

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1904.

Number 345.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Mr. Roosevelt is reported as being delighted with the results of the election, and the Chicago Tribune interprets it as a vote "by the people that Theodore Roosevelt deserved well of the republic." Mr. Roosevelt may be pardoned for his self-gratulation, but the Tribune is wrong in its interpretation. The people did not vote that Roosevelt deserved well; they voted that a plutocratic Democracy deserved ill.

The landslide for Roosevelt is not for him affirmatively. It is for him only negatively. It spells democratic discipline of the Democratic party. This is abundantly evident from the fact that the overwhelming pluralities for Roosevelt come as the climax of an apathetic campaign. Had the people intended to express admiration of Roosevelt by their votes they would have made their admiration apparent in enthusiastic campaigning. But the absence of banners, and buttons, and parades, and window pictures, and such other tokens as a character like Roosevelt would call out from enthusiastic admirers, testifies that there was no enthusiasm for him. The enthusiasm was against Parker, not for anybody, and was manifested in the way in which that kind of enthusiasm always is manifested—in an overwhelming but resentful and silent ballot on election day.

This landslide is very much like that of 1894, when the people rebuked President Cleveland at the Congressional elections, and for much the same reason. Cleveland

had identified himself with the plutocracy, and in 1894 the Democratic majority of 41 in the lower House of Congress gave way to a Republican majority of 74. Parker comes forward the branded candidate of Cleveland, Hill, Belmont, McCarren and other plutocratic elements of his party, and he has gone down to the most disastrous defeat his party has experienced for thirty years.

It may be supposed that the astute politicians who were buncoed into nominating Parker are keenly enjoying the wonderful victory they were promised. "We are for Parker because we are weary of defeat!" exclaimed Senator Daniels at the St. Louis convention—if not in those exact words at any rate to that purport and in phraseology not much different. Senator Daniels is presumably as weary as ever. He ought to be disgusted as well as weary. Some of the defeats he had gone through were well fought battles for democratic principle. But this last defeat!

It may have been a "united" party that Parker led down to this disaster, but it was not a unified party. Plutocracy and democracy cannot unify, even if leaders unite. Although Mr. Cleveland could support Parker, he couldn't carry his plutocratic followers into a party in which Bryan was a prominent figure. Although Mr. Bryan could support Parker, he couldn't hold his democratic friends in line for a candidate who seemed to them only a substitute for Cleveland. Bryan and Cleveland stand for opposite things in the public mind, and their followers can no more be merged in one political party than oil and water can be mixed in one vessel.

This is the opportunity the plutocratic Democrats have spent

their money for. The defeats of 1896 and 1900 they attributed to Bryanism, deliberately ignoring the crushing disaster of 1892 which was due to Clevelandism and out of which Bryanism, badly as it was beaten in the count, raised the party again into life. They schemed for control and they got it. Their own candidate was nominated against Bryan's protest. That candidate of a "united" party threw the gold standard shibboleth into the faces of Bryan Democrats, as the plutocratic clique in New York ordered him to. He minimized the democracy of the platform in his speech and letter of acceptance, just as they desired and required. Bryan put no obstacles in his way, but served in the campaign as and where he was requested to, and only so. He spoke in Indiana where he had followers to win; he staid away from New York where he had political enemies who might be affronted. He did all he could to elect Parker, and he did it in sincerity, with self respect and with vigor. Yet the Democratic party, under the plutocratic control of the Belmonts, and Hills, and McCarrens, and the leadership of the "safe and sane" Judge Parker, suffers a vastly greater defeat than it did under the democratic control of the Bryans. If there is any such thing in politics as estoppel, the plutocrats of the Democratic party are estopped from again claiming title to it on any of the grounds they have so vociferously pleaded. It was turned over to them to "reorganize," and they have "reorganized" it to an irreducible minimum.

The time is now ripe for Mr. Bryan's movement for reorganizing the party in Democratic directions (pp. 257, 264, 283). He has already been heard from. He will doubtless be heard from more definitely at an early day.

Meanwhile it is the part of wisdom for eager democrats of all parties to practice with reasonable moderation the saving grace of patience and to cultivate the virtue of political common sense. Whether the Democratic party is to come out of this confusion rejuvenated and reinvigorated, or a new party with a new name is to spring up out of the circumstances, no one can foresee and no one need pretend to. Events will determine this; no man, no committee, no conference, can do it, and no toy politics can lend any very useful aid. If a new party comes it will not be an expansion of any paper party; it will more probably be an outburst of the democratic elements of the Republican party. If the old Democratic party has still a democratic future, it will not be long before something of that future is foreshadowed. Meanwhile let us all—democratic-Democrats, democratic-Republicans and democratic-Populists—remember that a cause is more important than a party, and principles than partisanship; and be prepared to adjust ourselves to the fighting method which events may thrust upon us.

The election of Douglas as Governor of Massachusetts shows what can be done by a democrat who leaves "weasel" words to the Presidential candidate, and puts his principles before the people in plain language. He made a free trade campaign; made it with good sense, but without timidity; made it in the interest of the people and not in fear of this protected interest or that one; and a State that Parker lost by almost 100,000 as Democratic candidate for President, he has won as Democratic candidate for Governor by nearly 40,000.

Although the election is over we reproduce in our Miscellany, from the Commoner, Mr. Bryan's address to the Populists. We do this because we regard this brief editorial as having historical value. With one part of it we do not agree. According to Mr. Bryan, Democrats who regarded their

party as having been captured by the plutocrats ought not to have voted against Judge Parker with a view thereby to hastening its reorganization. On this point Mr. Bryan says that "no one can afford to put the interest of his party or of his faction of the party above the interests of his country." That is quite true when the interests of one's party or faction are not in his judgment identical with the interests of his country. But in this case the interests of the democratic faction of the Democratic party were regarded by an immense number of Democrats as identical with the interests of the country. For the plutocrats, already owning the Republican party, had secured control of the Democratic party and named Judge Parker as their own chosen candidate for it. It thereupon became a question for the genuine democrats of the party to decide, each for himself, whether plutocratic control of the country itself could, in the long run, best be thrown off by supporting Parker or by defeating him. We cannot, therefore, accept Mr. Bryan's dictum that voting against Parker in order to hasten the reorganization of the Democratic party was doing evil in the hope that good might come out of it. It might just as well be said that voting for Parker by those who regarded him as representing the plutocracy of his party, but in order to achieve some possible good in spite of that fact, was doing evil in the hope that good might come out of it. It is turning into a question of eternal moral principle something that is simply a question of temporary political policy. This same thing is what the Populists also have done. They have said, with reference to Mr. Bryan himself, that he was supporting a positive evil for a possible good. Unjust, illogical and petulant to an absurd degree have many of them been in charging him with inconsistency. Mr. Bryan answers them, in the article we quote, and does so with characteristic dignity, good feeling and thoroughness. He shows them that as matter of general political policy, and

this is incontestably true from any common sense standpoint, his own proper path in the late campaign was the one he took. He goes further. He shows them that it was the only righteous path for him. While we object to the dictum that those Democrats who voted to discredit the plutocratic control of the Democratic party were doing evil that good might come, we fully appreciate the fact that Mr. Bryan himself, believing as he most sincerely did regarding what he describes as paramount issues in the recent campaign, could in good conscience have done only as he has done.

Too much cannot be said in favor of the Chicago public school innovation, credited to Superintendent Cooley and the principals, which contemplates organizing in the schools working models of the political systems of the country. Following is a description of the innovation as understood by the Chicago Tribune and reported in its issue of the 6th:

Miniature city councils upon which the public searchlight may be turned at any time; miniature legislatures minus the shadow of the octopus; and near-real Congresses in which the national policy will be molded without regard to party prejudices are to be organized in the Chicago public schools. In addition, "good government" and "improvement" clubs will be formed. All of these departures from traditional methods are advocated by Superintendent Cooley as a most efficient means of teaching practical civics to the high school students. City, county, State and national conventions will be held—unless the pupils decide to try the direct primary experiment—and nominations made for all the offices in all branches of government. The platforms of the school parties then will be outlined. One organization may put in a plank declaring against the use of cigarettes by minors and fixing a penalty for their sale to children. A prohibition clause may be inserted. They will, however, be constructed in the "regular" way and the campaigns carried on in a dignified, well ordered manner. The voting will be by the Australian system, and in this way the pupils will be thoroughly instructed in regard to the laws governing voting. The city councils will not only discuss questions of vital interest to the government of the school, but also those of foremost interest to the municipality. They will take up such problems as traction and municipal ownership. Corps of schoolyard "white

wings" also are to be organized, with a view to teaching the prospective voters a practical lesson in municipal cleanliness. One of the chief duties of the members will be to keep the playgrounds clean. These organizations are to serve as a medium of instructing the students in a practical way in the more important obligations which students owe to society and the rights and protection which they may demand of society.

An announcement in the daily papers of Prof. Triggs's industrial school (76 E. 20th street, Chicago) was a fine specimen of the slipshod and cynical kind of reporting that modern newspaper methods have fostered. Reference to this instance is necessary because we were misled by it (p. 476) into saying that in Prof. Triggs's school "higher mathematics will be omitted as of little value and history and geography will have no place." The same reports evoked flippant editorials in some of the daily papers. These reports were of a speech by Prof. Triggs in which he had said nothing of the kind reported. The substance of what he did say was this: "History as a record of the acts of kings and rulers, and geography as an account of the rivers in China, will have no place." The prospectus of the school declares its purpose in this respect where it says: "Geography as the history of the earth in becoming a dwelling place for man, and history as giving a record of the evolution of the human race, will be prominently considered."

A practical method of great simplicity and economy for popularizing ideas, has been successfully operated for a year and a half by E. B. Swinney, of 134 Clarkson street, Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. Swinney's purpose is the promotion of the single tax movement, but his plan is adaptable to any other subject. Its principal feature is the placing of propaganda literature, not casually by loose distribution, but directly in the hands of those who express a desire for it. Whoever writes for literature gets it free. The expenses are paid by voluntary con-

tributions. As an illustration of the economy of this method of work and the fact that it can be supported, Mr. Swinney's October report is significant. Since May, 1903, the expenditures have been only \$647.39, of which all but \$31.47 has been contributed, in amounts ranging from a dollar or less to \$5 or more; yet the pieces of literature placed number 100,198—an average cost of less than 7 mills. It is difficult to think of a more economical way of putting directly into the hands of an inquirer the particular bit of printed information regarding a cause which he himself desires. Others have adopted this plan of Mr. Swinney's in connection with the same movement, notably Anton S. Rosing of Ravinia, Ill., and F. H. Bode, 1401 S. 4th St., Springfield, Ill.

