National Farmers' Union, the United Mine Workers of America or the various farm granges or other civic and reform organizations affiliated with us, nor will we charge you with "insinuating" anything by your mentioning in any of your communications or literature the names of our officers or members. We disclaim any purpose of attempting to stigmatize your Association by our reference to the distinguished gentlemen who support your cause. Your sub-conscious excitement is unwarranted.

We are pleased that you now definitely state that you are opposed to the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. Your declaration to the effect that majority rule "is not a rightful basis of government" will interest, if not astonish, the American people. It is paramount to saying that the real sovereignty of this nation lies not in the people but in the Consti-

tution, which is supposed to be an instrument of their creation. Will you be good enough to inform us who then is to designate, and by what process determine, what shall and shall not be contained in our Constitution?

You prophesy that the introduction of majority rule will be followed by business and industrial paralysis. This oncoming "calamity" causes you to express solicitude, not for the very rich but for the wage-earners of the country. We have more confidence than you in the intelligence and integrity of the American people. Why are wage-earners and farmers so overwhelmingly in favor of majority rule? Are they incapable of taking care of themselves?

You ask us to credit you with sincerity of purpose and not consider you "in any sense representing the 'elective oligarchies' and 'invisible influences'" to which we referred in our letter as existing under the present system.

Your attitude forces us to the belief that your Association cannot stand the light of publicity, cannot stand open debate, cannot stand public scrutiny of your reasons; and, while we have not charged you with representing invisible influences, we say without hesitation that the minority rule which you advocate and your hostility to majority rule favor a form of government peculiarly subject to the control of invisible influences, from which this country has so keenly suffered.



Army and Navy Increase Planned.

Plans for army and navy increase recommended by Secretary of War Garrison and Secretary of the Navy Daniels were published on October 15. These plans will require appropriations for 1916 of \$405,000,000 for both army and navy, an increase of \$147,000,000 over the past year. For the navy \$221,000,000 is to be asked, an increase of \$72,000,000. For the army \$184,000,000 is to be asked, an increase of \$75,000,000. During the next five years there are to be built 10 dreadnoughts, 6 battle cruisers, 25 scout cruisers, 80 destroyers and 125 submarines. The army is to be increased to 140,000 men and a reserve of 400,000 men to be provided in addition. [See current volume, pages 717, 861.]



Panama Canal.

Major General Goethals reported under date of October 13, details of the recent slide in Gaillard Cut that has put the Canal temporarily out of commission. Of the extent of this movement of earth, which began October 14, 1914, the report says:

Length of channel involved 1,300 feet, of which 200 feet has present width of twenty-five feet and depth of three to fifteen feet. For week ending Oct. 9, 209,000 cubic yards of material were dredged, but as the movement continued the result has been to maintain only what slides left in the first instance. Canal is therefore physically closed temporarily. On the east side bank is upward of 300 feet above canal level and on the west side varies from 300 to 400 feet above. Material in settling and moving

creates earth waves with deep depressions behind, those being some 500 to 600 feet from the canal prism with elevations of sixty to eighty feet above water surface. These waves undoubtedly counter-balance weight of broken mass on either side, and when removed may cause another similar movement, hence impossibility of making any prediction as to date of reopening.

General Goethals has advised commanders of ships now in Canal waters to proceed by other routes. [See current volume, page 1006.]



Mexico.

Secretary Lansing and the members of the Pan-American conference on Mexican affairs, at a meeting on the 18th, agreed upon a form of recognition for their respective governments. Secretary Lansing after the meeting made the following announcement:

The conferees under instruction from their several governments will recognize tomorrow the de facto government of Mexico of which General Carranza is the chief executive.

Generals Villa and Zapata will be treated as insurgents, and the shipment of arms to them will be placed under an embargo, in accordance with the joint resolution passed by Congress in March, 1912. [See current volume, page 1002.]



General Villa's fortunes appear to be rapidly waning. Guaymas, the only seaport of importance in his possession, has been taken by the Carranza forces. Wholesale desertions are wearing away his army. General Rodolfo Fierro, his leading general, has quit his cause.



European War.

No decisive actions have taken place at any point. The Russians continue to hold the Germans in check south of Rigi. Dvinsk resists all attempts of General Von Hindenburg, while the Russians have made some offensive movements. In Galicia the Austrians are still giving way before the Russians, though the progress of the latter is slow. Indications are that the Teutonic forces are now directed toward the drive through the Balkans. [See current volume, page 1001.]

