

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1904.

Number 339.

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.

Judge Parker's letter of acceptance is in almost every respect in pleasing contrast with President Roosevelt's (p. 369). It is infinitely superior in manners. It is statesmanlike in tone. It is free from misrepresentation. It is democratic in spirit. The tendency of its influence is away from the "going" policy of benevolent aggression, and toward those ideals of government which contemplate the fullest liberty for each individual within the limits of like liberty for every other. —

In his indications of party purposes Judge Parker rises to democratic heights. Economy of administration in place of extravagance; the strong and steady hand of impartial law, in place of fluctuating regulations by political oligarchies or individual caprice; equal opportunity instead of special privilege; popular rule instead of benevolent despotism—what more than adherence to these principles could be asked of any President by the democracy of any party? If Judge Parker's letter had begun and ended with the peroration, in which these purposes are summarized, it would have put democratic life into his campaign. From the pen of a man who can say, as Parker does, that he has put aside congenial work to which he had expected to devote his life, in order to unite his party for the promotion of those principles, this peroration in itself is a stirring appeal. —

But many there are who, when they read the whole letter, will wonder how deep seated and vital

with Judge Parker those principles really are. Without suspecting his sincerity in the least, they may well question his perception and the intelligence of his purposes; and questioning, they may doubt whether, after all, his administration would differ much from Roosevelt's. To doubt in such a case is most likely to decide against Judge Parker. Party men, who feel that this campaign is not the last in which the Democratic party will engage, and rightly judge that their proper place this Fall is in party harness no matter what their views may be as to present party control—men like Bryan and Johnson and Garvin, and thousands of lesser leaders who believe and feel with them—will find it far more difficult to keep their followers within party lines on the basis of Parker's letter as a whole than would be possible on the basis of its peroration alone. —

This is not to say that the letter as a whole is in every respect discouraging. It is far from that. We have spoken already of the peroration as inspiring. Other generalizations are equally so, notably the passage on foreign relations. Nor are all the points of detail objectionable. What is said, for instance, of administrative economy, is welcome; and this is no minor point, for governmental extravagance fosters plutocracy. What is said of the pension usurpation is not only sound, but courageous. It has the same ring of defiance that characterized Judge Parker's gold telegram. Yet in comparison with other parts of his letter it tends to intensify the wish that he might meet larger questions in like spirit. The same definiteness and courage with which he has defied bimetalists and Roosevelt's autocratic pension order,

would shine much more gloriously in defiance of the powerful plutocratic forces that really threaten the popular liberties of this Republic. —

Having injected the gold standard question into the campaign, although it was not an issue and had therefore been carefully excluded from the platform, and having emphasized it in his speech, Judge Parker now renews in his letter of acceptance his expressions of perpetual loyalty to that theory of finance. This is in opposition to the only declarations on the subject his party has ever made, and in harmony with those of only one party in this country—the Republican. On that question there is admittedly no difference between him and his adversary, Mr. Roosevelt; and gold standard men who do not prefer Judge Parker for other reasons are unlikely to swap gold-standard horses. Bimetallists, on the other hand, unless strongly driven toward him by other considerations, are almost certain to vote against him in resentment of his gratuitous assault upon their doctrines. —

On the question of imperialism, Judge Parker's letter strikes the true note until it descends to particulars. His letter is in this respect far better than his speech (p. 273), for he now makes it perfectly clear that he looks forward to action regarding the Philippines similar to our action toward Cuba. But he distinctly swings away from the platform of his party when he favors promising independence to the Filipinos "as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it." The platform demands that we shall grant them independence "upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal." Why has Judge

Parker amended his party platform in this respect? Why does he substitute for a positive platform declaration this elastic pledge to make that declaration good when the Filipinos "are reasonably prepared"? Is it possible to read into that substitute pledge—which must, under all the circumstances, have been deliberately framed—anything more than a purpose to let the question of Philippine independence drift? Who shall say, and by what tests, when this promise matures? Who can decide when any people are "reasonably prepared" for independence? Judge Parker's letter leaves the decision to the good pleasure of the very "benevolent despotism" which in his peroration he condemns. These verbal variations as to the Philippine question are not reassuring. While it is easy to see many reasons for voting for Parker in preference to Roosevelt, the difference in pledges of the two candidates regarding the Philippine question is not one of those reasons. Better by far for the Filipinos and for this Republic, that the imperialists carry their policy of benevolent despotism to the point of reaction under Roosevelt, than that the anti-imperialists be placed in a position of acquiescence in the same policy under Parker. Under Roosevelt, elected against anti-imperial sentiment, the policy can be combatted; under Parker, elected by anti-imperialists, it would have to be regarded thenceforth as the settled policy of the country.

