

Total number of subscribers for week ending Jan. 29 346,236
 Number of new subs for week ending February 5 14,882
 Number of existing subs for week ending February 5 8,227
 Total Number of Subs for Week Ending February 5 352,871
 Total Edition Printed Last Week 509,150

Established Aug. 31, 1895

FIFTY CENTS A YEAR
 Six Months 25 Cents
 Clubs of Four or More (40 Weeks) 25 Cents

This is Number 742

Appeal to Reason.

J. A. WAYLAND

Entered at Girard, Kansas, postoffice as second class mail matter.
 FRED D. WARREN,
 MANAGING EDITOR.

Girard, Kansas, U. S. A., February 19, 1910

Debs Dates for Pennsylvania
 Du Bois, Pa., Avenue Theater, Sunday, February 20, 2:30 p. m.
 Reading, Pa., Auditorium, Monday, February 21, 8 p. m.
 Pottsville, Pa., Union Hall, Tuesday, February 22, 8:15 p. m.
 Philadelphia, Labor Liceum Hall, Wednesday, Feb. 23, 8 p. m.
 Dates for West Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and New York will be announced next week. Route begins March 12th.

A BRACE OF JUDICIAL MOUNTEBANKS---WILL THEY BE IMPEACHED?

WITH the last six or seven issues of the Appeal the character and conduct of Peter S. Grosscup, senior federal judge of the Seventh judicial circuit, have been subjected to as merciless an expose as was ever accorded a public official in the United States. In separate and successive articles we have branded and proven him to be a home-wrecker, an embezzler, a bribe-taker, a traction looter, a manslayer, a derelict in office, a Standard Oil hireling, and a genuine scoundrel from the place of his birth to his present residence. It was charged and the evidence disclosed that he has committed nearly every crime in the calendar, from rape to manslaughter.



Preceding the Grosscup disclosures, in a series of five articles, this paper charged and proved that John C. Pollock, judge of the federal court in Kansas, possessed the characterless personality of a Pilate and pointed out that his judicial record by comparison would dishonor a Benedict Arnold. He was shown to be a traitor to clients as a lawyer and a prostitute to plutocracy on the bench. Specifically and definitely Pollock was charged with being a drunkard, a gambler, a taker of bribes, a servant of the corporations and an uncompromising foe of the people.

As livid as the light of heaven these men have been held up to public analysis so that today millions of men and women in America know them as they really are—a brace of scoundrels garbed in judicial ermine and masquerading as conservators of law and justice.

Again this paper charges Grosscup and Pollock with their crimes. Either these charges are true or they are false.

If false, the editor of this paper and the writer of the articles should be sent to jail.

If true, Grosscup and Pollock should be impeached and retired to private life in disgrace.

Lengthy repetition of the charges against these judicial big-wigs is unnecessary here. It is enough to declare that beside such men as these an ordinary horse-thief is a white-souled gentleman and a colored cut-purse a public benefactor.

If it were possible to use harsher language to make the comparisons more invidious harsher language would be employed. To adequately express the contempt and righteous indignation that rises against these judges simple pen and ink are insufficient.

At a conservative estimate the Appeal is read by a million persons each week. The audacity of the judiciary disclosures has astounded this nation and the truthfulness of the charges against Grosscup and Pollock has precipitated a discussion that will not, and cannot, down. Everybody wants to know what is going to be done. In the face of these charges this paper, voicing the sentiments of its readers, asks Grosscup and Pollock what they propose to do?

The same query is put direct to congress.

That body is the constitutional creator of the federal judiciary and is empowered to dissolve the institution at will. Congress has been confronted with the facts of the official maladministration of Grosscup and Pollock.

FROM NATIONAL PROHIBITIONIST, CHICAGO, JAN. 27th.
 It would seem to us that it is "up to" Judge Peter S. Grosscup, of the United States court, to take some action against the Socialist paper, the Appeal to Reason, or to confess that the staggering charges made by that paper concerning him are true. If the statements which the Appeal to Reason has published concerning the personal character and official record of Judge Grosscup are not true, someone ought to be severely punished for the publication of a gross and outrageous libel. If they are true, the continued presence of Judge Grosscup on the bench of a federal court is an outrage upon the whole American people.

FROM THE GAZETTE, MEDINA, OHIO, REPUBLICAN.
 There is a man named Peter Grosscup, a United States judge at Chicago, who is a disgrace to the bench and a reproach to the judicial ermine. If he is clean in any way, proven facts don't disclose it. He is an Ashland, Ohio, product mentally well equipped, but morally close to the degenerate class, his position and opportunity in life considered. He's a convicted home wrecker, he's a petty railroad-pass grafter, he's a demagogue and at the same time a willing servant of all corporate interests as instanced by his reversal of Judge Landis' decision fining the Standard Oil company \$29,000,000. Yet this incarnated moral perversion sits on a United States court bench to disgrace it and bring reproach and suspicion upon it.

If these two federal judges will not take action against the Appeal to Reason, then congress should immediately begin impeachment proceedings that will deprive these judges of their jobs.

At the outset the Appeal realized that in analyzing and exposing the federal judiciary it was assaulting capitalism's strongest bulwark. For a century lawyers and politicians and preachers and other public dignitaries had inculcated the idea that the federal judiciary was a sacred institution and that the judges were above criticism. Taking advantage of this situation the judges, like "miners and sappers," have encroached more and more on the other departments of government, and, with the flight of years, have added to their power until today—this moment—they are the arbiters of the nation's destiny, the dictators of the people's will.

Against this dictatorship the Appeal dared to raise its voice. Careful analysis disclosed that the unwarranted power assumed by the federal judiciary is always used to protect and promote the interests of plutocracy and to further enslave the working class. In its investigations the Appeal was specific and definite. The first two judges investigated were found to be reeking with rottenness and steeped in crime. Instead of being better and holier than the common run of men, as the time-serving lickspittles of capitalism would have the people believe, these wearers of judicial ermine were shown to be human and vulnerable. Subsequent investigations disclose that Grosscup and Pollock are typical of their tribe; virtually the entire federal bench is composed of conscienceless poltroons appointed by mercenary politicians to subserve the interests of the rotten rich.

The facts of these disclosures can neither be refuted nor denied. Every well informed person knows the Appeal has told nothing but the simple truth about the judiciary, and that the stories printed in these columns are only a portion of the whole truth that might be told were all the facts obtainable.

Grosscup and Pollock dare not face the Appeal in a Kansas court in a suit for criminal libel. These judges know this paper can prove its charges, and that according to the Kansas statutes—

"In all prosecutions or indictments for criminal libel the truth may be given in evidence to the jury, and if it appears to them that the matter charged as libelous was true, and was published with good motives and justifiable ends, the defendants shall be acquitted."

Scores of letters are being received daily asking what the Appeal proposes to do about this matter. In reply we declare that this paper has power only to ascertain the facts of judicial rottenness and publish them to the world. This the Appeal has done, and will continue to do.

The congress of the United States alone has power to act. That body can investigate any federal judge and impeach him if the evidence warrants such action.

A congressman at any time may introduce a resolution asking for the investigation of a federal judge. If the judiciary committee decides to act it can be authorized to examine evidence and subpoena witnesses. Upon the findings and recommendation of the investigating committee depends the action of the house.

In common with hundreds of thousands of men and women of every political creed this paper believes the time has come when action, immediate and decisive, should be taken by congress against the federal judges whose records have been exposed.

