

The Woman Patriot

Dedicated to the Defense of the Family and the State

\$1.00 Six Months

AGAINST Feminism and Socialism

\$2.00 a Year

Published Twice a Month by The Woman Patriot Publishing Co., 8 Jackson Place N. W., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter April 26, 1918, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Vol. 10 No. 9

WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 1, 1926

10 Cents a Copy

Louisville Women Demand New Declaration of Independence

Insist Upon Democracy, State Rights, and Individual Club Freedom Against Usurped Dictatorship by General Federation

THIS publication has said several times, "What is needed is a new *Declaration of Independence* for women voters from women dictators."

The Woman's Club of Louisville, Kentucky, April 13, 1926, by a vote of 254 to 80, after a debate between Mrs. Atwood R. Martin of Louisville, who defended the local club and democracy, and Mrs. Edward Franklin White, first vice-president and legal adviser of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, who came down from Indianapolis to defend dictatorship of the central office over all local clubs, adopted the following amendment to its by-laws:

"The Woman's Club of Louisville shall not be bound by any action of the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs or General Federation of Women's Clubs, until such action shall have been ratified by the members of this club at a meeting called for the purpose."

In other words, the 700 members of the Louisville Woman's Club will no longer submit to dictatorship, gag rule, disfranchisement, and *deception of Congress* and the public in order to allow Mrs. John D. Sherman, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs (and figurehead of the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" at Washington) to count them, *without their consent*, among the mythical "millions of women" Congressional Committees are falsely assured are behind the SOCIALIST LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM of Mrs. Florence Kelley at Washington!

Without any authority whatever, delegated or implied, Mrs. John D. Sherman, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, made a ruling, in June, 1925, at the West Baden Biennial Council of the General Federation, that practically anything that can be put through a General Federation convention is automatically binding upon every State Federation and local club, and that every local club and State Federation *should be MUZZLED* on any political issue upon which it is in disagreement with the central dictatorship!

Of course, she didn't use such plain language, but that is what it amounts to. Judge for yourself:

"When a resolution has been adopted at such meetings, either unanimously or by a majority, it should be regarded as the action of the organization. State Federations, or individual clubs, opposed to the action taken, *should not conduct a campaign in the name of the State or the Club*, in opposition to that of the General Federation. Individual members of the State Federations or individual members of clubs, are free to enter campaigns in opposition as individuals but not as clubs. In no other way can the General Federation speak as an organization."

In other words, without *anybody* presuming to claim that the State Federations and individual clubs have delegated to the General Federation the right and power to determine, without their consent, *how every club shall stand on every political question*, Mrs. Sherman simply usurps the power!

Demand Silence or Support

Once Congress has been told that "3,000,000" clubwomen want Mrs. Kelley's Socialist "Child" Labor Amendment, because Mrs. Kelley has bamboozled Mrs. Sherman and a few dozen General Federation delegates, **NO STATE FEDERATION OR LOCAL CLUB SHALL TELL CONGRESS THE TRUTH!** The lobby lie that all the clubs "as clubs" are for SOCIALIST measures, must be allowed to stand so long as Mrs. Kelley and Mrs. Catt can keep Mrs. Sherman bamboozled! Local clubs or State Federations must either *support the lobby program*, or *keep silence*, "as clubs." As *individuals*, they are *graciously permitted* by Mrs. Sherman to differ with Mrs. Kelley and Miss Abbott in regard to surrendering their homes and children to Socialism, but "as clubs" they must let the lobby lies stand—lest perhaps Congressmen "get wise" to the fact that *the women voters* out in the States are *not* in favor of the Socialism that *the women dictators* and professional lobbyists at Washington say they favor!

The issue is clear-cut. The Louisville Club is demanding democracy, local self-government and individual liberty. It is also demanding HONESTY—that there shall be something more than a snap-vote of a hundred or more busy delegates on a "legislative committee's" report before the "legislative committee" (polite term for lobbyists) shall be permitted to go before congressional committees and pretend that "3,000,000" clubwomen demand or indorse some revolutionary amendment or bill of which perhaps less than 500 copies have ever been printed!

The General Federation, on the contrary, is hanging on to the dictatorship of the Washington lobby over all the State and local clubs. Mrs. Sherman DOESN'T DARE submit these lobby measures to the individual clubs, and the individual members, and let the policy for or against them *come up from the bottom*. No, that would put the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" and the Kelley Socialist Program at Washington *out of business*. It is the first principle of every autocracy that dictatorship must be *handed down from the top*; that the *central authority* shall decide as it pleases and compel all the State and local subjects to obey.

Fighting for the life of the Washington lobby, Mrs. Sherman and Mrs. White present many excuses for this form of dictatorship and wholesale *misrepresentation* of women voters. Mrs. White says, for example:

"It is a cardinal principle, not only of parliamentary law, but of our United States Government, that the majority must rule. . . . I may liken our position to the United States Government."

Aside from the fact that it is *not* a cardinal principle of the United States Government that the majority must rule (the cardinal principle being "a government of limited powers" that denies *any* form of despotism and gives even *one-third* of Congress and one more than *one-fourth* of the States the right to retain any constitutional rights, and *one* State power to retain its equality against the other 48); and aside from the fact that the machine Mrs. White is talking about IS NOT A MAJORITY BUT A MINORITY; and aside from the fact that the position of these dictators is *exactly opposite* from the position of the United States Government (which claims no powers until they are *delegated* from the States and people) Mrs. White's excuse is fairly good, if submitted to moron minds only.

As Mrs. Martin pointed out at Louisville, in answer to this ridiculous plea that they are imitating our Government:

"The will of the majority as expressed in Congress is binding on the several States and the citizens thereof, but only to the extent and within the *limits of authority specifically conferred* on the Congress by the States. Any attempt in Congress by a majority and even a unanimous vote, to control the actions of the States or of the citizens, in matters where authority has not been specifically conferred on the Congress, is null and void."