On the tariff question, Judge Parker says much in a general way that is most encouraging. The principle of equal opportunity in place of special privilege which he states in his peroration is well amplified in the body of his letter; and he takes unmistakable ground for revenue tariffs only. These he refers to as defining an old difference in principle between the parties, and asserts that "this difference of principle still obtains." But when he gets down to detail, it is not a revenue tariff that he proposes, but "tariff reform."

This offense might be overlooked if he had explained that the obstacles in the way of securing tariff for revenue are practically insurmountable, and that the goal must therefore be sought step by step. But that is not his explanation. He shies at the principle of tariff for revenue only, not because of the legal and political obstacles in the way, but because it would "disturb business conditions." In other words, protection, which Judge Parker's platform declares to be "robbery of the many for the benefit of the few," must be continued indefinitely, in slowly diminishing degrees, lest business conditions suffer by speedy change.

Any man ought to know that the "business conditions" which depend upon robbery will be disturbed as well by slowly reforming the robbery as by abolishing it. They won't be disturbed as badly, that is true; but for this very reason they will be all the stronger to stimulate reaction against the reform. By the same token the business interests that do not depend upon robbery will assert themselves all the more quickly and strongly for being at once restored to their rights.

Judge Parker's idea that "tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken, on scientific principles," with a view to avoiding any disturbance of "business conditions," is discouragingly suggestive of Mr. Cleveland's tariff performance. He, too, was afraid to disturb business conditions. He, too, therefore shied at the logic of the platform. He, too, had visions of "prudently" and "sagaciously" reforming protection robbery on "scientific principles." The result may be read in the election returns of 1894 and the Dingley tariff subsequently adopted. When the Democratic tariff "scientists" brought their "prudence" and "sagacity" to bear upon "tariff reform," they turned out as pretty a piece of protection legislation, on a slightly reduced scale, as the "prudent" and "sagacious" Re-

publican tariff "scientists" had cursed the honest business interests of the country with. What wonder, after this, if the people, intending by their votes in 1892 to condemn protection as robbery, turned in despair to other theories in explanation of their impoverishment, and so made possible that Democratic disorganization which in 1896 opened wide the door to McKinleyism? History sometimes repeats itself, and Parker's election this year, if it were possible, might prove to be like Cleveland's in 1892, the best conceivable prophecy of an overwhelming reaction four years later in favor of the Republicans.

Readers interested in the remarkable disclosures of the new system of valuations for taxation in New York (vol. vi, p. 724), may now procure, at slight expense, official reports of some of the more important results. Under this system improvement values and site values are stated separately. The first assessment under the system has shown that the taxable site values of New York City are 60 per cent., while the taxable improvement values are only 40 per cent., of the total value of all the taxable real estate of the city. More interesting and significant, however, than this general result, are the details, which show that in cases where improvements are most valuable, the site value is farthest in excess of the improvement value. For instance, the aggregate values of ten recently constructed and largest office buildings of the city are 75 per cent. of the total value of sites and improvements together, these costly buildings having a value of only 25 per cent. of the total—only one-third as much as the value of the lots on which they stand. As the New York tax law requires the publication of assessments, any one desiring it may, at a cost of 25 cents for the report and 10 cents for postage, 35 cents in all, procure the full assessment for so much of the borough of Manhattan as lies south of Grand street. This report, which itemizes each piece of real estate, giv-

ing full value of site and improvements separately, together with other details as to real estate values of much more than local interest, can be had of the "Supervisor of the City Record," City Hall, New York City. It may be described as "Section 1, Blocks 1 to 315, Borough of Manhattan," of the assessment roll supplement of the City Record. Reports of other sections are ready for delivery at the same price—25 cents each, plus 10 cents for postage.

Whoever takes an active part in public affairs is subject to suspicion. A poor man who champions something in which there is manifestly no "boodle," is usually suspected of harboring envy of the "successful." A rich man who champions something in which there is no "boodle," is usually suspected of being a demagogue seeking popularity with the lower mob. Anybody who champions something in which "boodle" is probable or possible, is likely to be suspected of being a "boodler." Oftentimes these suspicions are malicious. Yet any of them may in particular cases be well-founded. Experience goes far to prove that the last of the three is the least frequently indulged, the most reasonable in its nature, and oftenest the best founded in fact.