The president of the Society of Chemical Industry probably did not know that, in his address before his society, reported in the October issue of the Journal of the Society of Chemical Industry, he was tearing the vitals out of the most effective argument for protection. But that is the mischief he was doing. In referring to the cost of labor, he stated, as the Journal reports him, that—

it was his experience that it paid well to pay men well, and cited an instance where by paying certain laborers double the wages they received abroad for certain work it cost his firm rather less to turn out a ton of ore with those identical men than it did their former employers at half the wages. That was the only way in the world that the American manufacturer with high-priced labor was able to compete with the foreign manufacturer at lower cost. In other words, it was perfectly possible in his judgment for the foreign laborer to produce twice his present result if he received twice the pay.

Now, Mr. Protectionist, stand up straight and tell us why protection is needed to enable employers to pay high wages, if double wages results in double product.

Not long ago the headlines of Chicago newspapers were superlatively boastful of the putting down of "hold-ups." Criminals convicted of this crime were being

sent to State prison for life and that was expected summarily to end the evil. But it didn't. "Hold-ups" have been more common since this vindictive remedy was adopted than before. And now it is proposed to go a step further. An astute grand jury recommends the death penalty, and thoughtless citizens approve. Only a little reflection is needed to see that this would be as futile as the life penalty. One "hold-up" man, now in jail, has been interviewed on the subject, and he puts more horse sense into his brief interview than can be found in all that his "gooder" fellow citizens have said. He asserts that the penalty is without deterrent effect, no matter what it is; because the "hold-up" man never contemplates the possibility of getting caught. His remarks are worthy of consideration and we quote them in full:

I don't think it would make any difference to the sticker-up whether they make it hanging or not. I do know that it never would have cut any ice with me. I had to have the coin and I didn't think about anything else. Yes, I'd a-gone right ahead just the same if I'd known I could be swung up if caught. We don't figure on getting pinched. I didn't want to kill anybody unless I had to. The shooting part was just a matter of protecting myself. I never knew exactly what I could get if I got pinched—of course I knew it was enough. I supposed I could be sent up for 20 or 40 years—or for life, and if I killed anybody I could be hanged. As for the law, I personally don't think it makes any difference. When you go holding anybody up you got to take a chance of getting plunked right there, anyhow. And when you're caught right, the way I was, you don't care what happens to you.

These suggestions open a line of thought regarding the prevention of crime which our medieval penologists might wisely pursue.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—MARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE.

We now confront the crucial question regarding divorce (p. 484), the question on which the whole controversy over divorce really hinges. It is the last of the five test questions heretofore reserved (p. 452) for consideration seriatim, namely:

(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?

Divorce itself, considered merely as nullification of the conventional contract of marriage (p. 485), does not necessarily operate, as we have already stated, to justify a subsequent marriage by either party while the other party lives. There is, therefore, no necessary inconsistency in advocating untrammelled divorce, as we have done, and yet opposing marriage after divorce and during the lifetime of either party to the divorce.

This distinction may at first seem to be a distinction without a difference. Since the divorce nullifies the conventional marriage, why does not right of remarriage follow as matter of course? How can a nullified conventional marriage logically stand in the way of contracting another conventional marriage? It would not be polygamous, it would not be bigamous; upon what principle, then, can conventional divorce be distinguished from the right of subsequent conventional marriage? Does not the right of conventional marriage after divorce depend strictly upon the legitimacy of the conventional divorce?

These objections seem to be unanswerable; and so far as relates to the propriety, logical or otherwise, of forbidding remarriage, they may be so. But they do not remove the necessity for the distinction we make, as a little consideration of the subject will show.

There are persons of austere mind who would have the law forbid conventional marriage where one of the parties is afflicted, physically, mentally or morally, in such manner as possibly to injure posterity through hereditary transmission. Among these drastic reformers are some so extreme that they would have the law step in to make marriage a natural impossibility with such persons. Their propositions are advanced without regard to prior marriage or divorce, the proposed inhibition applying as well to persons who have never been married as to

those who have been divorced. Repugnant as these propositions are, they show the necessity for distinguishing between divorce and remarriage, which is the point we are now trying to make.

Some divorce laws go to prove the same necessity. Divorces are not infrequently granted by court decrees which forbid the remarriage of one of the parties to the marriage so annulled. The difference between divorce and remarriage is thereby recognized.

The same difference was recently recognized by Bishop Potter, who ascribed the confusion in the popular mind regarding divorce to obtuseness on the part of those who demand rigid divorce laws. "There is," he wrote, "a profound and widespread feeling that a woman, married to a brute or a beast, though she may not be able to prove the offense which involves his marital infidelity, should be relieved from the degradation of living with such a person; that she should be allowed to remarry is an entirely different question. The two should be made distinct by the law, which could afford relief by granting divorce for cruelty or drunkenness or brutality, as well as for marital infidelity, but which should prohibit remarriage in all cases." Idolatrous reverence for conventional marriage, regardless of natural marriage, is evident in the distinguished Bishop's remarks about the degradation of living with "such a person." Is it any more degrading to live with a cruel, drunken or brutal husband than to live with one who is not cruel, drunken nor brutal, yet whose marital title is no longer sanctified by marriage love? This, however, only in passing. The Bishop's recognition of the difference we have endeavored to distinguish is the point in hand.

Notwithstanding that the right of marriage after divorce seems to follow logically from the divorce, it is evident that the police power of organized society must be reckoned with, and that under this power and upon the assumption that it is for the common good, marriages may be prohibited as well upon the ground of previous marriage, divorce or no divorce, as upon any other ground. Separate consideration of the subject of divorce, and of marriage

after divorce, as independent subjects, is thereby necessitated.

The distinct question at issue, therefore, is whether conventional marriages after conventional divorces ought to be tolerated during the lifetime of either party to the divorce.

That they ought to be prohibited where there is no divorce, and the previous conventional marriage subsists, we have already urged (p. 470); the reason being that inasmuch as conventional marriage is merely symbolical of natural marriage, and as two natural marriages of the same person cannot subsist at the same time, therefore two conventional marriages cannot properly so subsist. There can consequently be no second contract of marriage, with propriety, until the prior one has been annulled.

We have further insisted, however (p. 486), that upon the dissolution of a natural marriage by the death of the marriage love that makes it, society ought to assent to a corresponding dissolution of the corresponding conventional marriage, with only so much reservation as may be necessary to conserve all the civil rights involved.

We now contend that when this dissolution has been ceremonially declared, the civil bar to subsequent marriage should be thereby and thereupon removed. The natural marriage is dead; it died with the death of its vitalizing love. The conventional marriage also is dead; it died with the conventional divorce. The parties, therefore, are now unmarried. They are unmarried both naturally and conventionally. They are as completely and truly unmarried as if one of them had physically died. Except, then, upon the abhorrent theory that society should establish a system of meddling paternalism regarding marriage, each of the divorced parties ought to be, in so far as civil coercion is in question, free to enter again into natural marriage and to proclaim it by conventional marriage.

True, back of these civil considerations there are ecclesiastical ones. But they must be left to the churches. Churches are as much entitled as any other voluntary associations to set up their own rules and regulations; and

the rules and regulations of voluntary associations are not legitimate subjects for general debate, so long as they do not assail or threaten the civil rights of outsiders. With civil regulations, however, it is different.

Extremely absurd, not to say invasive in high degree, is it for organized society to forbid the conventional marriage of any persons of "sound and disposing mind and memory," each of whom asserts their natural marriage and is at the time married to no other person either in substance or form. And what organized society cannot properly forbid in this respect, public opinion cannot justly censure.

Grant the propriety of conventional divorce, and you thereby grant the propriety of remarriage, unless you inyoke the arbitrary functions of the police power and insist that society should prohibit any marriage which legislators can be influenced to regard as unfit. Prohibition of conventional second marriages while the prior ones subsist, rests upon the bedrock of marital principle; but prohibition of second marriages after divorce, rests only upon arbitrary power. This power may, indeed, be invoked; but so may governmental might against natural right in any case. It cannot be invoked, however, without tending to injure the parties, to discredit conventional marriage, to degrade natural marriage, to distort social proprieties, and to demoralize social purity. Like governmental might against natural right in all cases, arbitrary coercive rules regarding marriage after divorce are certain to react prejudicially upon every good object sought thereby to be attained.

There should be no difficulty in seeing that prohibition of marriage after divorce as a penalty for offenses prescribed as causes for divorce, is a gross perversion of the wholesome principles of the criminal law. This prohibition is in the nature of a penalty as truly as imprisonment would be. Of that there can be no doubt. But if it is a penalty, the offender should be regularly tried for his crime and punished according to the ordinary standards of punishment. Think of the absurd cruelty of adjudging that drunkenness,

or brutality, or adultery, shall be punished with a sentence upon a marital offender to remain during the lifetime of the other party to the marriage, an unmarried person. Bishop Potter would go further. With hardened insensibility to its grim humor, he advocates the same sentence for both parties—the innocent with the guilty. If cruelty and drunkenness and adultery are proper offenses for legal penalties, let them be punished regularly as criminal offenses; but away with this barbarism of marital outlawry.

Not only is that outlawry absurd—hard-heartedly so; it is manifestly inexpedient from every consideration of social order.

One party to every divorce—both parties, if Bishop Potter's idea were to prevail—though a marriageable member of the community, is forbidden to marry. What is the almost inevitable result but increasing indifference to marriage conventionalities? Natural law is stronger than legislation, stronger even than social institutions. Sooner or later, with a growing army of marital outlaws standing before the fortress of conventional marriage, that fortress will fall.

