

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1904.

Number 346.

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.

That new political alignments are probably at hand is as prophetic as political history can make it. The Presidential election of 1904 resembles that of 1852, the culminating year of the old regime, as two peas in the same pod resemble each other.

In 1852 there were two principal parties, and, growing out of the chattel slavery evil, a minor party. In 1904 there were two principal parties, and, growing out of economic evils, several minor parties.

The minor party of 1852, the Free Democracy, was fundamentally democratic. It polled a popular vote of only 156,149, about 5 per cent. of the total, and not one electoral vote. The minor parties of 1904—Socialist, People's, Prohibition, etc.—were democratic in various interpretations of the term, even if their germ principles are more or less paternalistic. Their popular vote is as yet unknown, but in percentage it is probably about 6 or 7 per cent. of the total.

Of the two principal parties in 1852, the Democratic was bound hand and foot by the slave oligarchy. In its platform it declared that "the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." Of the two principal parties in 1904 the Republican stood in a similar relation to plutocracy.

The second principal party in 1852 tried to make itself as valuable a defender of slavery as the other. In its platform it declared that the slave compromise acts, including the fugitive slave law, are a "settlement in principle and substance of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace," and deprecating "all further agitation of the question thus settled, as dangerous to our peace," pledged the party to "discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation whenever, wherever and however the attempt may be made." The second principal party of 1904 stood in a similar relation generally to the other on the issue of plutocracy; and in Parker's telegram proclaiming the eternality of the gold standard there was a striking resemblance, in form even if not in substance, to the Whig declaration of the eternality of the slavery compromise.

Those being the impressively analogous circumstances, let us turn to the election results. There was an electoral-vote landslide in 1852, apparently for the Democratic party, but really against the recreant Whig party. There was an electoral-vote landslide in 1904, apparently for the Republican party, but really against the recreant Democratic party. The electoral vote of 1852 was 254 for the Democrats and only 42 for the Whigs; in 1904 it was 335 for the Republicans and only 141 for the Democrats.

Now for the sequel. A new party sprang up during the four years following the election of 1852. It was not the Free Democracy of 1852, but an entirely new party born out of the issues and the occasion. In 1856 it polled 114 electoral votes to 174 for the Democrats, and in 1860, 180 to 84—

thus going into power eight years after the Democratic party had swept the country. The slavery issue, decided overwhelmingly to all appearances in favor of slavery in 1852, was thus decided the other way in 1860. A few years more and slavery had been abolished. The issue of plutocracy vs. democracy, decided overwhelmingly to all appearances in favor of plutocracy in 1904—how soon will that issue be decided the other way and plutocracy be wiped out, if these historical parallels continue as they have so significantly begun?

That history will continue to repeat itself in this matter, as it does in most matters, one can hardly doubt. It is not to be inferred, however, that the repetition will be perfect in detail. History repeats in broad outline, not in minor particulars. So it must not be assumed that a powerful party will spring up between 1904 and 1908 as one did between 1852 and 1856. Neither is it to be assumed that such a party will not spring up. New political alignments are inevitable, but the parallel with the '50's will be just as close without a new party as with one, if the realignments straighten out the battle line between plutocracy and democracy.

That this will be done by the old organizations and under the old names is the more probable outcome. At any rate it is something which leaders cannot control. Mr. Watson, for instance, can no more make a new party than he can make a new moon. Even Mr. Bryan, with a vastly greater hold upon popular confidence, great as Mr. Watson's indisputably is, could not make a powerful new party. Parties are not made, they are born. They spring out of occasions, full born

and not still-born. No one has to be dragooned into lending a hand at the advent of a new party. Everybody knows it is coming, and the difficulty which worries those who attend upon its organization is not the dragging of strong and reluctant leaders in, but the keeping of weak and officious leaders out. By this sign can the vitality of a new party movement be known: When you have to beg men to serve on committees and implore them to become candidates, your new party is still-born; when you have to scrutinize your volunteers for committee work and sift your excessive supply of candidates, your new party, though it may not grow to maturity, is at any rate alive at birth. We see no evidence of that kind of vitality now. We do see many indications of democratic vitality within the Democratic party.

Election returns are still too meager for intelligent analysis. It is impossible to say more than that the Democratic party under plutocratic leadership and controlled by plutocratic influences, with the silver question omitted from its platform and the gold standard banner held aloft by its candidate, with a large campaign fund and immunity from obstruction by the democratic leaders of the party, has been beaten enormously worse than was the same party under democratic leadership and controlled by radical influences, with the silver question in the foreground, with a campaign fund hopelessly small, and with all manner of obstacles interposed by the plutocratic leaders and papers of the party.

In these circumstances it is gratifying in the highest degree to compare the splendid poise and gracious magnanimity of Bryan with the narrowness and meanness of the plutocratic leaders and papers in his party four and eight years ago, and only six months back, when they supposed they had politically buried what they called "Bryan-

ism" even as he knows that they themselves are politically buried now. Bryan's editorial in the *Commoner* of November 11 (reproduced in our *Miscellany* this week), in which he discusses "Democracy vs. Plutocracy — the Election's Lesson," is a complete vindication of the judgment of all who in these eight years of journeying through the political wilderness have seen in Bryan elements of great leadership which so many with intentions just as sincere were not able to see.

Whatever the differences of opinion may be among Jeffersonian democrats as to the details of Bryan's programme in the future, there ought to be none in the slogan he proposes for battling against trusts—"Death to every private monopoly," he says, "must be the slogan of the party on this question; any other position is a surrender." Mr. Bryan may still regard monopoly as the fruit instead of the germ of trusts; but that makes no practical difference at the present time. So long as "death to monopoly" is his objective, his policy of no surrender will in due season expose the seat of this social disease and suggest the cure. It will be observed, moreover, that the specific reforms Bryan advocates are aimed less directly at monopoly as a product of the trust evil than at monopoly as its cause.

A similar view of the political future is taken by Joseph W. Folk, the governor-elect of Missouri. He says that "one principle runs through all the evils the country suffers from, and that is the principle of 'graft.'" Used in the comprehensive manner in which Mr. Folk uses it, this new term, "graft," is synonymous with "monopoly." All legal privileges are "graft"—from tariff protection and Federal loot, to street car franchises and city spoils, from money-mongering to landlordism. "Graft" is a better term than "monopoly," also, because it visibly includes the agents, lawyers, lobbyists, legislators, bank-

ers, clergymen and other servants and parasites of monopolists—classes that do not obviously fall within that category themselves. A significant term is "graft." The only objection to its use in Democratic politics is that we should then be "anti-grafters," wherefore the Republican newspapers might again sneer at us as "anties." "Anti-graft" would be as objectionable to them as any other "anti"—more so to many of them.

But names are as yet of no more importance than candidates. The thing is the thing itself, and not its name. As to candidates, both Mr. Folk and Mr. Bryan say the true word. Says Mr. Folk: "Political contests should be made for principles, not for men;" while Mr. Bryan says: "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 discuss 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." From those sentiments of two worthy men who do measure up to the standards of availability, yet put their cause first and themselves second, the friends of Mr. Hearst should draw a lesson. Whether or not Mr. Hearst has intended it, his methods in the past have justly created a widespread impression that he puts himself first and not second relatively to his cause. Should that appearance continue until the time for selecting candidates comes, he is not likely to be found among the relatively available.

Among the suggestions at once wise and inspiring for reorganization of the Democratic party is that of John DeWitt Warner, a distinguished lawyer of New York city, who has served with democratic purpose and exceptional force in Congress. Immediately

after the election Mr. Warner made this declaration:

As to reorganization of the Democratic party, it strikes me that what is most needed is organization from the voters up, in the good old democratic way. If that is had there would not be left enough of the lately beaten machine to obstruct it. If it is not, there is not enough of that machine to be worth repair. Personally I believe that the issue Democrats are best agreed upon and can best make is that of government of the people, by the people and for the people, against government of trusts, by trusts and for trusts. This means repeal of tariff taxation and the adoption of a more equitable system; it means government control, or rivalry, as fast as any necessary of life becomes a private monopoly; it means, first of all, stopping private railroad monopoly in inter-State commerce; it means that just as government a century since assumed the carriage of letters, it shall now take control of its postal service, including carriage, and so extend it as to provide for most of what is now controlled by private express monopoly.

One of the gratifying results of the recent election is the evidence it furnishes of progress in discriminative voting. Whether the discriminations were wise is not the point; the fact that they were made is the encouraging thing. In the home of Tom L. Johnson, for instance, although the county returns a landslide plurality of something like 34,000 against the Democratic national ticket, it reelects Robert C. Wright as auditor by a plurality of 2,598. Not the least significant thing about this result is the fact that Mr. Wright is well known to be a single tax man. He is, in fact, one of the ablest supporters of that idea in the country; and for several years, both in office and out, he has been at Johnson's right hand in promoting his movement for radical revenue reform.

While the discriminative vote has not depended wholly upon the true Australian ballot system, its manifestations have been most marked where that system is established. In Massachusetts, for instance, there is no "straight" voting. Every candidate must be voted for by putting the cross against his name. Largely as a

consequence of this, although Mr. Roosevelt carries Massachusetts by 85,000, Mr. Douglas, the free trade Democratic candidate for governor, wins by 35,000. One of the most urgent duties of every honest legislature where "straight" voting, this "bosses'" device, is allowed, is to abolish it at once. Not alone does it facilitate "straight" voting by those who wish to vote "straight," which is not objectionable; but it deters discriminative voters from "scratching," lest they may make their ballots defective, which is not only objectionable but highly so. If any voter is to be facilitated in his voting, at the expense of inconvenience to others, it is the discriminating voter who uses his judgment and conscience, and not the "straight" voter who is as a rule the mere tool of a "boss."