Heavy fighting has been almost continuous on the western front in the Champagne district, and near Souchez; but little change in the line has been made. In the Vosges Mountains of Alsace the struggle between the Germans and French has been fierce, and severe losses on both sides mark a slight advance by the French. Hartmanns-Weilerkopf changed hands several times, but finally remains with the French. Heavy artillery firing marks the fighting all along the western front.



The Balkans continue to hold the chief interest. The three German armies invading Serbia, two on

the north crossing the Danube and the Save, and the third crossing the Drina on the northeast, have established themselves within the country. The Serbian forces are retreating slowly toward the mountains, where they will make their final stand. Very heavy losses are said to mark the advance of the Teutonic forces. The Serbians are threatened by the Bulgarians, who are advancing from the east to attack them in the rear and flank, and to cut the railroad north of Nish, over which the Allies hope to move. Another Bulgarian force, striking at the Nish-Saloniki road a little north of the Greek border, was met and defeated by the Allies advancing from Saloniki. The Bulgarians were driven back into their own territory, where they were forced to surrender the fortified town of Strumnitza. The Allies continue to land troops at Saloniki. They have also taken possession of Enos, which was recently ceded to Bulgaria by Turkey, and which offers a base for an attack on Bulgaria's chief port, Dedeagatch, as well as for land operations against Turkey. Montenegro is actively aiding Serbia by operations against the Austrian forces on her northern border. Greece and Roumania continue to maintain armed neutrality. Great Britain, France and Italy have followed Serbia in formally declaring war on Bulgaria.



Italy is pushing her campaign against Austria with more vigor, with a view to compelling the Teutonic powers to withdraw some of their forces from the Serbian campaign. Progress on the Isonzo River has been made that foreshadows the fall of Goritz. No new developments are reported from the Dardanelles.



Little activity is reported of sea operations. The German admiralty announces that since the breaking out of the war it has sunk 610 ships, including transports and fishing boats, representing a tonnage of 1,055,608 tons. British submarines now appear to be taking greater toll of German shipping than the Germans are taking of the British. Undersea boats from England have made their way into the Baltic Sea, where, operating from Russian harbors, they have sunk a number of German vessels, and interrupted trade.



The most fatal Zeppelin visit to England occurred on the 14th, when bombs were dropped at random on the city of London shortly after midnight. The number of persons killed is reported to be 55, of whom 14 only had military connection, and the wounded is given as 140, of whom 13 were connected with military establishments. A large number of those killed and wounded were women and children. Some property was destroyed, but no military damage was done.



British public opinion is impatient at the turn

of affairs in the Balkans, and the lack of progress at the Dardanelles. General Ian Hamilton has been succeeded in command at the Dardanelles by Major General Charles Carmichael Monro. Sir Edward Carson, Attorney General, has resigned from the cabinet as a protest against what he believes to be a lack of vigor in pushing military operations. Conscription continues to be a live issue, with the cabinet divided. The Daily News estimates the issue as having the support of nine members, and the opposition of twelve.

NEWS NOTES

—Three thousand spectators witnessed a public hanging at Murphysboro, Ill., on October 16.

—The trial of directors of the New Haven Railroad, on charges of violating the Sherman anti-trust law, began at New York on October 13. [See vol. xvii, p. 683.]

—More than 3,000 persons registered at Minot, N. D., on October 18 for a chance to file on one of the 700 homesteads in the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation to be opened for entry in May.

—The California State Railroad Commission decided on October 7 that the jitney bus is not a public utility and is not subject as such to laws applying to railroads and trolley lines. [See current volume, pages 566, 573.]

—The reprieve of Joseph Hillstrom, sentenced to be shot at Salt Lake City, expired on October 16. He was denied a commutation and was resentenced on October 18 to die on November 19. [See current volume, page 984.]

—After excluding the magazine *Fatherland* and *The Gaelic American* from the Passaic, N. J., public library, the trustees, on September 29, in response to many protests, voted to readmit the papers. [See current volume, page 933.]

—Of New York State's total population about 9,700,000, only 2,500,000 live in the rural districts, according to a report of Secretary of State Frances M. Hugo on October 17. New York City has more than half of the population of the State.

—F. J. Dixon of Winnipeg, member of the provincial parliament, and prominent in the direct legislation and singletax movement of Manitoba, will speak in Chicago on October 22 at the City Club at noon, and at the Singletax Club in the evening.

—Senator Ashurst of Arizona announced his intention on October 8 to introduce a resolution when Congress opens to provide for the printing of 50,000 copies of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations. [See current volume, pages 834, 929, 973.]

—On recommendation of Secretaries Lane and Houston, President Wilson on October 14 issued an order abolishing the national forest of 138,000 acres in western Kansas. It will be opened to settlement on November 1. The land office is at Dodge City, Kansas.