We are living in an age of graft. From the railroad passes with which most legislators and not a few judges are brought into pleasant relations with corporation influences, to the large sums that business interests contribute for the purpose of electing "safe and sane" men to office, we are engulfed in a flood of grafting. All of it is not vulgar—not even splendidly vulgar. Social aspirations, political ambitions, professional careers, are largely dependent on the good will of men who profit by governmental favor. They find this field for grafting cheap. Men who are too honest to be bought with "dirty dollars," will often serve respectable grafters faithfully for the social favors, political prestige or profession-

al advancement which those grafters command. But much of current grafting is brazen bold. Although it assumes garbs of gentility which in Tweed's day would have seemed superfluous, it makes few pretenses of virtue. Readers of Lincoln Steffens's articles in McClure's ought to be pretty well convinced that this is so.

Mr. Steffens's latest article, that in McClure's for October, is on the politics of Wisconsin. Its revelations make meaty food for thought. Senator Spooner denies what it reveals about him; but his denial is like the South Carolina darky's lame back, which was "powerful weak." Mr. Steffens confirms by this article his previous intimations that the business classes and their "safe and sane" tools in office are the worst enemies of the Republic. One of his incidental observations is particularly striking. We do not remember having seen the fact noticed in print before; yet it is a very significant fact, which can hardly have escaped any observer. "I have noticed," writes Mr. Steffens, "that a public official who steals, or, like Lieutenant Governor Lee, of Missouri, betrays his constituents, may propose to be governor without being accused of ambition. 'They' seem to think a boodler's aspirations are natural. He may have a hundred notorious vices; they do not matter. But a 'reformer,' a man who wants to serve his people, he must be a white-robed, spotless angel, or 'they' will whisper that he is—what? A thief? Oh, no; that is nothing; but that he is ambitious." This is said apropos of Lu Follette, whom the grafters accuse of ambition, having nothing else to accuse him of yet feeling the force of the onslaught he is making upon their graft structures. But its application is universal. It is so common that one may infer, with the almost absolute certainty of being right, that the public man who is reputed in high business or social circles to be "ambitious" or a "demagogue"

is raising havoc with some kind of graft. Conversely the reputation in those circles of being "safe and sane" is almost as sure an indication of fidelity to high grade grafters and devotion to their profitable privileges.

In the controversy over the Chicago traction question which has for several days been lively in the local papers, there have been only two important contributions favoring the proposed compromise ordinance. One is from Alderman Foreman, who, as chairman of the transportation committee, is the nominal sponsor for the ordinance. The other is from Edwin Burritt Smith, who, as leading special counsel to the committee, is responsible for its legal perfection. Mr. Smith's contribution is only a republication of his letter in reply to Judge Tuley (p. 352) first published several weeks ago. Neither Mr. Foreman nor Mr. Smith have met the issues which they themselves have raised. The most strenuous reasons for urging the adoption of the ordinance are, first, that it would give the city, at the end of 13 years, a free hand in dealing with the traction question by ridding it of the obstacle of obstructive litigation; and, second, that it would meantime secure good traction service. That the ordinance would produce those results is denied by Judge Tuley and Judge Dunne, and their opinions in that particular are buttressed by the published opinions of a considerable number of practicing lawyers of unquestioned ability and respectable standing. Yet Mr. Smith and Mr. Foreman both ignore these objections. They assume that the results named would be accomplished, and defend the ordinance upon that assumption. They neglect to show that the city could not be tied up with litigation at the end of 13 years under the ordinance, as well as now without it; and they make no attempt to explain how it would be practicable under the ordinance, any better than without it, to compel the traction companies to furnish good service.

Another singular thing about the Chicago traction controversy is this public admission on the 25th, by the corporation counsel, Edgar B. Tolman, through the Chicago Tribune of that date:

If the street car companies do not come to terms with the city a municipal street railway system founded on the Chicago Passenger railway lines and the expired City railway and Union Traction franchises undoubtedly will be the next step on the part of the city.

Why the next step if the companies "do not come to terms"? Why not the next step without waiting for them to come to terms? One of the favorite reasons given for the compromise is its alleged necessity, owing to the professed inability of the city to establish a system of its own. But Mr. Tolman now admits, what the "hair-brained cranks" of the municipal ownership movement have repeatedly assured the "safe and sane" representatives of the city, that the city is free to found a system of its own, on the basis of expired and expiring franchises which the 99-year claims do not touch. If the city is free to do that, why surrender its freedom in a compromise of such dubious value to the city and such manifest value to the traction companies as the city's representatives are trying to "club" the companies into accepting? Municipal ownership and operation of public utilities have proved everywhere to be superior to private ownership and operation. Not only is this true abroad; it is true in this country. Even the worst water-works in the United States, for instance, that are municipally owned and operated, are better than the best that are privately owned and operated. For the superiority of private systems of public service none but fools and partisans of privilege any longer contend. That element of practicability is out of the question. The question is one of legal power and financial ability. But Mr. Tolman admits that Chicago has legal power and financial ability to establish a street car system. Then why not drop this higgling

with "widows and orphans" and establish it?