A significant news paragraph from Syracuse, N. Y., has been obscured by the more exciting news of the elections. According to this paragraph, which we take from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 8th, a tramp has been rewarded in a remarkably indicative manner, under the circumstances, for returning a considerable amount of lost property. We quote:

As a reward for having saved the New York Central \$15,000 by picking up valuable jewelry and personal effects and turning them in after the Western express had been wrecked at Lock Berlin, near Lyons, on September 24, Charles Casey, a "bobo," then walking the tracks, has been given a good job as freight brakeman in the Central yards at Dewitt.

That paragraph is significant for several reasons, some of which we shall state in interrogative form. Is work so scarce that jobs at freight-braking are given and accepted as rewards of merit for exceptional honesty? Has opportunity to earn a bare living at laborious and dangerous work become so great a boon? Then where is our boasted prosperity and why do we rail at the tramps as idlers? Think it over.

The independent newspaper is a feature of the time. But there

are different breeds. The newspaper that stands for principle regardless of party is independent; so also is that paper "independent" which holds out for the heaviest or the most respectable bribe.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—MARRIAGE.

In the series of editorials of which this is the last, we have thus far considered the general subject with reference principally to its more notable problems.

In doing so we first distinguished marriage itself, or natural marriage, from the conventional symbols or contract declaratory of the natural marriage relation (p. 405), concluding that all marriage problems must be determined in the last analysis, not by considerations respecting conventional marriage, which are necessarily superficial, but by considerations respecting marriage itself—a relationship so obviously an institution of natural and not of human law.

Next we paused to speculate upon the probability of spiritual elements in the marriage relation (p. 421) which might give an eternal quality to marriages—a speculation which can not be without practical value to all who accept the idea of human immortality.

Polygamy and "free love" were then considered (p. 437), with reference to the principles of natural law already disclosed.

After that, the remarriage of a party to a former marriage upon the death of the other party (p. 452) was brought to the test of the same principles of natural law, and approved.

In preparation for a discussion of the divorce problem, marriage ceremonies (p. 468) or conventional as distinguished from natural marriages, were then examined and their importance affirmed.

The last but one of the editorials preceding the present, approved liberal divorce (p. 484) simply as a decree of nullification and regardless of remarriage; and the one immediately preceding this final one advocated freedom of remarriage after divorce (p. 499), on grounds of expediency with reference to conventional mar-

riage and of morality with reference to natural marriage.

We have now to consider the marriage relation apart from the shadow of divorce possibilities.

Marriage itself, which is constituted by the harmonious union of one man and one woman through reciprocal love abiding in its nature, is a natural human relationship. It is as natural as motherhood and fatherhood, to which it is Nature's condition precedent.

On the physical or animal plane of human life, this is too obvious to require elucidation. The intimate physical union without which procreation is impossible furnishes its own demonstration of its own indispensability to fatherhood and motherhood. Describe that relationship as only the expression of a momentary animal impulse if you will, yet the fact remains that even then Nature is seen to declare for monogamy, for unity, for reciprocity, for affection, and in many ways to suggest the idea of abidingness.

But man does not live upon the physical or animal plane alone. Though we brush aside all thought of human immortality as an idle speculation, we cannot escape the obtrusive natural fact, a fact in the domain of human nature, that man possesses moral as well as physical qualities.

You may say, if you will, that moral qualities are nothing but modes of the physical; as, for instance, that the impulses of human marriages are only poetizations of animal matings, and that the impulses of human motherhood are the same affections in kind as those of the dam for her cub. Nevertheless, none can deny that human action is often determined by disinterested love of another than one's self or one's own, and by devotion to ideal standards of right and justice. Nor does it make any difference if such love and devotion be characterized as impulses originating in the physical, or as mere phases of selfishness. We do not get away from the essential thing by changing its name or surmising its origin. The crucial facts themselves remain. Men and women do act from motives of love for others than their own. They do have regard for equality of rights,—even if temptations to be selfish

often pervert their conduct with reference to the principle of equality, even if temptations to falsely appear unselfish often distort their perceptions and their expressions of that principle. They do set up and support moral ideals. Where they get those ideals, or whether the ideals are perfect, is immaterial. The determining facts are that they set them up, and that their tendencies are altruistic. Everyone is conscious of moral impulses to which he often yields,—impulses to turn from selfish comforts and interests, even to the extent of sacrificing his own life, in order to maintain humanitarian standards. These facts prove, not necessarily that human life has a moral origin, to be sure; but incontestably that it advances upon a moral as well as upon a physical plane, in response to unselfish as well as selfish impulses, and with reference to altruistic as well as egoistic natural law.

Possibly some of the lower animals have exhibited identical traits. Let him who believes this believe it; it does not affect the question. If any of the lower animals do exhibit moral traits, then those animals, too, live on a moral as well as a physical plane. But whether animals live upon a moral plane is not to the point. The point is that man indisputably does live upon such a plane. Regardless of whether it may or may not be so with any of the lower animals, man is clearly both a physical and a moral being.

It is this moral quality that transmutes what might otherwise be the indiscriminating sexual attractions of man's animalhood into those indescribably tender and chaste affections, and those subtle human harmonies, which give to genuine marriage its distinctive character in the apprehension of all those multitudes who experience its satisfactions and foster its unities.

The secret of marital happiness is only suggested or crudely symbolized by that union of sexual opposites in which mere animal or physical mating consists. Since man is an animal, physical union is indeed one of the conditions of human marriage; but inasmuch as he is more than an animal, there are other and higher and equally

indispensable conditions. Not only are mankind masculine and feminine physically in their bodies, as are the lower animals, and mentally in their modes of thought, as also are the lower animals though in lower degree; they are also masculine and feminine morally in the modes of their altruistic affections. And just as sexual duality physically may bring together one man and one woman, in obedience to procreative animal impulses, so may sexual duality on the mental and moral planes, bring together that man and that woman, complementaries in moral and mental character as well as in physical form, in obedience to mental and moral procreative impulses. It is this complementary union of sexual opposites on all the planes of human life, mental and moral as well as physical, that constitutes human marriage and distinguishes it from animal mating. Such unions are centers of vigorous family life, and out of them the race not only multiplies but advances.

Procreation, however, is the secondary and not the primary object of marriage. It is only the result of a certain kind of life; it is not that life itself. The essential quality of the marriage relation is companionship—the most intimate companionship conceivable—physically, mentally, morally. It is a companionship which can only exist between complementaries. As key to lock, such is the companionship of marriage. If it exist on the animal plane alone, it will be only bestial; but if it flourish also on the mental and moral planes, it will be human, harmonious and sacred.

Are not these suggestions confirmed by psychological considerations? It must be evident to all who reflect upon their own experiences and observations, that the masculine mind is distinguished for what is often colloquially though not very appropriately called judgment. We say of a man that he acts with good judgment or with bad judgment, meaning that he is a wise man or an unwise man, as the case may be—and this regardless of his learning. Not so with the feminine mind. That a woman's reason is "because," has passed into a good-na-

tured joke. Very seldom do we find ourselves weighing in women what in men we call judgment. We say of a woman that her perceptions are keen or otherwise, but not often that her judgment is good or bad. Individual women are usually thought of, not as having good or bad judgment, nor as being endowed primarily with wisdom. The distinctive feminine quality, as usually observed, is affection. Although women as well as men are acknowledged to possess intellectual qualities, these appear to be subordinate to their confiding affections; whereas with men, although they as well as women are seen to be endowed with affectional qualities, these appear subordinate to their wisdom, or intellect—or, as it would ordinarily be expressed, to their judgment.

Nor are these observations mistaken. They are defective only in that they are incomplete. Superficially, the normal marriage relation may be described, not inaptly even if metaphysically, as a union of masculine intellect with feminine affections, coupled with a transverse union of feminine intellect with masculine affections, wherein the masculine wisdom is superior to the feminine and the feminine affections are superior to the masculine. But that is true only superficially and with reference to what we curiously enough call "practical" in contradistinction to "moral" concerns.

When observation goes beyond the superficial, or purely "practical," it discloses a reversal of those relative superiorities. At times of great stress, especially if the stress relate to the deeper experiences which every mature man and woman undergoes in some degree and at some time, it is not the masculine mind that rises preeminent in wisdom and judgment, nor the feminine that seems superior in confiding affections. What man is there, for example, who, at some crisis of his soul, in the presence of an overwhelming temptation or in the midst of a terrible experience resulting from error of judgment or crookedness of conscience, who has not beheld with wonder and unwonted affection, a woman's judgment rise out of her affections and tower above his own judgment, even as at such a crisis

his affections seem more alive than hers? And when the crisis is over, has he not with equal wonder seen this unusual feminine judgment collapse, and the usual feminine affection resume its accustomed sway? That this is true must be known to every man with a record of soul-trying experiences, which he has shared confidently with a good woman between whom and himself the natural union of genuine marriage has subsisted.

It is hardly reasonable to think of these unusual manifestations as abnormal. Is there not a better explanation? May it not be that in the deeper, the more intensely moral or more spiritual concerns of life, the intellectual qualities of the wife and the affectional qualities of the husband exchange places of relative superiority? Yet, if that be so, then what more natural than the inference that perfect marriage would consist in a complete equilibrium of feminine affections and masculine intellect with masculine affections and feminine intellect, each individualized yet all in harmonious union?