But the fact is that the majority of the 3,000,000 clubwomen have no more chance of expressing themselves through the "duplex and illogical system" of the General Federation than they have of casting individual votes on the "Child" Labor Amendment through Mrs. Kelley's "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" lobby.

Each local club, whether it has 700 members or 17 members, counts 1 vote at the General Federation Council; but the State presidents, officers, directors and past presidents of the Federation also each have one vote; so that, for example, two "past presidents" can outvote any club of 1,000 members, and any two clubs with 25 members each cast *double the vote* of a club of 1,000 members!

Of course this isn't "democracy," as Mrs. Sherman pretends, but Prussian plural voting, the craziest form of dictatorship in existence, and one of the most dishonest in the use to which it is here put, for when Congress is told that "3,000,000" clubwomen indorse or oppose a certain measure, everybody knows that Congress is considering the "3,000,000" as *individual votes*, that the plain meaning intended and understood is that all or a real majority of 3,000,000 *women* are in favor of or opposed to the legislation. Congressmen care nothing whatever about how a "past president" has the same vote as a club of 1,000 members at a Federation Council; they want to know, and have a right to know how the *individual women voters*, or the majority of them, stand at the polls, where all women, including "past presidents" are equal. And to rig the machinery to deceive Congressmen and then make-believe that it is "majority rule" is sheer trickery.

Of course, as stated, the lobbyists are fighting for their lives and for the "full grant of power" involved in the Kelley Program of Socialist Legislation for the bureaucrats and lobbyists at Washington.

Consequently, it is not to be expected that the resolution of the Louisville Club will have any more *immediate effect* upon the General Federation schemes of despotism than the Declaration of Independence of 1776 had upon the schemes of George III. *Ultimately* it will prevail, *if fought for*.

But the dictators and lobbyists will hold their power as long as they can, and their "apparatus of power" for a dictatorship, through the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" and the General Federation of Women's Clubs is *mechanically* almost perfect.

Therefore, no one should expect too much, too soon, from the Louisville resolution. "Rome was not built in a day," nor can any form of independence, republicanism, honest representation, democracy or individual liberty be won from a despotism that is established in power, without a long, hard struggle.

It remains to be seen whether the daughters of the framers of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence can be forced *tamely* to submit indefinitely to the Socialist-led dictatorship of a distant lobby in which they have *less real representation* than the American colonies had in the British Parliament!

Eventually, the Washington interlocking lobby dictatorship, led by a Socialist (Mrs. Kelley) over clubwomen and women voters, will be overthrown by women themselves. "If eventually, why not now?"

Lobby Dictatorship Vs. Capitalist Democracy

To see how absolutely *undemocratic* the Socialist-Feminist Women's Lobby Dictatorship at Washington is, in comparison with "hard-boiled" Big Business and Capital, in demanding that every State federation or local club shall appear "as a club" behind any SOCIALIST SCHEME Washington lobbyists want, let us quote the following excerpt from the By-Laws of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America:

"Article XIII, Section 10. On a question submitted to referendum no organization member found to have voted with the minority shall be deemed to impair its standing in the Chamber by adhering to its position or by continuing its efforts in support thereof."

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States holds a *referendum*. It takes a *two-thirds vote* of the *member organizations* to commit the *national Chamber*—and even then, every local chamber among the *one-third* voting the other way, is left perfectly free to adhere publicly to its position.

That is democracy, local self-government, individual freedom. But the thing is not to be found anywhere in the so-called "great national organizations of women" in the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee."

Also, in the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" *if any five* of 20 or more organizations form a "Subcommittee" in favor of some measure, all the other organizations are bound to *support it or keep silence!* "As a club" 15 or more "great national organizations" can be *MUZZLED* on any Federal legislation that 5 others in the "pool" support. No wonder, with this machine at her disposal, Mrs. Kelley says:

"We are now organized with a thousand ramifications. We have more interlocking directorates than business has." (Meat Packer hearing, House Agriculture Committee, May 2, 1921.)

With equal truth Mrs. Kelley might have mentioned that they also have more DICTATORSHIP AND DOCILITY than "big business" ever dreamed of having.

THE WOMAN PATRIOT furnishes DOCUMENTED INFORMATION, with names, dates and references, on:

1. RADICAL LEGISLATION AND MOVEMENTS that threaten Individual Liberty, the natural rights of Parents, the reserved rights of States or the security of the Nation.
2. PUBLIC OFFICERS, ORGANIZATIONS and INDIVIDUALS, regardless of party, race, creed or sex, who promote Communism, Feminism, Pacifism or Paternalism in the United States.
3. CONCRETE AND DEFINITE MEASURES to uphold American Constitutional Government against its foreign or domestic enemies.

THE WOMAN PATRIOT is specific, fair and fearless. It stands for a STRONG GOVERNMENT of constitutionally limited powers, with *courage* to govern, and right to do *nothing else*. It advocates, with Thomas Jefferson, "a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from INJURING one another and LEAVE THEM OTHERWISE FREE."

Subscription Price, \$2.00 a Year; Six Months, \$1.00

Socialism Presented as "Philanthropy"

FOR forty years, Mrs. Florence Kelley, Socialist, formerly Mrs. Wischnewetzky, friend and translator of Friedrich Engels, has been, according to her own testimony, trying "to find the point of least resistance" to "make an end" of the capitalist system.

Friedrich Engels himself, September 15, 1887, wrote to Mrs. Kelley (then Mrs. Wischnewetzky) that Socialism "will take unexpected forms"; and Engels wrote to the Socialist Sorge, the next day, September 16, 1887, that the masses can be set in motion only in "a way suitable to the respective countries" and that "this is usually a roundabout way. But everything else is of minor importance if only they are really aroused." (See Marx and Engels on Revolution in America, No. 6 of "The Little Red Library" issued by the Daily Worker Publishing Company, Chicago, official American publishers for the Communist International at Moscow.)