Consider it. Men are naturally distinguished by passion for sex rather than respect for marriage. They are not without the latter, but it is dormant until the subtle influences of natural marriage awaken it. Women, on the other hand, are naturally distinguished not by passion for sex, but by devotion to marriage. Yet in consequence of natural marriage their dormant sex consciousness awakes as does man's dormant marriage consciousness. There is a resulting complementary union, natural and sacred, of the two lives, masculine and feminine, in all their relations, through which children of legitimate natural birth come into the world, and about which a normal family group is formed. While such a natural marriage survives, the natural tendency is toward an equilibrium of impulses, those that relate to sex and those that relate to marriage. This is in accordance with obvious natural laws—the obvious laws of human nature. But what if a natural marriage prematurely dies,

as genuine natural marriages may? What if, though the natural marriage dies, dissolution of the conventional marriage is forbidden, or being allowed is accompanied with a stern decree against remarriage? Sex consciousness has been awakened where once it was dormant, and where love for marriage has lost none of its fervor; love for marriage has been awakened where once it was dormant, and where sexuality is not yet impotent. Yet here are two people, in full mental and bodily vigor, in middle life or it may be in youth, forced by law, each while the other lives, either to hug the cold corpse of their former marriage love, or ruthlessly to suppress their awakened and intensified and supremely marital emotions. Their only other recourse, if they escape the degradation of concubinage, is the opprobrium of natural marriage illicitly maintained.

Does anyone suppose that under such coercion this repugnant recourse will grow more repugnant? Then his imagination is weak and his common sense at fault. It will grow less and less repugnant, not only in the minds of those who embrace the alternative, but in the minds of their friends and sympathizers, and so eventually in the common mind. If this is so, then rigidly coercive legal restraints upon conventional marriage after divorce, can have no other ultimate than the breaking down of the present conventional barriers and the creation of a new social theory of sexual ethics. The worst enemies of conventional marriage are not those speculative minds that hold it in contempt, nor those licentious minds that trifle with it; but those paganistic ones that idolize it as sacred in itself, and, forgetting it is only symbolical of natural marriage, strive to make its bonds unnaturally rigid and galling.

Make no mistake. Inhibitions upon remarriage after divorce deter no persons who believe they are in love from entering providently into marriage originally. They have then no expectation of divorce, and no thought of marrying again. Inhibitions upon remarriage are therefore utterly excluded from all their calculations. So far as they are influenced by them, these inhibitions might as well not exist. Their existence can

influence none but those who set deliberately about contracting false marriages. Apart from such cases, insignificant in number, they can operate only to prevent the very sensitive from marrying again when natural law urges them to, and to drive the less sensitive into unconventional forms of married life.

If conventional marriage is a useful thing, as we believe it to be, then prohibition of marriage after divorce is inexpedient. Conventional marriage where natural marriage exists is strengthened, not weakened, by liberal divorce laws.

It is, also, immoral to prohibit marriage after divorce; and for reasons akin to those that make it inexpedient. The inexpedient and the immoral are but complementary sides of the same shield. It is immoral because it tends to the prostitution of marriage functions.

When conventional expressions of natural functions are arbitrarily narrowed, the functions themselves become distorted. Marriage is not an exception. We cannot, with safety to social morals, close the door of conventional marriage to men and women whose natural love for marriage, with all that this implies, has been awakened and is in full vigor. Many of the illicit relations that might result, alienated as they would be from the guiding and fostering influences of marriage-conventionality, would tend to go far astray, not only from conventional but also from natural chastity. Given a large population of marriageable people condemned indefinitely to a celibate life, and it can hardly be expected, if they formed sexual alliances at all, as many of them almost certainly would, that their tendency under those circumstances would always be in the direction of illicit natural marriage. The stronger tendency might be in other and more deplorable directions. The very illicitness of these natural marriages would have a prejudicial influence. Just as arbitrary legal prohibitions of other things not wrong in themselves invite resistance, and so promote indifference to all legal prohibitions, the legitimate as well as the arbitrary, so do arbitrary restrictions upon

marriage invite resistance and thus promote indifference even to the moralities of marriage.

If marital morality is what we would cherish, careful indeed must we be about exposing conventional marriage to the kind of public opinion which a bigoted theory of this conventionality, rigidly reduced to practice in civil government, would be most apt to generate. Concubinage, promiscuity, practical polygamy, shameless prostitution in various forms—these are the progeny not of reasonably liberal, but of arbitrarily strict, conditions of divorce.

It would be unkind to accuse the advocates of enforced celibacy for divorced persons of promoting immorality; they are not intending that. But that it would be the natural effect, increasingly, of strict enforcement of their idolatrous theory of marriage, one needs but to know human nature to realize.

There is a sense much more profound, however, in which it may be said that narrow and rigid divorce laws would propagate marital immorality.

What can be more immoral with reference to marriage than the arbitrary prevention of genuine natural marriages? Yet this is what society and public opinion aim to do when they make divorce a bar to subsequent conventional marriage during the lifetime of either party. The marriages thus forbidden may be in their nature as abiding and pure and in all respects as true as the holiest marriage ever celebrated. They may even be eternal in their abidingness,—who can tell? But their conventional expression, which is to natural marriage what personal reputation is to personal character, is arbitrarily forbidden. The divorced man or woman, therefore, who is sensitive to marital reputation and shrinks from exposing a marriage of good character to the bitter ordeal of bad repute, must forego remarriage itself or cultivate a spirit of defiance or indifference toward the conventionality which is thus tyrannical over them. How is it possible to force upon anyone this cruel and demoralizing dilemma, without offending grievously against marital morality?

Marital morality is not wholly

negative. It does not consist altogether of "thou-shalt-not" commands. On the contrary, it is primarily and tremendously affirmative. The command, "Thou shalt," is addressed by nature and by nature's God to every man and woman who mutually understand that they are drawn together by genuine marriage love. Of all the commands of marital morality is not this the greatest and holiest? Surely it is not too much to say, to all who in their heart of hearts believe in marriage as they believe in life, that if in the catalogue of marital immoralities any one may be called the unpardonable, it is the immorality of celibate conditions thrust by public opinion or forced by law upon individuals against their will. Itself a sin of the first magnitude, it hatches out most of the others.

In the language of a worthy and thoughtful clergyman of the Episcopal church, a man who holds marriage among the most sacred of things, "society must not condemn men and women to the degradation and debasement, the physical and moral wreckage of individuals in forced union, nor, as an alternative, to the perpetual sterility of lives that might be happy and useful and fruitful." He has further said, as wisely and strongly, that its doing so is "absurd, ridiculous, immoral and full of the most portentous and evil significance to our social and domestic life. It means that a man may drag his wife through the foulest gutters, may debase and debauch her in body and soul, may make life a perfect hell to her, and she has no remedy except separation, permanent widowhood, and prohibition of all possibility of gaining human happiness and true love while she and he live on earth."

And so we come to the end of our inquiry regarding marriage problems. But no such inquiry can with satisfaction be abandoned to its fate with a conclusion relating chiefly to the shadowy side of the subject. There is a sacredness about marriage which demands some consideration of it in a manner wholly affirmative, as if divorces were unknown or only vaguely possible; and to that demand we purpose in a concluding article to offer a response.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTRALASIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Oct. 7.—On September 20 Mr. Watson, the leader of the Opposition and of the Labor party in the Federal House of Representatives (p. 455), moved a "no-confidence" motion against the Reid ministry. The motion has been debated ever since, and the vote has not yet been taken, but it is practically certain that the ministry will win by two votes.

A "closer settlement" bill has been passed by the State parliament of Victoria (p. 214), giving the State power to purchase large estates, compulsory if necessary, and resell the land in small blocks. An amendment by the leader of the Opposition and Labor party to substitute perpetual leasing for selling was defeated.

A bill on exactly the same lines is promised in New South Wales (p. 455), where more sensible proposals were expected, especially with Mr. Ashton as minister of lands, for he used to be a strong advocate of perpetual leasing.

In New Zealand (p. 455), the Labor party has not so far had such a distinct organization as in Australia, but it is now proposed to form one. As a result of the decision of a conference of delegates from trades and labor councils which met last Easter, a delegate meeting of these bodies was held in Wellington in September last, which drew up the following platform for the Political Labor League:

- (1) A state bank, with the sole right of note issue, which shall be legal tender.
- (2) Abolition of the sale of Crown lands, with periodical revaluations of Crown lands held on lease; resumption of land for closer settlement to be at owner's valuation for taxation purposes, plus ten per cent.; tenants' absolute right to improvements.
- (3) Parliamentary franchise for all local elections, with one man one vote.
- (4) Referendum, with initiative; abolition of the Upper House; elective Executive.
- (5) Statutory preference of employment to unionists.
- (6) Cessation of borrowing, except for redemption of loans and completing works already authorized by Parliament.
- (7) Nationalization of all mineral wealth, and establishment of state iron works, woolen and flour mills, and clothing and boot factories.

In addition, there is a municipal platform, the planks of which include payment to mayors and councillors, the municipalization of industries or services which the electors may decide on; all work to be done by day labor; quinquennial valuations by owner, with the right of the municipality to take over property at such valuation, plus ten per cent., etc. A form of pledge was adopted, which must be signed by candidates for positions.

A deputation of the delegates waited on Mr. Seddon, the prime minister, and placed before him the planks of the platform and other demands. Mr. Seddon

spoke sympathetically regarding several of the views advanced, and criticised others. Referring to the movement to form an independent labor party, he said he understood they were just hiving off, and going over to the position which had been disastrous to the Labor party in Australia. If they parted, however, he felt sure they would part good friends; but felt bound to tell them that but for their connection with the advanced Liberal party in the past they could not have got the labor legislation which had been passed.

ERNEST BRAY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 10.

At the Presidential election on the 8th, Theodore Roosevelt was elected by the largest electoral vote ever given to a Presidential candidate in the whole history of the country. The electoral vote for Mr. Roosevelt will be 343. That for Alton B. Parker will be 133—22 less than Wm. J. Bryan received in 1900 and 44 less than he received in 1896, in both of which years the electoral college was smaller than now by 29 votes. This allowance of 343 to Roosevelt includes, however, Colorado and Maryland, both of which are in doubt.