This idea of sexual opposites may be carried into the realm of the spiritual, where it serves to explain analogically the character and motive of creation. In the words of a thoughtful theologian (Charles H. Mann, in "Psychiasis"), "it is because God and man are opposite to each other in their attributes, and not because man is inmosty divine, that their conjunction is of such surpassing sweetness." In elaborating the same subject this author writes: "The very essence of divine love, that which impelled God to create, and that which thence constitutes the very substance of all genuinely heavenly love in whatever degree or form manifested, is that it should love some one out of self. To find one's self inherently sufficient unto himself, is to the spiritual man death. To love others, and thus to have the ends and purposes of one's life in the neighbor, is the warp and woof of every love that is heavenly. It is the very end of creation. All true spiritual blessedness consists in a union in love with others. The differences in the nature of those who are the constituent parts of

such a union are the very ground of the blessedness. This is illustrated in all forms of neighborly charity, and is in its height shown in the ultimate form of human personality which is dualistic, male and female; and whose very summit of blessedness is provided for in the heavenly union of these differing parts—that is, in marriage. In his relation to God, therefore, man realizes the blessedness of his own life, not by finding himself to be in his own self-sufficiency God (God forbid!) but by conjunction with Him; and God at the same time realizes the end of his love by union with man."

Believers in the spiritual, whatever their church affiliations or non-affiliations, cannot but recognize the exalted sacredness of marriage when thus considered as the type in human society of God's relations of love to all human kind. Not only does nature teach its purity through the instincts of those animals that suggest purity to the imagination; but its sacredness is emphasized in its natural symbolism of God's relation to man.

To recognize this exalted sacredness, however, is not necessary for our present purpose. It is enough to perceive that marriage is a sexual conjunction, not merely on the animal plane of life, but also on the moral. To perceive that, is to feel the human dignity of the position of husband and wife, and the consequent dignity of fatherhood and motherhood. It is to distinguish the human mother from the animal dam. It is to acknowledge the naturalness of monogamous marriage and to realize the natural abidingness of the marriage union. It is to understand that marriage is an expression of a natural law which ramifies the universe of matter and morals, but finds higher expression nowhere else within mortal ken. If that is not a sacred thing, what can be sacred?

Whoever looks upon natural marriage in that reverent way can hardly fail to experience an increasing respect for its symbol—conventional marriage. For it is by this symbol that the marriage principle is made to appear concrete.

That there are those capable of appreciating abstract realities

without the aid of symbols we do not dispute. But most persons appreciate abstract principles better when they are concretely represented. Patriotism is a principle; we represent it concretely with a flag. Religion is a principle; we represent it concretely with church worship. Good will is a principle; we represent it concretely with terms and forms of politeness. Natural marriage is a principle; we represent it concretely with conventional marriage.

All useful concretions may indeed be abused. Sentimental regard for a flag may obscure the patriotic principle; idolatrous regard for church worship may make a travesty of the religious principle; and beneath polite forms of courtesy hatred may take the place of good will. So with marriage. Devotion to conventional marriage may become so idolatrous as to degrade natural marriage. But the possibilities, or even the actualities, of abuse of anything prove nothing against the value of its uses.

Without attempting an exposition of the usefulness of conventional marriage, let us refer to one use which may possibly prove suggestive of many others. In the natural order, marriage takes place at an early age. If it be a genuine marriage each party is influenced by the principle of marriage love. Yet neither is mature in thought, and both are incapable of analyzing or understanding this principle. They only feel its force. But by contemplating the symbol of conventional marriage they gradually grow into a full appreciation of natural marriage. The symbol is then of no more importance than their wedding clothes. But at the beginning it was of tremendous importance. It created an appearance, a projection, a concretion of the natural marriage principle which was moulding their lives together into a dual life unified, and so it served to prevent the possible death of their marriage love in its infancy.

For it is no more in the natural order that marriage love should die in infancy than that children should. When children die, we know that some abnormality in their structure or environment has cut them down prematurely. This is true also of marriage love.

When it dies prematurely, preventable causes have killed it. Some of these causes are in our time prevented by means of conventional marriage. Possibly all of them might be if conventional marriage were kept in its place as a symbol and never allowed to usurp the place of marriage itself.

Though there were no other reason for conventional marriage, this reason alone would justify it. Think of the dangers peculiar to the infancy of married life, and say if conventional marriage has not a useful function.

Some marriages may end for the paradoxical reason that they have never begun. There may have been no marriage love to start with, but only selfishness allied with sexuality, or with family pride, property interests, solicitude for economic support, or something else either wholly alien or only partly related to the marriage principle. These are not genuine marriages and no conventional forms can make them so. The sooner they end in appearance as well as in fact the better. To perpetuate them in form is sacrilege in principle.

Other marriages may begin genuinely but end prematurely. Though they have marriage love to start with, the marriage love may die. For these marital disasters there is in every case a cause that may be discovered and possibly removed.

Idolatry of conventional marriage is one cause. It tends to make the symbols appear as shackles. Let conventional marriage grow irksome, and marital love is assailed in its most vital part.

Another cause is authoritative dominion, usually on the part of the husband. It has a correlative cause in jealousy, usually on the part of the wife. No marriage love can long survive either cause. The husband who rules his wife will soon kill their marriage love not only in her but in himself. The wife who allows jealousy to enter her heart will not only lose her husband's love for her, for which she supposes she is solicitous, but she will lose her own for him.

Another and most subtle cause of the premature death of marriage love is diversity of interests.

Interests cannot grow apart and the lives remain together. There can be no mental and moral companionship in mental and moral separation. Marriage love cannot flourish where the husband is devoted to his business or his club and the wife to society and her home. This is far from implying that home is not the wife's sphere. What is implied is that the home must also be the husband's sphere, and that his business and other interests must also be his wife's, if their marriage love is to live. Masculine and feminine functions go hand in hand through all departments of activity. It was once supposed that women have at any rate no military function; but now we know the value of the feminine element even there. There is no exception. In the home, in society, in the club, in the atmosphere of business, unless the masculine and the feminine elements are in them all, the wife tends to grow into an old maid and the husband into an old bachelor—into persons, that is, with the intellectual and the affectional sides of their nature unbalanced. For it is a narrowed life and not the absence of marriage ceremonies that makes a man a bachelor or a woman an old maid. Unmarried persons may in great degree avoid this intellectual and affectional narrowness, and so escape the old maid and old bachelor state though single; but married persons can hardly escape it if their intellectual and affectional interests flow apart. The more perfect the association of husband and wife in every sphere of the activity of either, the more wholesome and vigorous, in the very nature of things, must their marriage love become.

For the prevention of marital disasters, the clergyman who officiates at conventional marriage ceremonies occupies a position of tremendous influence. Here is the point, rather than in making paganistic demands for strict divorce laws, where he can serve the holy cause of marriage best.

When a couple ask him to perform this ceremony for them, they do so either to be conventional or because they recognize more or less vaguely a religious element in marriage which they wish to ex-

press by religious symbols. In either case his opportunity is the same. He cannot forbid the marriage if he thinks it false, but he can advise regarding it. He can say to them in effect: "You alone can pass judgment on the legitimacy of this marriage, but I am enough in doubt to ask you to postpone the ceremony. If you believe you are indeed marital partners, go to a civil magistrate and declare your conventional marriage. But I advise you to reflect—for a day, a week, a month—and then return to me." This might not prevent unhappy marriages, but it would elevate the general regard for marriage, and whatever does that tends to prevent unhappiness in the marriage relation. It would, moreover, have a very strong tendency to dignify the religious ceremony in public estimation.

Or, and this might well be by far the more usual thing, such a clergyman upon performing a marriage ceremony could give advice which if it were done without cant would head off many a cause for the premature death of marriage love. He could, for instance, advise the young man and the young woman to say to each other, at least once or twice or thrice every day, not only in the honeymoon but throughout life, and no matter what petty irritableness might intrude: "I love you!" This phrase could not make love where love was not. That is true enough. Neither could it resuscitate love where love had died. But it would preserve and stimulate the living marriage love and thereby guard the marriage from the subtle advances of indifference, something as deadly to marriage love as diphtheria germs to babes. Indifference asphyxiates and kills. The daily reiteration of some such phrase of endearment, would moreover tend to create and foster that spirit of cooperative equality the absence of which is to marriage love an insidious enemy.

Marriage cannot be quite complete while its environment is imperfect. So long as women are not economically independent, other influences than marriage love will create and regulate marriage unions. It is only as women are bread winners, that they can

enter into marriage free from all considerations of the necessity of being provided for, and simply in response to the promptings of marriage love. So long, also, as men are in a struggle for a livelihood—a struggle which seems to be intensified rather than modified by the wonderful advances in methods of producing supplies, and which must therefore be due to maladjustments in the apportionment of results,—just so long will other influences than marriage love affect their attitude toward marriage. The economic factor is an important one in connection with marriage. But it has far reaching problems of its own and cannot be here discussed. Let us simply observe that the economic factor in the marriage problem does not affect marriage among the poor alone.

Given equality of economic opportunity for men and women, each according to their natural functions, masculine and feminine—but according to those functions naturally, and not by standards that make washtubs feminine and lead pencils masculine tools—and, whether among rich or poor, marriage would approximate its ideal of partners in business, chums in amusements, equal parents in the home, equal citizens in the state, cooperative companions everywhere and in everything.

The whole subject of marriage is embraced in the single phrase, "cooperation in equality." Where this principle of the marriage relation is observed on all its planes, no marriage originally genuine can lose its virtues. It will grow onward toward perfection, and all within its influence will feel its beneficence and charm.

For cooperation in equality implies the subjugation of self out of love for another; and subjugation of self by each marital partner with reference to the other, produces and maintains an equilibrium like that state of ideal justice which would prevail in society at large if each individual were to cultivate a spirit of unselfish respect for the rights of every other. As we should then have no wars, no race animosities, no parasitical classes, no poverty, no crime, so in the domain of marriage we should have no marriage

problems. Whenever and wherever selfishness is subdued, Nature rules with a sensitive hand.