—Mayor Joseph E. Bell, of Indianapolis, was acquitted on October 13, of the charge of conspiracy. He had been on trial for five weeks. He had been

indicted with Thomas Taggart and others in a case growing out of a recent election. [See current volume, page 645.]

—A poll taken by the *Literary Digest* of the press of the United States on Suffrage resulted, as announced on October 12, in 526 replies from 1,000 papers interrogated. Of the replies, 391 were affirmative, 97 negative and 38 undecided. [See current volume, page 1005.]

—Potash in paying quantities has been discovered in Piute County, Utah, by a special agent of the United States Geological Survey. A vein ten feet wide and of unknown depth has been traced for 3,500 feet. Germany has heretofore been the chief source of supply, the imports into the United States in 1913 amounting to \$15,000,000.

—Among the speakers announced to be at Ford Hall, Boston, this season are Francis Nellson, M. P., on October 31, Kate Barnard on November 14; Louis F. Post on November 21, Mrs. Havelock Ellis on November 28, Frank P. Walsh on January 9, George L. Record on January 23, and Professor Scott Nearing on February 27.

—The Supreme Court of Iowa on October 7 decided in a case that came up from Carroll County, that school teachers may wear a religious garb in the school room, may read from any version of the Bible, may recite prayers and hang religious pictures on the school room walls. The case resulted from objections to the action of the trustees of Maple River who, while the local school house was being repaired, had rented for public school purposes a room in a Catholic school.

PRESS OPINIONS

An Ominous Tendency.

Kansas City (Mo.) Post, Oct. 15.—The agricultural lands of the United States rapidly are passing into a new era—the absentee landlord and tenant era. It already has obtained a firm foothold, has this custom which brings so many misfortunes in its trail. Lack of employment, destitution, high cost of foods and the most vital evil of all, lack of opportunity, are among the growing wrongs which this system will increase. The profits and rewards of factories and mines and of other great industries are denied the real workers in them. The custom is so well established that it escapes notice of all but the few. Is agriculture to follow suit? Are we to have a vast land owning class and a body of serfs working for them, sustaining them in the control of the area of land to which you and you and you were born?

Dollar Patriotism.

Coast Seamen's Journal, October 13.—"Hauling down the American flag" has been adopted as the stock phrase of the gentry who have driven the American seamen from the oceans and substituted Orientals. But no incident will better illustrate our local coolie-lovers' devotion to the American flag than the little story about thousands upon thousands of tiny silk American flags said to be held at the San Francisco custom house because the receivers of

the goods can not very well use them as intended. The story is to the effect that the noble coolie-patriots conceived of an ingenious scheme to discredit the new Seamen's law. The idea was to distribute thousands of these tiny flags, attached to a wee little masthead with the inscription "This flag needs your help. Only five of them remain on the Pacific." . . . But like its originators the appeal was coolettainted. The beautiful little flags were "Made in Japan." And when the bogus patriots discovered that there is a law which requires all articles made abroad, and intended for individual distribution, to be stamped as having been manufactured in the country of their origin there was consternation in the "American" coolie lovers' camp. At any rate, it is reported that the flags are still in the custom house for the schemers have arrived at the conclusion that the "Made in Japan" inscription would not carry a particularly logical appeal to the heart and head of the average American. Oh, patriotism, what crimes are committed in thy name!



A Matter of Justice.

Edmund B. Osborne in Newark (N. J.) News, Oct. 9.—I became an equal Suffragist more than twenty years ago. I had never heard a Suffrage speech nor seen an "Anti." Suffrage was in no sense an issue then in Iowa. I just got interested in the subject and settled it, so it has stayed settled ever since. I knew my mother was as well fitted for citizenship as my father. In fact, her judgment on the average was better than his. I knew my sister was quite as intelligent and conscientious as her two brothers. I was certain my wife was fully as competent to vote wisely as I was. And I was sure that I was no exception—that the average man's mother and sister and wife were as well fitted for voting as the average woman's father and brother and husband. I knew that women were benefited by good government and injured by bad government exactly the same as men. Why shouldn't women vote then? I asked myself. There was only one answer, "She is, as a matter of justice, entitled to vote on the same terms as men."

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

SONG OF THE WORKING GIRLS

Harriet Monroe in *Life and Labor*.

Sisters of the whirling wheel
Are we all day;
Builders of a house of steel
On Time's highway,
Giving bravely, hour by hour,
All we have of youth and power.

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Fingers fly and engines boom
The livelong day,
Through far fields when roses bloom
The soft winds play.
Vast the work is—sound and true
Be the tower we build for you!