Reports of the popular vote are not yet sufficiently complete to be noted to any advantage for purposes of comparison; but the indications are that Judge Parker's popular defeat is vastly worse than Mr. Bryan's in either of the latter's campaigns. Following are the roughly reported pluralities for Mr. Roosevelt this year in some of the principal States (as compared with those for Mr. McKinley in the same States in 1900):

State.	Roosevelt.	McKinley.
New York	174,691	143,696
New Jersey	61,000	56,899
Connecticut	30,000	28,570
Massachusetts	86,279	81,867
Ohio	210,000	19,036
Indiana	75,000	26,479
Michigan	189,197	104,784
Illinois	292,245	94,924
Wisconsin	130,000	106,581
Minnesota	100,000	77,750
Iowa	140,000	98,543
California	105,000	39,779

The States carried by Mr. Bryan but lost to Judge Parker are (with their electoral votes in the present electoral college) as follows:

Nevada	5
Idaho	3
Montana	3
Missouri	12
Colorado	Doubtful
Maryland	Doubtful

It will be seen, therefore, that the least hopeful predictions, namely, that Judge Parker would fall far behind Mr. Bryan, and not carry even one Northern State, has been more than verified. Not only does he not carry a single Northern State, unless Colorado may turn out to have voted for him, but he loses at least one Southern State, Missouri, and may lose another, in Maryland.

Prior to the election Judge Parker continued to press his charges of extortion and trust support against the Roosevelt administration (p. 486), and Mr. Roosevelt responded. Mr. Roosevelt's response was issued from Washington on the 4th over his own signature. It denounced Judge Parker's accusations as "monstrous," adding that—
if true they would brand both of us [Mr. Cortelyou and Mr. Roosevelt] forever with infamy.

On the subject of corporation contributions Mr. Roosevelt said:

That contributions have been made to the Republican committee, as contributions have been made to the Democratic committee, is not the question at issue. Mr. Parker's assertion is in effect that such contributions have been made for improper motives, either in consequence of threats or in consequence of improper promises, direct or indirect, on the part of the recipients.

In closing Mr. Roosevelt reiterated his denial as follows:

The statements made by Mr. Parker are unqualifiedly and atrociously false. As Mr. Cortelyou has said to me more than once during this campaign, if elected I shall go into the presidency unhampered by any pledge, promise or understanding of any kind, sort or description, save my promise, made openly to the American people, that so far as in my power lies I shall see to it that every man has a square deal, no less and no more.

Judge Parker made at Brooklyn on the 5th a speech which, it had been intimated, would be a reply to Mr. Roosevelt. This speech was to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt had made no denial of receiving campaign contributions from corporations, voted out of their treasuries. This, Judge Parker concluded, was the essence of his accusations, since it is not to be supposed that a trust would expend money belonging to its stockholders unless its purpose was to get something in return.

The following telegraphic communications passed between Judge Parker and Mr. Roosevelt early in the evening of election day:

To President Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.: The people by their vote have emphatically approved your administration. I heartily congratulate you. Alton B. Parker.

Alton B. Parker, Rosemont, N. Y.: I thank you for your congratulations. Theodore Roosevelt.

Judge Parker issued on the 9th an address to the Democratic party in which he said:

I shall never seek a nomination for public office, but I shall to the best of my ability serve the party that has honored me, and through the party serve my country. The party has in the near future a great mission. Before long the people will realize that the tariff-fed trusts and illegal combinations are absorbing the wealth of the nation. Then they will wish to throw off these leeches, but the Republican party will not aid them to do it, for its leaders appreciate too well the uses to which the moneys of the trust can be put in political campaigns. When that time comes, and come it will, the people will turn to the Democratic party for relief, and the party should be ready—ready with an organization of patriotic citizens covering every election district, who are willing to work for the love of the cause. . . . To accomplish much in this direction, however, we must forget the difficulties of the past. . . . And we must by constant teaching, through the press and from the platform, apprise the people of the way the vicious tariff circle works. We must bring home to them at other than election times the fact that money contributed to the Republican party by the trusts is not only dishonest money, but it is given that the trusts may, without hindrance, take a much larger sum from the people. In the presence of a defeat that would take away all personal ambition, were it true that otherwise it possessed me, I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion the greatest moral question which now confronts us is: "Shall the trusts and corporations be prevented from contributing money to control or to aid in controlling elections?"

William J. Bryan issued an address on the same day, to appear in full in the current issue of the Commoner. It is entitled "Democracy vs. Plutocracy — The Election's Lesson," in which he compliments Judge Parker as the candidate, and after describing the situation, says:

In 1896 the line was drawn for the first time during the present generation between plutocracy and democracy, and

the party's stand on the side of democracy alienated a large number of plutocratic Democrats who in the nature of things cannot be expected to return, and it drew to itself a large number of earnest advocates of reform whose attachment to these reforms is much stronger than attachment to any party name. The Republican party occupies the conservative position. That is, it defends those who, having secured unfair advantage through class legislation, insist that they shall not be disturbed, no matter how oppressive their exactions may become. The Democratic party cannot hope to compete successfully with the Republican party for this support. To win the support of the plutocratic element of the country the party would have to become more plutocratic than the Republican party, and it could not do this without losing several times as many voters as that course would win. The Democratic party has nothing to gain by catering to organized and predatory wealth. It must not only do without such support, but it can strengthen itself by inviting the open and emphatic opposition of these elements. The campaign just closed shows that it is as inexpedient from the standpoint of policy as it is wrong from the standpoint of principle to attempt any conciliation of the industrial and financial despots who are gradually getting control of all the avenues of wealth. The Democratic party, if it hopes to win success, must take the side of the plain, common people. . . . The election has opened the eyes of the hundreds and thousands of honest and well-meaning Democrats who a few months ago favored the reorganization of the party. These men now see that they must either go into the Republican party or join with the Democrats of the West and South in making the Democratic party a positive, aggressive and progressive reform organization. There is no middle ground. . . . It does not matter so much who the nominee may be. During the next three years circumstances may bring into the arena some man especially fitted to carry the standard. It will be time enough to nominate a candidate when we are near enough to the campaign to measure the relative availability of those worthy to be considered; but we ought to begin now to lay our plans for the next national campaign and to form the line of battle.

Mr. Bryan continues with an enumeration of the issues he urges, which are opposition to a large army and navy, independence for the Filipinos, the tariff question, an income tax, bimetallism and divorce of Wall street from the treasury department, and the trust question on the basis of "death to every private monopoly," as declared by the platforms of 1900 and 1904. The

immediate reforms he believes to be needed and possible are— the postal telegraph system, State ownership of railroads, the election of Federal judges for fixed terms, and the election of postmasters by the people of their respective communities.

Mr. Bryan closes as follows:

Instead of having the government controlled by corporations through officers chosen by the corporations, we must have a government of the people, by the people and for the people, a government administered according to the Jeffersonian maxim of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Hope and duty point the way. To doubt the success of our cause is to doubt the triumph of the right, for ours is and must be the cause of the masses. "With malice toward none and charity to all" let us begin the campaign of 1908; let us appeal to the moral sentiment of the country and arraign the policies of the Republican party before the bar of the public conscience.

An innovation in the way of American election amenities is made by the Emperor of Germany in the following cable dispatch to Mr. Roosevelt as the successful Presidential candidate:

Neus Palais, Nov. 9. — President Roosevelt, U. S. A., Washington: Sincerest congratulations, May heaven give you prosperity. May your good administration be happy and prosperous to the American people. William. I. R.

The third party Presidential vote is too inadequately reported to be recorded here. As far as heard from in scattering returns it is as follows:

	Soc. Dem.	Soc. L.	Pop. Pro.	Pro. Con.
Chicago	41,595	2,774	2,542	4,334
Cook Co., Ill., including Chicago	44,221	2,909	5,172	..
Ill., (est'd)	100,000

In Milwaukee Debs polled 17,093 to only 16,378 for Parker. His vote is estimated by the party managers at 50,000 in Wisconsin, 12,000 in Indiana, 10,000 in Iowa, 22,000 in Oregon, 10,000 in Minnesota, 4,000 in Nebraska, 8,000 in Kansas, 3,000 in Utah, 7,000 in South Dakota, 5,000 in Montana, only 1,800 in Colorado, 4,000 in Idaho, 13,000 in Massachusetts, 50,000 in Texas and at from 500,000 to 1,000,000 in the country at large.

Although Massachusetts voted for Roosevelt, Republican, for President, it elected W. L. Douglas, Democrat (p. 482), for Governor, by a plurality of 36,530. Min-

nesota also voted for Roosevelt for President, but elected John A. Johnson, Democrat, for Governor by a plurality of about 20,000. In Rhode Island, which was carried for Roosevelt by about 15,000, Gov. Garvin was defeated for reelection by George H. Utter by a plurality of about 594.

Robert Baker (p. 482) was defeated for reelection to Congress in Brooklyn borough, New York, but by what vote is not yet reported. Charles A. Towne was elected and Bourke Cochran, Wm. Hearst and William Sulzer were reelected in Manhattan borough, New York.

According to the latest reports the political complexion of the next Congress will be about as follows:

Senate:	
Republicans	58
Democrats	32
Rep. majority	
Republicans	245
Democrats	141
Rep. majority	
	104

From Cleveland, although the county of Cuyahoga gave a plurality of some 30,000 against Judge Parker, Robert C. Wright, Democratic candidate for county auditor, the head of the county ticket (p. 357), is reelected; but in Nebraska the fusionists (Democratic and People's party) have been defeated and the expectation of Wm. J. Bryan's election to the United States Senate is thereby disappointed.

The result in Chicago is phenomenal. Although Chicago is normally a Democratic city, its vote for President is 201,658 for Roosevelt and 97,840 for Parker—a Roosevelt plurality of 113,818. McKinley's plurality over Bryan in 1900 was only 7,621. The whole Democratic ticket was carried down in the landslide. Among those defeated is William Preston Harrison (p. 843), brother of the Mayor, who lost a district normally 8,000 Democratic by 7,000 Republican. The Democratic candidate for Governor of Illinois, Lawrence B. Stringer (p. 482), lost Chicago by a plurality of 96,000 for Charles S. Deneen, the Republican candidate. He lost the State by a plurality of about 289,000 for Deneen—about 175,000 more than

the plurality against Altgeld in 1896.