Very intimately related, too, is the function of marriage in subduing selfishness to the character of society as a whole. As genuine marriage softens and subdues the selfish spirit of marital partners toward each other, so does it intensify the purposes and broaden the field of the unselfish life. True marriage is the kindergarten of the regenerating soul. From it proceeds all manner of unselfish righteousness, and upon its moral fruitfulness society depends for the ultimate reign of justice and peace.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 17.

Election returns (p. 503) are still incomplete, and probably no full reports will be available until they appear in the political almanacs of the coming year.

The vote of Illinois (p. 503), unofficially reported, is as follows for the Republican and the Democratic candidates for President and for Governor:

	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	630,068	332,608	297,460
Governor	630,429	339,525	290,904

For purposes of comparison we insert similar tables of the vote of Illinois for 1896 and 1900:

	1896	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	607,130	464,523	141,517	
Governor	587,637	474,256	113,381	
	1900	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	597,985	503,061	94,924	
Governor	580,198	518,966	61,232	

In Pennsylvania the unofficially reported vote for President, as compared with that of 1900, is as follows:

	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
1904	820,312	335,600	494,712
1900	712,665	424,232	284,433

As the press reports from other States give only estimated pluralities and not total votes, they are of little more use for comparison than the original telegraphic reports.

The third party vote (p. 504) is as yet hardly noticed in the reports in any detail. In Massachusetts it was as follows for Presidential candidates as compared with the Presidential vote in the same State in 1900:

	1904	1900
Socialist	12,678	9,565
Socialist Labor	2,669	2,599

Total Soc.....	15,637	12,194
Prohibition	4,275	6,207
People s	1,235	None.

Presidential returns, as thus far revised, show that the electoral vote (p. 563) will be as follows:

States.	Rep.	Dem.
Alabama	11
Arkansas	9
California	10	..
Colorado	5	..
Connecticut	7	..
Delaware	3	..
Florida	5
Georgia	13
Idaho	3	..
Illinois	27	..
Indiana	15	..
Iowa	13	..
Kansas	10	..
Kentucky	13
Louisiana	9
Maine	6	..
Maryland	?	?
Massachusetts	16	..
Michigan	14	..
Minnesota	11	..
Mississippi	10
Missouri	18	..
Montana	3	..
Nebraska	8	..
Nevada	3	..
New Hampshire	4	..
New Jersey	12	..
New York	39	..
North Carolina	12
North Dakota	4	..
Ohio	23	..
Oregon	4	..
Pennsylvania	34	..
Rhode Island	4	..
South Carolina	9
South Dakota	4	..
Tennessee	12
Texas	18
Utah	3	..
Vermont	4	..
Virginia	12
Washington	5	..
West Virginia	7	..
Wisconsin	13	..
Wyoming	3	..
Total	335	133
Plurality	202	

The totals omit the eight votes of Maryland, which are still in doubt. It thus appears that the States carried by the Democrats in 1900 but lost to them in 1904 (p. 503), in addition to all that they lost in the former year, are:

Nevada	3
Idaho	3
Montana	3
Missouri	18
Colorado	5
Maryland	Doubtful

In an after-election address, Thomas E. Watson, the People's party candidate for President,

outlines the following political plans for the future:

My own plans for the future embrace a complete organization of the people along the lines of Jeffersonian democracy, the re-establishment of reform papers, and a systematic propaganda of Jeffersonian principles, in order that in 1908, there shall be a party of genuine opposition to the Republican party and its present policies. I have no faith whatever that reforms will be accomplished by the Democratic party. It is discredited in the eyes of the people by a series of crushing defeats, but it has been so vacillating in its course, it has changed its principles so often, has run from one extreme to another so recently, had such a magnificent opportunity in 1892 to work out the reforms to which it stood pledged and made such a wretched use of that opportunity that it cannot inspire the confidence which leads to success. Since 1892 the Democratic party has almost entirely boxed the compass in political profession of faith. It has been for pretty much everything until this year, when it stood for everything or nothing, according to the interpretation which the voter chose to put upon its ambiguous platform.

It is now estimated that in the next Congress (p. 505) the Republican majority will be 26 in the Senate and 110 in the House. Illinois will be represented by but one member—H. T. Rainey, of the Twentieth district.

In the Wisconsin delegation to Congress, Congressman J. W. Babcock, of the Third district will reappear. He is reelected by a plurality of only 369, where he had 8,250 two years ago. Mr. Babcock is the Republican Congressman whose connection with the railroad interest in postal adjustments Congressman Baker, of Brooklyn, exposed in Congress (vol. vi, pp. 802, 807), at the last session. Mr. Baker is defeated for reelection, but his vote is 543 greater than that for Parker in his district.

In explanation of his defeat Congressman Baker says:

An analysis of the vote by election districts shows that the reports which came to us in advance of election, that certain of the Democratic election district workers were in the pay of my opponent, were well founded. In no other way is it possible to account for the great disparity in the vote cast for me in a few of the election districts as compared with that cast throughout nearly the entire Congressional district.

The Congressional district is made up of two whole Assembly districts and nearly all of two others. In three of the Assembly districts and in one-half of the fourth, i. e., in 83 out of 97 election districts, I ran ahead of Judge Parker to the extent of 734 votes, while my opponent received in these districts 504 votes less than Roosevelt. In seven-eighths of the territory I was relatively 1,238 votes stronger than Parker. In these election districts Watson received 296 votes, so that even if all who voted for Watson voted for me I was still 942 votes stronger than Parker. In four of the remaining districts my opponent received 155 votes more than Roosevelt. As these election districts are sandwiched in between districts where I ran ahead of my ticket it is obvious that this great disparity cannot be accounted for on the ground either of his being popular or my being the reverse. My defeat, however, was not due primarily either to the lavish expenditure of my opponent or to Democratic treachery. It is chiefly due to our system of voting. If we had in this State the Australian system—the alphabetical arrangement of the names of candidate for the various offices—I am confident that even in this landslide I should have been elected. The reason for this confidence is founded in the fact that a few days before election I received letters from more than 20 Republicans announcing their intention of voting for me, while voting for Roosevelt; at the same time I received not less than 200 letters of the same nature from Democrats, at least one-half of whom reported that among their Republican friends they knew of two, three, or more, who intended to vote for me. All of these letters were from strangers. If the same proportion held good over the district it meant that not less than 5,000 Republicans intended to vote for me. That they did not do so is largely because the act of voting, recurring only once a year, a large proportion become flustered in the voting booth and fearing to spoil their ballot vote a "straight" ticket. The election of Douglas in Massachusetts, where a "straight" vote is not provided for on the ballot, shows that the people will discriminate in their voting when the opportunity exists.

Although the Republican candidate for President is now conceded to have carried the State of Colorado (p. 503) by 15,788 plurality, the Democratic candidate for Governor, Alva Adams, claims election by a plurality of 25,434 over Gov. Peabody. This is the fact on the face of the returns. But Gov. Peabody is contesting the election on the ground of fraudulent ballots in sufficient

number as he asserts to reverse the result; and the Democratic committee is advised by legal counsel, as reported from Denver on the 15th, that "Gov. Peabody if he insists on declaring himself reelected can compel the people to submit. Following is the explanation advanced:

Peabody has control of the canvassing board and also control of the next Colorado legislature. He can appoint two Republican justices to the Supreme Court, making four Peabody justices to one Democratic justice. The canvassing board, legislature, and Supreme Court are the only bodies to which an appeal can be taken.

The dispute is now before the Supreme Court of the State, and the official count is stayed by injunction.

On referendum voting in Illinois (p. 505) the unofficial but revised returns for the whole State on the Chicago charter amendment to the State constitution give an affirmative vote of 631,621. The negative vote is 103,723. As the total vote of the State is 959,606, the two-thirds affirmative vote needed to carry the amendment was 639,736. The amendment appears, therefore, to have been adopted, but with only 8,117 votes to spare.

Revised returns on the other Illinois referendums (p. 505), as cast in Cook county alone, are:

Torrens law	234,984	28,919
Bond issue	225,372	30,309
Direct primaries	230,216	21,355
Referendum veto	216,243	25,527
Local option in taxation.	182,345	54,569

The Torrens law and the bond issue propositions, both mandatory referendums and only county questions, are therefore adopted. The other propositions are State questions and the State returns are not yet reported. As they are not mandatory, but only advisory, under the public policy law, a majority will serve simply to indicate the state of public sentiment regarding them.

Reports from over seas bring rumors of the death of Kuroki, the famous Japanese general in the north Manchurian operations of the Russian-Japanese war. These rumors were confirmed from Moscow on the 13th, through a trustworthy Russian war correspondent, Nemirovich Danchenko,

who reported that the splinter of a shell had struck Gen. Kuroki, tearing out a portion of his breast and abdomen, and that he had died October 4 at Liaoyang whence his body was sent to Japan. The Japanese army staff, according to Tokio dispatches of the 15th, pronounce the report absurd.

No important movements are reported from Mukden (p. 505). Both armies are said to have gone into winter quarters facing each other across the Shakhe river.

Horrible fighting, some of it under ground, is evidently still in progress before Port Arthur (p. 505); but the Japanese, although they have almost penetrated the last defenses, are still outside.

According to an announcement recently made by Mr. Delcasse, the French minister of foreign affairs, the Anglo-Russian arbitration of the North sea attack by the Russian fleet upon a fleet of British fishing boats (p. 490) is to be conducted at Paris. A very probable explanation of this mysterious affair may be found in the London correspondence of the Manchester Guardian of the 2d. The Guardian's correspondent quotes a letter received by a Russian merchant in London from his son, a sub lieutenant in the Russian fleet. The letter is described in these terms:

After various references to the extreme difficulty of getting a letter posted without scrutiny, the young officer affirms that the great majority of the crews—officers and men alike—were intoxicated, and gives this as the reason for the fleet being so far out of its proper course down the North sea. "We knew we were out of our course, and had fears that we should run aground somewhere. An alarm was given that the Admiral's flagship had done so, and in the confusion which followed three of the vessels of the rear squadron collided. In the midst of this confusion we came across what we believed to be a flotilla of torpedo boats, and as we had instructions to fire upon any suspicious craft we quickly trained our guns and sank several. Here at Cherbourg" (where the letter from which I quote was posted) "they tell us that the vessels we fired upon were British fishing vessels. That may be, as the confusion in our fleet was so great. We certainly got nothing in return; but later on in the night there was a rapid exchange of shots between our vessel and another, and it was only

when we recognized from a small shell which came aboard but did not explode that the ammunition was Russian that we saw a mistake had been made and that we had been firing upon one another. We had several men wounded. Can you imagine a more unfortunate affair? But it is not surprising. Everyone, from the Admiral downwards, seems so demoralized and without heart or hope."

NEWS NOTES.

—The annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is in session at San Francisco,

—Successful experiments with wireless telegraphy in connection with ballooning were made at the St. Louis Fair on the 12th.

—D. R. Anthony, brother of Susan B. Anthony, and a distinguished Kansan, died at Leavenworth on the 12th at the age of 80 years.

—New York city was entirely cut off from communication with the South and West on the 13th by a fierce hurricane accompanied by rain and snow.

—An alliance of tenants for offensive and defensive purposes against landlords and janitors is being organized in Chicago by T. P. Quinn, of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

—A Congressional committee, with Congressman W. B. Hepburn as chairman, which was appointed to inspect the location of the Panama canal (p. 73) sailed on the 14th on the United States transport Sumner for Colon.

—The mine owners of the Telluride district of Colorado (p. 328) have granted the eight-hour day demand of the miners, with a minimum wage of \$3, in mills as well as mines. Refusal heretofore to grant this demand was the cause of the strikes which resulted in military interference.

—On the 15th the Chicago Examiner gave formal notice to the mayor of Chicago, verified by affidavit, that the petition for a referendum next Spring on the proposed traction franchise (p. 476) had then been signed by 133,903 voters. The number necessary to meet the Mayor's demand is 101,000. As the petition is not to be filed with the election commission until 60 days prior to the municipal election, the Examiner retains possession of it.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Nov. 14.—The Democratic party is a national enemy to concentrated power and illegally concentrated wealth, and it will now, under the matchless leadership of W. J. Bryan go back to the masses and form a battle line with those elements that are opposed to the plutocracy set up and maintained by the Republican party.

Milwaukee News (Dem.), Nov. 10.—There must be a reorganization of the Democratic party along radical lines. It must

stand for something besides tradition. It must face to the future and cease living in the past. In a word, it must stand firm against monopoly, special privilege, trust extortion and corporate control of government. It must offer real remedies. Mere opposition will avail it nothing. It must be essentially constructive.

The (Grand Forks, N. D.) Evening Press (Dem.), Nov. 10.—The party must be purged of every stain of suspicion of a secret alliance with the interests of plutocracy, and this can be done only by driving from the ranks every traitor to the interests of the people. Following in the wake of the splendid and inspiring leadership of Bryan, Johnson, Garvin and Folk, the Democracy will go forward from service to service until it receives its reward in the thanks of a grateful people, whose rights and liberties have been secured.

Clinton, Ind.) Saturday Argus (Dem.), Nov. 12.—The result of Tuesday's election was not unexpected by democratic Democrats, and by thousands of these seems to have been especially desired. It is a crushing rebuke to the faction of plutocrats who propose to make the Democratic party a pale reflection of the Republican party. It forever dispels the foolish delusion that the Democratic party can in-dorse special privileges, tariff protection, money monopoly, imperialism and the whole Republican programme, and yet win.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Nov. 12.—Fear is being expressed—generally in the organs of the "sane and safe" statesmen who are responsible for Tuesday's wreck—that as a result of the smashup the party will swing away from "conservatism" and become "radical." Their fear is justified. The Democracy has had enough of "conservatism" to last it for a generation—forever, let us hope. The Democratic party has no right to be in any degree "conservative" in the sense meant by these disqualified advisers and discredited critics. It has no right to conserve any institution, law or practice that is hurtful to the people. It is the fundamental duty of the Democratic party to be radical in assailing wrong.

Dubuque Telegraph (Dem.), Nov. 12.—In the eight years elapsing since 1896, Mr. Bryan has grown and expanded and has won the respect of all men of whatever station in life. The epithets "demagogue," "anarchist," "enemy of private property," and others applied by a press that misunderstood his motives, are applied no longer. No man with honesty in his heart withholds from Mr. Bryan credit for honesty, perfect candor and devotion, as he sees the light to the welfare of the whole people. Men of opposing parties, holding antithetical opinions on every principle and policy of government, agree in the popular judgment that Bryan is a patriot, zealous for the right, uncorrupted and uncorruptible. This nation of ours never found itself in a crisis when God did not bring forth a leader to show the way. Thus he gave us Washington and Jefferson, and Jackson and Lincoln, and Bryan.

Philadelphia Ledger (Ind.), Nov. 11.—There can be no doubt that this proclamation from Nebraska points to the new line of cleavage, the new alignment which of necessity must follow the overwhelming Republican victory. . . . The aggressive party must be radical, and whether under Bryan, or Watson, or another, and whether called Democratic or by any other name, the rise of such a party is inevitable. It probably will be called the Democratic party, for the reason that what is left of the Democratic organization will now be easily controlled by the radicals. . . . It is quite safe to assume, on the basis of present conditions, that the Democratic candidate for President in 1908 will represent an aggressive radicalism, much more

pronounced than that of 1896 or 1900, and that the old-fashioned Democrats of the East, of the type of Cleveland, Olney and Parker, will be out of it. Whether or not they will be in the Republican party, as such, will depend on the line of cleavage there. There is a conservative and a radical element among Republicans, also. It is beyond question that a large part of Roosevelt's huge majority has come from those who preferred him to Parker, but would have preferred one of Bryan's type to either. Moreover, the demand for tariff reform, for the restraint of monopoly, for various other features of the Parker platform, is not confined to Democrats, and the triumphant West is going to be heard.

DISCRIMINATE VOTING.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Nov. 11.—Remarkable as was the result of this year's elections in the enormous majorities given the Roosevelt Presidential electors, not only in the Republican States, but also in those which had been regarded as at least doubtful, the eccentricities of voting on State and local candidates were no less surprising. The effect of the Australian ballot in promoting independent voting was never more distinctly apparent.

WRIGHT, OF CLEVELAND.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Nov. 10.—The election of County Auditor Wright under such conditions is a tribute to his ability and integrity in office as creditable to the good sense of the voters as it is complimentary to that faithful official. It is also a striking evidence of the power of the independent voter and of the revolt of a large element in the local Republican party against its attempted domination by corrupt bossism. The transformation of 34,064 majority for the head of the ticket into a minority of 2,495 for a candidate lower down on the same ticket, and for whom powerful influences in local politics made special efforts to win success, is an object lesson in independent voting that cannot be ignored.

MISCELLANY

WASTING HIS SUBSTANCE.

Lincoln's heirs are we all,
and Lincoln in his generation
came of the seed of Jefferson,
from whom we also inherit
an undying love of liberty;
ardent, consuming, unquenchable;
to whom also Lowell spoke,
addressing his lines:

—"and they are slaves most base
Whose love of right is for themselves,
And not for all the race."

Whatever party one follows,
it were insensate folly
did he shut himself out from his heritage—
the godlike thirst of Jefferson
for justice exact to all,
the human heart of Lincoln
embracing all in its love.

Let no man dare,
Democrat or Republican,
to deny his inheritance;
to repudiate the bequest
given him first by Jefferson,
enlarged and strengthened by Lincoln.
The ingrate who would do that
would fling in the face of his fathers
his heirship of all the ages—
all that they toiled and hoped for,
all that they dared and fought for;
squandering all their thrift
in a day of riotous living;

to lie down then with the hogs,
more brutish than they,
feeding with them on the husks
of sodden commercial success,
eating their dead sea apples
of glory, blood red and death bitter.

Of that grand bequest,
worthy the life of a nation,
no one can rob us.
We only could lose it
by carelessness and indifference.
Powder and shot,
bristling bayonet
and harveyized steel,
never could take it from us.
But the hour we forget our trust—
that moment it vanishes from us,
and the nation becomes
a statue of brass
standing on feet of clay.
How shall its vastness save,
if the soul has departed?

Friends, follow Lincoln's thought,
take up Jefferson's words,
peruse your deeds of succession—
their life's will and testament,
graven in heart throbs
as a phonograph's record is written,
echoing the song of the angels
that witnessed the new birth of Man—
peace on earth and goodwill.
Have we so soon forgotten?

Aye, let us purge ourselves
of vanity and vainglory,
pride and hypocrisy,
and test by those standards our actions—
That the nation may live and not die;
that the heart of the great republic
may beat with warmth and vigor
that it had in those calow years
when men gave up all for liberty,
ready to stake their souls
on the supreme hazard of freedom.
That when we too run our course
we may join in the shout of triumph
of those who have kept the faith.
—Goodhue Co. News, of Red Wing, Minn.

QUIT THE MINE TOO SOON.

Whiskytown Correspondence Sacramento
Bee.

Ten men employed in the Gambrinus mine, on the outskirts of this little mining town, have a great joke on the Eastern company that has the property under bond. The company was unable to meet its obligations to its employes under the bond through some misfit between the Eastern stockholders and their moneybags.

As the only honorable way out of the dilemma the management at the mine here told the men that they could take the mine and mill and run it themselves until November 22, under the restrictions of the bond, and possibly they might take out enough gold to pay them what was their due and for their work in digging out their pay.

The miners fell in with a will, and fortune smiled upon them. They struck a good pay streak, and the little two-stamp mill was kept pounding away on all the ore that could be shoveled into it day or night. The miners had worked on their own hook only a few days when

all arrears were paid up in full, and now they are clearing all the way from \$4 up to \$16 a day for each man. They never make less than the big wage of \$4 a day, and \$16 has been the highest wage taken out. Ten dollars a day is about the average, and they have almost a month right of way ahead of them.

A LESSON FOR WISCONSIN AND OTHER STATES AS WELL.

An editorial in The Milwaukee Daily News of October 13, 1904.

James Bryce, the distinguished British parliamentarian and author of "The American Commonwealth," when asked to set forth some of the lessons the English people have learned in a thousand years' experience that the American people might profit by, unhesitatingly replied that the first thing the American States should do is to preserve the right of free foot passage along the lakes and streams, that access to them may be open to all the people.

This is a lesson that the people of Wisconsin above all should heed. The State is dotted with lakes and rivers and running brooks. As yet the population is not dense enough to emphasize the wrong to the masses of the people involved in denying free access to the streams and lakes. There is little difficulty in obtaining access to the lakes and streams. Private owners do not insist upon the legal right to forbid trespass. But with the pressure of population it is inevitable that the time will come when the public will find itself barred from access to the lakes and streams of the State. While it is yet time the State legislature should reserve this privilege to the people.

It is a shame that the State did not reserve a strip of land along the borders of the lakes and rivers. In northern Wisconsin the shores of the lakes have been denuded of the pine trees, and nothing remains but charred stumps and brush piles, nature seeking to repair the vandalism with growths of poplars. These lakes are gems wrenched from their settings. It will take years before their natural beauty may be restored. It never can be restored wholly, as the pines do not renew themselves.

At this time it is too much to expect in an American State that the public will take possession of the boundaries of the lakes and rivers and restore their natural beauty and preserve them as a heritage to all the people, but it ought to be possible at least to reserve

footpaths along the lakes and streams. This ought to be possible, even at the present time. It would not interfere with despoiling nature of its beauty in the making of dollars. The lakes and rivers have been stripped of the trees of commercial value that fringed their shores.

The only thing that stands in the way is the desire for exclusiveness that possesses the holders of wealth. This spirit of exclusiveness has not yet taken possession of the owners of the soil, as it has in Europe, but, as Prof. Bryce intimates, like conditions will breed like results. We should profit from the experience of others.

"RELIGION HAS OFTEN FORGOTTEN THAT LIFE IS GOOD."

A portion of a sermon delivered in the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., November 13, 1904, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

How often has religion forgotten that life is good! How often has the church preached the gospel of repression and contraction of human interests.

If you will pardon a personal reference, my grandfather and mother, about the time of my birth, withdrew from one church and joined another, because they disapproved of the use of instrumental music in God's house. A jewsharp was the only musical instrument my father was allowed as a boy. Those good people firmly believed that the devil was in the fiddle. The love of music was frowned upon, and talents which might have been developed and added something to the enjoyment of my father's life, were sternly repressed by the parental conscience.

After telling me this story only this summer, my father excused himself, and, going to another room, returned with a violin. I had never seen him with such an instrument. To my amazement, he sat down and played tune after tune. In the winter of his seventy-first year he had learned to play the fiddle. Since passing out from under the parental authority, this was the first opportunity he had had of satisfying that desire which slumbered within him. Who can say how much more life might have been to men had their religious convictions been tempered with reason.

But yesterday I received a letter from one of our young men who has traveled afar from us. Fresh from school he is beginning life as a "roustabout" in one of the mines of the West. He is face to face now with the serious business of the world. Will he succeed? Any man succeeds who keeps his ideals. The young man writes me from the strange, new country that he misses the stimulus

of the old church, and is conscious of the struggle ahead of him, if he avoids the common fate of men in "sacrificing self for selfishness." The phrase is his. "Sacrificing self for selfishness." That tells the story. Failing in order to succeed. Succeeding but to fail. That is a greater misfortune than poverty.

The other day in passing a house I heard unusual sounds. I looked, and on the porch, quite alone, sat an aged man. He was in a chair and his hands rested on a cane. Lost in reverie, he was singing a song, and the cracked and muffled notes had a music of their own.

He had not a tooth in his head, but he had a song in his soul. That song of old age was a tribute to some son or daughter. To the beatitudes I would add! Blessed are they that honor gray hairs, for they shall be comforted.

But more than this, the song of the old man was symbolic of that composure and peace of mind which ought to go with the widening vistas and the ripening years.

To hold in old age the ideals of youth; to keep one's honor through it all; to store up an heritage of generous deeds; to sit at the journey's end and look into the future and sing; to have a life abounding in duties done and crowned at last with hope; to go through the world with a brave heart and to leave it with a song. That is an achievement worthy of any man and possible to all.

CAUSES OF DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT.

A letter published in the Elizabeth (N. J.) Evening Times of Nov. 11.

Your editorial of yesterday, while furnishing good reasons for the overwhelming Democratic defeat of Tuesday last, does not, in my opinion, dwell strongly enough on the fundamental cause of this great Roosevelt landslide.

While Roosevelt's personal popularity had much to do with the tremendous popular vote in his favor, yet it should be plain to any thinking person that the Democratic party would this year have been signally defeated, no matter whom the Republicans might have nominated. The Democratic party dug its own grave last July when it put men of the caliber of Gorman, Belmont, McCarren and Sheehan in the control of the National organization. It dug its own grave in the State of New Jersey when it left in control the men who, since 1894, have continuously led the party to inglorious defeat. While the platform adopted at St. Louis was Democratic, as far as it went, yet Judge Parker was not allowed at any time to stand on it, and was made to straddle

everything so strenuously that his own campaign became a bow-legged one, and, among a large class of people, excited both derision and contempt.

To say that the National campaign was managed with an astonishing blindness to real public sentiment is putting it mildly. Begun by a policy of waiting, of silence, of nervelessness, and inaction, the campaign on the Democratic side wound up in a blaze of panic-stricken activity—an activity which did not convince and which was not commenced until every man had made up his mind which way he was going to vote. Many believe that this activity injured rather than helped the Democratic electoral ticket.

In our own State a most remarkable moonlight hunting trip was indulged in. The much-vaunted activity of the State Committee and the "splendid organization, not equalled since the days of Tilden," was the purest moonshine and possessed a far flimsier substance than the Milky Way. There was more activity every day in the small Union County headquarters than the writer could ever see at the headquarters of the State Committee. Yet there was some activity in the latter place. The irrepressible Naar held forth from day to day and all buttoned their pocketbooks as his notes swelled on the breeze. To the onlooker it was Naar's campaign and not Parker's.

This sound trouncing should at least teach the Democrats a lesson. And this lesson is that the party cannot temporize with its secret enemies and hope for any act of success. The party cannot become the reactionary political organization of the country. The Republican party is already impregnably established in that position and unless the Democratic party can take the reverse stand, there is no logical excuse for its existence. In its generic sense democracy stands for the furtherance of freedom, of equal rights and of justice to all. Therefore unless the party is willing to come out into the open and stand for these things, it will sooner or later die, and it should die. But if it will so stand, then it will live and sooner or later reap a deserving victory.

Let all believers in compromise, restrictive tariffs, unequal legislation and the conserving of monopoly go into the Republican party, where they belong. Let all believers in equal liberty and of freedom come into the Democratic party and cooperate with those who will now take the helm. Then, and then only, will we have a clean-cut fight against the iniquitous and debauching influence of false Republican

doctrines, and in the interest of social justice and true morality.

JOHN MOODY:
Cranford, November 10, 1904.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE BRINGS ANDREW JACKSON INTO THE WHITE HOUSE.

Printed from the Original Manuscript.

Dear John: Next mornin' I went up to the white house agin to the cabinet meetin'. There was clearly no dream about it, for there they were. By the new invention of graftin' a live dead man onto a dead live man, Andrew Jackson was in Roosevelt's place, John A. Rawlins was secretary of war and John P. Altgeld attorney general.

There was a full board, for the secretaries had quit electioneerin' and come in off the road.

"Pshaw!" says one. "No use makin' any more speeches. Parker would be better than this. Hades has arrived." They looked grim and determined.

"The first thing to tackle," said Old Hickory, "is this coal famine."

One of the cabinet turned pale and sprang to his feet.

"Your excellency!" says he.

"Your what?" says Jackson.

"Mr. President, I hope that this administration will do nothin' unconstitutional; that it will not disturb the balance of the respective departments, nor engage in trade, and that it will hew to the old lines."

"That reminds me," said Old Hickory, "of somethin' I was goin' to say. All you boys will be required to sell out all corporation stocks in ten days, and file a certificate to that effect or your resignations."

"But, Mr. President, that is an outrage."

"It will keep us from trampin' on each other's toes," said Jackson; "and besides that, you don't have to serve. The government pays you a good salary, and I want your interest in the business. Anybody not drawin' his salary will raise his right hand."

Altgeld remarked here, with a twinkle of his dark blue eye, that he hadn't drawn his yet, but he allowed to as soon as he could get around to it—said he wasn't fortunate enough to have any stocks.

"It's no reflection on anybody," said Jackson. "We are just settin' an example to the judiciary. And mind this, too: Speculations of all kinds by cabinet members are barred. Now let's get to business. A coal famine when coal is plenty, or a food famine in a condition of plenty, is a state of war and intolerable, so it seems to me. I don't

know what the attorney general thinks."