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Ours the future is—we face
The whole world's needs.
In our hearts the coming race
For life's joy pleads.
As you make us—slaves or free—
So the men unborn shall be.

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.



INVESTIGATING THE ANTIS.

Floyd Dell in *The Masses*.

"Vote No!" the banner screamed at me. I went in. The elevator starter informed me that some noble women, animated by a keen sense of political duty, and fearful that the men of New York State might vote wrong if left to themselves, had set up shop here to teach what was what. On the third floor I would find them, he said, equipped with campaign literature, speakers and an educational phonograph. I went up. . . .

When I entered the other door the educational phonograph was being played. I gathered that it was an anti-suffrage speech. A very efficient woman in a shirtwaist and stiff color stood listening. Two men occupied chairs. I also listened, curiously. In a flat metallic voice the machine was saying: "Chivalry must be preserved." Knowing something of the laws of chivalry, I glanced quickly at the two men, expecting them to leap shamefacedly to their feet and offer their chairs to the standing lady. But they continued to sit.

I listened to the machine again. It was saying: "Woman's place is in the home." I looked at the woman. She was nodding approval.

"That's a good record," she said as it finished. The men agreed with her hastily. . . .

When the woman had finished making arrangements for the sale or rent of a certain number of the records, and the men had gone, she turned to me.

"What can I do for you?" she asked.

"Do for me? What could you do for me but continue to be what you are—a woman! I beg you, dear madam, to preserve those peerless prerogatives inherent in your sex, those charms and

graces which exalt you and make you the ornament and devoted companion of man. You are indeed a queen, and your empire is the domestic kingdom. The greatest triumphs you would achieve in public life fade into insignificance, madam—fade into insignificance, I say, compared with the serene glory which radiates from the domestic shrine, which you illumine and warm by conjugal and motherly virtues!"

I might have said this, quoting from the statement by Cardinal Gibbons, which I held in my hand. But I didn't. I was afraid she would think I was crazy. I merely said: "I want to get some of your literature."

"Certainly," she said, and proceeded to sell me 50 cents' worth. At least she charged me 50 cents for it.

In one of the pamphlets I read, while standing there, of the shyness with which the women who opposed woman suffrage had to contend. "They confessed," said the pamphlet, "to a struggle before they could make up their minds to come forward."

I looked at the woman before me with a new admiration. Had she had to struggle with herself before she could come forward and sell anti-suffrage pamphlets? No doubt, no doubt. But, like a Spartan mother, she concealed her agony. She did up my pamphlets without a trace of suffering and took my 50 cents with apparent cheerfulness. One would have thought she actually *enjoyed* being there in that public place and talking to casual strangers. One might even have imagined that she preferred it to the sacred duty of cooking. She looked as if she relished the idea of earning \$25 a week. Ah! thought I—the heroism and the hypocrisy of woman!

But I was only beginning to learn—Fifty cents! Those pamphlets are worth thousands of dollars to me if they are worth a cent! I learned about women from them. . . .

Dr. Charles L. Dana, he of the 1880 medical college, put me on the right track. "*There are,*" he says, and I italicise the words, "*some fundamental differences between the bony and the nervous structures of women and men. The brain-stem of woman is relatively—*" But I cannot go on with it—it is too painful. Suffice it to say that there are differences between the sexes. "I do not say," concedes Dr. Dana magnanimously, "that they will prevent a woman from voting, but they will prevent her from ever becoming a man. . . ." I had not thought of that! . . .

These things, innocent as they always seemed to me, have marked woman as a thing apart from the life of mankind. She does not think as man thinks; her whole psychology is deranged by the fact of her sex; much of the time she is practically insane, and at no time is she to be trusted to take part in man's affairs. She is chronically queer; of an "unstable preciosity." She is not in fact a

person at all, capable of thinking and acting for herself; others must think and act for her. If permitted to behave as a free and independent human being, she would do injury to herself and the community. . . .

But the pamphlets puzzle me. Having established these dark facts about woman, they tell you to cherish her, worship her, make her the queen of the kitchen and the nursery and the bedroom, the consolation and delight of your life. *Why*, I should like to know? . . .

And yet—can these people be mistaken?—I have known women who were mothers; I have seen something of the discomfort and the delight that children bring; I have helped put crying babies to sleep, and felt the delicious softness of infantile flesh against my cheek. And in all this there seemed to be nothing dehumanizing. I never failed to regard woman, in spite of her babies, as a person, a fellow human being.

What if I were right, after all?

THE SEX OF DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS.

For The Public.

The thinking world, for the past century, has been turning its attention, with an ever increasing intensity upon the questions concerning woman's place in the scheme of things. Even where facts have been inconclusive, controversy has raged. A ray of light may perhaps be thrown on the factual side of the problem by an inquiry into the relative numbers of women and of men who have done noteworthy things.