Robert M. La Follette (p. 449) is elected Governor of Wisconsin by 50,000. He was supported by Bryan Democrats. In Missouri Joseph W. Folk (p. 264) is elected Governor by nearly 40,000, although the State on the Presidential issue went against Parker by about 12,000. The other State candidates on Folk's ticket were defeated.

All the Illinois public policy propositions (p. 483) are believed to have been carried. The referendum on making the Torrens land title system compulsory in Chicago also carried. Use of voting machines hereafter in this city was ordered by a referendum on that question. While the affirmative vote for the Chicago charter amendment was very large in Chicago, its adoption by a two-thirds vote in the whole State was at first in doubt, but its adoption is now assured. Following is the Chicago vote on the referendum questions:

Charter amendment	254,515	19,128
Torrens law	220,483	26,733
Voting machines	220,787	26,705
Bond issue	211,877	17,509
Direct primaries	216,735	19,720
Referendum veto	203,788	23,894
Local option in taxation	172,408	50,982

At the general parliamentary elections, held in the Dominion of Canada on the 3d (p. 491), the Liberal party was returned to power. The constituencies heard from, 207 in number (elections in 7 others yet to be held), give the Liberals 141 members and the Conservatives only 66. Issues were complex. To some extent the tariff question with complicated ramifications was one issue, and to some extent also the proposition to make the new continental railroad a government road, both as to construction and operation, was involved. But as the latter proposition was put forward by the Conservative party, and not so much affirmatively as in the way of criticism of a contract made by the Liberals with the Grand Trunk railway company, the issue did not come squarely before the people.

Parliamentary elections were held in Italy on the 6th. Reports are meager, but no substantial

changes in the general political situation appear to have resulted.

Nothing from the seat of the Russian-Japanese war near Mukden (p. 491) is reported for the week; but Port Arthur (p. 491) has been continuously under bombardment by the Japanese. Although many rumors are coming in from this point no further reliable news is yet at hand.

NEWS NOTES.

—Paul de Cassagnac, the French journalist, died on the 4th at the age of 62.

—At the Ohio election on the 8th, the city of Glenville, voted itself into the city of Cleveland.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 442) for October shows on hand October 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash	146,352,757.23
Total	\$296,352,757.23
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1904	319,027,342.39
Decrease	\$ 22,674,445.16

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 442) for the month ending October 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$88,537,736.15
Internal revenue	80,046,846.80
Miscellaneous	18,440,487.56
	\$187,025,070.51
Expenses:	
Civil and misc	\$53,433,746.89
War	53,006,092.43
Navy	41,026,522.67
Indians	4,248,956.70
Pensions	47,122,003.58
Interest	9,396,807.13
	\$208,834,159.40
Deficit	\$ 21,809,128.89

PRESS OPINIONS.

ROOSEVELT'S FUTURE.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 9.—Hereafter Roosevelt will not be "merely filling out the unexpired term of President McKinley." He can feel himself neither sheltered nor hampered by a McKinley tradition. He himself is responsible.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Nov. 10.—There is nothing stable in politics, and there is always great danger for a party in an overwhelming success. It is apt to produce an unwarranted complacency, arrogance, inattention to much that is deservedly calling for recognition. It is apt also to result in serious disappointments of expectation. It imposes upon those who are intrusted with power the very special duty of supplying of themselves that alertness that is naturally developed when there is a strong opposition. It encourages the evil elements in the party, bad men and aggressive, selfish groups, to aim at a tyrannous control that may lead later to party disaster. So the Republican party to-day should feel that it must resist such a control. It should understand that the people still have faith in its promises of reciprocity and tariff revision; that they are looking to it for the enforcement of the anti-trust laws, and that their support

will vanish if it should be a party of special privileges instead of a people's party.

ELECTION LESSONS.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Nov. 9.—Judge Parker simply failed to inspire the earnest, the genuinely democratic elements of his own party with confidence. They did not feel that in voting for him they would be voting for democratic principles. And he did not attract Republicans who are tired of the reign of special interests and are ready to come over to the Democracy when the Democracy has the courage to be democratic.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Nov. 9.—The most important specific result is that the Democratic reorganizers have been practically wiped off the political map. They have had their chance and they have failed grotesquely to improve it. . . . The reorganizers sought to destroy the ideas for which Mr. Bryan stood. They have proved that only those ideas can rouse their party to aggressive enthusiasm. The reorganizers sought to consign Mr. Bryan to political oblivion. The result of their efforts has been to make Mr. Bryan greater with his party than before, and to leave him as the only active Democratic leader of national dimensions. William Jennings Bryan is still the leader who leads the Democratic party. He stands for radicalism, and radicalism is what the Democratic party wants. It has tried conservatism and ignominiously failed. Henceforth it will be devoted to radicalism, because radical ideas are the only ones that inspire it and give it even the hope of victory. Therefore it behooves the Republican party to remember, in its hour of victory, that it must hereafter confront an opposition not only willing to be radical, but even driven to radicalism as its only hope of success. And it behooves the Republican party to remember that there is nothing so dangerous to its continuance in power as a Democracy sincerely devoted to radicalism—fighting for principles as principles. A political party is never in such danger as when it seems to itself to be perfectly secure in power through an overwhelming victory. That is the position of the Republican party to-day, and unless it sees the truth about its position and takes its measures accordingly, its overthrow is only a question of time. There is a rising tide of radicalism in this country. The rapid increase of the Socialist vote is an index of its rising. The Socialists are merely the spray that flies before the coming flood of democratic radicalism. No stagnant policy will enable the Republican party to face and check that flood. The Republican party cannot stand still. It must go forward. It must go forward to grasp the new problems of the day and pause not in the solution of them. That has been its past. That ought to be its future. In a word, the Republican party is put by its victory of yesterday in a position where it must plan and watch and work as it has not done since it gathered behind Abraham Lincoln to save this Union from disunion.

BRYAN IN THE CAMPAIGN.

The Commoner (Dem.), Nov. 4.—Mr. Bryan is sometimes asked why he does not use the present opportunity to get even with the gold Democrats who helped to defeat him. There are four reasons: First, that Parker and Davis both voted for him, and he does not care to retaliate on men who had the courage to vote for him when so many Eastern Democrats voted against him; second, because he has more important work on hand than trying to get even with anybody; third, because there were so many who contributed to his defeat that life is too short to get even with any large number of them; and, fourth, because it will keep him busy the rest of his life to get even with the people who have helped him, and he can only get even with them by securing each year the most in the way of reform that can be secured.

OHIO POLITICS.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Nov. 8.—Those who are wise enough to see a small way beyond the end of their noses understand that it could only be a short while till the so-called "isms" and "fads" of Tom L. Johnson would be exceedingly popular with the public at large. There has been tremendous progress made in a single year when Mr. Johnson's worst enemies and the interests which are profiting most by the continuation of the things which he is fighting find that it is necessary to claim that they are standing on Johnson's platform in the hope that they may thus fool some people into voting for them and their candidates.

JEFFERSONIAN UNITY.

Sioux City Daily Tribune (Ind.), Nov. 1.—Tom Watson says it is his purpose to organize Jefferson Democrats. He will have trouble organizing Bryan and Cleveland, and Jefferson is dead.

LABOR'S VANTAGE GROUND.

Annie Withington, in Chicago Commons, Nov.—One of the most suggestive things I saw in Fall River was a confirmation of my belief that there can be no industrial security for the landless workingman. The unskilled Portuguese were really relatively far better off than their higher paid neighbors because they had not forsaken the agricultural pursuits of their ancestors. Their little plots of land hired outside the town were keeping them alive and I would that every union man would follow their intelligent custom. He would be better equipped for his next industrial war if he would.

INDUCTIVE AND DEDUCTIVE REASONING.

The (Chicago) Bear (stocks), Oct. 21.—The ancients were not the only offenders in the reckless use of deduction. There are even now perpetual motion cranks and visionary socialistic dreamers whose attempts at reasoning are like a ridiculous caricature of the real thing. It was unwarranted however for the moderns to wholly reject deduction because it had been clumsily used. The intelligent way is to master it as electricity has been mastered, and make it approximately as useful as it is potential of usefulness. While the professors have largely rejected deduction and have heaped contempt upon it, the practical scientists of the world, the doers of things, have never ceased to employ it. All the great engineering and architectural accomplishments have been carried out upon a priori designs. Imagination and deductive reasoning are the highest form of intelligence; they are the real creative agents employed by inventors and designers. Before the airship becomes a realized success it must first be reasoned out in the mind of the inventor. Because the inventor and deductive reasoner cannot in advance say that their conclusions have been tested by actual trial they are always at a disadvantage with the so-called conservatives, really the moss-backs of society. Of course true critics who employ careful deduction to detect the flaws in careless deduction perform a useful function; but the mere scoffers and inert vegetables who decry every deductively reached proposition of inventors and "radicals"—they are the mud through which the wheels of progress have ever laboriously to be dragged.

Ponce de Leon had discovered the fountain of youth. "Ain't it simple?" he exclaimed, as he dipped in his finger and tasted the mixture. "Why, it's nothing but rouge and burnt matches, and a little pink powder!"—Cleveland Leader.

MISCELLANY

LO!

"When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers."—The Singer of Israel, in Psalm 50:18.

"Ye pay tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."—The Christ, in Matthew 23:23.

Lo, the poor minister, whose tutored mind
Sees God in books, and not in human kind,
And delving late in ancient stones and scrolls

Sleeps at God's sunrise, and is losing souls.
Even the corpses in a rising tide
Float upward; churches dead in pride
Heave on the bosom of the ascending flood,
Whose billows breathe the unfettered word
of God.

That which once spoke within the Gothic nave
In mine and factory hears the wage-bound slave,
Send up strong prayers to serve a stronger need,
And cries to heaven to be unearthed, and freed.

How dare we hold our own salvation sure,
Who preach good manners to the murmuring poor,
But share with wealth which does not yet repent
The unjust tariff, and the unearned rent?
—From "The Unearthing of God," by
Charles H. Fitch.

A BUTTERFLY PREACHMENT.