Grosscup and Pollock should be impeached. They are proved criminals, defiantly holding the highest official positions in this government. Their continuance in office is a reflection upon the integrity of their congressional creators and a damning disgrace to the American people.

Their removal would have a salutary effect upon the remaining members of the bench, and would inspire the people with the thought that congress had not gone completely over to the plutocracy, as is charged by the Socialist press.

The Appeal cannot act, but congress can.

To test congress in this matter, and, if possible, compel it to act, I am going to ask every reader of this paper to write at once to his or her congressman, reciting the facts of the Appeal's exposures and indictments, and demand that their Washington representative do something.

Besides writing this letter, I want to suggest that copies of the Appeal containing the Grosscup and Pollock exposes be sent with the letter to the congressman. If the Appeals are not at hand I will supply the entire series at cost.

Comrades, let us put it up to congress in no uncertain tones that now is the time for it to show its hand.

We can compel congress to impeach Grosscup and Pollock, or, by failing to act, brand the national legislature as the sponsor and backer of this brace of judicial harlots.

It is not enough that the federal judges be exposed. Let us make congress take a definite, decided stand in this matter.

Write your letters at once—five hundred thousand strong—and send the Appeal's judiciary articles direct from your homes to Washington.

We have the judges' records. Let's see if the record of congress will be as black.

THE APPEAL NOT AFRAID.

Since resolutions were introduced at Chicago calling for an investigation of the federal judges, and, in case they were proven guilty of what the Appeal has charged, that they be impeached, while if the Appeal fails to make its case, that it be ruled from the mails case, that it be ruled from the mails case, not a last test—that the judges will be whitewashed and the investigation be made a mere excuse for destroying the Appeal. Carl Strover, in the Chicago Daily Socialist voices the protest thus: Let us hope that the Chicago Federation of Labor will have the good sense to vote down that part of the resolution last referred to. The representatives of labor can under no circumstances afford to endorse any such dictatorial and outrageous power as the exclusion of any paper from the mails by executive order for a part of fear. Have we not had enough of that sort of thing? Are the workers of Chicago shortsighted enough to endorse the principle that whenever a publication has a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking a person of prominence, that then it should be suppressed by executive order, if you please, congressmen? Or, if you please, we advocate the abolition of the freedom of the press. Is it not enough that the editors may be fined and jailed for criminal libel—that a "mistake" in attacking

GREAT OUT-POURING IN OHIO

The Debs Speaking Tour Gaining in Force and Recognition--Eleven Thousand Subs Taken This Week

The three meetings at Hamilton, Dayton, Columbus and Canton were the greatest Socialist demonstrations ever held in these cities. They were remarkable for their vast audiences and tumultuous enthusiasm. Comrades at each point had done their work thoroughly. Dayton and Canton come in for first honors, to say nothing disparaging about the others, for they were all of the first magnitude. But the outpourings at Dayton and Canton were so magnificent that they were worth walking a hundred miles to look upon. At Dayton the National theater, the largest and finest opera house in the city was crowded to the doors. The band consisted wholly of Socialists and rendered the most stirring military airs. The pit, parquet, all the galleries, and boxes were packed with as fine an audience as ever gathered on any occasion. In his opening Debs alluded to it as a vast fountain of inspiration. All acts and favors were shown in the admission as the price was the same to all and the first who came were the first served. Judges touched elbows with hod carriers and swell society ladies sat side by side with factory girls. Every phase of society was represented and all were alike interested in the gospel of the revolution which poured forth in a steady torrent for over two hours.

We left the comrades in high feather, all agreeing that it was the greatest Socialist meeting Dayton had ever seen and that the outlook for the movement was brighter than at any previous time in its history. At the close of the lecture the crowd repaired to the Socialist headquarters which occupy an entire ground floor in the heart of Main street. Many came forward to join the local and the headquarters was packed to the doors and presented a scene of animation rarely witnessed.

At Canton a tremendous meeting was held in the auditorium, the finest and largest in the state of Ohio. The crowd was like that at Dayton and equally enthusiastic. It was the greatest Socialist meeting Canton had ever seen, and at the close the Socialist yell resounded on all the streets of Canton. When we left there the comrades were all flushed with exultation and everybody was talking about that wonderful Socialist demonstration. On the streets the "kids" were giving imitations of Debs' oratory and striving to fit themselves to proclaim the glad tidings of the coming revolution.

One remarkable feature of the meetings is that the judges and lawyers are out in full force. They all seem to feel that there is a special call to them and they are not disappointed. At Canton two of the most prominent judges in Ohio shook Debs by the hand and told him that his indictment of the courts, terrific as it was, was right and that his speech ought to be heard by every judge and by every lawyer in the United States.

Needless to say that the federal judiciary is handled without gloves. The review of the Warren case is the vital feature and never fails to evoke the most tumultuous applause. These meetings are raking the Buckeye state as the old state has never been raked before.

Debs at Ashland.
Gazette, Ashland, Ohio.
Even those who differ with him must concede the earnestness, ability and charm of orator possessed by Eugene V. Debs, the great labor leader, who spoke to the five hundred men who filled the lower floor of the opera house Monday night. He came under arrangements made with the Appeal to Reason, the Socialist organ, which is now making such a bitter attack upon Judge Grosscup, whose former home was in Ashland. This, in a measure, accounted for the large audience, but those who went for the purpose of hearing a rehearsal of Judge Grosscup's private career were disappointed, as Mr. Debs confined himself to his judicial career, but what he said about that was most severe and scathing.

Debs Dates for Pennsylvania.
Du Bois, Pa.—Avenue Theater, Sunday, February 20th, 2:30 p. m.
Pittsburgh, Pa.—Auditorium, Monday, February 21st 8 p. m.
Pottsville, Pa.—Union Hall, Tuesday, February 22d 8:15 p. m.
Pittsburgh, Pa.—Labor Union Hall, Wednesday, February 23d, 8 p. m.
Dates for West Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and New York will be announced next week. Route begins March 12th.

Success at Portsmouth.
By telegram to Appeal to Reason.
Portsmouth, O., Feb. 11.—A terrific snow storm is raging at Portsmouth, but the comrades have already sold nearly a thousand tickets, which insures a successful meeting. One ardent young comrade has sold ninety-seven tickets.

Debs Dates for Pennsylvania.
Du Bois, Pa.—Avenue Theater, Sunday, February 20th, 2:30 p. m.
Pittsburgh, Pa.—Auditorium, Monday, February 21st 8 p. m.
Pottsville, Pa.—Union Hall, Tuesday, February 22d 8:15 p. m.
Pittsburgh, Pa.—Labor Union Hall, Wednesday, February 23d, 8 p. m.
Dates for West Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and New York will be announced next week. Route begins March 12th.

Will Print the Report.
On page 1028 of the congressional record for January 26, 1910, Vol. 45, No. 29, appear the following words taken from a speech delivered by Congressman Adamson while discussing the white slave bill: "The publication of such vile stuff is not advisable. A few dirty things printed in the report of the late Homes Commission provokes such a protest as to result in its suppression." Our servants at Washington are very much concerned as to the sort of literature which falls in the hands of the common people. As Adamson's Commission were of such a character that the capitalist congress has suppressed the report, this report discloses a condition which is appalling and disgusting—an exhibition of capitalism in all of its nakedness. It gave the direct lie to Roosevelt's mouthings about the morality of the supporters of the present system. It would not do, therefore, to let the common people know that this committee appointed by Roosevelt himself, had discovered. Fortunately the Appeal secured a copy of the original report, and as our readers will remember, a special edition of the Appeal was printed and circulated broadcast throughout the land. It was the publication of this report which

forced Roosevelt to back down in his attack on Socialism, using as his principal argument the statement that "Socialism occupies a position of all morality and especially to domestic morality position so revolting that it is difficult to discuss it in a respectable paper." The world has heard very little from Roosevelt since that time. The wide circulation of his Homes Commission report by the Appeal, which will be followed later on by the wide distribution of a special issue of the Appeal containing the suppressed portions of the report on the white slave traffic, will make it pretty plain to the American people where Roosevelt and his class stand on the question of morality.