The most available list of distinguished Americans is found in "Who's Who in America." The volume for 1912-13 contains 18,794 names—a list purporting to include the distinguished persons in every walk of public life. The compilation is of necessity incomplete. There are, of course, omissions; while the mere inclusion of a name in the list is no guarantee of distinction. On the whole, however, it is a fairly representative list.

The data in "Who's Who" was studied in the following manner. A schedule was arranged to show, first the profession; second, the decade of birth; and third, the place of birth of persons of native birth, taking the names consecutively, beginning with the first page of the volume. Information was tabulated for the first 10,000 native born persons, with the idea that the generalization for the first 10,000 names might be applied with safety to the names in the remainder of the volume.*

The most impressive fact which the study of sex distribution among distinguished Americans brings to light is the phenomenally small proportion of women whose names are included. Among

*The first 10,000 native born persons were found among the first 11,208 names.

the first 10,000 names of American born persons appearing in "Who's Who," only 770 are the names of women. The figures, classified by occupation, show some marked inequalities.

Table I. Sex Distribution of the First 10,000 American Born Persons in "Who's Who In America" (1912-13) by Occupation.

Occupation.	Total.	Men.	Women.
Educators	1,932	1,826	106
Lawyers	1,354	1,349	5
Business men	998	994	4
Public office holders.....	1,346	1,344	2
Authors	908	519	389
Clergy	732	726	6
Doctors	619	606	13
Scientists	614	600	14
Journalists	595	543	52
Miscellaneous	902	723	179
Total	10,000	9,230	770

The women listed among the first 10,000 names in "Who's Who" constitute 7.7 per cent of the whole. There are four occupations as classified in Table I, for which the distinguished women are practically non-existent, and two others in which they make but a sorry showing. Lawyers, Business Men, Public Office Holders and Clergymen include 4,413 men or 48 per cent of the total number of distinguished men. The same four occupations report 17 women or 2 per cent of the distinguished women. Add to these four occupations, Doctors and Scientists and the aggregate of the six occupations is 5,619 (61 per cent of all distinguished men). The same six occupations report only 44 (6 per cent of the distinguished women). The six occupations, Lawyers, Business Men, Public Office Holders, Clergy, Doctors and Scientists report 5,619 distinguished men and 44 distinguished women—a ratio of 8 women to 1,000 men.

The great bulk of the distinguished women listed among the first 10,000 native born persons in "Who's Who" are Educators, Authors, or Journalists. These three occupations, with 2,888 distinguished men (31 per cent of the total number) have 547 distinguished women (71 per cent of the total number). In these three occupations the ratio of women to men is 183 per 1,000 or somewhat less than 1 to 5.

The one occupation in which women approach men is that of Author. Among the 908 authors listed from the first 10,000 American born persons in "Who's Who," 389 (43 per cent) are women. At the same time, the 389 women authors comprise almost exactly one-half of all the distinguished women whose names appear in "Who's Who."

This showing takes on peculiar significance in view of the fact that until within the last thirty or forty years, women were practically excluded from law, public office, the ministry, medicine,

and higher education, while they were admitted, with some degree of freedom to the fields of education and journalism, and could not, in the very nature of the case, be excluded from authorship. It may be true, as some students urge, that women are peculiarly adapted to emotional activities, of which certain lines of literary achievement are typical. At the same time, the searcher after truth may point with equal justification to the fact that women occupy a position commensurate with that occupied by men in the one profession where they have been given an opportunity.

The figures dealing with decade of birth lend immense emphasis to the idea that the failure of women to attain positions of distinction has been due, in the past, to the restriction in opportunity.

Women have been free to enter upon careers that led to public distinction only within the past thirty or forty years. Extensive higher education for women does not date back more than twenty or twenty-five years. The great majority (82 per cent) of the distinguished persons under consideration were born before 1870, which is forty-five years ago.

Table II. Sex Distribution of the First 10,000 American Born Persons in "Who's Who In America" (1912-13) by Decade of Birth.