At the Vine Street Congregational church, in Cincinnati, Nov. 6, 1904, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, commented as follows on an article of Secretary Morton:

We have heard the optimist likened to a man who fell from the top of a 17-story building, and who said to himself as he passed each floor on his downward plunge: "I'm all right so far. I'm all right so far." The optimism of our new secretary of the navy seems to be equal to almost any occasion.

In a recent number of the Independent he gives reasons for voting for Mr. Roosevelt. The validity of these reasons it is not the present purpose to discuss. Attention, however, is directed to one or two sentences which will not be indorsed by every man who votes for Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Morton said: "The millionaires of to-day, in most instances, were the poor boys of 40 and 50 years ago." One may accept that sentence without swallowing the next: "The boys of to-day have just as much opportunity to become the millionaires of the future as had the boys of 40 years ago." Then the author proceeds to lay down a formula for success: "Strict attention to business, unusual brain power and great energy and application is

the only recipe that I know of to attain wealth in the United States."

You are waiting on the street corner for a car. There are 19 others waiting for the same car. It has but 30 seats, and when it arrives, 20 of them are preempted. The successful man is he who gets a seat. The millionaire is he who gets the end seat.

Therefore, pay strict attention to business. You will need unusual brain power and energy and application. Look sharp! There's your chance! Rush in ahead of that woman! Bravo! Now get out your paper and bury your face in it so that you will not appear to see that decrepit old man who, with difficulty, is clinging to a strap in front of you.

Then when you hear a man insisting that the company ought to furnish enough seats to go round, denounce him for trying to inflame the masses against the classes. Tell him that he is envious or lazy, and that any man can get a seat in this car of success if he pays strict attention to business, and has unusual brain power and energy and application. Then if the man asks you how 40 men can sit in 30 seats, call him a pestilent fellow, and tell him that the postal department ought to deprive his paper of the second class mailing privilege.

The young man returning from the Civil war could go to Iowa, and for \$10 an acre could buy the opportunity to toil on as rich soil as Nature ever made. But the young man back from the Spanish war would have to pay \$75 an acre before he would have any right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness on that soil.

There is much truth in that recipe, Mr. Morton. But it is not the whole truth. There is also some truth in Mr. Kipling's lines:

The toad beneath the harrow knows
Exactly where each tooth point goes;
The butterfly upon the road
Preaches contentment to that toad.

A CALIFORNIA "SPELLBINDER."

From "The Campaign Spellbinder," by Lindsay Denison, in Everybody's Magazine for September.

The last gubernatorial campaign in California discovered Franklin K. Lane. He was a candidate, of course, but he did things which had never been done before by a Democratic candidate. California is normally 20,000 Republican. Mr. Lane came within 1,500 votes of election, notwithstanding the most energetic efforts of the powerful Hearst influence to beat him by aiding the Republican candidate. Lane sets off no fireworks in the

course of his speech-making. But he shows every single fact which is concerned in his campaign, and sets it forth as he sees it, in such a manner that the voter must see it his way. Without making any apparent effort for effect, the man gets at the feelings and the reasonableness of every man within reach of his voice as though that man were all alone with him on the other side of a dining-room table. Lane's voice is big and powerful, and, moreover, flexible. His own campaign discovered him, and sooner or later he will be drafted over into the greatspell-binding army this side of the Rocky mountains.

ENFORCED PEACE.

The report for Thursday, October 6, of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, held in Boston, was headed in the leading daily: "Would Force Peace." It was a clever comment by the reporter on Andrew Carnegie's proposition for stopping war immediately. Carnegie's letter to the Congress proposes the most extreme war measure possible for the obtaining of peace, that of slavery. He says:

Suppose, for instance, that Great Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor states as would certainly join them, were to take that position [binding themselves to settlement of all disputes by arbitration], prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender, if there ever were one, being rigorously dealt with, war would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth.

This has an exact parallel in the proposition of the father who took his son to enter Sunday school, and thus directed the teacher: "If he don't get his lesson, you just tell me. I'll lick it into him!"

How that boy must have loved the Bible, "licked into him" by his zealous father! And how those lesser states will love the bonds of "peace" in which they writhe in the iron grasp of the Great Powers!

But let us not ourselves make war upon Mr. Carnegie while we are testifying to the need of a peace interior to the external form of it. Therefore, let us realize how he came to make such a singular proposition. He probably gave way to that extremely human tendency to be carried off one's balance by enthusiasm for some longed-for condition, forgetting that the mere external has absolutely no power for good without the presence of corresponding underlying causes.

Such enforced peace would result in the bondage and consequent inevitable oppression of the weak nations by the strong. War, in freedom, horrible as it is, is a mild hell compared with

bondage made peaceable by force. Every person or people has a divine right to self defense, and no abuse of that right can make slavery a virtue. The word "peace" is desecrated by giving it as a name to such a condition. The picture arises involuntarily in one's mind of the horrors of the situation of a little nation, oppressed by the united powers, unconsciously often, because those powers will be absorbed in arranging their own affairs to their best possible advantage, and the little nation will not be able to lift a hand in self-defense. Have we not seen enough of such oppression to warn us against its systematic perpetuation throughout the earth?

Much more to the point are the words of the British workingman, Pete Curran, to the congress: "War is caused by greed of territory." Every single taxpayer knows the truth of that, and it gives us a new impetus for work. Much more has been written and said of national and individual benefits of the single tax than of the international. Now the time is ripe to press that aspect of it, and it will further the knowledge of the lesser ones. Arbitration is in the air. Ten treaties in ten months have been made. More are about to be concluded. This kind of peace may come much sooner than we have anticipated. It will be a step onward, but it will soon result in enormous injustice, unless it can go further. International peace, with special privileges to the few, will soon cease to appear even as peace, and will become a new form of slavery. Internationally, the world must establish itself on the rights of all men to use the earth, before international peace can be anything but a new name for larger special privileges. Now is the time for single taxpayers to spread abroad this truth.—Jane Dearborn Mills, in The Single Tax Review for October, 1904.

BRYAN TO THE POPULISTS.

From The Commoner of Nov. 4, 1904.

Some of the Populists criticize Mr. Bryan because he advocates the election of Judge Parker. They point to the fact that the Populists supported Mr. Bryan in 1896. The case is not parallel, as everyone must admit who has stopped for a moment to consider the circumstances. In 1896, the Populists indorsed Mr. Bryan's candidacy because they thought by so doing they might be able to elect him and thus secure those reforms upon which the Populists and Democrats were agreed. With the aid of the Populists, Mr.

Bryan came so near election that a change of 20,000 votes, properly distributed through the close States, would have changed the result. The Populists, therefore, acted wisely, in doing the best they could under the circumstances. If at this time the race was between Mr. Watson and Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Bryan could help defeat Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Watson, he would be in the position that the Populists occupied eight years ago, and would be open to criticism if he refused to assist. But that is not the situation to-day. If Mr. Bryan supported Mr. Watson, he would simply help elect Mr. Roosevelt, and thus become responsible for what Mr. Roosevelt might do; whereas, by supporting Judge Parker, he hopes to elect Judge Parker, and thus secure such reforms as are within reach at this time. Four years ago Mr. Bryan declared imperialism to be more important than any economic question. His sincerity would be open to criticism if to-day, on account of differences on the money question, he refused to support a man who stands squarely against imperialism, and who has a chance to win. In like manner, he would also be open to criticism if he refused to help reduce the army, which Judge Parker promises to do; or refused to assist in ridding this country of the warlike spirit which President Roosevelt has inaugurated. In 1894 Mr. Bryan, after having received a unanimous nomination for Senator, urged the Democratic convention to nominate Judge Holcomb, the Populist candidate for Governor, and he gave as his reason that the nomination of a Democratic candidate at that time would not result in the election of a Democrat, but would assist the Republicans; and that the Democrats, desiring the defeat of the Republican candidate, could best accomplish that defeat by the support of the Populist candidate. The convention took this view of the subject and Judge Holcomb was indorsed and elected. This was the beginning of fusion in Nebraska. In supporting Judge Parker to-day, Mr. Bryan is acting upon exactly the same principle. To support Mr. Watson would be to help Mr. Roosevelt and to deny to the people the good that can be accomplished through the election of Parker and Davis. It is argued that Judge Parker's defeat might hasten the reorganization of the Democratic party; but no one can afford to put the interest of his party, or of his faction of the party, above the interests of his country. No one can afford to become

responsible for four years more of Rooseveltism in order to help his element of the party obtain control of the party organization.

In other words, no one can afford to do evil in the hope that good may come out of it. The only safe plan is to do at all times that which seems best for the country; and at this time, the reduction of the army, the overthrow of imperialism, the removal of the race issue, and the substitution of a spirit of peace for a spirit of war, are the best things within reach, and these things the election of Parker and Davis would help to bring about. And since Mr. Bryan has declared, and still believes, imperialism to be a graver issue than any economic question, he could not with honesty or honor fail to render such assistance as he can to the reestablishment of the Declaration of Independence and constitutional government.

A GENUINE REPUBLIC.

From an article on "The Use of Wood in Switzerland," by Wendell C. Corthall, in *The Craftsman* for October, 1903.

Let us remember that the life in Switzerland is distinctively that of the village. Here is the only true republic in Europe, a republic of far more freedom, dignity and real democracy than that of France, or even than that of our own. A land is here without a "Boss," where every member is free to cast his ballot and have his full share in the general corporation. The forests are among his assets, and all are interested to have them kept at their full value. . . .

The cost of the government is only three dollars per capita per annum. In England it is \$12, and in France \$15. . . .

Switzerland has no castles, no walled towns. She has been governed for 500 years by her own people, and without the help of kings. She is a land of villages, of homes. Of 600,000 householders, 500,000 own a bit of land. The Swiss are the freest people in the world, the Athenians of modern times. They are the most universally educated of any country, it being their boast that everyone who is not mentally incapacitated, is able to read and write. They have all the virtues and none of the vices of our own political life.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE CRAFTSMAN.

An editorial which appeared in the *Boston Transcript* some time during the month of August last, com-

pletely justifies the statements made by Mr. Corthall regarding the prosperity of Switzerland and the causes for the same.

