

divorce has to do. The discussion raises a social and civil, not a religious question; and it is with reference to the social and civil phase of the subject that our inquiry is made. In harmony with the general theory already outlined, we shall encounter in that inquiry problems that may be summarized in these five questions:

(1) May society properly exact binding contracts of marriage, and assume for social and civil purposes that if there be no contract of marriage there is no marriage?

(2) If so, has society the right to regulate marriage contracts so far as to inhibit the making of a second marriage contract while a previous one subsists between either party and a third person?

(3) If society has this right, has it also the complementary right to annul marriage contracts?

(4) Assuming society to have this right of nullification, may the parties to the contract or declaration of a marriage which has come to an end through the dissolution of the unifying love that made it—may they themselves, or either of them, properly call upon society to annul the contract?

(5) Is either party to an annulled marriage contract properly at liberty, while the other lives, and not only as matter of naked legal right but also with reference to the just censures of public opinion, to enter into a marriage contract with a third person?

The first two of these questions relate to the ceremonial of marriage in its civil and social, as distinguished from its ecclesiastical aspects; the other three have to do with questions of divorce. We shall discuss them in their order.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK.

New York, Oct. 18.—The political horoscope indicates but little change in the situation in this State. There is no excitement or enthusiasm anywhere. Even the Socialists and the People's Party seem to be in about the same condition as the two old parties, while the Wall street gamblers give evidence that they care not a whit how the election goes. Within a month of the election the sales of stocks are much heavier than they were for the corresponding period of last year, with a marked advance in values. A young Chicago Board of Trade operator who has been

in New York for the past three or four years told me last week that his business for the past month or two had increased several times in volume from what it had been at any corresponding period of time since he had been operating here. This would indicate that the country is exceptionally prosperous and that the Republicans would easily win.

But the stock and grain markets are not a true barometer of the general prosperity of the country, nor even of that portion of it in proximity to the stock market center. An advertisement was inserted in the New York World of Sunday, October 9, for a stenographer and typist. Before noon on Tuesday, October 11, the firm inserting the advertisement had received eight hundred and fifty (850) answers from applicants for this position. The World is running a letter from this firm in large black type as an advertisement of its columns as an advertising medium. The following extract from the letter would indicate that conditions are worse than usual.

We scarcely anticipated such wonderful amount of replies. We have advertised many times ere this, but have never been so deluged with applications, there being those from almost every point within a distance of fifty miles.

The senior member of the firm thought the number of applicants from one short advertisement so remarkable that the World deserved a testimonial, which he has sent unsolicited, according to the published statement of that journal. It does not seem to have occurred either to the World or to the firm that the condition of the unemployed had anything to do with the wonderful success of the advertisement.

In a three-column double-leaded editorial, "Not a Government by the People," the Times of yesterday seems to have given up hope of Parker's election. The wall of the editorial is that the trusts are not dividing their contributions. If Mr. Bryan were to use some of the language in the Commoner used in this editorial, conservative society would be shocked. Here are a few extracts:

They [Republicans] have grown used to seeing the Presidency bought with the funds of corporations, to seeing the powers of the Government farmed out to the providers of campaign funds. That is why the public is indifferent, the voters unconcerned. . . . Where do these conditions lead? How long will they be continued? Where they lead, history tells us. . . . The common people of France overthrew their government, and cut off the head of their King when they could no longer bear the merciless exactions of the nobility and the clergy, at that time the privileged class of France. Our trusts and combinations lack patents of nobility, but in what other respects do they differ from the French nobles who lived in luxury and splendor upon tax monies squeezed out of the pockets of a starving peasantry? . . . So we are already come upon the time when special privilege creates

that inequality of condition which, in the history of other countries, has been cured by revolution. It will be cured by revolution here, a peaceful revolution, through the use of the ballot, but nevertheless it may be a costly one. There is no possible concealment of the magnitude or the source of the great fortunes that have been accumulated in the country through government favor and privilege. The people know about them, the people are much given to discussing them. In the orderly course of natural law and evolution, the instruments by which great social and political changes are brought about begin their work automatically and in the ripeness of time. The people of the country are coming to understand what special privilege means. . . . Mr. Roosevelt may be elected President. . . . If there be no change in the Republican administration and legislative plan, . . . then the year 1908 may prove to be one of grave political importance, it may mark an epoch in the economic development of the country. If we would picture to ourselves what it is that impends, what may be the origin and nature of the coming change, and with what forces the regime of special privilege is to be brought to an end, we need go no farther back than to the campaigns of 1896 and of 1900.