Decade of Birth.	Total.	Men.	Women per 100 men.
Before 1850	2,818	2,687	131 5
1850-59	2,715	2,595	120 5
1860-69	2,717	2,559	158 6
1870-79	1,304	1,194	110 9
1880-89	95	74	21 28
1890-99	2	1	1 100
No age	349	120	229 ...
Total	10,000	9,230	770 8

The figures given in Table II are in one sense unsatisfactory because of the large proportion (one-third) of the women who gave no age. From the table as it stands, one fact of striking significance appears. Before 1870 the ratio of distinguished women to distinguished men is almost exactly the same—about 1 to 20. Within the next decade, 1870-79, the ratio advances to 1 to 11, and in the next decade it is only a little more than 1 to 3; while in the last decade for which figures are available, it is 1 to 1. No right thinking person would even suggest that the figures for the decade 1890-1899 are in any sense significant; even the figures for the decade 1880-89 are open to serious misinterpretation. At the same time, it is a profoundly significant fact that the opening of opportunity to women during the past three decades seems to be bearing fruit in the rapid increase of feminine achievement.

Additional weight is lent to this argument by an analysis of the ratio between distinguished women and distinguished men born in the twenty-seven cities of the United States, which had a population of 20,000 or over in 1850.

Table III. Sex Distribution of Those Persons Among the First 10,000 American Born Persons in "Who's Who in America" (1912-13) Who Were Born in the 27 Cities of the United States Having a Population of 20,000 or Over in 1850, Classified by Decade of Birth.

Decade of Birth.	Total.	Men.	Women per 100 men.	
Before 1850	613	588	25	4
1850-59	647	619	28	5
1860-69	617	573	44	8
1870-79	388	347	41	12
1880-89	40	29	11	38
No age	126	41	85	..
Total	2,431	2,197	234	11

Here, again, the low ratio of women to men, in the earlier decades, gives place to a rapidly increasing ratio during the last two decades. The argument need not be further stressed. It is sufficiently apparent on its face.

The argument in favor of the belief that increasing opportunity will result in increasing distinction for women is strengthened by another bit of evidence gleaned in the course of the general study. Time and time again it has been shown that the cities produce a larger share of distinguished persons per 1,000 of population than the rural districts. The same fact holds true here. In the country at large, the number of distinguished women per 100 distinguished men was 8. In the cities it is 11. Furthermore, a very few cities produced an unusually large proportion of women.

Table IV. Sex Distribution of the First 10,000 American Born Persons in "Who's Who in America" (1912-13) for Certain Selected Cities.

	Men.	Women per 100 men.	
United States	9,230	770	8
27 Cities	2,197	234	11
Boston	254	32	12
Cambridge	40	7	17
Chicago	98	14	14
New Orleans	32	9	28
New York City.....	445	52	11
Philadelphia	283	31	11
Rochester	20	7	35
San Francisco	42	6	14

All of the figures seem to lead in one direction—toward the conclusion that as opportunities are placed before women, they will, to a greater and greater degree, take their place among the distinguished persons of the day. While figures are never conclusive, their trend is frequently significant. Argument which has been rife on this point, has held, as a general proposition that the increasing opportunities which the present generation has placed before women, must result in an increase in feminine achievement. In so far as these facts carry weight, they substantiate this genial belief.

SCOTT NEARING.

A WORKING MAN'S REPLY TO "MEN WANTED FOR THE ARMY."

For The Public.

I'm "wanted to go in the army."
Well, what would they give me to do?
"You'll have to be killing your brothers
If one of them doesn't kill you."

I'm "wanted to go in the army."
Say, what is there in it for me?
"You'd help to be saving your country
From brother-men over the sea."

My country? Who says I've a country?
I live in another man's flat
That hasn't so much as a door yard—
And why should I battle for that?

I haven't a lot nor a building,
No flower, no garden, no tree.
The landlords have gobbled the country—
Let them do the fighting, not me.

CELIA BALDWIN WHITEHEAD.

BOOKS

THE RURAL PROBLEM.

The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education.
By Albert H. Leake. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. Price \$2 net.

One does not associate the names of Hart, Shaffner and Marx with the study of economics, and yet the house of Houghton, Mifflin Co. is advertising almost two dozen titles, including such subjects as Socialism, Freight Classification, Ship Subsidies, the Panic of 1893, besides many others of equal value and interest. These are prize essays on subjects chosen by a committee composed of Professors J. L. Laughlin, J. B. Clark of the Columbia University, Henry C. Adams of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Horace White and Edwin F. Gray.

Albert H. Leake is the author of two of the volumes, *Industrial Education: Its Problems, Methods and Dangers*, and *Methods of Agricultural Education*. The latter work is a genuine attempt to consider the problem, "How the agricultural land may be made to produce an adequate food supply for the rapidly growing population, while at the same time provision is made for such social and educational advantages as will induce the best of our country people to remain in the open country."

In sufficiently thorough manner, the author reviews the many attempts made to improve educational conditions in the country to educate the farmer and his children, to bring the city and the farm into closer connection and points to the example set by Denmark in its progressive educa-

tional movements. And all this makes good reading, pleasantly presented.

But Mr. Leake seems to have missed the point—he has not put his finger on the real cause of the labor shortage in the country side. The fact is that the farmer boy is attracted to the city by the lure of higher wages. And the farmer, on the other hand, fully realizes that the low wages he is able to pay offers no great inducement to the boy of spirit. For, after all, the majority of boys on the farm have themselves an ambition to own a farm, and only leave that which they fully concede to be a better life, because as they imagine, the city for a few years offers a better opportunity to save something than the country. That the illusion is soon dispelled is not to the point.

Any talk of an application of the Singletax frightens farmers. As Herbert Bigelow says: "Plan your campaign without reference to a tax on land values. Call it rather the elimination of the burdensome tax now placed on the farmer." And Bigelow is quite right, and supplies the answer to the problem sought by Mr. Leake. Once cease taxing the farmer for his productivity and you enable him to pay better wages. Once let him be able to pay better wages and the passage of the farm boy to the city will cease. And the rest will follow.

CHAS J. FINGER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—Voting Trusts. By Harry A. Cushing. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.50 net.

—Paris Reborn. By Herbert Adams Gibbons. Published by the Century Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$2.00 net.

—The Normans in European History. By Charles Homer Haskins. Published by Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1915. Price, \$2.00 net.

—The Last Incarnation. Translated from the French of A. Constant. Published by Richard G. Badger, Boston. Price, \$1.00 net.

—Health and Power Through Creation. By Paul Ellsworth. Published by the Elizabeth Towne Co., Holyoke, Mass. 1915. Price, \$1.10 postpaid.

—The New Philosophy of Money. By Alfred B. Westrup. Second Edition. Published by Maud Denning Westrup, 539 E. 42nd Pl., Chicago. 1915. Price, \$1.00.

—The Life and Letters of John Hay. In Two Volumes. By William Roscoe Thayer. Published by Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1915. Price, the set, \$5.00 net.

—The Work of Our Hands: A Study of Occupations for Invalids. By Herbert J. Hall and Mertice M. C. Buck. Published by Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. 1915. Price, \$1.50 net.

Men in earnest have no time to waste in patching fig leaves for the naked truth.—Lowell.

PERIODICALS

Dynamic Faith.

One does not often see in magazines nowadays such an article as that by Samuel McComb, published in the *Contemporary Review* and reprinted in the *Living Age* of Oct. 9. The title of the article is "Faith as a Dynamic." Our age has been so intensely a scientific age that we have been in danger of losing sight altogether of the side of life which may, if you please, be called mystical. Not that faith is all mystical, for the intellect and the emotions have a part in the act. But faith depends upon intellect and will plus that something else. "Now we cannot all be mystics," says the author, "and experience that all-absorbing faith which is the divine air inbreathed by the masters of the spiritual life; but we can all be more mystical than we are, and we can all have a real faith, even though it may be at a lower level." Again he says: "Faith is sustained by hidden forces that make it triumphant over all obstacles. . . . No man ever achieved anything worth achieving without a measure of faith." We can see the author's argument by taking a concrete case. Take the faith of the supporters of some great movement like the Singletax. Can we not see that in addition to the intellectual vision and the emotional element there is that other something which gives the triumphal note? How splendidly, in all its fullness, Henry George had this triumphal note of faith. The absence of faith brings lifelessness and indifference. Let us quote in full the author's illustration: "Take, for example," he says, "faith in democracy. One of the saddest features of our age is the decay of this faith among young people, for which, perhaps, our colleges and universities are in some degree to blame. On the other hand, it was never so strong as now among persons of maturer age. The man who has once been possessed by this high trust in humanity can never lose its noble inspiration. His faith is not blind, for faith is not the absence but the presence of vision. He sees the coarseness and the commonness of popular rule. He marks how often its leaders are demagogues, inspired by corrupt motives; how, under the guise of advancing the doctrine of equality, its advocates meet culture and refinement with only jealous contempt. Yet he believes in democracy, for he believes in freedom, in humanity, and in the goodness of man's fundamental instincts. Did he not so believe he would fall into self-despair." The quotation is long, but it is worth pondering for its own sake as well as in illustration of the author's thesis.

J. H. DILLARD.

Singletax Review.

The September-October number of *The Singletax Review* (150 Nassau St., New York; price, 25 cents), has a full report of the San Francisco conference taken from the official minutes. This should be especially interesting not only to those who attended but to all who are interested in what took place. There is also the usual bi-monthly news letter and interesting articles on various subjects.

S. D.

"Jimmie, your face is dirty again this morning," exclaimed the teacher. "What would you say if I came to school every day with a dirty face?"