The editorial opens with a quotation from Mr. Peck, a former United States minister to the mountain republic, who lately said: "There is no country, no nation on the globe, which can compare in quality and number of educational institutions with those of Switzerland, according to the number of inhabitants." The writer of the article then develops a comparison between Switzerland and Massachusetts, in both of which commonwealths it has been discovered that the intelligence of the people is a prime cause of all other prosperity, material as well as moral.

In the course of his observations the writer states that, long ago, emigration from Switzerland ceased, and immigration into that country began; since Germans, French, Italians and Slavs were and are still attracted by the excellent economic conditions there prevailing.

The democracy of the European state, the writer maintains, is much more essential and powerful than that of Massachusetts; popular control being now almost absolute, and preventing the use of the public resources for the selfish advantage of the few. These conditions are maintained by means of an article of the constitution, the referendum, which provides that all measures of vital import, in order to become laws, must be referred to the whole body of the citizens.

The editorial closes with a second quotation from Mr. Peck, who says that the 3,000,000 of Swiss consume more commodities to-day than the 15,000,000 of Italians, although the natural productiveness of the two countries cannot be compared.

In these and many other favorable facts to be noted in the present condition of Switzerland we may discern the effects of good government, pure and simple; but before instituting a parallel between that country and Italy in the matter of commercial consumption, the geography of the two countries should first be considered. Switzerland is protected from the greed of the continental powers by a natural barrier. Her children are thus left free to cultivate the soil, to develop manufactures, and to elevate themselves. On the contrary, Italy is now, of necessity, an armed camp, forced to nourish its defenders, who

are drawn away from 'the peaceful life of the fields that they may learn to kill, to devastate and destroy.

THE SOUL'S ELECTION-DAYS.

Every soul must have its election-days, when it must definitely express its will in regard to great moral and spiritual issues. The old alternative of God or Baal is forevermore presenting itself under every variety of modern form. Life and good are being constantly set over against death and evil, and come before us perpetually for our adjudication. Questions vaster in their eternal import than those of imperialism, currency, protection, tariff, the control of trusts, the age-limit of pensions are being decided daily by common men everywhere, but no one notes the profound meaning of these transactions. The minor choices of men as to their places of residence, their business, their political and social affiliations are not to be brought into comparison with those which touch the deepest interests of the spiritual life.

This power of choice—this endowment of solemn responsibility—is one of the profoundest mysteries which belongs to humanity. It involves all the world-old inexplicable enigmas which center about man's free agency, the foreknowledge and foreordination of God, and the insoluble problem of evil. It negatives any purely fatalistic philosophy, any theology which at once puts man helplessly under the relentless grip of necessity and Divine compulsion, and then holds him accountable for his acts. It is the title-deed to our greatness. Our choice must be our own. In every political campaign, after the speeches and letters of acceptance, the ratification meetings, the addresses of campaign orators, the distribution of literature, the appeals of the newspapers, the organization of clubs, the quiet activity of individuals—after all this, it is the voter who must decide for himself and by himself how he will cast his ballot. So men may seek to influence their fellows; parents, by training, example, and precept may seek to secure virtue in their children; pastors, by exhortation and private pleading, may endeavor to lead their brother-men into ways of righteousness; friends, by loving companionship and sympathetic counsel, may try to exert a potent influence for good. But after all is said and done, in the final event, every man—despite all that God or men can do for him—is the determiner of his own destiny for weal or woe. No fact in the universe is fuller of more solemn significance than this. The starry heavens, the moral law, and man's responsi-

bility—these have been declared to be the three things which should fill the mind with the greatest awe. For time and eternity we are sovereigns of our own fate.

In the body politic national elections fall on some specific day of the year and after an interval of years; in the spiritual realm they are ordered daily and hourly. The polls are always open. Determinations which may involve crises are as numerous as the calendared months. Mistakes may figure as fatalities. In governmental matters changes of administration may, indeed, have considerable weight and far-reaching effects. But no such results can measure with the outcome of the count in the spirit's booth. At a Presidential election a nation is the intensely interested participator and spectator. At the soul's election, friends on earth and in Heaven, the angels, Christ, and God wait in prayerful hope and expectation. If the majority blunder at the nation's polls, many years may be required to rectify the resulting bad legislation. If the soul shall choose wrongly, it will travel many a mile of suffering and loss before its perilous mistake is remedied.

At the country's ballot boxes the voters drop secret ballots. They fall silently, but they are decisive. So secretly and silently does the soul record its preference for the good or the evil. There can be no split ticket—no division between God and mammon—in that voting. No citizen who ignominiously remains at home on election day can avoid his share of responsibility for what was then done. And no one can escape deciding, by imagining that he will not decide the great questions of the soul and eternity. And we may be sure that every vote in the precinct of the soul will be counted. There is a self-registering contrivance for this purpose.

Sometimes men, under stress of conviction, feel that they must sever their old party ties and go, with whatever sense of pain, into the new cause. Thus often does it cost the soul some agony to break up its old connections and choose the new path of truth; but that path leads to the House of Peace. And as, after the battle of the ballots, the country recovers from its perturbation and excitements and settles down into regularity, so, in conversion and in all the critical judgments which the soul must make, after "the great transaction" is done there is an entering into a serenity which is like a benediction.—Western Christian Advocate, for Nov. 2, 1904.

A CORRECTION—LINCOLN AND LABOR.

Several weeks ago there was reproduced in these columns (p. 299) an editorial from the Detroit Times of May 5, 1904, which was entitled: "The Greed of a Few a Peril to the Liberties of the Many." The editorial concluded with a postscript by the editor of the Times in which the following statement was made regarding what had preceded:

It was written by Abraham Lincoln 40 years ago, forming part of his message to Congress in 1864. In reprinting it we have changed the Lincoln "I's" and "my's" to "we's" and "ours," but otherwise it is word for word as Lincoln wrote it.

In copying this article from the Detroit Times, The Public gave full credit, and having no reason to doubt the genuineness of the quotation from Lincoln, made no investigation. The Times itself must have been similarly misled by some other publication, for it is inconceivable that it would have credited the extract to Mr. Lincoln's message of 1864, when nothing like it appeared in that message, but much of it did appear in his message of 1861.

In his first regular message to Congress, of December 3, 1861 (see "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," published in 1900 by authority of Congress, Vol. VI., page 56), Mr. Lincoln wrote:

It continues to develop that the insurrection is largely, if not exclusively, a war upon the first principle of popular government—the rights of the people. Conclusive evidence of this is found in the most grave and maturely considered public documents, as well as in the general tone of the insurgents. In those documents we find the abridgement of the existing right of suffrage and the denial to the people of all right to participate in the selection of public officers except the legislative boldly advocated, with labored arguments to prove that large control of the people in government is the source of all political evil.

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions, but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention.

It is the effort to place *capital* on an equal footing with, if not above, *labor* in the structure of government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow by the use of it induces him to labor.

This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall *hire* laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or *buy* them and drive them to it without their consent. Having proceeded so far, it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either *hired* laborers or what we call slaves. And further, it is assumed, that whoever is once a hired

laborer is fixed in that condition for life. Now there is no such relation between capital and labor as assumed, nor is there any such thing as a free man being fixed for life in the condition of a hired laborer. Both these assumptions are false, and all inferences from them are groundless. Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits. The error is in assuming that the whole labor of community exists within that relation.

Mr. Lincoln's message here proceeds to describe the economic condition which had prevailed in this country down to his time, a condition in which there were masters and slaves, hired men and employers, independent workers (mixed laborers and capitalists), etc., and to notice the tendency of hired men to pass into the condition of independence. Of this tendency his message then went on to say (same volume of Messages, etc, page 58):

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which it surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost.

In the article we are now correcting, some of the foregoing passages occurred, and from it some of them were omitted. Other passages were interpolated, which do not appear in Lincoln's message nor in any other public document to which his signature was attached.

The first of these interpolations is at the commencement of the article, in the place of that part of the message beginning with the words, "It continues to develop," and ending with the words, "source of all political evil." The interpolation is as follows:

We see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves us and causes us to tremble for the safety of our country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. We feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of our country

than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that our forebodings may be groundless.

The second interpolation occurs at the end of the article, in place of the part of the message beginning with the words, "This assumed, it is next considered," and ending with the words, "all of liberty shall be lost." This interpolation is as follows:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could not have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. We bid the laboring people to beware of surrendering the power which they possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all of liberty shall be lost. In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of mankind, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good has been or can be enjoyed by us, without first having cost labor. And inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world, that some have labored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government. It seems strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces. This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

That these passages were improperly credited, in the article in question, is undeniably true. With the exception of one clause of the second interpolation they do not appear verbally in any message of Lincoln's nor in any of his public addresses. The excepted clause is as follows:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration.

That clause does appear verbatim in the message of 1861.

Although these interpolated passages are improperly credited, it is by no means certain that they are forged, as has been charged.

If forged, the forgery consists for the most part in transferring Lincoln's sentiments, expressed in public speeches and authentic letters, to his message with slight verbal alterations. The only part of the interpolations for which substantial authority from Lincoln's speeches and letters cannot be found is that which refers to the enthronement of corporations. But even such transference—with its verbal alterations and though it in no wise misrepresented Lincoln—would fairly constitute literary forgery. It is worth referring to only because the supposed

transference might have been made by Lincoln himself. That is, the document which the Detroit Times published and The Public reproduced (p. 279), while not a Presidential message, may have been some other product of Lincoln's pen—a letter or a fragment of a speech.

Lincoln was habitually bold in reproducing his own words of one occasion on other occasions. The fact that he used certain words and phrases in his message of 1861, does not prove that he did not use them before or after in another document or speech and in other connections and collocations.

A remarkable instance occurs in connection with this very message of 1861. Mr. Lincoln's statement in that message that "labor is prior to and independent of capital," etc., is credited word for word by Geo. S. Boutwell to a speech of Lincoln's in 1854—seven years before the message in which those words appeared. The second interpolation quoted above is evidently made up of extracts partly from the message of 1861 and partly from other Lincolnian sources, while the substance and much of the language of that message itself on the subject of labor may be found in Lincoln's speech at Cincinnati on the 17th of September, 1859—two years before the message.