Is this not a warning to the trusts that if they elect Roosevelt the radicals will take the Democratic saddle and in all probability elect their candidate in 1908?—and on a more radical platform than in 1896 or 1900?

Congressman Robert Baker has begun a cart-tail campaign in the Sixth Congressional district. If he has the physical strength to make the same kind of campaign he did two years ago he will not be long in arousing enthusiasm throughout his district. Several incidents have occurred since Baker's nomination to indicate that deliberate, although quiet, measures are taken to prevent him from getting the fullest opportunity to speak at the meetings controlled by the Brooklyn boss, P. H. McCarren.

Baker was nominated in spite of McCarren's domination in Brooklyn, because two of the largest districts are not controlled by the Brooklyn boss. Although it is pretty generally conceded here that McCarren has exceptionally close relations with the Standard Oil Co., he is also chairman of the Democratic State executive committee. Two of the three largest halls in Brooklyn are situated in Baker's district. A large meeting has already been held in each. At the first meeting Baker was completely ignored. At the other his name was not announced as one of the speakers until after he made a vigorous protest, and then not until the night preceding the meeting, although it had been advertised several days before, and the name of the candidate for State senator, a minor office as compared with Congressman, given a prominent place on the bills, although he makes no pretensions as a public speaker. He preceded Baker, reading his speech closely from manuscript, and not finishing until after 11 o'clock. Even at this late hour the chairman made no attempt to hold the audience for Baker, but deliberately

played his cards to drive the audience away without giving Baker a chance to address them. But although it was nearly midnight when Baker began speaking, he held the audience for forty minutes, scoring the Republicans for their subservency to the trusts, and in denunciation of Rockefeller and Standard Oil methods of finance, although McCarren was on the platform with a number of his cronies. The audience greeted Baker's exhortation of Wall street methods of fleecing the public, with rapturous applause, while McCarren and his friends winced and covertly sneered. A few nights subsequent to this, at a district meeting where Baker was billed as the chief speaker, an ex-Congressman was introduced first and held the platform for an hour. Baker was billed to speak at two other meetings that same evening and requested the chairman to notify the speaker that he had these other engagements. It has always been the custom in Brooklyn for speakers to give way temporarily to candidates who have other appointments to fill. After repeating the request Baker left without addressing the meeting. However, he took pains to let both his friends and enemies know that the leaders had deliberately planned to squelch him.

Although not in favor with the Anti-Bryan Democrats who have control of the Brooklyn machine, Baker is popular with the rank and file Democrats who do the voting. They give evidence that they admire his fighting qualities wherever he addresses them. Even at a conservative business men's noonday meeting in New York, at 597 Broadway, one day last week, at which I was present, Baker was the only speaker that evoked enthusiasm, although his talk was along the most radical lines. He received quite an ovation from the audience at the conclusion, the reporters joining in the applause.

A few evenings ago I was passing through Baker's district on a trolley car. Just before I got off a couple of gentlemen, who by their dress and demeanor gave evidence of being successful business or professional men, took seats near me. One of them expressed himself very strongly in favor of Baker's course in Congress and said that he believed the people would return him, the other gentleman quietly assenting. Some of his friends are predicting that he will lead the ticket, notwithstanding the secret knifing that he will receive at the hands of McCarren's friends. Baker, himself, feels sanguine of victory if he had friends to make an aggressive and thorough campaign. To do this effectively he must not only conduct the cart-tail campaign, but the forty thousand voters in his district should receive his record both in and out of Congress. This alone will cost a thousand dollars. The circulation of his article in the September Arena, entitled "The Reign of Graft and Its Remedy," would be an effective campaign document.