On January 27, 1887, Friedrich Engels wrote to Mrs. Kelley:

"The less it [Socialism] will be knocked into the Americans from without and the more they test it by their experience . . . the deeper it will go into their flesh and blood." (Quoted in *New York Call*, Socialist organ, Jan. 29, 1923.)

"Find the point of least resistance," use "roundabout ways," "unexpected forms" and work Socialism "into their flesh and blood" as something else—that is the Engels-Kelley Socialist Program.

Also, of course, Socialism must follow what Col. Raymond Robins called, "the general rule, to use a woman" that the Germans and Bolsheviks found successful in Russia (Bolshevist propaganda hearing, U. S. Senate, Feb.-Mar., 1919, p. 792) and which Satan also employed long before to deceive Mother Eve.

In all candor, it must be admitted that Mrs. Kelley has been quite successful in promoting Socialism as something else, and that hardly anybody else has been so successful, politically, in "using women."

On November 22, 1920, Mrs. Kelley and a lot of "non-communist hands" organized the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee"—a lobby pool in which "the great national organizations of women" were to combine their legislative agencies at Washington for "pressure" on Congress for Federal legislation.

The "non-communist hands" included Mrs. Maud Wood

Park, Mrs. Edward Franklin White, and Miss Lida Hafford of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Miss Ethel Smith of the Women's Trade Union League, and others not worth mentioning.

The real power in the thing has always been Mrs. Kelley—though Mrs. Park, and later Mrs. Sherman, of the League of Women Voters and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, respectively, have served as *figureheads*, "fronts" and "chairmen" of the outfit.

Mrs. Kelley's leadership over the "Women's Joint Congressional Committee" is shown by the fact that she has actually led all its big "drives."

Its chief objects in life since its creation have been:

1. The Maternity Act—with Mrs. Kelley head of its Maternity Act Subcommittee.
2. The Child-Labor Amendment—with Mrs. Kelley chief draftsman of the amendment (See *Congressional Record*, May 31, 1924).
3. Opposition to the "Equal Rights" Amendment—also led, of course, by Mrs. Kelley, assisted by Miss Ethel Smith.
4. Opposition to the Wadsworth-Garrett "Back-to-the-People Amendment" which suddenly began *only* after the Massachusetts referendum against Mrs. Kelley's "Child" Labor Amendment—the lobbyists convincing themselves that they have no chance whatever of putting over alleged "women's measures" by Federal amendment to socialize women and children, if THE PEOPLE, including women voters, are to be consulted at the polls.

To show how adroitly Mrs. Kelley can sell Socialism—and all the Socialist "fundamental" books to young college women entering "philanthropic" or "social" work; to show that this great woman Socialist leader is forty years ahead of her "non-communist" followers and dupes in *knowing where she is going*; to prove that this publication is *fair and accurate* in describing many of these alleged "welfare" schemes as STRAIGHT SOCIALISM (particularly when Mrs. Kelley, who scorns "palliatives," is found drafting them and driving them through Congress or women's clubs), and to give club-women and other women an idea of the SOCIALIST METHOD in connecting *class-hatred* and revolutionary doctrines even with "love of mankind," we print below the *full text* of Mrs. Kelley's famous lecture on "Philanthropic Work" delivered in New York within three months after Friedrich Engels instructed her how to work Socialism "into their flesh and blood."

"THE NEED OF THEORETICAL PREPARATION FOR PHILANTHROPIC WORK"

A Paper Presented to the New York Association of Collegiate Alumnae on May 14, 1887

By FLORENCE KELLEY WISCHNEWETZKY

ETYMOLOGICALLY, philanthropy is, of course, the love of mankind, and, at first sight, it seems superfluous to undergo theoretical preparation for expressing one's love of mankind. That seems to be wholly a matter of the heart, the sympathies, the sense of right. But experience has long shown that these qualities alone do not suffice. For man lives in society and society has its own laws of development, an understanding of which is absolutely necessary if our philanthropic effort is not to be wasted or worse.

If, for instance, in our goodness of heart and our ignorance of the laws of development of the society in which we live, we should assume that all men are brothers, it would be only to make the painful discovery that these "brothers" are, today, divided into two classes, engaged in a life and death struggle: the smaller class owning all the necessities of life, all the means of production, houses, lands, mills, forges and furnaces; the harvests and the ships and trains in which they are transported; in short, everything with which work can be carried on; and the larger class, the vast majority of these "brothers" owning nothing but

their labor power, and forced to sell that, piece by piece and day by day, for what it will bring in the labor market. In practice, every interest of these "brothers" is and must be diametrically opposed and if, in our want of theoretical preparation, we prefer to believe differently, a thousand proofs meet us day by day. Every strike or lockout is at bottom a class struggle. The workers will work less and have more, and the employers will pay less and have more, and each side must, in the struggle for self-preservation, assume the attitude it does assume. But not in the labor market only is the class struggle forced upon our attention. In the church, the priest who speaks his honest conviction in the interests of the workers is "isolated" by the hierarchy; in politics, the man who stands forth as their standard-bearer is covered with ridicule, branded the enemy of order and civilization, a crank, and whatever epithet seems most opprobrious; while, before the law, the striker—the worker—is liable to imprisonment for conspiracy; the employer—the capitalist—who locks out his men has yet to be molested in this State.

One consequence of the division of society into two warring

classes is this: that there are two sorts of philanthropy. There is our bourgeois philanthropy, to which we college graduates are born and bred; and there is the philanthropy of the working class which differs radically from our own.

I shall try, first, to make clear the nature and limitations of our bourgeois philanthropy; and then I shall try to make clear the nature of the philanthropy of the workers. And if I succeed in doing this, the need of theoretical preparation for philanthropic work will demonstrate itself in the process.

Our bourgeois philanthropy, whatever form it may take, is really only the effort to give back to the workers a little part of that which our whole social system, systematically, robs them of, and so to prop up that system yet a little longer.