Appeals.
Please be guided by the following and the Appeal clerical force will see up and call you blessed. Sign your name and address to everything you receive. Make all checks, money orders, drafts, etc., payable to Appeal to Reason—not to individuals. When renewing a subscription be sure to give number of present report. Don't ask for sub cards on credit. The margin of profit on a subscription is so small that to open a book account for it would turn it into a deficit. Don't address communications to, nor expect answers from, individuals connected with the Appeal. When sending new subscriptions or renewing old ones be sure to give rural route and box numbers if paper is to be sent to a rural route. Write on printing for amounts less than \$5.00.

Demands Grosscup be Impeached

Chicago Daily Socialist.

"Scum" and "vermin" were terms emphatically applied to Judge Peter Stenger Grosscup in the Chicago Federation of Labor at its meeting Sunday, when a set of resolutions came before that body asking for a congressional investigation of the charges made by the Appeal to Reason, the Socialist weekly, of Girard, Kan. The resolutions aroused one of the most enthusiastic discussions ever indulged in by the delegates to the federation.

The resolutions were submitted by John C. Flora of the Carpenters' union, at the request of W. L. Rodriguez of the painters' union. Although it was pointed out that the editors of the Appeal to Reason wished it so, considerable argument was aroused over that section in the resolutions, calling for the exclusion of the Appeal to Reason from the mails if it could not prove its charges. It was claimed that the Appeal could not get a fair hearing. The matter was finally referred to the executive committee for investigation, with the understanding that a report will be returned to the federation at its next meeting.

Text of Resolutions.
The resolutions are as follows:
To the president of the United States, and to the senators and members of congress from Illinois:
Whereas, the Appeal to Reason, a paper of large circulation, published weekly in Girard, Kan., in a series of articles, has charged, among other things, Judge Peter S. Grosscup of the United States circuit court with corruption in office, and conduct unbecoming a federal judge;
Whereas, many of these articles are being printed in other papers, with editorial comment, to the great injury of the people of Illinois;
Whereas, among other things, the Appeal to Reason specifically charges Judge Grosscup with having appropriated to his own private and personal use money belonging to the United States court, a charge, which if true, should subject Judge Grosscup to impeachment and criminal prosecution;
And whereas, believing that an unimpaired and upright judiciary is necessary to the promotion of justice and to the perpetuation of representative government in this country;
Resolved, By the Chicago Federation of Labor, that the president of the United States, and the senators and members of congress from Illinois, be requested to take such action as will bring about a congressional investigation of the charges made by the Appeal to Reason to the end that if the charges are substantiated, Judge Grosscup shall be removed from office by impeachment;
And that a copy of these resolutions be immediately sent to each of the senators and congressmen from Illinois, to the special judicial committee of the House, to President William Howard Taft and to the editor of the Appeal to Reason.

An attempt to table the resolutions was quickly squelched by the delegates. A motion to concur in the resolutions, made by Delegate Charles Curtis, was seconded and the discussion gave the delegates an opportunity to say what they thought of Judge Grosscup.

Should Be Impeached.
"I believe that if Judge Grosscup is guilty of these charges, he should be impeached and thrown out of office," said Delegate Flora, who stood sponsor for the resolutions. "I am not here to prove the truth of these charges. I believe, however, that they are the most incriminating charges brought against any man in this country. The people of this country should know what kind of a man this Judge Grosscup really is."

Delegate Esdorn of the painters' union held up a copy of the last issue of the Appeal to Reason, drew attention to its large circulation, and then pointed to the article on Judge Grosscup, entitled "Judge Grosscup—the Man Slayer."

Is he a man slayer, or is he not a man slayer? asked Delegate Esdorn. If the Appeal to Reason prove its charges.

"If this matter is put up to congress for an investigation, the Appeal to Reason will be found guilty. That is a foregone conclusion. It will not be a foregone chance," said Financial Secretary Fred C. Hopp, who was against laying the Appeal to Reason liable to exclusion from the mails. "This will give congress an opportunity to put the Appeal to Reason out of the mails. It will be only a beginning toward putting every labor paper in the country outside the mails."

"Don't bother with such scum and vermin," said Delegate James B. Connors, international vice president of the switchmen's union, who didn't know whether the federation should adopt the resolutions. "If Judge Grosscup feels aggrieved he is the man who should fight the matter."

"Judge Grosscup is the most damnable scoundrel on earth," declared Delegate Glasgow. "I'm a Socialist, and if the charges made by the Appeal to Reason are not true, I'm sure that every Socialist in the United States would know it. A congressional investigation would be in favor of Judge Grosscup, who is a part of the essence of capitalism. Such an investigation would not be in favor of the Appeal to Reason. It would not be in favor of the Socialists of the United States. The capitalist newspapers would give the side of the investigation that would support the capitalist class."

Like the Daily Socialist.
Miss Margaret Haley, a delegate from the teachers' federation, said she feared giving congress an opportunity to exclude the Appeal to Reason from the mails. She pointed out how the Daily Socialist had been treated by State Attorney John E. W. Wayman, who declared there was not a scintilla of truth in what the Daily Socialist had charged, showing, however, that the charges were now being borne out by the findings of the Merriam commission and the grand jury. She said that the Appeal to Reason would receive similar treatment at the hands of a congressional investigation committee.

"If Judge Grosscup is given an investigation at Washington he will be white-washed so completely that you won't know him if he comes back here," said Delegate Connors.

The matter was finally referred to the executive committee which will be expected to enforce the resolutions after they are passed.

A JOKE ON THE FARMER.

An associated press dispatch from Salem, N. J., tells a good story illustrating how the profits from the high prices do not go to the producer but to the dealer.

According to this story a farmer brought two hogs to a local butcher and offered them for sale. A price was quickly agreed on and the farmer said he would sell, but wanted the hams and shoulders. To this the butcher was willing, and after the weight had been taken the desired parts of the hogs were cut off and handed to the farmer, who asked for the balance coming to him. After figuring a moment the butcher replied: "You owe me \$2.85." And the farmer had to pay it.

The butcher had bought the hogs at wholesale price and charged the farmer retail rates for the parts he reserved.

In effect the farmer had made the butcher a present of two hogs and then had paid \$2.85 for certain parts of them.

The Greatest Slave Market

White-slavery was at the bottom of the fight on free speech in Spokane. The Appeal was the first paper to make this statement, but subsequent information fully confirms what it said.

To understand the situation, one must remember that while Spokane has only 100,000 inhabitants, it is the recruiting center for labor for six great states. It is estimated that workers to supply 300,000 places are yearly recruited from Spokane. As many of these places are to be filled several times a year, the total number of workers annually recruited from that city runs close to a million. It is because of this fact that the employment agencies have become such a power in Spokane. These employment agencies have had demands, not only for men, but also for supplying women for immoral purposes. Cases are on record where application has been made to them as a test, for women, both professional and innocent, for supplying houses in half a dozen states, and they were willing at all times to supply any demand.

The first complaint that was made against the employment agencies was over the matter of supplying women for resorts, including what are known as white-slavery. The complaint came from the I. W. W. The response was the resurrection of a forgotten ordinance forbidding street speaking at the fire limits. After this ordinance was invoked, both Taft and Bryan spoke on the streets without molestation, but the ones who had exposed the corruption of the slave agents were strictly forbidden the use of the streets, and complied with the order. Not content with this, the I. W. W., who made the exposure, were boycotted to the extent that halls were systematically denied them. Afterward they were arrested and maltreated, as has been printed in the Appeal heretofore. The chief of police was so disgusted with the injustice of the procedure that he resigned his position, and a new man, who would not be so squeamish about silencing the revealers of graft, took his place.

Of course, there were other elements that entered into the fight later on. Spokane was simply a slave mart on an immense scale, greater than America had ever known before, and all the terror and heartlessness that go with slave driving ensued. There were charges of graft involving men high in official position. There were even indictments. The I. W. W. spoke about these things. Slave drivers cannot be expected to have any respect for the slaves they sell, and so the agitators served two purposes, the stopping of agitation and the diversion of public attention from the charges of graft. These facts account for the persistence with which the fight was waged. Grant that the I. W. W. were common-workers, that they were poor, that they lacked refinement and spoke in uncultured words; grant that they were merely slaves who had no standing with the masters (and slaves never have standing with their masters); still they were treated worse than chattel slaves were ever treated in the south; still they were wondrously patient and non-resistant; still they were the men who were building the empire of the northwest into greatness; and still they were, to a large extent, Americans who were beaten down as though they were dogs, in a way to disgrace all the land.

The fight is not yet over. There is a pretense of investigation of the white slave traffic on in this country. If it is a sincere investigation, it will go to Spokane, Wash., the greatest slave mart in the United States, and look into the situation there.

MORNING.
Light as new as ever; as songs as new as ever time has held; paintings as new, on clouds as new, as ever hung in any sky of any age; breezes sweet, and glowing dew-drops throwing beams of light as fair as earth has seen; night slipping away, hiding his while behind things old, then gliding to forest retreats and disappearing in distances; Morning bears a new world out of the deeps of the universe!

Mornings too, I see in the lives of individuals; a new light breaks and spreads till the whole of life is filled—new songs, new hopes, new purposes, new needs, new thoughts, new loves, and new roads leading on and on, sweet in the light of Purpose!

Mornings too, I see in the lives of nations and societies; the Old dying; the New taking full possession and yielding her sweet fruits over and over. This Now, this Hour, for the peoples of the earth, is Morning. Wonderful beyond words the great light that trembles and hovers and grows and beats its way across all fields.

State Secretary of Kansas.
Keep up the letters to congressmen and senators for copies of "Senate Document No. 110, Sixty-first Congress, Second Session, 1909." Give full title as indicated by question marks. Send the answer you get to the Appeal.

The Feast of Dives

Pittsburg (Pa.) Leader, Jan. 9, 1909.



PROTECTED as by their own armour plate and as secure from alien eyes as their own millions behind time-locked vaults, 78 millionaire steel barons (as guests of the operating officials of the Carnegie steel company at their thirtieth annual dinner), gathered at the Fort Pitt hotel last night, and put Lucullus, Epicurus and Bacchus to shame, in their own inimitable and highly cultured ways.

To calculate the millions, the hundreds of millions represented by those tickling their tired palates with caury and the sparkling Burgundy, would stagger the imagination even of a Jules Verne.

So, indeed, it was no more than fitting, when the nabobs did gather to feast gastronomically that uniformed men of brass should be present to guard them. And then, like true retainers, to assist the lords, if need be, to their awaiting equipages, after the feast.

They were there, those guards—trusted men and true. And right well did they their duties perform. So thick and so valiant were they that 'twould have been impossible to have projected so much as a whisper toward the bedecked hall, without detection. Presumptuous and inquisitive outsiders who surreptitiously sought to send glances into and through the vineclad entrances were all but annihilated by scorchingly scathing glances, and every glance was put down as an applicant for a (Carnegie) medal.

But, after all, there was something earthly about the banquet of the gods of steel and finance. Admittedly, the viands were much more costly, the decorations vastly more sumptuous and the bouquet of the wines incalculably more fragrant than that which ordinary mortals and steel molders and iron puddlers enjoy, but the feasters were only men, after all, men who made that banquet disintegrate as banquets that have gone before.

And just at each of those 12 feasts that went before the Broadway-fed appetites became satiated and their thirsts became assuaged long after the thirsts continued to accept. And there was much song. Echoes of the blue-clad retainers of the Carnegie company, despite their double rows of brass buttons, could not prevent percolating to the outer confines. Valiantly did they draw close to one another, and like good and brave soldiers, sought to indicate that they wotted not of this thing, and that, therefore, other ears must deceive their possessors.

Finally, after the terrapin, the quail and the preliminaries had gone the way of all such things, and the unnecessary cut glass, silver and nappery was cleared away to give easier setting to the goblets, the hallow-stemmed glasses and the ten-piped green-hued receptacles with tinfoil around their necks, the brave attendants looked askance and imploringly toward the inquisitive, as if beseeching them to disbelieve their own ears.

And then while all without waited anxiously and expectantly, the key-holes of the doors were plugged and the sound of song and the notes of laughter, staccato, pianissimo and otherwise, was muffled, as it were, but not altogether subdued.

The barons within were ready to be up and really doing; and the barons were merry; but the barons were fearful.

Whereupon, with due ceremony, black curtains were dropped over all the windows and red curtains over all the doors of the hall.

And, moreover, as if the curtains were not sufficient, the musicians with disappointment in their eyes and chagrin in their hearts fled out. And it was by the clock only 10 p. m.

Whereupon, the waiters left the halls, after the manner of wet hens, appearing almost bedraggled. And as they emerged the doors necessarily were opened and again there was a noise as of Babel. And it was 10:15 by the clock.

Then more waiters emerged bearing songless canary birds in their cages. Parenthetically, it might be mentioned that the puzzled many outsiders, who do not believe that little birds "ever tell." And it was then 10:19.

And, finally, Hotel Manager C. A. Blanchard was most thrust out of the hall. It was evident that he was chagrined—that he did not like the lack of trust upon his part of his "guests." But, nevertheless, he emerged somewhat like a catapult in all the dignity of his action. But even though he was perturbed he would give no information other than to deny that there were any feminine fish of the human species disporting in the southern lagoon that was the centerpiece of the decoration. In great detail he denied there were any women, dancers, variety actresses or otherwise.

And since none left the hall after the musicians, the waiters, the songless birds and the hotel manager, those interested must ask of the barons to learn just what happened later at the annual cats and wine ball of the steel barons—just what cause the incongruity and lack of sympathy in the



THE MODERN JINX
INFORMED LACKIES

THE MODERN JINX
INFORMED LACKIES

THE MODERN JINX
INFORMED LACKIES

Dead in the Bread Line

New York World, January 9, 1910.



THE OLD man died first, but the young man seemed to be the weaker and the hungrier as the two friends in adversity tottered to the door of the Municipal Lodging house, at Twenty-fifth street and the East River, last night. So it was that the starving man of sixty supported his starving companion of twenty-eight as they dragged their dreary way along the water front to the city's bread line, supported him and urged him to hold out for another block or two, to keep up his spirits for a few more minutes until he could get to the free food, and thus strengthen himself for the next day's hunt for work.

The starving man of only twenty-eight groaned and staggered on with the help of the feeble arm about his waist.

The starving man of sixty said cheerily, "There's the lodging house light block up! Ajoo ajoo! Ajoo! We'll smell the coffee in a minute."

There were a hundred men in the line ahead of them when they reached the goal. Those hundred were merely hungry, suffering from hunger, but they did not have to hold each other up till their turfs came. So these derelicts recognized that there were grades of suffering even on the bread line. They stood aside to let the old man and the young man pass in ahead of them. They risked their own precarious places by stepping out of line to let those who were starving get to the bread.

"Don't you smell the coffee now?" murmured Sixty to Twenty-eight; but the younger man was senseless. It was only the support of his friend of the streets that kept him from falling before the pyramid of bread and the steaming urn of coffee.

"He's starving; I know him, but I don't know his name. Feed him, quick," murmured Sixty to Twenty-eight; but the younger man was senseless. It was only the support of his friend of the streets that kept him from falling before the pyramid of bread and the steaming urn of coffee.

Relieved of his burden, the old man stretched out his hand toward the bread. He touched it and fell dead.

The hungry hundred knew that he was dead; no need for the red tape of the coroner to tell them that. The red tape merely required that he should be covered with a sheet and left where he fell, between the society's doler of the bread and coffee.

The evening rites went on with one little difference. As each one reached out across the man who was no longer hungry for the allowance of bread with one hand he raised the other to remove a battered hat in honor of the dead brother.

The younger man was revived for a few minutes. He said that he was Lawrence Scott, a plumber, of No. 51 Mills street, Cincinnati. He said he had walked 175 miles, in making his way to New York. He said he did not know the dead man, and added: "We were together on the street. He helped me get here. I don't know his name." Then the younger man became unconscious again and was taken to Bellevue. The doctors say he, too, will die of starvation.

Neither man had been drinking. Neither man had an overcoat or underclothes—just outside rags to conform to the law if they not fit the temperature. Neither man had so much as a scrap of paper that would suggest his identity. But the police must have statistics and records is the best they could do for a record of the incident on the blotter of the East Twenty-second street precinct.

Man, about sixty years old, unknown, five feet eight; died at Municipal Lodging house; starvation.

Man, about twenty-eight years old, unknown, five feet seven and a half, removed in dying condition from Municipal Lodging House to Bellevue; starvation.

Socialist Fables

The Ruler of the Roost.
Biddy had laid an egg and proceeded to crow over it. After she had her say for while an old Rooster upbraided her: "For heaven's sake," said Chanticleer, "when are you going to be still?" "Didn't I do this work?" inquired Biddy? "Haven't I a right to crow over it?"

"Mildly, perhaps; but this agitation is tiresome. Whose egg is it, anyhow?" "Mine," was the reply.

The Old Rooster laughed. "You will find out when the fellow who feeds you comes to gather it."

"Who is he?" inquired Biddy with great airs. "He feeds me, I feed him, too; and he wouldn't feed me if he was not getting the most out of it."

"Quite correct, my dear," said her lord. "It is for this reason that you should be a little less noisy about what you accomplish."

"What harm can it do?" persisted the proud hen. But the Old Rooster effectually squelched her when he said: "Drop it quick. You may lay the egg but it is the Ruler of the Roost that counts. I am that. Be still!"

RAILROAD MEN.—What a caboose without the Appeal? Answer: A fine place to live in times of four cups. See that you do it the best time you can, a caboose.

ONE MORE GOOD BULL.—District of Columbia will send me to the hospital. Send me cards or remittance. Be used in raising the D. C. list to 3,000.

RAILROAD MEN.—What a caboose without the Appeal? Answer: A fine place to live in times of four cups. See that you do it the best time you can, a caboose.

ONE MORE GOOD BULL.—District of Columbia will send me to the hospital. Send me cards or remittance. Be used in raising the D. C. list to 3,000.

RAILROAD MEN.—What a caboose without the Appeal? Answer: A fine place to live in times of four cups. See that you do it the best time you can, a caboose.

ONE MORE GOOD BULL.—District of Columbia will send me to the hospital. Send me cards or remittance. Be used in raising the D. C. list to 3,000.

"You'll find this on page 28 of the Appeal to Reason," writes E. C. Birmingham, Geneva, N. Y., who sends in this article. Here's what he refers to:

Page 28—Lincoln on slavery: "I have been told that you thought that all men should be free; but if any should be slaves it is not your business to care. I desire it for myself, and secondly, those who desire it for others. Whether I bear any argument for slavery I feel a strong impulse to see it tried on him personally."

March 17, 1855, speech to an Indiana regiment.

Full that on the next employer or politician who advocates wage slavery. Tell him to try a dose of his own medicine. Give him your authority. If he's a republican politician he'll either go to work or have to admit that Lincoln was "messed back, an agitator and an undesirable citizen."

FACTS: A 96-page, vest-pocket booklet, bound in full morocco, chock full of vital statistics, presented in an entertaining manner, comes free for bustling twelve weeks only. The purchase of a dozen twenty-five cent sub cards or through joining the Bundle Club for a weekly bundle of twelve copies for a year at \$3.00.

APPEAL'S CHICAGO FIGHT.

The Chicago grafters have decided that the Appeal to Reason is too much given to telling the truth about Grosscup and skulduggery in general. Therefore, the Appeal has been denied the right of sale on any Chicago news stand. An order has gone out from the notorious Inspector Lavin that "persons" found distributing this paper on the downtown streets will be promptly arrested and prosecuted.

To give the "order" a semblance of legality an old ordinance was raked up prohibiting the sale on news stands of anything but "daily newspapers printed and published in Chicago." A representative of the Appeal was sent to Chicago. There he purchased from various news stands copies of the "Saturday Times," a weekly, published in Chicago, the "Saturday Evening Post," a weekly published in Philadelphia, Pa., weekly of race-horse pamphlets, tips on races, guaranteed to win open gambling devices—Chop Strey recipe books, etc., etc. There he laid before the chief of police calling his attention to the department's discrimination against the Appeal.

The chief, after much bluster, promised that the Appeal's sale should not be interfered with. But it ended there. The gang quickly closed in on the chief, or he backed down at the nod of the chief gangster, and word was passed along that only the Appeal was to be kept off the stands.

During the circulation man's several visits to the chief's office, one of the attendants asked him if any one had yet "tried to buy the Appeal off the Grosscup story." When told that no such overtures had been made for the very good reason that the grafters knew better than to try to "buy up" the Appeal he shook his head affirmatively and said: "I guess that's so."

Therein lies the secret of the gang's determination to crush the Appeal to Reason. It cannot be bought. Its mission is to tell the common, garden variety of truth and its spells death to the gang. They know that the influence behind Grosscup is so powerful and so plentifully supplied with money that were there any chance to stop the judiciary exposures it would have been done ere this. Therefore, the other bootlers are taking no chances.

The Appeal has not been excluded from Chicago news stands because it is a weekly paper—many weekly papers are offered for sale on the stands; it has not been ruled against because it is an out-of-town paper—the Saturday Evening Post and others are still offered for sale; it has not been discriminated against because of objectionable advertising matter in its columns—it carries no commercial advertising; it has not been denied news stand privileges because it is a Socialist paper—other Socialist papers, daily and weekly, are on Chicago stands. The Appeal to Reason cannot be sold on Chicago news stands because—it is the Appeal to Reason.

The Chicago gang is counting without the Appeal Army. Perhaps they've never heard of one Pollock, of Kansas, who sentenced the Appeal's editor to jail—and what happened to the Kansas subscription list. If the Appeal cannot be sold on the Chicago news stands it can at least be delivered by U. S. mail carriers. This is just a suggestion to the Army, particularly to the Chicago comrades. The gang can be licked to a standstill through new Chicago subs. The thing they most fear is publicity. They believe, and not without reason, that if the Appeal once gains a foothold in Chicago others will be held up to the light a la Grosscup.

The fight is on!

Whom do you know in Chicago? Put them on the list.

A present the Appeal has 2,275 subscribers.

Comrades of the Army: Get busy!

DID HE?

Did God ordain that one set of men should dictate to the others what they should pay for riding when they wanted to travel away from home?

Did God ordain that another set of men should say to the millions that they own and control the fuel of a world, and that the millions must pay what they demand or freeze?

Did God ordain that another set of men should own or control the oils buried in the earth for millions of years, and none should touch them except on their terms?

Did God ordain that another set of men should dictate the price of meat to the millions and the millions unborn?

Did God ordain that a few men should control the trees in the shape of lumber that God put on the planet for all?

Did God ordain that some men were born to rule and others born to serve?

Did He didn't, is it not their right to live and thrive on the planet, regardless of the wishes of these self-elected kings, dukes and despots? Isn't it?

It is not enough to vote for the "good man," if that man belongs to a party that stands for a bad system. You might elect "good men" till doomsday, and the exploitation of the workers would continue. Indeed, the election of a "good man" to office on an old party ticket is a calamity in that it lends respectability to a system that is essentially and morally wrong, and so bolsters it up more than the selection of a bad man to the office would do. The only way to register a vote for a real change and for real honesty is to vote a straight Socialist ticket.

PROF. THOMAS CARVER of Harvard, a man who forecast the panic of 1907, declares: "I will stake my reputation as an economist that in 1912 or '13 this country will undergo one of the worst panics of history. The supply of foodstuffs in this country is gradually becoming less than the demands of the public, and in not many years the United States will of necessity be obliged to import a quantity of its meat and other foodstuffs." There is a curious mixture of logic and crudity in this. That the panic is coming is based on sound reasons. That the United States will have to import foodstuffs in the near future is probably correct. But why it should be so the professor does not say. The reason is that the masses are being robbed until they are deteriorating. Some nations, possibly the Japanese or Chinese, who have not been so systematically robbed of late and whose resources are not yet tried, will succeed to dominance, affording the capitalists further opportunities of robbery. That is the whole aim of the present—robbery, regardless of consequences. The Harvard professor does not propose to stop the robbery—he merely shows that it is bringing ruin to America.

Any effort that would tend to benefit the people as a whole, in a kingdom, would of necessity be against the rights and privileges claimed by the king and the nobility, and they would scent danger from afar and do all they could to check it. That is true of any ruling class. So in this country any effort to relieve the people from the pressure and burdens imposed by capitalists would of necessity arouse them to more or less violent opposition. This is to be expected. Anything that they would not oppose would not be in the interest of the people. So their opposition is the sincerest evidence of the good of any proposition to the masses. When you see them snarl and threaten you may know that they are hit. They are planning all the time to gain further advantage. They never cease effort in this line, and hence they have accomplished so much. They have secured control of the government and are using all its powers to aid them. The working people must capture the government first before they can even begin to start to benefit themselves. The class that controls the government controls all the people.

Did it ever occur to you that kingdoms were made just as modern great industries are made—by merging smaller and weaker peoples or clans into a whole and managing them from one center? Well, that is just what has occurred and just what is occurring every day right now. That is the meaning of the Russian soldiers in Finland today, just as it is in the United States soldiers and sailors in Nicaragua and the Philippines; just as the steel trust, the sugar trust, the meat trust and other trusts are absorbing the lesser and weaker ones. The same old game that made ancient Rome, modern Germany and Russia is at work making modern industry, and the smaller, warring interests are being absorbed by the same law and tend to produce the same essential slavery of the many as did the ancient conquerors. And you are blind to all this? O, you fool, that has not read history understandingly. Dupe of false ideas, victim of circumstance of which you cannot interpret correctly any single move! I see it in every item of every daily and weekly paper that I pick up—and you see nothing. You are as a child reading without understanding. Socialists would give you understanding, but you were taught blind faith and no reason. And the world is tumbling forward to a tremendous fall because you are dupes of illusions, and the real is not with you. O, that I were a hypnotist that I might wake you up to the real things of the universe! Wake up, you fool and see.

CONGRESS CORRUPT.

Isn't it too bad? Senator Heyburn is out in opposition to the proposed postal savings banks on the ground that they would "destroy incomes to the amount of hundreds of millions a year." He says:

Inasmuch as the fund under the bill would reach fully \$700,000,000 it would enable the board of trustees to dictate the rate of interest throughout the country. In other words, the government proposes to fix the rate of interest at 2 1/2 per cent.

Now wouldn't it be sad if the people could borrow money at 2 1/2 per cent? Would it not be a calamity if the people were saved the payment of "hundreds of millions of dollars annually" in the way of interest which now goes to the plutocrats and the bankers? Guess you pays Heyburn; the people or the plutocrats?

As a matter of fact, the postal savings bank as proposed by Taft would prove a fake. The money would be collected by the government and then turned over to the banks, making the government a mere collecting agency for the plutocrats. There is no serious opposition to the fake proposition, this talk of Heyburn being all for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the people. The only important feature about it is the fact that men who are supposed to represent the people dare to spit on the workers so publicly and the slaves have not the stamina to resent it.

A genuine postal savings bank, where the money deposited, instead of being turned over to the banks of the big capitalists, would be used in refunding the national debt and paying the running expenses of the government, would be a most salutary law. But you need have no fear that a servile congress, with pockets stuffed with patents for public lands obtained by fraud in the interest of legislation, will do anything whatever in the interest of the people.

THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

The agitation for women's suffrage reminds me. It was in 1893 that I first engaged in politics and was recognized as one of some influence in the new political movement that was forming out of the alliance, union labor and other protest factions. I had been very active in the Pueblo, Colo., politics and we had a convention at that place with delegates from the southern congressional district. In that meeting appeared a little woman named Emma Ghent Curtis, from Canon City, who button-holed the delegates in favor of putting a plank in the platform for women's suffrage. Our convention was the first of all the parties. I was not favorable to it at first, not because I was opposed to it, but because I felt it was not expedient just at that time—I had not progressed far enough to demand right because it was right, and as my influence was really a dominant one in the meeting, she had to have me. I could not reason her out of it, and finally agreed to let the plank go in. Then she went to the democratic convention later and got it in that, and then she got it into the republican platform—so that all the platforms had the demand for women's suffrage. And it was made into a law because that little lone woman left her home and her babies and battled for it alone. I feel somewhat ashamed now that I stood out against it, but I did what at that moment seemed right. The women of this nation ought to know the name of the woman who made the first break in the solid phalanx of masculine rule—that name is Emma Ghent Curtis. I do not know if she now lives, but I think not. One woman can be a power when she puts her soul into it. Colorado was the first state to give women the suffrage, and she was the cause that produced it.

THE ETERNAL WINNER.

The rulers of men spit on the laws. You know the czar of Russia does not obey his own laws; nor do the rulers of any land—not even this land. Whenever the work people undertake to benefit by any law, that law is immediately trampled under foot. The slave owners trampled the law under foot and denied the right of free speech and press; the mine owners in Colorado did the same thing; the coal mine owners in every instance have done likewise; the bosses in Spokane are doing the same thing now. But the eternal pressure of man for greater freedom is slowly but surely crowding the masters of old could not do, the masters of today will not be able to do. It may look like they are winning, but they are losing. The outrages of the master class at Spokane has done capitalism more harm than it has had let the speakers alone. It has changed the fealty of more men and women toward capitalism than all the hundred thousand people who make up Spokane. Had slave masters been wise they would not have been stripped of their slaves without payment and they would not have had property and lives destroyed. The masters of Spokane are just as big fools as their slave master prototypes. The world moves forward regardless of the conservative forces. All acts help Socialism, just as the action of the British lords in rejecting the tax of their lands will finally strip them of all their lands and special privileges. Don't worry about the progress—keep on explaining it and show up the tyranny under it. That is the work that counts.

UNDERSTAND DIRECT LEGISLATION.

The reason that the wrongs of society are not done away with is because each citizen loses so little on any particular graft that he cannot afford to take the time and expense to agitate against it, while the man who gets a big rake-off can afford to spend a long time and much money and go on the attempts to check his efforts to trap the public. This YOU may not be robbed more than \$10 a year by the street car company, and you cannot afford to spend weeks in writing, agitating, organizing and fighting the private ownership graft, and perhaps spending much money, for so little. But the company that can make millions out of the deal can afford, simply as a business or investment, to spend many thousands in influencing the papers and voters who are too ignorant to see it in hiring corrupt men to work for them, and keep at it for years to make the millions. That is why a few men can control the many. And it is why there should be some method prepared by the public by which the people could express themselves with the least time and trouble and expense to cast their votes on the matter. That would be direct legislation—and that is why the corporations are opposed to direct legislation. Under direct legislation the citizens could express their wishes without loss of time, money or business. They could defeat every scheme to graft off them by simply no other effort than by putting their ballot in a box.

PRESSURE ON MEAT INSPECTORS.

A meat inspector writes the Appeal justifying the work of inspectors on the grounds that they are compelled to overlook violations of law by those higher up. The writer says: "I have met inspectors from almost every station in the country, and positively know that there are many ardent Socialists and some of other political faiths, who are willing to do the work according to the regulation found in B. A. I. order No. 150, but are hampered from higher up, and if they insist on protecting the people's rights to another until they become disgraced and quit the service." The Appeal is glad to make this correction. The employees are corrupted under this system in the interest of robbery by profit, and then if exposure comes they are made to bear the brunt of it, as in the sugar trusts.

THE BEAUTY OF IGNORANCE.

You average citizens know little about what is going on in your national capital. You read something about the tariff on sugar or some tariff about the trusts and that is about the extent of your knowledge. While you are thinking of these things laws and orders and schemes are being worked that give millions and millions to a few favored men in a hundred different ways. You never see the list of appropriations. They are not for general distribution. If you could get a list of the appropriations of the last congress and go over the hundreds of pages of expenditures, you would open your eyes. You would find millions appropriated for things you had never heard of and did not know existed in the world. Can't you see how corruption is natural when you who furnish the money do not know what it is being spent for? But the men who are interested in the spending know, and they are there to push the good thing along, while you poor fools are working like slaves (if you are permitted) to make a miserable living. How can you expect a good and honest government when the men who send the money know you do not know what is going on and are being importuned by men of influence to do this and that and the other that will make them rich? You wouldn't trust many of your well-known neighbors to handle your money that way, but you trust a lot of politicians whom you would not trust with your purse at all. Yes, this is a free government—where the people rule!

LOOTING THE COMMONWEALTH.

Just as the Taft government was arranging for the sale of 5,000 acres of coal lands in Alaska for \$10 per acre, John A. Ballaine, of Seattle, came along and made a proposition, in writing, to pay for these lands a royalty of fifty cents a ton for the coal mined. Accompanying this proposition was an estimate that this would net the government as high as two million dollars per 100 acres or \$20,000 per acre. There is quite a difference between ten dollars and twenty thousand dollars per acre, yet this difference represents what a vile government was preparing to give away out of the commonwealth of the people. Indeed, the contemptible steal was even greater, because it is evident that Mr. Ballaine himself expected to reap a profit from the transaction in case his proposition was accepted. But there is another feature behind it which is even more significant than the mere stealing of the people's wealth, a thing which everybody expects under this system. It has been discovered that four congressmen are tied up in the coal land proposition in Alaska. These men were sworn to look after the people's interest, and the discovery of their connection with the grabbing of Alaskan coal land is creating something of the same sensation that prevailed when it was found, during the Grant administration that many congressmen were holders of Credit Mobilier stock. It doesn't look well. It is all a piece of rotteness, but only what one ought to expect from the capitalist system. It has been the policy of the system to take of the public lands, the commonwealth, and give them to individuals until a nation of wonderful resources has been fully looted. It is the principle of capitalism that is at fault. Either there must be a commonwealth or there will be no private wealth for the majority of the people.

OH, IT'S COMING.

Joseph W. Folk is one of the cleanest men in the democratic party, too clean in fact to be in that party. It was he who cleaned out the bootlers at St. Louis and by his fearless official conduct challenged the respect of the American people. A few days ago James B. Morrow, the newspaper correspondent interviewed Mr. Folk on the political situation for the eastern press and in closing his interview Mr. Folk used these significant words:

"For the first time in our history the two most important parties that are supported by the people are without a real and debatable opinion. To say that a man is a democrat or a republican is no longer entirely true. The people are divided into a distinct issue, preached and maintained with enthusiasm and harmony, in the socialist party, and that is the reason it is making so much headway among the voters of the country."

Mr. Folk realizes that the republican and democratic parties are practically one and that there is no debatable difference between them. The only reason they do not unite is that the capitalists need them both to fool the people.

Mr. Folk also realizes that Socialism has the only party with a principle and a program for the American people.

A few days ago Henry Watterson of the Louisville Courier Journal said that Socialism was inevitable and now Jos. W. Folk, another national democratic leader, says substantially the same thing.

Oh, it's coming, and you'd better get off the track and get aboard before something hits you.

THE BEST PEOPLE.

Did you ever reflect how ridiculous it is for the workers to want all they produce in face of the fact that the neverswats want a large portion of it? If not read what J. R. Atwell Watters, of Coalinga, Cal., says about the matter:

Really, I cannot conceive how any person can expect to be successful in the nation of Socialism serious consideration. What these disturbers of social peace ask and what they claim for is the thing they are making in the extreme. We could pass their belongings over in contempt if it were not for the harmful influence they obtain over the ignorant. They create a false ambition among our laborers by their teaching of the common ownership of land and machinery by the workers and the payment of wages equal to the full amount of the product.

The resources of the nation are in the hands of the people both on the land and street teams. They are building up a wonderful system and have and are working against tremendous odds. If the laborer would only be satisfied with his own provision, he spends his wages for luxuries, good cigars, wines and other liquors, theaters and other amusements, and many of these are so that you could not distinguish them from men of money.

If these corrupting agitators realize that they are appropriating the resources of this country the task of educating them.

The downfall of capitalism will mean the uplift of the world.

STILL CLIMBING.

Forty-six states increase this week. This beats last week's record and cancels all previous high-water marks. The Army long since outdistanced all competitors; now it's racing with itself.

There's no need telling which states increase this week; but six show a loss; all others win. The Army was never in such fine condition. I've never known such a wave of enthusiasm to sweep the workers. Here and there an individual worker has not yet caught the spirit of the new move. But they can't remain dormant much longer with such intense activity all around them.

Pennsylvania shows the result of splendid work among the comrades. Texas comes to the front with a fine burst of speed. Ohio, California, Oklahoma, Missouri—all of them buckle into the work with a strength such as only the Appeal Army can show.

There's just one danger and I hope every comrade will guard against it. DON'T STOP HUSTLING. TAKE UP OTHERS WILL MAKE UP FOR YOUR LACK OF WORK. They won't. The whole Army is hard at it now because YOU are working. YOU'VE been an inspiration to some other Socialist. He started after subs because you were already in the harness. If you STOP he'll QUIT. Make no mistake about this. It's the history of the Appeal Army.

Glance down this "off and on" report. Note the progress of your state. Don't be content with this measure of success. Bigger things yet are to be had by virtue of an aggressive Army. If your state happens to be one of the six with a loss this week—work like thunder to bring it out line with the rest.

The subscription report follows:

CIRCULATION BY STATES.

States	Off	On	Total
1. Kansas	696	1,099	753
2. Pennsylvania	593	1,119	2,726
More Than 15,000.			
3. Texas	811	1,905	19,229
4. Ohio	456	810	17,943
5. California	464	729	17,592
6. Oklahoma	588	609	16,352
7. Missouri	588	609	15,414
More Than 10,000.			
8. Washington	294	507	12,172
9. Illinois	380	596	11,390
More Than 5,000.			
10. New York	241	595	9,700
11. Indiana	296	503	9,033
12. Minnesota	183	903	8,457
13. Arkansas	228	496	9,312
14. Michigan	287	458	9,195
15. Iowa	178	258	8,927
16. Colorado	170	370	8,551
17. Nebraska	128	629	8,409
More Than 3,000.			
18. Virginia	76	281	4,819
19. Wisconsin	116	251	4,692
20. Massachusetts	114	187	4,593
21. Kentucky	76	180	3,840
22. Florida	70	106	3,811
23. Montana	81	158	3,385
24. Louisiana	119	165	3,342
25. N. Dakota	105	169	3,100
More Than 2,000.			
26. S. Dakota	80	154	2,970
27. New Jersey	69	129	2,860
28. New Mexico	65	146	2,422
29. Tennessee	66	110	2,361
30. Oregon	212	84	2,300
31. Alabama	78	88	2,134
32. Connecticut	45	420	2,108
More Than 1,000.			
33. N. Carolina	35	77	1,888
34. Florida	42	73	1,788
35. Maine	48	98	1,674
36. Idaho	70	120	1,624
37. Montana	22	44	1,482
38. Georgia	77	39	1,416
39. Nevada	196	28	1,189
40. Wyoming	33	113	1,181
41. Arizona	33	50	1,138
42. Wyoming	31	39	1,043
On the Sick List.			
43. New Hamp.	16	50	936
44. Dist. of Col.	12	35	908
45. Nevada	25	16	894
46. N. Carolina	20	12	878
47. Alaska	7	25	508
48. Vermont	2	10	427
49. Delaware	2	7	227
Total	8,227	14,862	352,871

In the Hospital.

McMaster's is the best I know. The author is a republican, so don't think I am trying to work off a Socialist work on you. It is expensive, in six volumes, but you can doubtless get it in your public library. Did you ever read Thorold Rogers' "Twenty Centuries of Work and Wages"? It would open your eyes as no Socialist book would, so far as actual history is concerned. Few people are well read. It is of more worth than riches, as any one will tell you who has both. Don't you have any ambition to improve yourself? Try it. Life will come easier if you will.

LAWS AND THE FACTS.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION.

Article 1. Congress shall make no law respecting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

In view of this, what do you think of the suppressing of papers by the government, of arresting people for speaking in hired halls, of failing them by the hundreds, as at Spokane, for talking to their fellow citizens on the streets and in halls? This nation is traveling the ways of other nations, where few citizens succeeded in getting into their possession the great part of the national wealth, and of course must suppress the liberty of the people to maintain it, just as is done down in Barbarous Mexico or in Russia. Of course every act of tyranny is done under the cloak of preserving the public order. It was done that way in Rome and Carthage and Tyre and Russia and Turkey. It would not do to tell the people that liberty is to be throttled. They would not stand for that, but they are lied to and their liberties are gradually taken away from them. But every nation that did injustice reaped the whirlwind, and the world is about like it always was. Read your constitution and see how it compares with conditions.

A NEW JERSEY man is holding three-million dozen eggs on cold storage waiting for them to bring sixty cents a dozen. They ought to take possession of them and—rotten egg him.

LUCKYREURE is the new name for that which was once called literature. It is a product of capitalism, made to sell, and is produced either by the masters of their trades.

STILL CLIMBING.

Forty-six states increase this week. This beats last week's record and cancels all previous high-water marks. The Army long since outdistanced all competitors; now it's racing with itself.

There's no need telling which states increase this week; but six show a loss; all others win. The Army was never in such fine condition. I've never known such a wave of enthusiasm to sweep the workers. Here and there an individual worker has not yet caught the spirit of the new move. But they can't remain dormant much longer with such intense activity all around them.

Pennsylvania shows the result of splendid work among the comrades. Texas comes to the front with a fine burst of speed. Ohio, California, Oklahoma, Missouri—all of them buckle into the work with a strength such as only the Appeal Army can show.

There's just one danger and I hope every comrade will guard against it. DON'T STOP HUSTLING. TAKE UP OTHERS WILL MAKE UP FOR YOUR LACK OF WORK. They won't. The whole Army is hard at it now because YOU are working. YOU'VE been an inspiration to some other Socialist. He started after subs because you were already in the harness. If you STOP he'll QUIT. Make no mistake about this. It's the history of the Appeal Army.

Glance down this "off and on" report. Note the progress of your state. Don't be content with this measure of success. Bigger things yet are to be had by virtue of an aggressive Army. If your state happens to be one of the six with a loss this week—work like thunder to bring it out line with the rest.

The subscription report follows:

CIRCULATION BY STATES.

States	Off	On	Total
1. Kansas	696	1,099	753
2. Pennsylvania	593	1,119	2,726
More Than 15,000.			
3. Texas	811	1,905	19,229
4. Ohio	456	810	17,943
5. California	464	729	17,592
6. Oklahoma	588	609	16,352
7. Missouri	588	609	15,414
More Than 10,000.			
8. Washington	294	507	12,172
9. Illinois	380	596	11,390
More Than 5,000.			
10. New York	241	595	9,700
11. Indiana	296	503	9,033
12. Minnesota	183	903	8,457
13. Arkansas	228	496	9,312
14. Michigan	287	458	9,195
15. Iowa	178	258	8,927
16. Colorado	170	370	8,551
17. Nebraska	128	629	8,409
More Than 3,000.			
18. Virginia	76	281	4,819
19. Wisconsin	116	251	4,692
20. Massachusetts	114	187	4,593
21. Kentucky	76	180	3,840
22. Florida	70	106	3,811
23. Montana	81	158	3,385
24. Louisiana	119	165	3,342
25. N. Dakota	105	169	3,100
More Than 2,000.			
26. S. Dakota	80	154	2,970
27. New Jersey	69	129	2,860
28. New Mexico	65	146	2,422
29. Tennessee	66	110	2,361
30. Oregon	212	84	2,300
31. Alabama	78	88	2,134
32. Connecticut	45	420	2,108
More Than 1,000.			
33. N. Carolina	35	77	1,888
34. Florida	42	73	1,788
35. Maine	48	98	1,674
36. Idaho	70	120	1,624
37. Montana	22	44	1,482
38. Georgia	77	39	1,416
39. Nevada	196	28	1,189