

two ounces, walked four miles and back, and gave the old woman her tea. Was Lincoln a simpleton or was that—just Lincoln's way?"

"Don't know," the listener replied.

"Well," the narrator said, "the American people know. They somehow believe in such things. Lincoln and Old Frank and, as I suspect, Jenks, the seller of 'little hawgs,' were all three of them 'simpletons.' But someday everyone will be just like that."

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.



## SINGLETEX AND THE HOUSEHOLD PROBLEM.

For The Public.

Look through the "Female Help Wanted" columns of any city newspaper and you will see scores of advertisements for domestic servants, with comparatively few for help in offices, stores, and factories. Press dispatches recently gave account of several thousand female applicants for employment at the Los Angeles municipal employment bureau, nearly all of them objecting to taking employment as domestic servants, but grasping eagerly at other work at mere pittance. Many caste-imbued women of European stock make docile domestic servants; but the daughters of a race with the freedom of centuries in its veins avoid "domestic service" except as a last resort—thousands, indeed, spurn it even as the *last* resort.

Many thoroughly well-meaning women "wonder why." How, they say, can a girl prefer to work long hours in a laundry, when she might have a home full of refining influences, with a comfortable room—somewhere up the back stairs—and better wages than she can get in any other line of "common" work? Of course no sensible girl would want to dine with the family, and history records only a single instance of a servant's having received her guests in the parlor. Yet the fact remains, domestic servants are scarce; and if that is true, with labor conditions as they are today, the supply will certainly be no greater when the social ideal of tomorrow is achieved.

For the masses of women the servant girl problem has no terrors. For them it is merely a matter of accomplishing forty-eight hours' work in twenty-four. Yet at bottom theirs is the same problem as that of their more fortunate sisters: how to lessen the burden of household drudgery. Surely no problem could be more worth solving, and to the task the brains of many men as well as women are devoted. That progress is being made is attested by the many labor-saving devices that have been and are being perfected for household use—the sewing machine, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, kitchen utensils, the electric light, hot and cold water at the turn of a faucet, the steam laundry—there has even been suggested a model laundry, which shall clean and yet re-

turn the goods *whole*—bake shops, with an enlarging field of possibility, not forgetting the cotton gin, weaving machinery, and other factory machines designed to lighten household tasks. Surely our grandmothers and their families must have lived the simple life.

But what has all this to do with the Singletax? Any unshelved Singletaxer would answer the question offhand. So long as the earnings of the industrious portion of the community are confiscated by the non-industrious, through confiscation of the "unearned increment"; so long as industry is stifled by the twin burdens of landlordism and taxation, with all the waste and needless duplication of effort that springs from an unsound social state; just so long will unemployment and a hard struggle for livelihood be the lot of the average family. Under such conditions only the fortunate few of the women of the world have access to the bulk of these home-labor-saving devices. Our women, therefore, have a common cause with the rest of the world's laborers, the cause involved in securing a just distribution of the benefits of advancing civilization. But beyond that, with the dawn of a better social order, come glimmerings of a broader life for women—of a life which shall conserve the best of the home life, and add to it more of the life of the outside world. The intensity of the household problem, as well as of many another "problem" of the day, will vanish away when the Cat is painted out of the landscape.

HARRY W. OLNEY.

---

## BOOKS

---

### MEXICO AND THE LAND QUESTION.

**The Mexican People: Their Struggle for Freedom.**  
By Guitierrez de Lara and Edgcomb Pinchon.  
Published by Doubleday, Page & Company, Garden City, New York. 1914. Price, \$1.50 net.

No peace lover who is for democracy as well as peace could have been betrayed into hostility to the Administration's Mexican policy had it been interpreted to him in the light of this convincing history. It is the story of the hundred years' war of Mexican democracy against Mexican despotism. Knowing what few Americans do, that "the Mexican people have democratic traditions as grand, pure, and sane as those of any race in the world," knowing too that "they have suffered bitterly at the hands of their own master classes" and been the "prey of the foreign exploiter as well," these sympathetic historians furnish the very information that is needed, not only to understand the Wilson-Bryan policy for preventing war with Mexico, but to stir in the American mind a fraternal spirit toward the Mexican peo-

ple. Beginning with the revolution of 1810 under the patriotic priest, Hidalgo, and closing with the military progress of the Constitutionalists in 1913, this history lays bare the terrible experiences of the Mexican masses in their patient efforts to recover land and liberty under law—under better laws in many ways than we boastful “Saxons” can truly claim our own to be.