It is the workers who produce all values, but the lion's share of what they produce falls to the lion—the capitalist class—and enables the capitalist arbitrarily to decide what he will do with it and whether or not he will use a part of the spoils for the good of the despoiled, a part of the plunder for the good of the plundered; and, however disinterestedly individual men and women may devote themselves to this task of restitution, the fact remains that, for the capitalist class as a whole, all philanthropic effort is a work of restitution for self-preservation.

This is outspoken for the class, as a class, when our social science congresses and associated charities meetings occupy their sessions with questions of the treatment of the dependent and defective classes, with plans to minimize the danger with which these elements threaten society, by palliating such of the evils consequent upon our present system of production and distribution as philanthropy can cope with.

The dangerous classes—thieves, murderers, paupers, all of whom are as much an integral part of our social system as we college-bred women—must be restrained; epidemic disease, as murderous to the ruling class as to the workers, must be prevented in self-defense; pauperism, inevitable consequence of free competition and man-superseding machinery, must be met by industrial training, the abolition of outdoor relief, the organization of charities—all in order that the system of production and distribution which engenders all these evils may endure a little longer; and the same unconscious, unformulated self-interest finds, perhaps its most adroit expression in the arrangement known as profit sharing. This institution embodies bourgeois philanthropy pure and simple. According to the accepted usage of the business world, he only may share the profits of good years who can bear his share of the losses of bad ones. But the workingman, having nothing, can not bear any losses whatsoever. So the share kindly given back to the workers out of the profits, the whole of which they created, is arbitrarily determined by the employer, who thereby kills divers birds with one stone; he eases his conscience by making some slight restitution; he binds the hands to the concern by means of the trifling increase in their wages, so that they watch one another to prevent wasteful work from diminishing the share, and they are loath to strike or in any way injure the profits of which they gratefully accept the share allotted to them.

In the struggle for existence, with the labor organizations on the one hand, and powerful competitors on the other, such advantages in the allegiance of the firms own hands are cheaply bought with the restitution of a share of the profits. And this form of individual philanthropy I find typical of the whole. We give back a percentage and find our account in prolonging the system that gives us all the rest.

I do not for a moment lose sight of the noble self-sacrifice of men and women who, in all disinterestedness, give years of their lives to philanthropic effort. Nor do I believe that all or most of such work is done with the conscious intention of propping up a system of society which is based upon the exploitation of the working class. On the contrary, it is because I am convinced of the honorable and noble intention which animates a vast part of such work, that it seems to me necessary for every thinking woman to pause before entering upon it and ask herself the question: What is the real nature of philanthropic work, and is the kind, usually entered upon by men and women of my class, such as will satisfy my longing to be of use to my fellow men and women?

For our grandmothers at our age, before the system of production had developed to its present stage, when the con-

trasts of class were less sharply defined, philanthropic work was simple enough; neighborly help of those less comfortably placed, or, possibly, contributions to the maintenance of some one of a few charitable institutions. For our mothers, and those of us who virtually belong to their generation, having lost step with the rapid march of industrial and social development that marks the last few years, the philanthropic problem, though complicated enough, is by no means a vital one. There is simply the choice among the thousand and one forms of philanthropic activity approved by the class to which we belong.

Accepting the social system of today as eternal, final, and the poor always with us as but an incident to it, the only problem would be how to minimize their number and alleviate their sufferings as far as may be. Then the only theoretical preparation possible would be a study of methods. But for the thinking woman of our generation the final question is no longer between giving doles to street beggars, on the one hand, or supporting the associated charities, on the other; or between the temperance, the White Cross and the suffrage movements, as to many persons it still seems to be. The question that forces itself upon us, and imperatively demands an immediate answer is this: In the great strife of classes, in the life and death struggle that is rending society to its foundations, where do I belong?

Shall I cast my lot with the oppressors, content to patch and darn, to piece and cobble at the worn and rotten fabric of a perishing society? Shall I spend my life in applying palliatives, in trying to make the intolerable endurable yet a little longer? Shall I spend my youth upon a children's hospital, when the dispensary rolls of the city show that the deterioration of the child physique in the working class is out of proportion to all that palliatives can do to check it? That increasing poverty brings increasing rachitic disease out of all proportion to the growth of population, so that hospital work is a Sisyphus task? Shall I send a score or a hundred children for recreation to the country, while year by year our factories and tenement-house workrooms demand fresh thousands of children to toil within their noisome prison walls? Shall I preach temperance to men whose homes are vile tenements, whose wives toil side by side with them because the father's wages no longer suffice to maintain the family? Men whose exhausted ill-nourished frames demand stimulants, because the wife has no time, strength, money, with which to procure and prepare good and sufficient food? Shall I preach chastity to homeless men, the hopeless discomfort of whose surroundings must concentrate their whole desire upon the gratification of animal passion, while want forces scores of thousands of women to sell themselves to the first comer? Shall I fritter away the days of my youth investigating the deservingness of this or that applicant for relief when the steady march of industrial development throws a million able-bodied workers out of employment, to tramp the country, seeking in vain a chance to earn their bread, until hundreds—aye, thousands—of them, broken, discouraged, demoralized—settle down into the life of the chronic pauper?

Shall I not rather make common cause with these, my brothers and my sisters, to make an end of such a system?

Here lies the choice. If we stand by the class to which by education we belong, our philanthropic work, whether we will or no, must bear its stamp, being merely palliative—helping one child while the system sacrifices tens of thousands, saving one girl while thousands fall, building one hospital while every condition of our social life grows more brutally destructive of human life and health.

As loyal members of the ruling class, our work must, I repeat, be merely palliative. For a radical cure of the social disease means the end of the system of exploiting the workers. But to stop exploiting would be suicide for the class that we are born and bred into, and of which we college-bred women form an integral part. Lest this should sound like mere abuse, we have but to recall to mind the origin of poverty in our society.

