

this superficial defect. Politicians seeking votes will be eager to do all and more for women than has been done for men. That is one reason for the suffrage. But will the establishment of these shelters, bureaus and agencies really dispose of the problem? In the midst of ever increasing wealth, and with the accompanying advantage of science and invention, must women and men depend upon the charity of the state to tide them over from one job to another? Suppose a slight re-arrangement were made in the management of the factors in production. Labor we have freed. How would it do to free the materials on which labor works? The primitive savage, with free access to natural opportunities, managed to live and reproduce his kind. Must we, armed with the thousand and one things that he lacked be content with less? Build shelters for unemployed women, but build them in such fashion that they can later on be used as libraries and museums to house the relics of an age when men and women seeking work were unable to find it.

S. C.

Woman Suffrage and Industrial Disorder.

Opposition to woman suffrage resorts to the same form of defective reasoning which leads tariff advocates to attribute low wages in England to "free trade," and to see no significance in the lower wages of protected countries of Continental Europe. Such reasoning is now indulged in by the Man Suffrage Association of New York. In a circular letter, designed to impress business men with the idea that equal suffrage means violence and disorder, it attributes to that democratic reform the industrial troubles of Colorado. That there have been similar troubles in places where women do not vote has no more significance to this association than the low wages of labor in protected Italy has to the protectionist who speaks of "free trade" England. One of the firms to which this letter was sent was that of Robert H. Ingersoll and Brother, the watch manufacturers, who returned the following reply:

August 14, 1914.

Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, Chairman,
Man Suffrage Association, 27 William St.,
New York City.

Dear Sir: You are correct as to this firm being interested in manufacture and other things mentioned in your letter. We are not, however, impressed that it is necessary to destroy all democratic movements in order to maintain these interests. The Woman Suffrage movement is one of democracy, toward which I hope this country is progressing, in spite of straws thrown in its path, some of which are hinted at in the circular accompanying your letter, the purport, however, of which

is not, to our mind, very lucidly stated. Colorado illustrates some things other than those you call attention to, notably the evils of monopoly of natural resources, which is in fact at the bottom of these and other questions that concern not only manufacturers, but society itself.

This letter gives the association some pertinent facts to consider. Will it consider them, or will it, like many other upholders of fallacies, disregard inconvenient facts and keep on repeating its original misstatement?

S. D.

Drifting from Our Moorings.

Professor Roscoe Pound of Harvard University, and director of the American Judicature Society, said in his convocation address before the University of Chicago:

Where yesterday our ideal was a government of laws, not of men, today our ideal is rather a vigorous government by strong men, with a minimum of judicial control. . . . Nothing was so characteristic in the nineteenth century as the completeness with which administrative action was tied down by legal liability and judicial review. . . . Today, on the other hand, the tendency is no less strong to take away judicial review of administrative action wherever it is constitutionally possible to do so and, where it is not possible, to cut down such review to the unavoidable minimum.

This summing up of national tendencies is fully warranted by the facts, and the reason, if one really wishes to find it, is not far to seek. Government by law is breaking down politically for the same reason that it is breaking down economically: because the laws of man are not in harmony with the laws of nature. Too many men have been elected as legislators who were absolutely unqualified for their duties. And having begun their work with a fundamental error—that is, of making the common inheritance of mankind, the land, the property of a few—they have added law to law in endless succession, in a vain effort to correct the evils flowing from the original mistake.

The early builders of American institutions, having experienced the evils of an autocracy, thought to correct them by setting up a government of law. The executive was hedged about by laws, and was still further restricted by judicial interpretation. But the desired results were not forthcoming. Liberty still tarried, prosperity was ever beyond reach, and justice slipped the bandage from her eyes. Then public opinion swung to the opposite side. The Legislature hav-

ing failed, recourse was had to a strong executive. This movement reached its maximum under President Roosevelt, who naively essayed to right the wrongs of the world by his own individual fiat. But in spite of his setting aside of laws, his grants of immunity to legal offenders, and his summary breaking of treaties, the people still look to the future for the establishment of Liberty, Prosperity, and Justice.



Many are looking to the Administration of President Wilson for the desired relief. He has shown a scrupulous regard for law. Yet, until Congress grasps the problem understandingly, and gets down to fundamentals, the President can do nothing permanent to relieve the situation. So long as Congress legislates against trusts—while leaving special privilege in private hands—and so long as legislatures and city councils persist in wasting their time with minimum wage laws and maximum price laws—while allowing the natural resources of the earth to be controlled by the few—we shall see our people turning from a government of law to a government of men, and from a government of men to a government of law in a vain attempt to secure the benefits of progress and civilization, which up to the present time have come to only the few. This uncertainty and confusion will continue until man learns to make his laws conform to nature's laws. When natural law finds expression in the statutes, and the courts confine their activities to applying the law, the vacillation noted by Professor Pound will cease; and social, economic and political development will proceed indefinitely.

S. C.



An Ohio Court on Trial.

Now comes word about a court that holds activity in labor difficulties to be treason. A miner named Joe Kobylak has been held under \$10,000 bond at Bradley, Ohio, on that charge. The specific act of treason of which this man is alleged to be guilty is inciting a mob of strikers to violence against privately owned mining property. Assuming that he is guilty of the act charged, it requires a very difficult stretch of imagination to see wherein it constitutes treason. It is much more easy to realize that the judge who held him on that charge is not fit for his place. It remains to be seen whether in the final disposition of this case further dangerous judicial outrages of this kind are to be encouraged. Every case like this puts a court on trial and some courts have failed to stand the test.

S. D.

A Tricksters' Conspiracy Against Popular Government.

That the pending so-called anti-singletax amendment in Missouri is in fact an underhanded attempt to make the Initiative and Referendum useless for any purpose, has been ably shown by Senator Owen of Oklahoma in a speech in the Senate. Senator Owen first shows what has been made plain before, that the proposed amendment forbids not only initiation of Singletax amendments but of any measure providing a change of any kind in the tax system. He then makes clear, what had not been so well known, and what was clearly the principal object of those back of the measure—it practically abolishes the Initiative and Referendum. The proposition provides that all petitions must be filed with the county clerks four months before election, that within thirty days thereafter these clerks must lay the petitions before the county courts and if the signatures are found to be genuine the petitions shall, at least three months before election at which they are to be voted on, be certified to the Secretary of the State. Commenting on this impossible provision, Senator Owen said:

Now, watch carefully! All petitions must be in the hands of county clerks four months before the election. That means in 1914, say, on July 3, with the election on November 3. But the clerk may hold these petitions for 30 days before turning them over to the county court. He can hold them till August 1 to 3, all petitions filed from July 1 to 3. Now, August 3 is the date on which all petitions must be in the hands of the secretary of state at Jefferson City—that is, "three months before the election"—after being examined and certified by the county courts. It would be a physical impossibility for the county court to do all this for all petitions filed late in June or early in July, and the history of similar petitions filed in States all over the Union shows that a goodly portion of such petitions are filed shortly before or on the final date set. And even if the people should file their petitions earlier, the power of the county clerk to hold them 30 days would still be a menace and could cause thousands of names to fail to reach the secretary of state in time.

The county court could easily refuse to certify a petition to the secretary of state on the grounds that it had not had time to examine the genuineness of the signatures.

It is perfectly clear then, that any petition opposed by a smaller number only of county clerks or county courts would have no possible chance to get through, and these officials would all act within their constitutional rights and could not be touched.

But more dangerous still is the unprecedented power given the courts to reject at will not only Singletax petitions but all other petitions of the people. The text says petitions shall be certified by the county courts "if the signatures thereto shall be found to be genuine signatures of voters of such