WHY WOMEN DO THE WORK OF MEN

CESSATION OF WAR MADE A VAST OPENING FOR WOMEN AND A VAST INRUSH OF WOMEN

ONLY 10 years ago the women numbered less than one-fifth of all the wage- and salary-earners in the United States. When these figures were published there was a great outcry of wonder and alarm—wonder at the changed conditions, alarm lest those changed conditions might be permanent and the old-fashioned woman of the fireside and the stoveside and the cradle-side might be passing away. Today nearly one-third of all the women in the United States earn their own living outside their own homes, and these independent women constitute no less than one-third of all the persons in the United States engaged in gainful occupations.

It is evident that the changed conditions are not passing, but permanent; that the "new woman" is the woman of the future. Yet we still have the old order talked of, as if it were not a departing order, and the new order criticized as if it were the creation of a few "freak" women.

The theory still is that man bears the brunt of the battle for food, clothing and shelter, while woman is sheltered and is comparatively at her ease. This theory never was sound. From time immemorial among the masses of the people everywhere the men and the women have worked equally for the support of the family both at home and away from home. But latterly, under the pressure of modern conditions which are forcing all into the general service of society, the women have been drawn from the obscure toil of occupations within and around the household; and also into the ranks of women toilers have gone hundreds of thousands of women from the classes which, until recently, did try to keep their women at home. We may presently see practically all the capable members of our society self-supporting and the home fundamentally reorganized to meet the changed conditions.

Some Modern Occupations of Women

Today the women vote in four states and hold public office in all the states and under the National Government. There are women policemen and firemen, women locomotive engineers, women masons and plasterers and gunsmiths, women street-car drivers and conductors, women blacksmiths and coopers and steel and iron workers, and even women sailors—to take only a few occupations which, on the face, would seem to exclude women. In fact, there is not in this country a single department of skilled or unskilled labor, except only soldier and man-o'-wars man, which has not its women workers in swiftly increasing numbers. In the professions there are thousands of women doctors, lawyers, authors, professors, musicians, artists, decorators, journalists, public speakers, and more than 100,000 women teachers. In the trades, there are thousands of women hotel and restaurant keepers, insurance and real estate agents, bookkeepers, clerks, merchants, officers of corporations, saleswomen, stenographers, telegraph and telephone operators. In manufactures the women operatives almost equal the men in numbers. There are thousands on thousands of women mill and factory hands, and many thousands of women are in responsible positions in the management of manufacturing corporations. All these corporations, with the exception of such occupations as nursing and teaching school and music, were once exclusively in the hands of men.

The cause of the change is the same as that which has revolutionized every part of modern society—the amazing discoveries of science, creating an enormous number of new occupations and radically changing the method of all the old occupations, from housekeeping to carrying on a national government.

Lack of War Responsible for Change

War was the department of human endeavor which not only excluded women from itself, but also kept her fast anchored at home. Until the second quarter of the last century war was the chief thought, the chief pursuit of the human animal. He was either just going to war or just coming home from war, or engaged in war or preparing for an imminent war. Obviously, so long as war occupied this position in human affairs, woman was inevitably in the background, in the secondary places, a household drudge or a plaything. But war is no longer the principal business of the race, with peace tolerated as a breathing spell now and then. Peace and its arts are now the serious business of civilization, with war as a dreadful nightmare. Civilization has been forced upon a peace basis by discovery and invention. It clamors for skilled hands, not for brutal hands. Hence, the vast opening for woman and the vast inrush of women.

This country was remote from other great nations, and, therefore, from the ever-present threat or actuality of war. It was also—perhaps through its freedom from war and war alarms—eagerest in seizing upon and using the mighty industrial machinery which science gave to the race. Thus, it has come to pass that with us the progress toward the industrial equality of the two sexes has been most rapid.