I need not waste words in pointing out to you that the recipients of philanthropic benefits spring from the working class, whether they are babies, who need crèches because their mothers are forced to go to the factory; or free kindergartens, because the working man has no money for school bills; or hospitals, because home nursing is out of the question; or free transportation to the West, because home life

has been crushed out in the struggle for life itself, and the Children's Aid Society must find a substitute for the real article; or whether the recipient is a candidate for some home for the aged, because wages can be earned only through the prime of life;—whatever the special case, the mass of cases come from the workers. Women to be rescued, men to be reformed,—whatever the form of the social wreckage, it all comes from the class of the plundered. Of course there are exceptions, as when boodle aldermen in jail are given flowers by well-meaning women. But the exceptions do but prove the rule that the recipients spring from the working class. Nor is the reason far to seek, for it is a law of political economy that the working class receives only enough of the fruits of its labor to maintain itself and bring up the rising generation according to the prevailing declining standard of life of the working class in the given country at the given time,¹ the remainder of the fruits of labor falling to the capitalist class, by virtue of the monopoly of the means of production held by that class. **The remainder which falls to the capitalist class is surplus value, and I must ask you to have patience a moment while I try to explain what that is.**

Under our industrial system the means of production are a monopoly of an irresponsible class, and the workers are forced to compete with one another for the privilege of employment in using them. In the struggle for existence that arises out of this competition the weak go to the wall, become the wreckage that philanthropy undertakes to deal with.

Under this competition of the workers among themselves, the labor power of each is a commodity which he or she must sell in the labor market for whatever price it will bring, and like all commodities, this labor power has a two-fold value—exchange or market value and use value. In the case of a shirtmaker, for instance, the market value of a day's labor power may be represented by 80 per cent or whatever it will bring, whatever the manufacturer can engage her for. But the commodity, labor-power, has a unique quality. It creates other values. So when the shirt manufacturer buys of the shirtmaker her labor power for a day it is in order to set it at work producing new values. But he is very careful to have it produce new values beyond the 80 cents he pays for it. Suppose he gives the shirtmaker shirting worth a dollar, and in six hours she has made shirts worth \$1.80; he has his money back (in value at least) that he pays her for the whole day. But he has bought her labor power for the whole day and she must toil on; and the product of the remaining hours embodies surplus value, value beyond the wages that represent the market value of her day's labor. It is out of this difference between the market value paid the shirtmaker for her day's labor power and the value created by her in the day's work that the manufacturer's profit comes. And if we take the whole class of workers, we must admit that this appropriation of surplus value, this exploitation of the workers, is the source of the poverty of the working-class, of its supplying wreckage to need philanthropic attention.

But any radical methods directed against this exploitation, this profit plunder, are measures directly against the class that lives by it—and to that class we belong by birth, and especially by education, and this fact it is which makes us especially need theoretical preparation for philanthropic work, if that work is to be abreast of the life of our time and not run in the old ruts.

For the first thing necessary is to get rid of the prejudices in which we have grown up, to see our philanthropy as it really is—and this is especially necessary for us college-bred women, because our colleges are so emphatically class institutions; the students are children of the ruling class, except in a small number of cases where scholarships help those rare exceptions among the workers' children who succeed in escaping daily drudgery for their daily bread, and by dint of all privation work their way to and through college; such scholarships are too few and too meagre to make the workers' children who obtain them other than rare exceptions among their more prosperous fellow-students. Moreover, the scholarships are usually mere tuition. In many cases, the scholarship is the exception and the pay student the rule—a fact which stamps the college as a class institution. But if, with one wave of change throughout the length and breadth of the land, every college were thrown open wide by free tuition and every student presenting himself, or herself, for successful examination were admitted and supported

throughout the college course, this would still change nothing of the character of the college as a class institution, for the infinite majority of American youth must earn their daily bread during those years of older childhood and early youth, which the children of the ruling minority spend in preparing for college. If our colleges were thrown open tomorrow, our telegraph and messenger boys, errand boys, door-openers, cash-girls, and the scores of thousands of mill children would never enter college. Our system of production and distribution demands their labor in increasing measure every year, and the **increasing poverty of the workers** makes the wages of the children more essential for the maintenance of the family. The grade of society from which children may be expected to enter college becomes, therefore, more and more sharply defined.

The class character of college life may be seen, too, in the political attitude of the students. In 1848 the students stood **shoulder to shoulder with the workmen on the barricades of the European cities** fighting to bring the middle class to the helm against the aristocracy and despotic monarchy. And in our own country, a quarter of a century ago, the Harvard regiment marched to meet its fate in the work of freeing the slaves, so doing what students could to bring the present perfection of capitalism and class rule, since capitalism presupposes the juridical freedom of the worker, and negro slavery hemmed its progress in America as monarchical and aristocratic reaction had hemmed it in Europe. But, today, that struggle is over, the middle class rules in both hemispheres, and the whole character of its struggle has changed, becoming one long endeavor to maintain ascendancy against the oncoming forces of the workers now claiming their turn as the middle class was still claiming its own at the time of our Rebellion. The class to which we students belong has survived its honorable role as the champion of freedom against oppression, and has become the defender of the day that now is, living by oppression and plunder as cynically as ever did the feudal aristocracy. And the students embody the sentiment of the class as they have always done, and place themselves upon the side of the old parties against the rising party of labor.

