

devoted to the pleasures of the rich, with no concern about the wants of the poor. If God didn't intend the land for private ownership, as the Single-tax people hold, he certainly did not intend it for great game preserves, to be used simply for the pleasure of the rich. The land is held in trust to supply food to the people and no man has a right to more than he can use for this purpose. That is Lloyd George's idea. It is not Singletaxism or Socialism, but a domestic regulation looking to the common good. An account says many British landlords have given up the battle with the new ideas about what the incidence of taxation should be and prefer to get their capital in liquid form, for investment elsewhere. A similar issue is sure to come up in this country, one of these days. Free land is no more, but as a result there are vast estates in the West, held by one person. Some day the policy will be to divide them up, through the "incidence of taxation," or otherwise, so that the number of food producers will be doubled in the land. Certainly that is one sure road out of doubt and want.



### The Plight of the Railroads.

Johnstown Democrat, July 14.—Had railroads never overcapitalized the freight rates they now enjoy, there would be no present demand for an increase. It is not the operating charges that are burdening our transportation lines; it is not the interest charges upon actual investments that annoy. The pinch comes when energetic railroad managements attempt to pay dividends upon stock issues that have capitalized not only the present but the future as well. . . . That is just the position the railroads are in. They have capitalized prosperity. They have capitalized their guess as to the business that should be done this year and the next. If there is a letdown, if there is a bit of a depression they straightway find themselves in straightened circumstances. . . . The lines that are conservatively capitalized will prosper in normal times. With the systems that are overcapitalized only boom times will show dividends. The railroads are earning enough right now to put them on easy street had they been properly financed. They cry out not because of conditions, but rather because of their past financial sins. Suppose the railroads were given not a 5 per cent boost in freight rates, but a 25 per cent increase. Suppose they overcapitalized that increase. The result would be that notwithstanding the rates the transportation systems would find themselves embarrassed when the first slack period came.



### A Wrong Way to Fight Fraud.

(Ironton, Mo.) Iron County Register, June 25.—Is there no Democrat in Congress with the courage to tell one little, wholesome truth to the Postal Department—that a citizen's use of the mails is his right, and not merely "a privilege?" The lately assumed "Fraud Order" prerogative is another thing that needs looking after. It is in its nature tyrannical and oppressive, and in one notable instance, at least, has been made to work a great injustice, according to the recent Congressional report on the famous Lewis case. The States can take care of

frauds, and we need no autocrat to hold our destinies in the hollow of his hands. Does our Democratic administration stand for such?

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### THE PAGEANT OF WOMAN.

By S. Gertrude Ford in *Lyric Leaves*.

Way, make way for the marching troops of justice!  
 High, yet nigh, gleams the goal that shall be won.  
 Near we, cheer we, the hope wherein our trust is;  
 Deep the night of sleep, but we go to meet the sun.  
 Stay not, stray not! the fight shall have its sequel.  
 Spin we, win we, the robes that clothe the free!  
 Rate man's mate as his comrade and his equal,  
 All ye who call to the race that is to be!

Cede our need, ye who look on these our legions—  
 Own our throne, in each realm we seek to share!  
 Art, mill, and mart, law and lore—in all their regions,

Nigh you, and by you, behold our footsteps fare.  
 Trade counts the maid in the foremost of her armies;  
 Sage, hold thy page for the woman's eye to scan!  
 Yield we not a field, for in all the woman's charm is,  
 Shining by the side of her partner, Man.

Mile on mile we file; through the highways still we gather;

Mass we, pass we, in all our marshaled might.  
 Cede our need! free the mother as the father;  
 So, only so, shall the race be reared aright.  
 Freedom our creed; in the battle where the dust is  
 Palms we see and calms of the country that shall be—

Way, make way for the marching troops of justice!  
 Man, join the van, till the army shall be free!



### HELPMATES.

From the Address of Catherine E. Marshall, Parliamentary Secretary of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, Before the 21st Congress of the Independent Labour Party at Bradford, England, April, 1914.

Although the immediate reason for the co-operation between the Independent Labour Party and the National Union is the fact that both are working for Women's Suffrage, there are other and deeper reasons why these two movements were bound, as I personally believe, to draw together in sympathy and understanding, if not in actual co-operation. Are we not two children of one mother—the great spirit of democracy? Is not the same motive power at the back of both movements—the determination that the rights of human beings, the recognition of their place in the social scheme, should be based on their humanity, and not on their membership of this or that class, or sex, or race? . . .

I do not want to speak today of how the Independent Labour Party and the National Union can help one another in those forms of work in which we are deliberately uniting our forces; but I do want to speak of another kind of help which you men of the Independent Labour Party, and indeed of the whole Labour movement, are giving, unconsciously, perhaps, to us women of the Women's movement—a kind of help which I believe we can reciprocate if you will let us.

When any section of the community has been fettered and oppressed, whether it be a class, or a sex, or a creed, or a race, the first result of a movement towards freedom is apt to be a feeling of bitter antagonism towards those who have been responsible for the fetters and oppression. The reaction from oppression is sometimes almost as unjust in its manifestations as the oppression itself. A phase of rather ugly self-assertiveness has to be gone through before the right relations are established and a state of normal healthy balance attained. We in the Women's movement are going through this phase now. We are clamoring a great deal about our rights; about the monstrous selfishness of man-made laws; the faithlessness of male politicians; there is, in fact, a danger that the Women's movement, which came into being as a result of a generous impulse to help men in the great work of social regeneration—there is a danger that this movement may for the time express itself in the form of sex-antagonism. It is this danger that you are helping us to overcome. How can we let ourselves fall a prey to sex-bitterness when the men of the Independent Labour Party are helping us at every turn in our work in the country—when we see that you feel our wrongs as keenly as we do ourselves? Above all, when we know that you are prepared to forego any further franchise gains for yourselves until women can share in them—we realize that it is not against men we have to fight, but against a wrong system which has erected an artificial barrier between men and women, dividing into two camps those who ought to be comrades working side by side.

And in the same way is there not a danger in the Labour movement that the result of an oppressed class may lead to class-bitterness? Can we in the Women's movement not help you there? We have broken down class barriers in our movement, just as you have broken down the sex-barriers in yours. You place sex-equality in the forefront of your programme, and you welcome women to your ranks as comrades on the same footing as yourselves. Similarly, membership of our Union is open on equal terms to men and women of every class and occupation. Everyone has a vote, and only one vote. We welcome as a fellow-worker anyone who wants to work, even if she happens to be a duchess! Cannot we do for you in the matter of class-antagonism what you are doing for us in the mat-

ter of sex-antagonism? Do not mistake me. I am not arguing against class-consciousness; but against class-bitterness. The former is a necessary stage in the process of emancipation; but bitterness never helps any movement; it destroys the clear vision and the balance of judgment.

I believe it is by saving one another from becoming bitter in the course of the struggle we have set ourselves, that the Labour movement and the Women's movement can give each other help far more valuable than any mere co-operation in elections—help that will bring out the best in both movements, and keep them sound.



### AT A CONGRESS OF ENGLISH WORKING WOMEN.

Janet Case in The (London) Nation of June 27.

During the last thirty years the Women's Co-operative Guild has been built up by the independent efforts of the women of the co-operative movement, aided by grants of money from the governing body of the Co-operative Union and from Co-operative Societies. It has stood for a progressive policy, which included the establishment of a minimum wage for all co-operative employes, the employment of none but trade unionists and the extension of co-operation in poor districts; and as an organization of married working women it has more and more expressed their needs and wishes, and has come to be recognized by the country as the natural exponent of their views.

Among these married women's questions is Divorce Law Reform, which for the last four years has been included in the subjects for discussion and for educational work. Year by year the support in the Guild has grown stronger, and resolutions have been passed at successive congresses with increasing majorities in its favor. This year, for the first time, the right of the Guild to shape its own policy has been called in question. The Central Co-operative Board, yielding to outside pressure from the Salford Catholic Federation, made its annual money grant to the Guild conditional upon their dropping the divorce agitation, and on their taking up no work disapproved of by the United Board.

This was a direct challenge to the independence of the women, and they left the Board in no doubt about their answer.

An urgency resolution on the subject was submitted to the congress at its meeting in Birmingham last week, and from the very first the end was easy to foresee. The great hall was packed from end to end with the 800 or 900 delegates, representing the 32,000 members of the Guild. The feeling was tense. From every side delegates rose in quick succession, speaking from their places in the crowded galleries, or making their