Where European societies had a very complex organization, our society had from the beginning simplicity as its chief characteristic. We were really all toilers—until recently almost all toilers at occupations close to manual labor. The women and the men were throughout on that equal basis which in Europe was, and to a great extent is yet, found only among the peasant and the shop-keeping classes. And as the new era—the era of steam and electricity—developed with us, our women and our men naturally remained side by side.

Why Women Were Backward.

Our Government was founded in war. Its founders assumed, from the history of all other nations, that offense and defense were to be its main functions. That explains the lagging of the political rights of women behind their industrial and civil rights—or, rather, industrial and civil necessities; for no right ever has been, or probably ever will be, recognized until it becomes a necessity. The development with us of a class of women who were housekeepers only and were, for the most of the time, idle or half idle, is a development unnatural to the spirit of our democratic Republic.

It was due in the main to three causes: First, the survival of the Old World, old era ideas of "woman's sphere," of the coarsening effect of labor upon her "finer nature," of the "aristocratic flavor" and "high breeding" of uselessness and idleness. Second, to the simpler tastes of even the better educated classes among our ancestors, and the comparative ease with which the labor of one individual in the family could provide money enough to satisfy those tastes. Third, to the very tardy development of a class of domestic laborers and providers to relieve woman of the care of the household and the nursery, when her talents could be more profitably employed in other occupations.

As a result of these three causes a class of idle women sprang up—not only among the rich and the well-to-do, but even among the artisans, small farmers and small shop keepers. And this class came to be regarded as typical and exemplary. In reality it is neither. It has no place in our tradition of mothers and grandmothers who spun and made preserves, did their own housework and were busy every waking moment about matters which are now largely attended to in factories and shops. And it has no place in our future, if the signs of the times mean what they seem to mean. Our society is founded upon two ideas—work and equal opportunity to all to work. It abhors an idler as nature abhors a vacuum. And as the old-time occupations of women are carried on in a different way, she must and will find other occupations.

Emerson well said: "Every man is as lazy as he dares to be." He meant every woman, also. The very powerful impulse that is acting upon the woman, bred to idleness and genteel inertia, is found in the passion for independence and the passion for luxury. These two passions impel women to work that they may be free and may have the luxuries and comforts which must be earned. These two passions impel men to refuse to burden themselves with the dead weight of the support of idle, incompetent women.

Men Also Displacing Women.

Thus we have a social organization which is in process of revolutionary change. The women are rapidly going to work at occupations which have been transferred from the domestic to the general sphere, and at the occupations new and old which, it was expected a few years ago, would be in possession of the men only. The men, on their part, are not only working as formerly, but also entering occupations once followed exclusively by the women. Some of the new employments of women have already been enumerated. The new employments of men in this country include laundry work, cooking, general housework, nursing, keeping boarding houses, teaching primary and kindergarten pupils, dressmaking, millinery and sewing. The list is far shorter and, from the old viewpoint where the equal dignity of all honorable labor was derived, seems far less dignified than the women's list. The reason for this is, of course, that the men had small room to expand their already multiform activities, while the women had all the room in the world.

The underlying principle of this redistribution of activities is the common sense principle that every unit in a society should do the work at hand for which it is best fitted. This principle explains every case. Where we find a man dusting, scrubbing and sewing and doing laundry work, it is because he could find nothing more remunerative to do and could outbid the women applying for that particular task. Wherever we find a woman plastering, or keeping books, or driving a street car, or managing a store or corporation, it is for the same reason. And this modern principle wholly ignores sex and looks only at the work to be done and the comparative skill of the male and female applicants for it.

It is not prophecy to say that, as more and more millions of women enter the industrial fields, these readjustments and redivisions, these absorptions of some occupations by women and of other occupations by men, will go on apace. We may not like it; but we can no more stop it than we can stop the physical and mental development of woman or the use of steam and electricity.

Fully to grasp what is even now in sight as to the future, one must consider the rapidity with which women are educating themselves. There is evidence of this from the statistics of colleges—already one woman college graduate to every three men. But that is not all. In higher education in any proper sense must be included the thousands of high schools. There we find the women outnumbering the men four and five and six to one. These are most conservative proportions. This means that in a civilization where education counts heavier and heavier as an industrial factor, the women are equipping themselves better than the men. And as our civilization develops along its now clearly defined lines, as the importance of coarse labor and even of skilled manual labor decines, as the higher wages go ever more and more to those who can minister to what were once regarded as luxuries and extravagances, will not the women inevitably assume an even more important position? Will not the men be harder and harder put to it to maintain their ground? They may retain the most of the few originating and directing positions; but how can they prevent the women from dividing with them the positions where the intelligent execution of plans and purposes formed by others is all that is required? Does not woman's intelligent receptiveness of ideas peculiarly fit her to excel in such work?

The great advantage the men have had thus far in this country has been not their superior strength or skill or faithfulness or industry, but that woman has worked merely as a temporary expedient. She has tenaciously assumed that she would presently "quit work" and be supported by some man. This dream has been largely fanciful. The woman, married, has too often found that she has not stopped working, but has undertaken a far more laborious and ever grudgingly paid occupation. But her indulgence in this dream has not only made her wages smaller—who will not pay more to a worker who expects to go on working than a worker who expects presently to quit and is meanwhile giving at least half the energy to another occupation, that of catching a husband? Indulgence in this dream has also prevented woman from cultivating ambition—why struggle to rise in an occupation which one hopes and intends presently to abandon for another that is wholly different?

We have an astounding increase in the number of divorces. We have the increasing frequency of families where both the husband and the wife work, contributing to the family income. We have more and more families where the woman's earnings are larger than the man's. We have the familiar restlessness of woman as she views her own condition and compares it with man's. Are not these unmistakable evidences of a coming race of women who will have the same ambitions for careers, for getting on, for industrial and social independence that men can have?

To be prepared for astonishing changes and developments in the relations of men and women to each other and to the social organization, which is even more a purely industrial organization, one has only to compare half a century ago with today, the time when our mothers and fathers were young, with this generation of ours. Then, the woman who showed herself in any department of life not immediately related to the household was looked on as a suspicious character, if there was any reason or excuse for thinking she might have remained in seclusion without starving. A girl was the close-kept ward of her parents until she was married. A married woman was, to use the legal phrase, in the condition where "husband and wife are one, and that one is the husband." Woman worked as hard as she does now, probably much harder, so far as physical toil is concerned, but she was "the great unpaid laborer of the world." Today, all one has to do to find out woman's industrial position is to glance about him as he walks the busy streets and goes in and out of the beehives of any American city or town.

There will be irritation and suffering, loud outcry, fierce protest, while the new order is establishing. Change always means discomfort. But in the end, since work is the secret of human content, and since work at a future, time-filling occupation with a future in it is the secret of human happiness, who will venture to say that the end is not to be for the best of bests? And, as we can't alter the decrees of destiny, may we not as well accept them cheerfully?

DAVID GRAHAM PHILIPS.

(Copyright, 1903.)

WOMAN'S PRINCIPAL VOCATION 100 YEARS AGO

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS

"Three Years War," by General Dewet, the Brave Boer Commander

INTERESTING to pro-Boer and anti-Boer alike will be the volume entitled, "Three Years' War," by Christiaan Rudolf De Wet, the Boer General, who was one of the bravest and most skillful of the adversaries of Great Britain in the recent South African War, and who was one of the last to give in. The testimony of a brave man must always be considered valuable, and much of what General De Wet has to say may be taken without reserve, but his book, as a whole, proves conclusively that the time for the writing of a history of the Boer War is not yet—the prejudices inseparable from that conflict are still too strong.

General De Wet begins his story when he was summoned, in September, 1899, to hold himself in readiness to go on active service at the shortest possible notice. The commando law stipulated that every burgher between the ages of 16 and 60 must be prepared to fight for his country at a moment's notice; he must provide himself with a riding horse, saddle and bridle; a rifle and 30 cartridges, and in addition he must be provisioned for eight days at his own expense. De Wet answered the first call, and with him went his three sons—Kootie, Isaac and Christiaan. His account of the organization of the Boer Army at the beginning of the war is very interesting; he explains how provisions were distributed, and tells how he himself was appointed Vice-Commandant. The first battle in which he took part was Nicholson's Nek. He describes the storming of the kop, which was in possession of the English owing to the negligence of Commandant Nel. He says that the English were very strongly posted, but the Boers stormed the kop and took it. Here, too, we get the first of many of General De Wet's accounts of the losses on both sides; always the Boer loss is very small, the British frightfully heavy. Although the British were intrenched in the hills and their position had to be stormed, General De Wet's statement is that the Boer losses amounted to four killed and five wounded, while the British: "I myself counted 200 dead, and there may have been many whom I did not see. In regard to our prisoners, as they marched past me four deep, I counted 817."

Through all the battles of the campaign in which De Wet's troops took part he takes his readers, and it may be as well to say here now once for all that in nearly every engagement his statement of the losses on each side is in proportion, similar to that given for Nicholson's Nek. Of the surrender of Cronje, General De Wet says little, save in the way of blame of Cronje for not having taken his advice:

> It may be that it was the will of God, who rules the destinies of nations, to fill thus to the brim the cup which we had to empty, but this consideration does not excuse General Cronje's conduct. Had he but taken my advice and attempted a night attack, he might have avoided capture altogether.

He shows very plainly, too, that Cronje's surrender was the beginning of the end. It disheartened the Boers, and from that time on many began to desert to the enemy. At the next battle, that of Poplar Grove, he confesses that "a panic seized my men. Before even the English had got near enough to shell our positions to any purpose, the wild flight began." He says, too, that it was such a flight as he shall never see again, and yet, later in the volume, he tells us of other flights of his troops in which he himself tried to beat them back with the sambjok in vain—they would not fight.

Another curious thing is the condemnation hurled by De Wet against the British for acts of war of which he availed himself without any suspicion that he was doing anything but carrying on the war legitimately. Against the English policy of destruction, as he calls it, he is very bitter, and in this regard it is curious to note how, on page 148, when the British were driving him from Cape Colony, he writes:

> The following morning we found good horse-provender and plenty of it. It was not as yet the habit of the English to burn everything they came across—they had not yet begun to carry out that policy of destruction.

And yet, on page 162, when De Wet was being driven into the Transvaal, he writes:

> And now it was my task to make it as difficult as possible for my pursuers. The Winter grass of the veldt was dry and very inflammable, and I decided to set fire to it in order that the English might find it impossible to obtain pasture for their oxen and cattle. I accordingly set it alight, and very soon the country behind was black.

It does not seem to occur to De Wet that it was he himself, perhaps, who taught the foe how effective a weapon the "policy of destruction" might be made.

Through all the campaigns De Wet's narrative takes the reader, and it is a record of hurried movements from place to place after Lord Kitchener gets into the field. Of the blockhouse system De Wet speaks in disparagement, but at the same time he shows that it did more than anything else to hamper his movements and prevent his operations. He shows that all during the last year of the war the Boer Generals were eager for news from their deputation in Europe that might give them some hope of European intervention; daily the burghers left the commandoes; many of them deserted to the enemy; others, sullen and cowed, went back to their farms. The negotiations for peace are fully described, and the minutes of the meeting of the Boer Generals to consider the peace proposals are given in full in an appendix. The result of this conference was that it was agreed that God was against them; their independence must be sacrificed; the war must be discontinued at any cost. There is true pathos in the closing paragraphs of the book:

> The whole miserable business came to an end on the 19th of June, when the burghers who had fought under Generals Niewouwdt and Brand laid down their arms—the nation had submitted to its fate!
>
> There was nothing left for us now but to hope that the power which had conquered us, the power to which we were compelled to submit, though it cut us to the heart to do so, and which by the surrender of our arms we had accepted as our ruler, would draw us nearer and ever nearer by the strong cords of love.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> To my nation I address one last word. Be loyal to the new government. Loyalty pays best in the end. Loyalty alone is worthy of a nation which has shed its blood for freedom.

The pathos of this would be greater were it not for the knowledge that the conquerors of the Boers are doing all that is possible to remove old animosities and to rule the Boers with justice and love. (New York; Charles Scribner's Sons.)

Mark Twain Asked to Be Funny in Hades.

Mark Twain has received dozens of voluntary obituaries of himself since he advertised for editorial obituaries to be sent him for revision. In this connection a Baltimore man, evidently a thoughtful student of spiritual economics, has sent him the following advice, which Mr. Clemens has received with mingled feelings of gentle appreciation and wondering admiration:

> Baltimore, Md., Dec. 9, 1902.—Mark Twain, New York.—Some people think you are immortal, but if you really ever do intend to die it is certainly your duty to go to H——. Funny men are needed there, but they are very small potatoes up in Heaven. You have always preached philanthropy, and now you have the chance of a lifetime to demonstrate your consistency.

Mr. Clemens is said to be pondering this idea, which he regards as "full of suggestion," and is considering how far a humorist's duty to his fellow creatures actually extends.

New Periodical and New Editor.

Mr. John Kendrick Bangs will be the new editor of the Metropolitan Magazine, which has just been purchased by Colonel George Harvey, editor of the North American Review, and President of Harper & Brothers. Mr. Bangs is particularly well fitted for his task, which will be the arduous one of raising the Metropolitan Magazine to the first rank from the position, considerably below that height, which it has hitherto occupied. The new Metropolitan will be devoted entirely to the human side of metropolitan life as it appears in New York. Mr. Bangs is essentially a city man and a thorough New Yorker, and the task of editing a periodical of this nature would seem a most congenial one. Mr. Bangs' best books, to the number of eight, have lately been issued by the Harpers in a popular subscription edition.

"The Queen of Cook Books."

Harper & Brothers have offered an eloquent protest, in their new Cook Book Encyclopedia, against the multiplication of detailed books on cookery, which bid fair to swamp the housewife's shelves and distract her already burdened brain. The present tendency is to devote a volume to a single domestic subject, such as "Luncheons," "Cooking of Meats," "Chafing-Dish Receipts," etc., and one famous compiler of such books is at present slowly but steadily engaged in turning out a whole library of them. The Harper one-volume encyclopedia in handy form comes as a welcome bulwark against a flood of specialized volumes on cookery. It represents the genuine spirit of the age, which is to condense and simplify all branches of knowledge and information. A recent reviewer has described it as "The Queen of Cook Books."

New Plan for American University.

President Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton University, author of A History of the American People, is at work on the development of a plan of his own which will be an innovation in American universities. He intends to introduce the tutorial system into Princeton, such as is used in Oxford, and by which tutors are available for every student in his individual preparation for classes. It will require $12,500,000 to institute the change effectively, and President Wilson is sure of getting it. His History of the American People, by reason of its flowing style and charm of narrative, is said to have made as great a popular as a scholarly success.

McClure's.

Never did McClure's Magazine begin a new year so auspiciously as with this present January number. There are Ray Stannard Baker's startling stories of "scabs" in the great coal strike, entitled, "The Right to Work," straightforward, ungarbled accounts of what it cost some of the workers in the coal fields to stick to the work as their conscience bade them. John Swain writes excellently of Adolf Lorenz, "The Great Austrian Surgeon with the soft, strong hand," telling just what we want to know of the great surgeon's history and of his famous operation. Clara Morris contributes, "I Stand Between Lady McBeth and Matrimony," and never wrote more entertainingly, which is not surprising, considering the two subjects of her article. This is the first of a series of autobiographical papers which Miss Morris will contribute to McClure's. George W. Smalley reminisces again about "English Men and Letters," and his list is a varied one, including Du Maurier, Hardy, Trollope, W. S. Gilbert and Mrs. Humphrey Ward. There are five tip-top stories, "The Impertinence of Charles Edward," by H. S. Rhodes, is an exceptionally ingenious love story, in which a serious breach of etiquette brings about an international marriage. Samuel Hopkins Adams has a mystery story, "The Flying Death," that succeeds in mystifying to the reader's complete satisfaction, and which the author leaves us to puzzle over until the February number. "Across the State," by George Kibbe Turner, is a powerful story of a child and a fugitive murderer; another delightful love story is "A Fair Upsetter of Customs," by Charles F. Embree; and Stephen Bonsal's "A Pilgrim from Abyssinia," is an engrossing and vivid tale of a strange land. McClure's has its work cut out to live up to the resolutions of its January number.

Atlantic Monthly.

The January Atlantic opens the new year with a cheerful editorial welcome as from No. 4 Park street, which wittily sums up past achievements of this typical American magazine and promises happily for the future.

Two prominent features of the number are the initial installments of Arthur Sherburne Hardy's brilliant serial, "His Daughter First," the only novel he has written for many years; and of J. T. Trowbridge's "My Own Story"—his reminiscences of a long and varied career, during which he has seen many men, many cities, and many strange events, all of which he writes about in a bright and entertaining manner.

Other notable articles are "The Contribution of the West to American Democracy"—the ideals and the civic achievements of the pioneer—by Frederick J. Turner; "The War Against Disease," by C. E. A. Winslow, an account of the long battle of science against epidemics; W. J. Henderson's "The Future of Orchestral Music"—a paper giving especial reference to the recent compositions of Richard Strauss; and R. Brimley Johnson's informing letter on England in 1902.

Stores and sketches include "Mammy," a Southern tale, by Julia R. Tutwiler; "A Land of Little Rain," by Mary Austin; "A Talk on Travelers' Tales," by Agnes Repplier; "A Memory of Old Gentlemen," by Sharlot M. Hall; "The Plateau of Fatigue," a delightful satirical sketch, by Kate Milner Rabb, and "Nox Dormienda," an instructive little essay on death.

Literary reviews and essays in the number are "Dickens as a Man of Letters," by Alice Meynell; papers on Howells and James; on "Books New and Old"; on "The Last Lears of Old France" (letters and memoirs of the time of Marie Antoinette); about "Twe Englishmen of Letters" (Richardson and Tennyson); on "The Epoch-Making Expedition of Lewis and Clark," and a review of two recent editions of the works of Edgar Allan Poe.

Scribners.

The January number of Scribner's Magazine, which marks the beginning of its 33d volume, contains two of the notable features of the coming year. It is seldom that the opportunity is offered to present the brilliant letters of a woman who has filled the highest social and official positions at the Courts of Europe. The letters of Madame Waddington, wife of the eminent French Ambassador, M. William Waddington, begin in this number, with entertaining and witty accounts of the English court in the eighties. Madame Waddington's observations have the greater value to American readers because she is an American, the daughter of a president of Columbia College and the granddaughter of Rufus King, who was American Minister to England. These letters were written to her relatives in this country at the very time in which the events described were fresh in her memory. They are therefore spontaneous, natural, and unconventionally bright. The illustrations are from portraits and other pictures in Madame Waddington's own collection.

OF INTEREST TO WOMEN

Sweetmeats for Home Frolics

Continued From Page 28

with a little vanila and mold into balls. Crack English walnuts carefully and remove the kernels in perfect halves. Press two halves upon each ball of cream, flattening slightly.

Cream Dates and Almonds.

Select large, fine dates, remove the stones and insert little rolls of the fondant. Press the edges together, allowing a little of the white to be seen, and roll in granulated sugar. The best almonds for the purpose are the Jordan. Blanch the nuts and use them as a foundation, moulding the cream or fondant over them until you have formed balls about the size of a walnut. Roll lightly in granulated sugar.

Mexican Nut Candy.

Put three cupfuls of best brown sugar in a granite or agate kettle, with one-half cup of sweet cream and a lump of butter the size of an egg. Set over the fire and stir continually until it forms a soft ball upon being dropped in cold water. Remove from the fire, flavor slightly with vanila and stir in two cupfuls of pecan meats. Drop in wafers on buttered paper.

Cream Peppermints.

Put two cupfuls of granulated sugar and one of water over the fire and boil until the mixture hairs. Then remove from the fire and beat with an egg whip until it becomes white and creamy. Flavor with one-quarter of a teaspoonful of the essence of peppermint and drop in wafers on paraffine paper. If the flavor of chocolate is desired dip lightly into melted, unsweetened chocolate, as directed for chocolate cream, taking care to drain thoroughly.

Such as Mother Used to Make.

The things that mother used to make are still in the world. Far in the recesses of life you shall find them. And the name of the magic charm is pork. Fresh young pork—home-raised pork—clean and fat and sweet. Pork that permeates and flavors, with no indigestion in its bones and no sorrows in its train. Verily there is more poetry in pigs than Homer extracted from their white and rosy hides—or even Charles Lamb. Oh, for some modern bard to sing the glories of the vanishing home-made pig! For where he exists joy is. Succotash—do you know it? Not the cold, hard, lumpy mixture, one part corn and other part bean—but succotash, the real thing, such as our Puritan ancestors knew and loved—bean flavored with corn, corn melting to bean, and all alive and palpitating to the gentle influence of pork.

Talk not to me of stockyards or of herds or butter or cottolene or oleomargarine or other just-as-goods. I would go far this morning to meet a respectable, a worthy piece of home-raised pork. It is not the things that mother used to make that are passing away, but the things she used to make them with, the things that were raised on the farm—and all that they stand for—the things that we must come back to in spirit and in truth and in actuality if we would taste again the true flavor, not the flavor of pork alone, but the flavor of life itself. —The January Atlantic.

Dr. Lorenz Censures the Vice of American Pies.

On the last day of his stay in this country, Dr. Adolf Lorenz, the Vienna specialist in hip disease, talked modestly of his impressions of the country in which his fame has recently spread so widely. Of these impressions the most vivid was that of the Great American Pie Belt.

"Both the physical and mental energy of your people are marvelous," said Dr. Lorenz, "and they are undoubtedly the chief cause of the wonderful growth and prosperity of your country. This energy puzzles me not a little, when I consider the different kinds of foodstuffs habitually indulged in that are constitutionally destructive.

"The pies, puddings, sauces and innumerable other dishes, most of which are unhealthful in the extreme, partaken of by old and young alike at every meal, have caused me to wonder that the people are not physical and constitutional wrecks, instead of, as they are, the very opposite.

"Pastry, I have noticed in particular, seems to be a chief delight to the American palate, and nothing is more injurious. At dinner the other day a little fellow sat not far from my table. He had a very large piece of pie. I was informed by his parent that he indulged in pie twice every day; yet he looked to me the picture of health. I cannot quite understand it, and when I visit America again I shall make the matter of your food a special study."

American women, Dr. Lorenz said, are as fine specimens of womanhood as there are in the world, but he also said they did not surpass the Austrian women, though American women in build are decidedly stronger than the Austrians.

"I think," said Dr. Lorenz, "they are a little too powerful for the men."

ONLY AFTER A STRUGGLE

Maisy—That is taken from Wagner. What do you think of it?
Cynicus—Well, Wagner seems to be giving it up mighty hard.

Division of States.

Is there any law by which any state in the Union may be divided? D. M.

There is no law to prevent the division of a state. Virginia was divided as a Civil War measure, in 1863. The Territory of Dakota was divided and admitted as two States in 1889. It was proposed to divide Idaho and attach the "panhandle" to Washington in that year. To this there was no legal impediment. It may be said, however, that the sentiment of the country is against division of states.