"You can have my portfolio any time, Mr. President; but so long as I hold it I shall never cease to protest against all action on unconstitutional lines—all anarchy, socialism, free silver—"

"What do you say, Altgeld?"

"Oh, constitutional lines by all means," says Altgeld with a grim smile. "We don't want to follow Republican precedents. Stacks of fine things can be done on constitutional lines. The plutes won't like 'em any better on that account."

"We have the supreme court and the interstate commerce commission," says the irate member.

"What do you say, Sam?"

"Well, Andy," said I, "I'll tell you how it strikes me: Supreme courts and interstate commerce commissions and alpeen glaciers are all right in their way, and they do move; but they're slow, Andy, slow. They work in cycles and eons of time; and I want meat for breakfast and coal to cook it with, and so I've been a-thinkin' how I can get coal to burn, or sell at any price I please, or give a bushel to a poor woman if the notion struck me, without havin' my own coal cut off by Baer; and I guess I've got the right notion. 'The night is the night, if the boys are the boys.' I'll tell you that yarn when I have time. Fact is, I'm gettin' mighty tired of the promises of political parties. I'd like to have a little performance by the men adrawin' my salaries."

Good-by, John. I'll tell you more next letter.

UNCLE SAM.

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS AT THE POLLS.

A portion of a sermon delivered by the Rev. Thomas P. Byrnes, at the People's Church, Kalamazoo, Mich., November 6, 1904, as reported in the Kalamazoo Evening Telegraph.

"And Jesus answering said unto them. Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's."—Mark xii:17.

In this text Jesus proclaims our duty to government, and our responsibility in sustaining the temporal power. As we approach our national election day, these words come home to us with religious sanction, and remind us of our duties as citizens of the great republic.

For the American citizen to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" means that on next Tuesday he ought to cast an intelligent, conscientious and patriotic vote for the men and the measures that in his judgment will conduce to the public welfare, and the true progress of our nation for the next four years.

This reminds us that we have both duties and rights, as citizens of this great country, called upon as we are from time to time to exercise the suffrage of a free people. Let us speak of the duties as the first in order, and as the first in importance in a democracy like ours.

Our first duty is to cast an intelligent vote. This means that we ought to be open in mind, free in spirit, and investigate to the best of our ability the men who, as candidates on the different tickets, ask for our votes, and to examine to the best of our ability the different policies and issues that are before the people for endorsement.

This attitude requires independence, self-reliance and courage, a fearlessness in the presence of the party boss, and a personality that can resist the tyranny of party dictation.

In a democracy the ballot should represent real conviction and be the expression of the intellectual and moral desires of the voter. Such a voter discards as base ethics the political war-cry of "my party, right or wrong," and puts in its place, "to vote for the best men and measures, is always the first duty of a patriot."

Even that party loyalty that says that "I can make the curves my party can make," may only mean that I can degenerate in moral tone as fast as my party can, and that I willingly become a partner in its crimes and political corruption.

It is the duty of the voter to cast an honest vote. This means that a man should vote in the interest of the public good. There are some vicious things which a man can do which only injure himself, but because our ballot is a social function a man cannot cast a vicious ballot without to that extent injuring his friends, his neighbors and his country. This principle condemns as a dangerous element in our political life both the briber and the bribed.

As the aim of an election in a democracy is to find out the opinion and conviction of the voter upon the issues at stake, so the effort to influence the voter by bribery, is an effort to destroy the fundamental purpose of the franchise. It may be assumed that a man who will sell his vote is not a man of real and strong political convictions, but in so far as he has convictions he is bought and bribed to depart from them, so bribery to this extent defeats the purpose and virtue of the ballot.

No party man, or political worker, will bribe a man to vote the way he intended to vote, so if he is bribed at

all, he must be bribed to depart from his real convictions such as they are, and it is this that constitutes the viciousness of bribery.

But if we are duty bound to cast an intelligent and honest ballot at every election, we also have the right to a free ballot, and an untrammelled suffrage.

In theory every American citizen in this republic is a sovereign, and this ought to be the case in practice as well as in theory.

We have no tribunal elected or self-appointed in this country who are supposed to sit in judgment on their fellowmen and decide how they shall vote.

This is left to the judgment and conscience of each citizen. Nevertheless, this principle is often forgotten, and in the strong desire for party victory, and because of the great principles and prizes at stake, the temptation is often powerful to force, browbeat, intimidate, crack the party whip, hold the club of social ostracism, and even the fear of loss of position and bread and butter, over voters and force them against their will and convictions to vote a given way.

This is all wrong in every instance, and is destructive of the very foundations of a republic.

Every American citizen should have the right to vote on all occasions as his judgment and conscience dictate.

Every American citizen should have the right to not only vote as he thinks, but he should have the right to make public his political preferences and convictions, without endangering his position, his bread and butter, or being subjected to social ostracism. A man should have the right to vote for the minor parties, and propagate by legitimate methods even radical political measures without being persecuted, or socially and politically boycotted.

This is a fundamental political principle in this country, and the most un-American elements we have in our political society are those who strike at this principle, and who by force and illegitimate pressure lead voters to depart from their real convictions and sentiments on election day.

There are many considerations appropriate to be discussed in a pre-election sermon, but it is my conviction that a free ballot, honestly and intelligently cast by the millions of American voters next Tuesday, will best insure the prosperity, greatness and moral soundness of this nation for many years to come.

DEMOCRACY VS. PLUTOCRACY— THE ELECTION'S LESSON.

The leading editorial in Mr. Bryan's *Commoner* for Nov. 11, 1904.

The Democratic party has met with an overwhelming defeat in the national election. As yet the returns are not sufficiently complete to permit analysis, and it is impossible to say whether the result is due to an actual increase in the number of Republican votes or to a falling off in the Democratic vote. This phase of the subject will be dealt with next week when the returns are all in. The questions for consideration at this time are, what lesson does the election teach, and, what of the future? The defeat of Judge Parker should not be considered a personal one. He did as well as he could under the circumstances; he was the victim of unfavorable conditions and of a mistaken party policy. He grew in popularity as the campaign progressed, and expressed himself more and more strongly upon the trust question, but could not overcome the heavy odds against him. The so-called conservative Democrats charged the defeats of 1896 and 1900 to the party's position on the money question and insisted that a victory could be won by dropping the coinage question entirely. The convention accepted this theory, and the platform made no reference to the money question, but Judge Parker felt that it was his duty to announce his personal adherence to the gold standard. His gold telegram, as it was called, while embarrassing to the Democrats of the West and South, was applauded by the eastern press. He had the cordial indorsement of Mr. Cleveland, who certified that the party had returned to "safety and sanity;" he had the support of the Democratic papers which bolted in 1896, and he also had the aid of nearly all of those who were prominent in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, and yet his defeat is apparently greater than the party suffered in either of those years.

It is unquestionable also that Judge Parker's defeat was not local but general—the returns from the eastern states being as disappointing as the returns from the west. The reorganizers were in complete control of the party; they planned the campaign and carried it on according to their own views, and the verdict against their plan is a unanimous one. Surely silver cannot be blamed for this defeat, for the campaign was run on a gold basis; neither can the defeat be charged to emphatic condemnation of the trusts, for the trusts were not assailed as vigorously this year as they were four years ago. It is evident that the campaign did not

turn upon the question of imperialism, and it is not fair to consider the result as a personal victory for the president, although his administration was the subject of criticism. The result was due to the fact that the Democratic party attempted to be conservative in the presence of conditions which demand radical remedies. It sounded a partial retreat when it should have ordered a charge all along the line. 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 occupied the conservative position. That is, it defends those who, having secured unfair advantages 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 Commoner has for two years pointed out the futility of any attempt to compromise with wrong or to patch up a peace with the great corporations which are now exploiting the public, but the southern Democrats were so alarmed by the race issue that they listened, rather reluctantly, to the promises of success held out by those who had contributed to the defeat of the party in the two preceding campaigns. The experiment has been a costly one, and it is not likely to be repeated during the present generation. The eastern Democrats

were also deceived. They were led to believe that the magnates and monopolists who coerced the voters in 1896 and supplied an enormous campaign fund in both 1896 and 1900 would help the Democratic party if our party would only be less radical. The corporation press aided in this deception, and even the Republican papers professed an unselfish desire to help build up the Democratic party. The election has opened the eyes of the hundreds of 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.

Mr. Bryan did what he could to prevent the reorganization of the Democratic party; when he failed in this he did what he could to aid Parker and Davis in order to secure such reforms—and there were some vital ones—promised by their election. Now that the campaign is over he will both through The Commoner and by personal effort assist those who desire to put the Democratic army once more upon a fighting basis; he will assist in organizing for the campaign of 1908. 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 discuss 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.

The party must continue to protest against a large army and against a large navy, and to stand for the independence of the Filipinos, for imperialism adds the menace of militarism to the corrupting influence of commercialism, and yet experience shows that however righteous the party's position on this subject, the issue does not arouse the people as they are aroused by a question which touches them immediately and individually. The injustice done to the Filipinos is not resented as it should be or as we resent a wrong to ourselves, and the costliness of imperialism is hidden by the statistics and by our indirect system of taxation. While the party must maintain its position on this subject, it cannot present this as the only issue.

The party must also maintain its posi-

tion on the tariff question. No answer has been made to the Democratic indictment against the high tariff, and yet, here too the burden of the tariff system is concealed by the method in which the tax is collected. It cannot be made the sole issue in a campaign.

The party must renew its demand for an income tax, to be secured through a constitutional amendment, in order that wealth may be made to pay its share of the expenses of the government. To-day we are collecting practically all of our federal revenue from taxes upon consumption, and these bear heaviest upon the poor and light upon the rich.

The party must maintain its position in favor of bimetallicism. It cannot surrender its demand for the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, but the question must remain in abeyance until conditions so change as to bring the public again face to face with falling prices and a rising dollar. This, therefore, cannot be made the controlling issue of the contest upon which we are entering.

The trust question presents the most acute phase of the contest between Democracy and plutocracy, so far as economic issues are concerned. The president virtually admits that the trusts contributed to his campaign fund, but he denies that they received any promises of aid or immunity. No well-informed person doubts that the large corporations have furnished the Republican campaign fund during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 and 1904, and no one can answer the logic of Judge Parker's arraignment of trust contributions. The trusts are run on business principles. They do not subscribe millions of dollars to campaigns unless they are paying for favors already granted or purchasing favors for future delivery. The weakness of Judge Parker's position was that the charge was made at the close of the campaign when it was neutralized by a counter charge. The trusts cannot be fought successfully by any party that depends upon trust funds to win the election. The Democratic party must make its attack upon the trusts so vehement that no one will suspect of secret aid from them. It will be to its advantage if it will begin the next campaign with an announcement that no trust contributions will be accepted and then prove its sincerity by giving the public access to its contribution list. In public enterprises the names of contributors are generally made public in order to denote the character and purpose of the work.

President Roosevelt has four years in which to make good his declaration that

no obligations were incurred by the acceptance of trust funds. He will disappoint either the contributors or the voters. If he disappoints the contributors, the trust question may be put in the process of settlement. If he disappoints the people, they will have a chance to settle with his party four years hence. "Death to every private monopoly" must be the slogan of the party in this question; any other position is a surrender. The platforms of 1900 and 1904 declare that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, and this declaration presents the issue upon the trust question.

The party must continue its defense of the interests of the wage-earners; it must protect them from the encroachments of capital. The fact that the laboring men have not always shown their appreciation of the party's position ought not to deter the party from doing its duty in regard to them. The labor question is not one that concerns employers and employes alone; it concerns the entire community, and the people at large have an interest in the just settlement of labor controversies; for that reason they must insist upon remedial legislation in regard to hours and arbitration, and they must so limit the authority of the courts in contempt cases as to overthrow what is known as government by injunction.

The party must continue its opposition to national banks of issue and must insist upon divorcing the treasury department from Wall street.

The party must continue its fight for the popular election of senators and for direct legislation wherever the principle can be applied. It must not only maintain its position on old issues, but it must advance to the consideration of new questions as they arise.

It takes time to direct attention to an evil and still more time to consolidate sentiment in favor of a remedy, and Mr. Bryan is not sanguine enough to believe that all the reforms that he favors will at once be indorsed by any party platform, but the Commoner will proceed to point out the reforms which he believes to be needed. Among these may be mentioned 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. 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 for 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 public conscience.

When thieves fall out, these days, honest men may read all about it in the ten-cent monthlies.—Life.

BOOKS

THE MOTHER-ARTIST.

I saw recently the following doggerel lines. A certain truth in them, which is said to be applicable to Fifth and other avenues, perhaps justifies their publication:

THE NEWEST WOMAN.

She'll be married if she can,
For the woman wants the man—
That's the law;
But 'twill make her very sad
If incumbrances are had—
That's the flaw.
She'll be busy on the go,
In society, you know,
All the while;
So she wants not even one,
For she's only out for fun—
That's the style.

Against the notion that children are a burden and a nuisance this little book by Jane Dearborn Mills (Boston: The Palmer Co.; 50 Bromfield St. Price \$1 net. Postage 6 cents) which she calls *The Mother Artist*, is a noble protest which puts to shame all trifling words on the subject, and makes us feel not only the holy obligations, but the rich joys of parenthood. No one better than she has appreciated the economic and social significance of the modern trend of thought on this subject, and her words deserve wide reading. It is a significant fact that such a book should be needed. We seem to be far away from the time when it could be sung as the glory of a woman that she shall be "the joyful mother of children."

To give some idea of the author's purpose we cannot do better than quote at some length from her prelude.

"There has grown up," she says, "in modern days, a pitying spirit toward the mother, carrying with it an idea of martyrdom, and that almost unendurable, if the number of children is greater than three. It is an exceedingly unhealthy notion for mothers, actual and possible, and for all the world besides. It is a discounting of the dignity of motherhood, for it looks upon its duties as if they were the unintelligent drudgery of the slave."

"This little book is a suggestion of the richness of growth possible in the

mother's life. No element of character is left unexercised in the doing of a mother's duties. Her love-nature is fully aroused; her intellect may be, and actively so, if she will follow where the children lead with their wise little questions, and answer them as truly as she can; and her character may grow more wholly rounded into beautiful relative proportions, each part to each, in this work and atmosphere than is possible to it in any other condition. The drudgery is only that which any artist finds connected with his work."

In a pleasant, chatty way Mrs. Mills takes us through the phases of the mother-artist's work, discussing the experiences and cares and problems of a mother's life. To all the difficulties and trials her answer is triumphant: "Your especial trials," she says, "are from the abundance of your blessings." And what these blessings are she has shown in the course of the chats with the mother throughout the book.

That the cause of the modern prejudice about children is due to our present social conditions the author has shown in other writings. Perhaps under better conditions even the society woman, who is "only out for fun," will come to have a different feeling.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Combinations, Trusts and Monopolies. By Edward J. Nolan, LL. B. New York: Broadway Publishing Co. Price, \$1.50. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

The Educational Review for November republishes the last presidential address before the English Society for Psychical Research. The significant fact is the publication of this address in this review. It is an additional indication of the headway which Psychical Research is making as a fit subject of study. Sooner or later scientific men will be compelled to consider this subject. The attitude of the foremost scien-

NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading *The Public* on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1905, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1905. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1906; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1905; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1905. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of *The Public*.

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 Copy, 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.

ATTORNEYS.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER, COUNSELLOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, Tel. Call, 4004 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012 NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON, CONTRACTOR. Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley and Municipal Work. Trolley Road and Street Work. 56 Liberty Street, New York.

SHE'S DISCOVERED IT.

"There's no use talking, William Jennings Bryan—you are my true affinity!"

tist of the world, told in this address, cannot be much longer maintained. This great man is quoted as saying that he would not believe so and so if he saw it himself.—J. H. D.

The current number of the Hibbert Journal keeps up the high standard of this splendid review. There is not an article in the whole number which is not worth study. There is a tone of seriousness in its pages which is positively refreshing in these busy, shallow days. The article of most general interest is perhaps that on the Ten Commandments.—J. H. D.

The Critic for November republishes, in what it claims to be a more perfect form, the lecture of the Poet Laureate on the Growing Distaste for the Higher Forms of Poetry. This lecture is well worth reading. Alfred Austin has been much laughed at, but Alfred Tennyson was laughed at, and Wordsworth, and Dante, and perhaps Homer in his day—though there was not so much laughing in Homer's day. Anyhow, there are many who will feel the force of the Laureate's words in this lecture. It is followed in the Critic by a so-called reply by Bliss Carmen, which is also well worth reading. The reply is by no means a rebuttal, as one may easily conjecture from the following quotation: "To care for poetry, one must first care for honor, for righteousness, for truth, for freedom, for fair play, for generosity, for unselfishness,—in short, for all those ideals of rectitude and loving kindness which the long battle of civilization has been waged to establish. If it is true that our life as individuals and as nations is permeated with cheap

facetiousness, with disregard for public honesty, with disparagement of personal nobleness, with forgetfulness of the high traditions which belong to our birth, then it would be very unreasonable to expect us to care for poetry.

The campaign for reform in diet and against "three square meals a day" goes on steadily in home journals and household magazines. Good Housekeeping (Springfield, Mass.) has an editorial on the subject in the November number, calling attention to the sturdiness of the rice-eating Chinese and Japs. "Intemperance in eating," reiterates the writer, "perhaps causes more ill health, unhappiness, failure, death, and economic waste than intemperance in the use of alcoholic beverages."—J. H. D.

A BANQUET will be given by the women of the Henry George Association in honor of Rev. H. S. Bigelow and Hon. J. Warner Mills on November 21st, at Kinsley's. Tickets, \$1.25. For further information, address Miss Nellie Carlin, 1202 Ashland Block, Tel. Central 925—or Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1014 Masonic Temple. Tel. Central 3691. Auto. 7691.

REV. HERBERT S. BIGELOW'S CHICAGO ENGAGEMENTS Monday evening, Nov. 21st. Banquet at Kinsley's. Tuesday evening, Nov. 22d. Address at Northwestern University Settlement. Wednesday evening, Nov. 23d. Address at the People's Church, Rockford. Thursday evening, Nov. 24th. Address before the Turnverein Vorwarts. Friday evening, Nov. 25th. Address at Millard Avenue Baptist Church, corner 24th and Millard Avenue.

THE PUBLIC

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

PUBLICATIONS
OF L. S. DICKEY & CO.
1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO.

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY.—By Louis F. Post. 400 pages, silk cloth, deckle edges, gilt top. Price, \$2.00 net. By mail, \$2.12.

BISOCIALISM.—The Reign of the Mas at the Margin. By Oliver R. Trowbridge. 400 pages, in cloth. Price, \$1.50 net. By mail \$1.60.

COMPLETE WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE, LIBRARY EDITION.—just issued in ten volumes, with Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr. Uncut edges, green buckram. Price, \$17.50 per set.

THE PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO.—A Monograph, by Louis F. Post, 80 pages. Per copy, 20c postpaid.

FREE AMERICA.—By Bolton Hall. In paper; 220 pages, 25 cents.

All of above sent to any address in the United States, for \$2.01 on monthly installments of 25c. Deliveries in Canada and Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for customs duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for customs duties and expressage.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.,
1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago.