

the Recall; but it is for the most part as American citizens, not as obedient churchmen.

so, however, with our newer citizens from the continent of Europe. For the most part they come out of the Catholic church and fighting they are within it and blindly obeying its laws in all things. It is to this class that the Cardinal's political sermon addresses itself, and to this class that its condemnations may be applied by subservient parish priests. This is the class that is likely to take such condemnations as a warning to the great danger of American citizenship on the one hand and of Catholic freedom on the other.

The Denver Register implies that probably a Catholic who previously believed in the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall has changed his views because of the Cardinal's utterance. This is probably so, but it is not the important consideration. How many Catholics who previously had no opinion either way, may be brought to reason-proof? How many such will not be brought to anything at variance with the Cardinal's utterance? There is the important consid-

eration is another important consideration: What will be the effect of the Cardinal's sermon upon the utterance by Catholics who disagree with it? Even intelligent American citizens of Catholic faith who are not deceived by ecclesiastical masquerading in politics, are not they, at least, just a little more prudent than those who are not, a little more reserved, in advocating the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall? Are the arguments of the Denver Catholic Register, for example, open to a discussion of that question on the ground that it is as a problem of American citizenship? How many Catholic papers in the United States will say as much regarding the Cardinal's utterance as the Register has said? Have many Catholics who believe the Register's wise and true, even if they believe in discrimination? Among the Catholics who will vote for those reforms, there are many who have a just and reasonable fear, who would advocate them in the same companies with as much freedom now as they have, as the Cardinal condemned them in a sermon from the pulpit of his cathedral. And how many Catholics are there who, believing in those reforms, would feel as much at liberty now as they do, to follow the Cardinal's sermon to advocate them on the same terms with anything like the boldness, freedom, and independence with which Archbishop Ireland condemned them?

These are the primary questions for American Catholics to consider. When the Cardinal in America preaches from his ca-

thedral pulpit against direct election of Senators, the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall, and Archbishop Ireland boisterously echoes that sermon from civic platforms, shall all Catholic-Americans who think the other way—laymen, press and priest—either abjectly acquiesce or abjectly shrink back, letting those prelates *seem to command* effectively whether they do or not? If so, then difficult will it be for non-ecclesiastical Americans to defend Roman Catholic freedom under American institutions against attacks like this: "The chief issue is not whether the addition of the Initiative and the Referendum systems do or do not promote the general welfare, but whether the people shall protect themselves against the attacks by the Roman Catholic rulers. The Roman Catholic Church is ruled from the top, and it claims to and does exercise control over its subjects, and for it to dictate concerning the people's system of civil government in the United States is contrary to American ideals."* If our Catholic fellow citizens do not more publicly and pointedly and vigorously defend themselves against *appearances* of Roman Catholic obedience in politics to a foreign potentate, who can do it for them successfully and how?

*From a circular of the "Publicity Bureau Concerning Activity of Roman Catholic Rulers Against People's Rule in the United States." P. O. Box 81, Washington, D. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN CALIFORNIA.

Pasadena.

Our success for woman's suffrage is due almost wholly if not entirely to the Insurgent movement which first of all placed Hiram Johnson in the Governor's chair and along with him gave us a legislature wholly free from the domination of the Southern Pacific Railroad for the first time in forty years. Through that legislature and our splendid Governor we got the amendments passed and ready for submission to the people and during the campaign all those fine men talked for suffrage with as great enthusiasm as for the other amendments.

Suffrage was as much a part of the State-wide campaign as any other subject. I never can remember the time when Governors, Senators, Congressmen, Judges, Mayors and lesser lights from this State and others took up with such fervor the entire Insurgent movement, and woman suffrage had its full share of their consideration. The women did their part too but the men were splendid.

I wish to say this principally because I believe the State of Illinois will never secure the ballot for women until the men and women of that State unite for a State-wide agitation for the Direct Legislation measures. Only in that way will the States, one by one, be freed from the control of party politics and

machine bosses, and only in that way will the woman's vote be permitted to count for a great moral impetus in State and government affairs. Only in this way will men and women of all classes and all parties and all ideals be enabled to join forces for purity and progress.

There are great questions to be met and dealt with. The Land question, the Labor question, Taxation, the Social Evil and many others. Universal suffrage, Direct Legislation, democracy and the ballot are the weapons with which to fight the present crusade.

CHARLOTTE C. HEINEMAN.

* * *

HENRY GEORGE, JR., IN CALIFORNIA.

Berkeley, California, Oct. 22, 1911.

Congressman Henry George, Jr., has just closed a brilliant engagement in the metropolitan district around the bay of San Francisco, whence he went to the southern part of this State. The newspapers gave generous space to reports of these addresses, and more than a million residents of California have read something new about the Singletax propaganda through the coming of Mr. George, who spoke in Berkeley, Alameda, Oakland and San Francisco.

In Berkeley Mr. George spoke before the students of the University of California where he was introduced by Professor John Graham Brooks, of Cambridge, Mass., who is here delivering a year's course of lectures on political economy and sociology. Dr. Frank Soule, Professor of Civil Engineering, emeritus, presided during the period allotted for asking questions. At this point Dr. Soule made the statement that he heard the original lecture at the University by Henry George a generation ago; that he was then convinced of the soundness of the Single Tax doctrine; that subsequent study and investigation had confirmed him in this belief; that upon every occasion when opportunity offered he had carefully questioned professors and students of political economy in this University and elsewhere, touching this important subject, and he declared that he had never heard what he considered a valid objection to the principles laid down by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty." Hence he stands today, as he has stood for all these years, a thoroughgoing and unswerving champion of the Singletax philosophy. Dr. Soule, as his title indicates, is one of the veterans of the university.

An evening meeting was held in the auditorium of the Berkeley Polytechnic High School, the largest meeting place in the city of Berkeley outside the University grounds, and it was crowded from top to bottom. Not only were the seats on the platform filled with women and men (this being the first general gathering in Berkeley since the enfranchisement of women in California), but the flies and galleries of the stage far above the head of the speaker were thronged with interested auditors. Mr. George gave a delightful address, touching on the salient points of the development of public interest in and adoption of the Singletax doctrine, showing that the principle is being recognized in all civilized countries, and is being incorporated in the legislation of the most advanced nations. He has a fund of quiet humor that is most pleasing, and was frequently applauded. Mayor Wilson of Berkeley

indorsed all that the speaker of the evening had advanced, explaining that while all genuine Socialists are Singletaxers, not all Singletaxers are Socialists. The Mayor was elected as a Socialist. He drew attention to the Singletax plank that the platform of his party contained, and pledged himself to stand by this principle, and to give his aid in bringing about effective legislation. The new amendment to the Constitution of California allowing the Initiative gives the voters an opportunity to fashion laws to suit themselves; and he hopes to see a measure adopted throughout the State which shall grant to the people local option in the matter of taxation, and permit the enactment of general laws which shall allow cities and counties to change the present inequitable and unscientific methods of assessment and taxation. Mayor Wilson gave approval to the Berkeley Local Option Tax Reform League that has just been organized, and mentioned the cards of membership that had been distributed at the opening of the meeting. A large number of citizens of both sexes signed the cards, thus laying the foundation for a movement to secure a Constitutional amendment permitting local option in taxation.

A banquet was tendered to Mr. George at the Argonaut Hotel in San Francisco, October 19, at which James H. Barry was toastmaster. Mr. George was most happy in his address, and remarks were made by Mayor Wilson of Berkeley, Joseph Leggett, Congressman William Kent, Walter MacArthur, Professor O. K. Cushing, Judge James V. Coffey, Miss Solomons, Mrs. Lydia Coffin and others. While in this part of California Mr. George addressed the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, and the State Schoolmasters' Club.

WELLS DRURY.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

AS TO ANNA H. SHAW'S SPEECH.

Cleveland.

In your editorial of October 27 entitled "Woman Suffrage and Direct Legislation" you deplore the advice given by the President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association to woman suffragists of Ohio. Let me make a statement as to the position of the organized woman suffragists of this State towards the coming Constitutional Convention.

The Ohio Woman Suffrage Association in convention in Dayton last month voted to ask the Constitutional Convention to submit to the voters of the State a measure providing for full suffrage for women, as a separate proposition. In this way the woman suffrage question cannot endanger the Constitution proper, nor need it prove an embarrassment to friends of other progressive measures. The interest of the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association in direct legislation is not to be questioned. The service of its leading officers is well known to the most prominent promoters of the Initiative and Referendum in Ohio, to whom every possible assistance has been given in times past. All that the suffragists are asking now is that the principle of the Referendum be applied to their question. It will be much easier to secure a referendum from the Constitutional Convention than by means of petition after the Initiative and Refer-