Our colleges being institutions owned by the ruling class (even when founded with public money) for the training of the rising generation thereof, and manned by its carefully selected employes, the economic and sociological teaching done in them is such as the employers require, of which samples may be found in the publications of Professors Sumner, Perry, Atkinson, Thompson and others. Lest this seem too sweeping, I ask: "Where are the teachers, men or women, who have placed themselves outspokenly on the side of the oppressed class?" In medicine, in the natural sciences, the word of the day is, "investigation regardless of consequences; the truth at all costs!" But in social sciences there comes always in some insidious form the misleading influence of personal or class interest. When a Dubois-Reymond forgets himself so far as to declare the German universities training-schools for the intellectual body-guard of the Hohenzollerns; when Virchow raises his voice in warning against Haeckel's plan for introducing the history of evolution into the public schools, because "the Darwinian theory leads to socialism" (as though the trend of social development could be helped or hindered by teaching or not teaching a certain department of natural science in the public schools!), surely it is much to demand of the rank and file of American professors that they rise superior to tradition and all considerations of personal advantage and espouse the cause of the class that does not employ them in direct antagonism to the class that does. Nor do I accuse the rank and file of American professors of dishonorable action. That which is unpardonable in a Virchow and a Dubois-Reymond, who know whereof they speak, may be honest ignorance in the rank and file the more so as the fundamental works of modern scientific political economy have been shut up in a foreign tongue, and are only now accessible to English readers. Fortunately the time is rapidly passing away when that excuse can be made for the modern literature of economics is now, for the most part, translated into English, and ignorance of it will henceforth be unpardonable for the teacher. But honorably or dishonorably, ignorantly or willfully, certain it is that we have, as a rule, been taught in our colleges to accept our present social system with the method of production that underlies it, not as a phase of development

leading to a higher order, just as antique slavery gave place to the serfdom of the Middle Ages, and feudalism to our capitalistic system, but as final, permanent, perhaps God-given.

The foundation of our social order being accepted, there remained for the teachers small field for critical research, and collegiate activity in the domain of economics and sociology might busy itself with subordinate questions of practical politics such as the relative merits of free trade and protection as well as with anything else. For such teaching as the prevailing text-books present, the time allotted in the ordinary curriculum is ample; since our professors of political economy do, as a rule, but present the now threadbare propositions of the few original minds who did work of their own in the last century and the earlier decades than the present one; or serve as mere apologists for the social system, the laws of whose development few of them attempt to investigate.

I have dwelt thus at length upon the nature of our collegiate institutions and of the instruction in economics given in them, because I wish to make clear the especial need which we college-bred women have of theoretical preparation before we can clearly appreciate the true nature of that bourgeois philanthropy which is an essential evil of our society. Born and bred among class prejudices and traditions, our college course of economic study usually affords us either no light on the subject or actual darkness, the teaching that should be in the direction of unprejudiced investigation being only too frequently dogmatic apology for the social system as it is today.

Within a very short time there has, it is true, been some progress made in the direction of critical investigation, and the appearance of the journals founded by Harvard and Columbia for this purpose is a symptom to be greeted with warm welcome.

For every graduate, however, who conceives philanthropic work to mean conscientious endeavor for the real elevation of the race, and not a mere gratification of her own goodness of heart, the need of theoretical preparation is most urgent at the moment of leaving college. For, her mind filled with dogmatic apology for society as it is, the task of hearing the other side lies before her, and it is no trifling task.

This other side is the theory of the development of society, the theory which is to political economy what the Darwinian theory is to natural sciences. It is the working class which naturally espouses the theory of the development of society, and looks to the future for improvement just as the class now in possession of all that makes life pleasant naturally accepts the apology for society as it is, and reveres our threadbare orthodox political economy for its services in that direction. And this attitude of the working class, even when it is only instinctive, makes contact with it indispensable for the honest student of economics or of the problem of the real elevation of the race. I do not mean by this, contact with the wreckage of the working class by means of participation in some of our thousand and one charitable institutions or associations; still less do I mean individual almsgiving. For any contact worth having with the workers the honest student must go to the embodiment of their healthiest, strongest life—their labor organizations. Here only is contact upon the basis of our common humanity possible, for we are as a rule condemned, as members of the ruling class, to meet our working brothers and sisters either as employers or alms-givers, and the class relation vitiates the intercourse, whether we are conscious of it or not. But when we go to the meetings of the workers or join their organizations, both these vitiating influences cease to operate, and we meet them simply as students honestly seeking enlightenment.

To the end of maintaining and strengthening their own class in its struggle for the ascendancy, the workers have their own institutions for preventing workers from becoming social wreckage: their sick benefit societies, reciprocal help in times of strike and lockout, and most of all, their trades organizations. There is no element of restitution in this, their philanthropic work, in their sharing their poverty and their savings. In all their reciprocal contributions and mutual benefits the emphasis belongs to the words reciprocal and mutual, the truly social idea "each for all and all for each," the principle of active brotherhood underlying them

all. Nor is their effort palliative in the sense of being calculated to prop up the system of capitalistic exploitation. On the contrary, the palliatives for which they strive, such as the shortening of the working day or the limitation of the labor of children, aim heavy blows at the production of surplus value, and would vastly conserve the strength of the workers for their struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. Nor do the workers reject any such philanthropic effort, from whatever quarter, as may contribute to maintain and strengthen their class. They accept it, the more enlightened recognizing the element of restitution, the less enlightened feeling instinctively that the workers, the creators of all values, are entitled to all and more than all the good that under our present social system falls to their lot. I shall have made clear our need of theoretical preparation for philanthropic work if I have clearly indicated the general difference between the restitution for self-preservation practiced half-unconsciously by our own class, and the reciprocal help of the workers among themselves, pending their struggle for the abolition of the system under which they, and with them the whole of society suffer.

As to the book-work to be done by way of theoretical preparation for efficient work for the elevation of the race, we Americans have had slender opportunity of becoming acquainted with the literature of modern scientific political economy, because its fundamental works have hitherto been locked up in a foreign language. We have, indeed, been at a double disadvantage in this respect, for not only were the works themselves not accessible, but the reports upon their contents were, in too many cases, made either by men who had a direct interest in misrepresenting them, or by persons insufficiently qualified for the task, whose résumés and popularizations, though, doubtless, honorably meant, have nevertheless been misleading. Now, however, the works themselves are accessible to all who are willing to do the preliminary elementary reading requisite for understanding them.

One excellent little preliminary work is an American volume, entitled "The Coöperative Commonwealth." Though by no means a strictly scientific work, this popular essay serves as a capital introduction to the theory of social development.

Another useful preliminary work is August Bebel's "Woman, in the Past, Present and Future," which is most suggestive and well worth reading, even by persons who do not propose to make any systematic study of social questions.

Having gone through these slender preliminaries, there remain in fundamental works, most of which have only now been made accessible in English—most, but not all of them, for one of the most valuable works of this literature is the creation of our fellow-countryman, Lewis Morgan, the result of his forty years of research into the development of society through the stages of savagery and barbarism to civilization. "Ancient Society," the most important of his works, shows that he reached by this wholly different route the same conclusions reached by the great founder of our modern scientific political economy, Karl Marx. Marx and his friend Engels have made a most brilliant popularization, elaboration and condensation of this work, under the title "Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staates," which is warmly to be recommended, to those who read German. It will also be translated into English in the near future.

Another of the indispensable books is "The Condition of the Working Class in England," by Frederick Engels, which is especially valuable for American readers, because the conditions described in it as prevailed in England at the time of its appearance in German are reproduced upon a still larger scale in America now at the moment of its publication in an English translation. It is the best introduction to the study of modern scientific political economy and of the fundamental work par excellence thereof, "Capital," by Karl Marx.

The last-named classical work has, within the past half-year, been made accessible to English readers. Published in 1867 in German, it was at once translated into Russian, and, after a lapse of several years, into French; but only now, after twenty years, has it come into the possession of the English-speaking peoples. It is to political economy what the works of Darwin are to the natural sciences, a theory of development and a critical investigation thereof. So great is the importance of this work, that despite the prohibition of the German Imperial Government and the enmity of professional opponents of its teachings, there is not a chair of

economy in any German University whose occupant is not forced sooner or later to deal with it; while candidates for promotion in the field of economics find it their most fruitful field for critical investigation. She who has mastered this work thoroughly finds a wholly new standpoint from which to judge the society of today, with its good and its evils.

The war of classes is seen in a new light as the struggle which can and must end only in a higher organization of society; the ever-intensifying concentration of the means of production in the hands of the few, however frightful the suffering it involves to the many, appears as the necessary transition from the haphazard production of today to the orderly work of the future. The organization of labor—that bugbear of the timid and the ignorant—is seen to be the one great hope of a peaceful transition from the wage-slavery and class-rule of today to that true democracy of the future when all shall be free, not in name only but in deed and in truth. The evils of oppression, exploitation and greed of gain, on the one hand, and of overwork, pauperism, disease, intemperance, and a thousand-and-one subordinate ills our philanthropy deals with, on the other, assume their true relations and proportions as integral parts, inherent qualities in a changing social system. And the real philanthropic work, the real work for the elevation of the race, the truest, highest expression of our love of mankind proves to be the task of making clear to the workers the cause of the evils under which they and, with them, the whole of society suffer,

showing them where lies their strength and where their weakness, where they can work in harmony with the process of social development, and where to find the point of least resistance.

For the future rests with the working class. As the civil elements of society once slowly grew to power, struggling long in vain against monarchy and aristocracy until with one mighty upheaval they threw off, in the French Revolution, the yoke of feudalism, so now the working class, slowly growing in union and power, in enlightenment and conscious will, is gathering its forces to assume the helm. However much the wreckage that our system engenders within its ranks, however great the privation, the suffering inflicted by our class rule, the wreckage after all is only a small part of the whole vast class, while the enlightened portion of it increases with every passing day. To cast our lot with the workers, to seek to understand the laws of social and industrial development, in the midst of which we live, to spread this enlightenment among the men and women destined to contribute to the change to a higher social order, to hasten the day when all the good things of society shall be the goods of all the children of men, and our petty philanthropy of today superfluous—this is the true work for the elevation of the race, the true philanthropy. And I think you will agree with me that before we are ready to enter upon it we have sore need of theoretical preparation.

FLORENCE KELLEY WISCHNEWETZKY.

Full Text of "Maternity Act"

[Public 97—67th Congress; 42 Stat. 135]

AN ACT FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE WELFARE AND HYGIENE OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums specified in section 2 of this Act, to be paid to the several States for the purpose of cooperating with them in promoting the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the current fiscal year \$480,000, to be equally apportioned among the several States, and for each subsequent year, for the period of five years, \$240,000, to be equally apportioned among the several States in the manner hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this Act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, an additional sum of \$1,000,000, and annually thereafter, for the period of five years, an additional sum not to exceed \$1,000,000: *Provided, further*, That the additional appropriations herein authorized shall be apportioned \$5,000 to each State and the balance among the States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the States of the United States, according to the last preceding United States census: *And provided further*, That no payment out of the additional appropriation herein authorized shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State for the maintenance of the services and facilities provided for in this Act.

So much of the amount apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unpaid to such State at the close thereof shall be available for expenditures in that State until the close of the succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Board of Maternity and Infant Hygiene, which shall consist of the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and the United States Commissioner of Education, and which is hereafter designated in this Act as the Board. The Board shall elect its own chairman and perform the duties provided for in this Act.

The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor shall

be charged with the administration of this Act, except as herein otherwise provided, and the Chief of the Children's Bureau shall be the executive officer. It shall be the duty of the Children's Bureau to make or cause to be made such studies, investigations, and reports as will promote the efficient administration of this Act.

SEC. 4. In order to secure the benefits of the appropriations authorized in section 2 of this Act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this Act and designate or authorize the creation of a State agency with which the Children's Bureau shall have all necessary powers to cooperate as herein provided in the administration of the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That in any State having a child-welfare or child-hygiene division in its State agency of health, the said State agency of health shall administer the provisions of this Act through such divisions. If the legislature of any State has not made provision for accepting the provisions of this Act the governor of such State may in so far as he is authorized to do so by the laws of such State accept the provisions of this Act and designate or create a State agency to cooperate with the Children's Bureau until six months after the adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature in such State following the passage of this Act.

SEC. 5. So much, not to exceed 5 per centum, of the additional appropriations authorized for any fiscal year under section 2 of this Act, as the Children's Bureau may estimate to be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act, as herein provided, shall be deducted for that purpose, to be available until expended.

SEC. 6. Out of the amounts authorized under section 5 of this Act the Children's Bureau is authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to be taken from the eligible lists of the Civil Service Commission, and to purchase such supplies, material, equipment, office fixtures, and apparatus, and to incur such travel and other expenses as it may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. Within sixty days after any appropriation authorized by this Act has been made, the Children's Bureau shall make the apportionment herein provided for and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount estimated by the bureau to be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the treasurers of the various States the amount which has been apportioned to each State for the fiscal year for which such appropriation has been made.

SEC. 8. Any State desiring to receive the benefits of this Act shall, by its agency described in section 4, submit to the Children's Bureau detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of this Act within such State, which plans shall be subject to the approval of the board: *Provided*, That the plans of the States under this Act shall provide that no official or agent, or representative in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall enter any home or take charge of any child over the objection of the parents, or either of them, or the person standing in loco parentis or having custody of such child. If these plans shall be in conformity with the provisions of this Act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes they shall be approved by the board and due notice of such approval shall be sent to the State agency by the chief of the Children's Bureau.

SEC. 9. No official, agent, or representative of the Children's Bureau shall by virtue of this Act have any right to enter any home over the objection of the owner thereof, or to take charge of any child over the objection of the parents, or either of them, or of the person standing in loco parentis or having custody of such child. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the power of a parent or guardian or person standing in loco parentis to determine what treatment or correction shall be provided for a child or the agency or agencies to be employed for such purpose.

SEC. 10. Within sixty days after any appropriation authorized by this Act has been made, and as often thereafter while such appropriation remains unexpended as changed conditions may warrant, the Children's Bureau shall ascertain the amounts that have been appropriated by the legislatures of the several States accepting the provisions of this Act and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount to which each State is entitled under the provisions of this Act. Such certificate shall state (1) that the State has, through its legislative authority, accepted the provisions of this Act and designated or authorized the creation of an agency to cooperate with the Children's Bureau, or that the State has otherwise accepted this Act, as provided in section 4 hereof; (2) the fact that the proper agency of the State has submitted to the Children's Bureau detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of this Act, and that such plans have been approved by the board; (3) the amount, if any, that has been appropriated by the legislature of the State for the maintenance of the services and facilities of this Act, as provided in section 2 hereof; and (4) the amount to which the State is entitled under the provisions of this Act. Such certificate, when in conformity with the provisions hereof, shall, until revoked as provided in section 12 hereof, be sufficient authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment to the State in accordance therewith.

SEC. 11. Each State agency cooperating with the Children's Bureau under this Act shall make such reports concerning its operations and expenditures as shall be prescribed or requested by the bureau. The Children's Bureau may, with the approval of the board, and shall, upon request of a majority of the board, withhold any further certificate provided for in section 10 hereof whenever it shall be determined as to any State that the agency thereof has not properly expended the money paid to it or the moneys herein required to be appropriated by such State for the purposes and in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Such certificate may be withheld until such time or upon such conditions as the Children's Bureau, with the approval of the board, may determine; when so withheld the State agency may appeal to the President of the United States who may either affirm or reverse the action of the Bureau with such directions as he shall consider proper: *Provided*, That before any such certificate shall be withheld from any State, the chairman of the board shall give notice in writing to the authority designated to represent the State, stating specifically wherein said State has failed to comply with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 12. No portion of any moneys apportioned under this Act for the benefit of the States shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of any buildings or lands, nor shall any such moneys or moneys required to be appropriated by any State

for the purposes and in accordance with the provisions of this Act be used for the payment of any maternity or infancy pension, stipend, or gratuity.

SEC. 13. The Children's Bureau shall perform the duties assigned to it by this Act under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor, and he shall include in his annual report to Congress a full account of the administration of this Act and expenditures of the moneys herein authorized.

SEC. 14. This Act shall be construed as intending to secure to the various States control of the administration of this Act within their respective States, subject only to the provisions and purposes of this Act.

Approved, November 23, 1921.

The Woman Patriot

ISSUED TWICE A MONTH

THE WOMAN PATRIOT PUBLISHING COMPANY

726 FOURTEENTH STREET NORTHWEST

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE WOMAN PATRIOT PUBLISHING COMPANY

President, Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, Southampton, N. Y.; Vice-President, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Cambridge, Mass.; Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Board of Directors: Mrs. John Balch, Milton, Mass.; Mrs. Randolph Frothingham; Mrs. Rufus M. Gibbs, Baltimore, Md.; Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, Mrs. B. L. Robinson.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF THE WOMAN PATRIOT

Published semi-monthly at Washington, D. C., for April 1, 1926, District of Columbia, ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia aforesaid, personally appeared J. S. Eichelberger, who having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of THE WOMAN PATRIOT and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse side of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher—The Woman Patriot Publishing Company, 8 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Editor—J. S. Eichelberger, 8 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. Managing Editor—None.

Business Manager—J. S. Eichelberger, 8 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

2. That the owners are: The Woman Patriot Publishing Company, 8 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C., with the following stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of the total amount of stock: Mrs. Horace Brock, 1830 Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. E. L. Carpenter, 300 Clifton Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.; Mrs. R. G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.; Mrs. Charles W. Henry, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. E. C. Lindley, 251 Summit Ave., St. Paul, Minn.; Mrs. Herbert L. Satterlee, 37 East 36th Street, New York City; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Greenville, Del.; Helen H. Whitney, Manhasset, L. I., New York.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also in cases where the stockholders or security holders appear upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a *bona fide* owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect, in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date above shown is . . . (This information is required from daily publications only.)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th day of April, 1926.

(SEAL)

J. S. EICHELBERGER, Editor.

IRVIN W. BUCKLIN.

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

(My commission expires March 24, 1930.)