Their struggle of a century has been animated by the longing of Mexican peasants to democratize Mexican land. Hidalgo led the first revolt. The land was in process of restoration to the people for tillage when he, betrayed to the aristocracy by one of his own officers, was condemned and shot for “treason.” But the hundred years’ war had only begun. Under the leadership of Morelos, the first Constitution was adopted in 1813. It recognized equality of citizenship and established liberty of the press, a free ballot, abolition of personal taxation, partial abolition of land monopoly, and the popular initiation of laws. In 1815 the pendulum swung backward again. Morelos also was executed. Still the war went on, and the pendulum once more swung forward. A new Constitution was adopted in 1824—though for national independence rather than popular freedom—and Guerrero, the great Mexican “Commoner,” became President. Guerrero abolished the last vestige of chattel slavery, and loosened the bonds of peon servitude. His successor, however, was treacherous to the people, and there was despotic reaction again. But again not for long. The democratic spirit came uppermost in 1833, when for a little while popular government resumed its sway, but only to be thwarted by revivals of the old aristocratic, ecclesiastical, and military conspiracies. Through these, Santa Ana vaulted into the dictatorial saddle.

At this time Mexico offered temptations to the American slave-ocracy similar to those which have more recently made American plutocracy keen for war, and our war of conquest began. Its passions have lingered in Mexico all these years. The Mexican people have distrusted us ever since. Nor without reason. Our object in making war upon Mexico remembered, and the efforts of American investors in Mexican concessions to precipitate another war of conquest considered, why should they not be distrustful?

On both sides, that war of Santa Ana’s day was “a rich man’s war and a poor man’s fight,” as most wars are. It served to solidify the Mexican classes while it lasted, but when it was over the long-drawn-out Mexican civil war of 1810 revived. The revolutionists under Alvarez were triumphant at first in this democratic revival, but his successor, Comonfort, was soon afterward displaced by upper class conspiracies. Conciliatory to those propertied interests of his country which never in any country conciliate except to gain leverage for

a vicious spring, Comonfort ended his life in exile.

Meantime, however, the Constitution of 1857—perhaps the most advanced democratic constitution in history—was adopted. It declared that the right to landed property depends upon occupation, and that this requisite cannot exist “unless the land be worked and made productive.” Described by the authors of this history as “the exact expression of the Mexican people as distinguished from the church, army, and aristocracy,” the democratic Constitution of 1857 had been forty-seven years in the making. For fifty-seven years following, the Mexican peasantry have fought for it against treachery within and speculation from without. They are fighting for it yet.

But their long war approaches its end under circumstances that warrant confidence, both among Mexicans and among ourselves, in the determination of the United States and the “A B C powers” of South America to protect the Mexicans from outside machinations and thereby from inside treason to democracy. The democratic peace for which the masses of Mexico have fought so long and which they are recently beginning again to win may this time be secured by the great American powers against those financial conspiracies which have heretofore succeeded in producing reactions and establishing plutocratic dictatorships.

Not only did the Mexican Constitution of 1857 demand the land of Mexico for the industrious people of Mexico; it expressly recognized that “the rights of man are the foundation and the purpose of social institutions,” that “everyone is born free,” that education must be free, that “every man is free to adopt the profession, trade or work that suits him (it being useful and honest) and to enjoy the product thereof,” that “no man shall be compelled to work without his plain consent and without just compensation,” that “the liberty of writing and publishing writings upon any matter is inviolable,” that religious institutions shall not own real estate except buildings used immediately and directly for their own services, and that there shall be no law establishing or forbidding any religion.

The ecclesiastical attempts to overthrow this Constitution, aided by foreign influences, were unsuccessful, thanks to the patriotic leadership of Juarez, until France established an imperial throne in Mexico with Maximilian upon it. When Maximilian’s throne toppled, Juarez came again into high service, and for nine years made that splendid Constitution of 1857 a living thing. He remained the people’s President from 1867 until his death, being again and again elected by free popular vote. During this golden reconstruction period Mexican peasants peacefully tilled the little farms that had been carved for them out of great estates under their Constitution of 1857.

But when Juarez had passed away, Diaz came into power. This was in 1876. With what the authors call "the Diaz myth" we are all familiar. The civilizing work done by Juarez has, by iteration and reiteration, been falsely attributed to Diaz. If our two authors are truthful, and they certainly seem to be, then all the encomiums that have been passed upon the Diaz administrations belong of right to those of his predecessor. His own work consisted not in building up the Mexican democracy, but in turning democratic Mexico into despotic and barbarous Mexico.

It was under Diaz that the Constitutional land reforms of Juarez were swept away by stupendous frauds made effective by unbridled power. It was under him that the degrading land monopoly system against which the people had fought, which under the Presidency of Juarez they had more than begun to conquer and which under Villa and Carranza they are today reconquering, was restored. The details are shocking. Industrious peasants were evicted summarily from their little holdings, lawlessly and without even an investigation of their rights. The Diaz policy was the immediate cause of a renewal of this hundred years' war, the modern echoes of which we have been recently hearing from Torreon, Tampico, Saltillo, San Luis Potosi, and even from the City of Mexico.

Its first great achievement in our day was the displacing of Diaz by Madero. With this democratic victory the war was apparently over. The Constitution of 1857 had come again into friendly hands for execution, and the evicted peasants naturally expected the restoration of the working opportunities that had been confiscated under Diaz. But European and American despoilers of Mexico found another Diaz in Huerta. This dictatorship might have been as secure as that of Diaz had the United States and the "A B C powers" recognized Huerta as the Constitutional President of Mexico. He was not so in fact, however, and those four powers deserve the highest credit for their refusal to recognize him. On the part of the American authorities the refusal required no little moral courage, for the pressure of powerful American investors for a war of conquest against Mexico was enormous and progressively difficult to turn aside. Fortunately, however, we have a President and a Secretary of State who are averse to war, and notwithstanding the pressure upon them, no war was made. But he who imagines that the Administration could have prevented a war of conquest by ignoring conventional causes for war, takes little account of the belligerent influences that were plainly at work.

The Vera Cruz episode has already defeated the efforts of the Interests to precipitate a war of conquest. It is doubtful if anything more pacific in appearance could have done so. Even as it is, probably nothing but the complete triumph of the

Constitutionalists in Mexico can frustrate the American and other foreign influences that seek sordidly for an invasive war. And probably nothing but the friendly and intelligent co-operation of the powerful democratic and peace-loving nations of this hemisphere can secure immunity to the Constitutionalists when in power from the disorganizing conspiracies promoted by agents of American and European exploiting interests. In the past hundred years conspiracies such as these have set back the democracy of Mexico again and again. In the future, also, will they do it again and again unless the great powers of our hemisphere unite to stand by the Mexican people in their Constitutional policy of placing the democratic government in Mexico which it is now manifest must soon dislodge the Huerta dictatorship, upon the firm foundation of "the land for the people."

"The Mexican People," this new and impressively true story of a people's war of a century for land and liberty against parasitical classes, is a book to stir the noblest impulses of our own citizens and to illuminate one of the splendid pages of our own history in its making. The land question is the core of this struggle by Mexican peasants for equal rights and by their adversaries for monopoly privileges. Until the land question in Mexico is settled, and settled right or in the right direction, the hundred years' war in Mexico, now well into its two hundredth year, will not end. There can be no permanent peace there until the land of Mexico has been democratized.

LOUIS F. POST.



**It is the business of the tailor to create gentlemen, and sometimes the creature is equal to his creator.**

F. R. H.



When its full significance is considered, perhaps the most important aspect of a school system's efficiency pertains to the system's success in attracting and holding pupils who have passed the age up to which the law compels attendance. Attracting and holding pupils in school is not, of course, the same thing as educating them efficiently; it is, however, a prerequisite to such education; moreover, it furnishes, in the long run, strong evidence of the value of the instruction given, for the judgment of youth eager for the activity and independence of the unschooled world is not prone to over-rate the school's service. Moreover, the significance of a school system's success in holding pupils beyond the compulsory age is not limited to the instruction afforded voluntary attendants; it is almost or quite as significant of the instruction given those compelled to attend. For whether a child remains in school after he is free to leave, depends at least as much on what the school has done for him as it does on what the school now offers.—Frank E. Spaulding, at the meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools.