

ner pail fuller than the Republican one.

The anti-slavery men of long ago attacked the slave values with such ferocity that slave owners rebelled and sought to build a free republic. Of course that was impossible. Contradictory propositions like that are always impossible.

The danger confronting us now is that the owners of land values will get up a rebellion and seek to make this republic as free as France was before the revolution, or perhaps as free as it was while Madame Guillotine reigned.

There is nothing so dangerous to society as meddling with the rights of freemen who have the legal right to get wealth without earning it.

The Forum editors should warn the unsuspecting of this danger.—Geo. V. Wells.

MOVIE CENSORSHIP. — As a reader of your paper and a frequent attendant of the "movies," I should like to pass a few remarks on our board of censorship.

In the first place, I think the general public should have something to say regarding the selection of such a board. I certainly think the present board is mentally dwarfed and unfit to tell any intelligent set of "movie" goers what kind of pictures they shall look at.

Last night I went to see "The Lure," and it was so chopped up when the censors (?) got through with it that it would have been a mystery to me had I not seen the play previously.

These censors show what kind of judgment they are capable of exercising when they take the real story out of a picture that would teach a moral lesson and then allow children to see those "Keystone Comedies" with their continual bedroom scenes and their lewd, filthy suggestions.

Mr. Funkhouser might have been fitted for a public censor sixty years ago, but at the present time we need

a man of science (why not a sociologist?) for the job.

I am for a board of censorship that knows the average person's idea of morality and that will not make the censorship of the pictures just a personal matter.

I think the general public knows what it considers fit to be seen and I think if the pictures were left alone they would be better than they are after Funkhouser and his "bunch" gets through with them. I think many of your readers will be with me in this.—I. B. H.

NOISE. — I read in The Public Forum some months ago a letter from one of your contributors stating that Roger Sullivan was a big enough man to give Chicago her next mayor, even though he failed to become a U. S. senator, or words to that effect. Maybe he was big enough at the time of the writer's prophesy, but during the intervening months he seems to have shriveled some. Political "big" men with "big" business affiliations seldom grow bigger (morally) while in office.

A few million dollars in the hands of a less "big" man than Roger Sullivan would probably have made just as "big" a noise and could easily have gotten the same results.

If a noisy noise annoys an oyster, what kind of a noise annoys Sweitzer?—Lyndon M. Hall, Maywood.

—o—o—
THE END OF IT

Young Lawyer (having passed his examination)—Well, I'm glad it's over. I've been working to death the last few years trying to complete my legal education.

Old Lawyer.—Cheer up, my boy; it'll be a long time before you have any more work to do.

—o—o—
Harry Rained, while clamming in Belvidere, Ill., found when he removed some clams from his hooks, two \$10 bills which he had speared while they were lying in the mud.