Both the national committee and the Congressional committee have refused him aid. He will receive no aid from the local committee. Unless his radical friends throughout the country lend a helping hand he has a difficult task ahead of him. His reelection would be a victory for radical democracy everywhere.

D. S. LUTHER

BUFFALO.

Buffalo, N. Y., Oct. 18.—In my last letter (p. 278) I told of the "public opinion" ordinance which had been adopted by the Common Council of this city, referring to the fact that a resolution had been introduced in the Board of Aldermen providing that a question be submitted to the voters to advise whether school houses shall be opened for public meetings under proper regulations, and saying that the resolution had been referred to the school committee, and that the Common Council had adjourned over the month of August. Since then some progress has been made.

The Board of Aldermen met on the 5th of September. Mr. Stockton, of the Referendum League, was unable to persuade the committee on schools to meet and take action on the resolution prior to the meeting of the Board. He did, however, persuade the Board of Aldermen to discharge the committee and adopt the resolution. Approved by the Board of Councilmen on the 7th and signed by the Mayor on the 8th the ordinance came in force just within the required time for placing it on the ballot.

The next problem was to get the question upon the ballot. The City Clerk on the 3d of October, under the direction of the Corporation Counsel, sent a certified copy of the referendum ordinance and the resolution to the Commissioner of Elections, who is a county officer, with a request that he place the question on the ballot and inform him (the city clerk) whether or not he would do so. The Corporation Counsel and Mr. Stockton were preparing to make application to the Supreme Court for a peremptory writ of mandamus to compel the Commissioner of Elections to place the question on the ballot in case his answer was unfavorable. This proved unnecessary, however, for a reply was received from that officer saying the question would go upon the ballot.

The problem now is to get the people to vote on the proposition. This question was adopted for the purpose of starting the referendum movement without the corporate opposition which would be met if a question more vital were submitted. The disadvantage lies in the fact that, owing to the character of the question and the shortness of the time before election, the vote may be light. This would give the opposition newspapers a string to harp on about the referendum always being a failure. The Referendum League is doing all in its

power to arouse interest in the question. The two morning papers are favorable and give us a good deal of space, and several high school teachers are trying to get their pupils to work at the polls. The Superintendent of Education is in favor of the adoption of the plan.

The League is also questioning candidates for the State legislature as to their stand on the referendum generally, and has prepared literature to send out in opposition to State Senator George A. Davis, who "held up" the referendum bills in the Cities Committee of the Senate last winter and who is now seeking reelection. The normal Republican majority in his district is 2,200, which the League hopes to reduce.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

AUSTRALASIA (p. 407).

Corowa, N. S. W., Sept. 15.—An important question in connection with land tenures is coming up for settlement in New Zealand. About 1,735,000 acres are held by nearly 9,000 tenants on lease; 1,565,000 acres being at a rent of four per cent. of the capital value, without revaluation, for 999 years, and the balance subject to periodical revaluation. There is a movement to allow these tenants to purchase the freehold. This is strongly opposed by a party which also desires to prevent any more crown land being sold. Mr. Seddon, the premier, who is an opportunist, has parried the matter so far, and has now shelved it by appointing a royal commission to inquire into the whole question of land tenure.

In New South Wales we have a perpetual leasing system, also, the land being let at a rent of one and one-fourth per cent. of the capital value for the first five years, and afterwards at two and one-half per cent., subject to revaluations. There is a similar proposal here, that the tenants should be allowed to buy the freehold, but the number of leaseholders is not yet large. The chief argument used in favor of the proposal is that tenants cannot borrow money on the security of their land. To read the Conservative papers, anyone would think a farmer could not be happy unless his land were mortgaged.

In this state the Reform party has organized a ministry, with Joseph Caruthers as premier and James Ashton, a true democrat, as minister of lands.

The Labor party has made a further gain in Queensland. There were three parties in the State parliament until the Labor party and another formed a coalition ministry. But the House was then almost equally divided, so that neither side could command a majority. An election was held in August, when the parties were returned as follows:

Ministerialist (coalition).....	19
Labor (coalition).....	34
Opposition.....	14
Independent.....	2

In the previous parliament the Labor