It is possible that the interpolations noted above are literary forgeries. But if they are, the fact cannot be proved on the ground that they misrepresent Lincoln's sentiments; for they do not. Neither can it be proved by the assumption that some forger made extracts from various Lincolnian sources and wove them together; for Lincoln himself was in the habit of doing that very thing and might have done it in this instance.

The only basis for an inference of forgery is the fact that the authenticity of these supposedly spurious quotations has not been affirmatively proved, and that the reference to the enthronement of corporations seems to be an anachronism.

Some effort has been made to show that in what Lincoln indisputably did say about labor he made no allusion to the labor question, as it now expresses itself; but that his mind was centered upon the question of slave extension.

"In this section of his message," says one critic, "he strove to arouse the industrial workers to the danger of the competition of slave labor. That was the thought in his mind. Lincoln lived all his life, before he became President, in rural localities, where the union movement, then in its infancy, was unknown."

This interpretation of Mr. Lincoln's words on slavery is complimentary to the intelligence of neither the interpreter nor of Mr. Lincoln. As to Mr. Lincoln, not only does the language of his message indicate, but

many other circumstances go to show, that he had in mind the whole broad principle regarding human labor, and not exclusively the one angle of it which touched upon slavery. And it is evident from his speech at New Haven, Conn., March 6, 1860 (Nicolay and Hay, vol. I. p. 625) that he had at least some knowledge of the distinguishing characteristic of the labor union movement of to-day—the strike. In that speech Mr. Lincoln is reported to have said:

I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike when they want to.

He then went on to urge that the right to strike ought to be given to the slave. His essential democracy was indeed stimulated by the slavery phase of the labor question; but no man like Lincoln could have addressed a community of striking shoemakers, as he did in that New Haven speech, without knowing something of the labor union movement—a movement which had begun in this country before he was born, and which had grown to sufficient proportions to have evoked from two of the greatest judges of Lincoln's palmy days at the bar (Shaw, of Massachusetts, and Savage, of New York) conflicting decisions, "leading cases," as lawyers call them, on the right of workmen to organize unions and carry on strikes.

L. F. P.

Boy—Is a dollar a week all I'm to get?

Superintendent — Oh, no; besides your salary you will learn the business.

Boy—And when I learn the business, do I get more pay?

Superintendent—Oh, dear, no. When you are worth more we shall let you go, and take another boy and let him learn the business.—Boston Evening Transcript.

He was a diner in a club which had opened its doors to the members of his club while some necessary repairs were being made. He did not know that some of his club waiters had been lent to the club which was offering its hospitality. He proceeded to abuse the food, and said to a servant:

"Go and tell the cook what I say."

"I couldn't well do that, sir," was the answer. "You see, I am only a guest in this club myself."

And the abuse of the viands ceased.—Sporting Times.

Drummer—What became of old Tuffnut, who formerly owned a disreputable dive on Blank street?

Merchant—Oh, he reformed several

years ago and is now one of our most honest and respected citizens.

Drummer—What business is he in now?

Merchant—None at all. He made a fortune out of his dive, and retired.—St. Louis Star.

The Saturday Evening Post says that "good times or bad" have "not enough importance to disquiet any man of the right sort." Considering the vast number of wage-earners who are obliged to live up to the last dime of their incomes week by week, and to whom the loss of a job in bad times means immediate privation, it would be somewhat interesting to see the Post's "right sort of man"—to observe how representative he is of a majority of the people.

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.

BOOKS

MISS HARRISON'S STUDY OF CHILD NATURE.

The copy of this little book that lies before us is marked twenty-second edition, but it is never too late to say a word about a good thing. Miss Harrison, of the Chicago Kindergarten College, is recognized the land over as an authority on child study, and this book is the heart of what she has to say on the subject. For mothers and for teachers of young children she says many helpful words that are in line with the best modern thought.

Her first italics are as good as anything in the whole book: "Build up the positive side of your child's nature and the negative side will not need to be up-built." If this could be laid to heart by all who deal with the young, it would make a great difference in all our teaching. To be positive and constructive rather than negative and destructive is a good injunction to put at the very beginning of instruction—and why? Because the positive attitude is the healthy attitude, and because it is so awfully easy to slip into the negative attitude. One of the chief values of Miss Harrison's little book is that, all through, it takes the positive attitude. She believes in saying "do, do" rather than "don't," and in seeking occasion to praise rather than in seeking occasion to blame.

Another strong point in her teaching is the insistence upon the great law of the "deed returning upon the doer's head." The text, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," is shown to be a divine law, which the mother should ever heed. "The more," says the author, "she lets the deed do its own punishing, the more impersonal her own part in the affair, the sooner does the child learn the les-

son." On this point, as on others, many illustrations are given which add greatly to the interest and effectiveness of the abstract injunction.

In reviewing such a book, which is throughout a protest against the critical spirit, it is hard to depart from the author's fine ideal, and to assume for a moment the attitude of criticism. One feels like a traitor. And yet—to one who has children of one's own, and has been called on to deal with other people's children of all degrees of culture and training, there cannot but arise the question, whether the virile side of punishment is not perhaps sometimes more necessary than the author imagines. One wants to be with her on every point, but silently questions whether one can be, at the present unregenerate state of the game.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—The New Lights: a Drama in Four Acts. By Hugh Mann. Boston: Richard G. Badger. The Gorham Press. Price, \$1. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

"All sorts of religious people," says the New York Independent, "however else they differ, agree to evade taxation." According to reports \$216,694,195 of church property escapes taxation in Greater New York. The Independent truly claims that "every dollar's worth evaded is so much of a lie to our principle of separation of church and state."

J. H. D.

The philosopher of the New York Independent, in an editorial on Making Life Worth Living, says some wise words about the accumulation of things in households. "There is hardly a house in America," he says, "that would not be improved in 'livableness,' in substantial comfort, and especially in attractiveness, if, some evening, the good man and his wife should sit down and make up a list of exactly one-half of their possessions to be consigned next morning to the bonfire." This is almost literally true. How many houses one enters in which getting about is like steering one's way through an archipelago.

J. H. D.

The article in the November Arena on Our Legal Machinery and Its Victims, by Dr. G. W. Galvin, of Boston, ought to be widely read. Dr. Galvin shows how misdirected is much of the work of prison reformers. "If such men," he says, "would accomplish the great purpose they have in mind, they must devote themselves to improving industrial conditions and the administration of justice." He criticises with deserved severity many of the statutes which have been passed at the instigation of well-meaning but mistaken reformers.

J. H. D.

The recent convention of the Episcopal church in Boston had a report on "Capital and Labor." Three members of the committee were Bishop Potter

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

CONTRACTORS.

GORGE H. ATKINSON, CONTRACTOR.
Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley and Municipal Work. Trolley Roads built complete and financed.
56 Liberty Street, New York.

A BANQUET will be given in honor of the Rev. H. S. Blagelov on November 21st, at Kinsley's. For further information, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1302 Ashland Block, Tel.—Central 925—or Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1014 Masonic Temple, Tel. Central 3991, Automatic 7991. Speakers and programme will be announced later.

writer, "is now daft over college athletics, the mania must sooner or later run its course; we cannot go on at the present pace forever. If our American colleges are to retain the support of serious people, they must do something to check the excesses of athletics, the reckless squandering of time, strength and money." J. H. D.

The Autumn number of the Single Tax Review is principally devoted to history and controversy. Questions and answers by Elmer E. Warner, and Revolution vs. Evolution, by L. R. Custer, are the principal controversial articles; the historical ones are the story of the single tax experiment at Hyattsville, by Jackson H. Ralston, and the story of the single tax campaign in Delaware, by Harold Sudell. A feature is made of the Henry George anniversary at Cincinnati, and "Fighting with Ormuzd" is another of James Love's merciless satires, with the economic professors for his easy mark.

Consternation and despair of the Trusts on the announcement of Roosevelt's victory.

and Messrs. Seth Low and Jacob A. Riis. The report, as we find it in various periodicals, is just what was to be expected—dealing with incontestable generalities. There is talk of "the organization of labor as essential to the well being of the working people;" but there is nothing definite and positive. If any church expects to win the allegiance of workmen by such generalities, it is awfully mistaken. And yet it is true that no other church has said so much.

J. H. D.

George Kennan, in the Outlook of October 29, writing of Russia and Japan, answers the question: "Which is the Civilized Power?" He very decidedly sides with Japan. The tone of the press in the two countries is made a test. He quotes from Russian papers, showing their ignorance and venom, and contrasts these with the fairness and temperateness of the Japanese papers. "Gen. Kuropatkin," he says, "is always spoken of with respect." He also asserts from personal observation that "Japan treats the wounded soldiers of her enemy better, in some respects, than her own."

J. H. D.

Collifer's for October 15 is a Gibson number, and contains some of his cleverest drawings, together with an "appreciation" of the artist by Robert Bridges. A marvelous economy of lines and a fine power of satire are Gibson's main characteristics. He is a true child of his age. He has cleverness and power and keen insight, and now and then pathos, but none of the far reaches of uplifting inspiration that belong to great art.

J. H. D.

Andrew Lang has an article in the November Harper on "Psychical Re-

search." "The subject," he well says, "is no more amusing than history, or anthropology, or anything that demands a persevering effort of attention." The results, he says, "tend to show that in man there are faculties not taken into account at all by orthodox science." As to evidence of the persistence of individual consciousness after death, he seems to think that investigations have so far been found lacking; but his conclusion is that the subject deserves scientific investigation, unbiased by the wish to prove anything. J. H. D.

A writer in the Contemporary Review for October, under the name of "Julius," has a long article bearing the title, "Absolute Monarchs versus Free Peoples." The subtitle better tells the trend of the essay—the twentieth century reaction. He notes "the ebb of moderate liberalism in the domain of politics, philosophy and religion and the growing strength of a reactionary movement." He does not seem to see, however, that while "modern liberalism" is declining, a radical liberalism may be quietly growing to upset the calculations of the reactionists. J. H. D.

The Nation for October 27, in the course of an educational editorial, says some plain words about college athletics. "Though the public," says the

WILL BE ON TRIAL
SENT
for the purpose of introducing it
to new readers, for the term of
four weeks for
10 CENTS.

THE PUBLIC