"I'd be too perlitte," grunted Jimmie, "to say anything."—Sacred Heart Review.



Some one noticed that Pat was ambidextrous. "When I was a boy," he explained, "me father always said to me: 'Pat, learn to cut yer finger-nails wid yer left hand, for some day ye might lose yer right hand.'"—Boston Transcript.

"Do you take any periodicals?" asked the clergyman on his first round of parish visits.

"Well, I don't," replied the woman, "but my husband takes 'em frequent. I do wish you'd try to get him to sign the pledge."—Sacred Heart Review.

**Old Age Pensions for All Members
Proportional Representation
Initiative, Referendum and Recall
All Operating in the**

Brotherhood of the Commonwealth

—Founded by Charles Frederick Adams, 1904.

All members divided into Year Classes (year of birth determines Year Class).

All members agree to leave at death all dues which they have paid into this Order to surviving members of their Year Classes.

Dividends on Basis (dues plus Inheritances) may be drawn, used to pay dues with, or left to accumulate annually.

Inheritances of Deceased members and Lapsed members (seven-year consecutive non-payment of dues lapses a member) apportioned annually in ratio to Capital or Basis of members.

Members neglecting to pay dues forfeit cash and Increment (inheritance) Dividends for that year.

Everybody admitted, Male or Female, Children or Adults. No age limit. No medical examination. No investigation. No initiating ceremony. Free as a savings bank.

Local Councils have own By-Laws.

\$1.00 Initiation Fee, \$1.00 Annual Dues, or more if desired by member. Each \$ represents Tontine share.

Treasurer is bonded for all he can control and our investments are in guaranteed first mortgages, U. S. bonds, U. S. City and State bonds only.

Among our members are: Ex-Gov. Garvin, Louis F. Post, Lawson Purdy, Robert Baker, Henry George, Jr., Dan'l Kiefer, Comptroller of N. Y.; Wm. A. Prendergast, Stanley Bowmar of Public, Chas. H. Ingersoll, Joseph Dana Miller, F. C. Leubuscher, Byron W. Holt, Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, ex-Congressman Wm. M. Calder, Judge McGuire of Brooklyn.

Persons desiring membership without further information must send to the undersigned at least \$2.00 and state year of birth, full name, and agree to abide by rules as far as they understand them from this brief explanation.

CARL A. MORR, Treasurer,
273 11th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

**New York City
Tax Liens**

(Exempt from Local Taxation in
the City and State of
New York)

(And Exempt from Federal In-
come Tax)

EARN 7% NET

If you are interested write to

The Tax Lien Company of New York
68 William Street
NEW YORK CITY

**Special Prices on Two or More
Subscriptions to One
Address**

Two copies, 1 year	-	\$1.65
Three " " "	-	2.00
Ten " " "	-	5.00

BUNDLE PRICES: Bundles of any issue can be had, postpaid, at the following rates: Twenty-five copies, 50c; Fifty copies, 75c; 100 copies, \$1.25; 200 copies, \$2.00.

THE PUBLIC

Circulation Dept., Ellsworth Bldg.

CHICAGO

\$50 Cash Prize for the Best Singletax Poster

A reader of The Public has placed in our hands \$50 cash to be offered as a prize for the best poster illustrating the Singletax idea.

The size of the original must be 11 by 14 inches, or in that proportion.

The selection of the pictorial theme, manner of execution, and the wording, is left to the individual artist, with the reservation that colors—in entries where colors are used—must not exceed the three primaries, and it should be remembered that the design will be produced as a poster and as a poster stamp.

Quite subordinated, but still clear, the words, "Interested? Read The Public, Chicago; 50c, 26 issues" should appear, probably in one corner.

The competition will close on November 15, and all originals must be addressed to the Poster Competition Editor, The Public, Ellsworth Building, Chicago, Ill.

Return postage must be enclosed, if return of originals is desired. The winner will be announced in The Public of December 3, and in the January number of "The Poster," the editor of which is announcing the competition.

Artists who do not understand the Singletax can obtain literature from The Public's Book Department. Send 10c.

Each artist may submit as many designs as he desires, but every one must bear its individual identifying word or symbol on the back, which must be repeated on the outside of the sealed envelope enclosed with the design, containing the competitor's name and address.

Judges will be Will Carqueville, of the George Enos Throop Poster Advertising Co., Chicago; Frank D. Butler, Treasurer Illinois Singletax League; and Otto Cullman, President Chicago Singletax Club.

Copies of the winning poster will be distributed, at about cost of production, by the Circulation Department as soon as possible after the closing of the competition. Address all designs to

THE POSTER COMPETITION EDITOR
The Public **Ellsworth Building** **Chicago**