What is probably entitled to rank as the least intelligent and most blindly partisan effort at obstructing municipal ownership in Chicago is the objection of the Daily News to the emergent petition now in circulation with the object of preventing the railroad-ing through of the compromise ordinance. Supplementing the principal question on that petition, the one relating to the ordinance now pending, are two others. They are intended to elicit an expression of public sentiment on the issue of compromise, and to anticipate such pettifogging on the part of the traction interests as might resort to verbal changes in the ordinance for the purpose of insisting that a popular vote against it is thereby nullified. The supplementary questions are as follows: "(2) Shall the city council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway Company? (3) Shall the city council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to any street railway company?" To these questions the Daily News objects that they are so framed as to preclude the possibility of an affirmative vote upon them. The reason given is that an affirmative vote would "approve in advance of any loose action the council might choose to take." This borders close on the silly. Questions of general legislative policy, popularly declared, are not to be interpreted by schoolmaster English when their meaning would be thereby confused and is clear without it. It is perfectly clear in this case that a negative vote on those two questions would mean that the voter is opposed to the policy of granting any franchises. It follows, with equal clearness, that an affirmative vote would be the reverse of that, and mean that the voter is in favor of the policy of granting franchises. By no reasonable interpretation could the affirmative voter be supposed to favor any and every kind of franchise ordinance. When the vote is reported everybody will

understand that the "No" vote means that that many oppose the policy of granting franchises, while the aggregate "Yes" vote means that that many favor the policy of granting franchises. To construe the affirmative vote as intended to license improvident franchises would be to pettifog. To insist upon such construction in advance is to pettifog in advance.

That the petition against the proposed traction ordinance is not only making tremendous headway but expresses the popular sentiment of the city, is evident from the hysterical manner in which corporation organs have begun to fight it. When the Mayor calmly proposed to railroad this ordinance through (p. 342), in spite of last Spring's vote against its principle and in spite of his own election pledges, unless a referendum petition under the "public policy" law were immediately presented against it, these papers echoed the Mayor's jeering advice to the opponents of the ordinance to stop talking and "get busy" with a petition. It was supposed at that time that the work of getting up such an enormous petition could not be accomplished. But since it is more than half complete, they sing another song. They find now that these repeated petitions are a "nuisance." Next they will demand the repeal of the "public policy" law. Reduced to the last analysis, all this outcry against referendums means no more than that the men who inspire it are grafters, of one species and another, who fear popular government. Their ideal of government is government by corporations in which they own stock. That kind of government is "business" government.

It is well that periodicals are giving publicity to the fact of the increase of child labor, which is said to amount to 33 per cent. within the past ten years. This, in spite of the agitation of certain good people against the employment of children of school age, is

an inevitable consequence of social conditions. And there is another inevitable consequence in contrast: the age of graduation in colleges and professional schools is increasing. The average age of graduation at Harvard is above 22. To this add four years for a profession, and you have the young man an embryo bread winner at 26. Nothing is more significant of the evil tendencies of American civilization than these increasing contrasts.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—A PRIMARY DISTINCTION.

Evidence of revived interest in problems relating to marriage presses upon us from many directions. The recrudescence of the Mormon question in its polygamous aspects is one very large and significant fact. Recent monitoring action by the less ecclesiastical church denominations is another. Considered by themselves there is nothing portentous about these facts. They might imply no more than a tendency toward greater institutional strictness with reference to marital obligations. But when the circumstances out of which they spring are considered, they become much more seriously significant than any previous expressions of solicitude for the marriage relation have proved or have even appeared. For they are manifestly in the nature of a protest against a loosening of public sentiment.

That common regard for the marriage institution is losing some strength, is to be inferred not only from the two large facts mentioned above; it is indicated in a thousand other ways. Serious arguments against marriage are frequently tolerated where once they were "taboo," and a considerable proportion of the people are either candidly indifferent or avowedly hostile to marriage sanctions. More significant still is the patent fact that so many who incline to respect the marriage institution are quite frankly "open to conviction."

What better evidence of this loosened state of the public mind could be required, than the character of the discussion that has followed the recent prediction of the greatest English novelist,

George Meredith, that marriages will some time be contracted, not for life, but only for a definite period—say for ten years. The freedom with which this prediction is discussed in quarters where conventionality usually holds sway, is it not very significant? Yet it is no different from the freedom with which every fad involving indifference to conventional marriage is discussed. The discussion is more extensive geographically, and that is all. The fact cannot be blinked that an ominous division regarding the sacredness of marriage is taking place in common thought.

In these circumstances some primary observations on the nature of marriage, with reference especially to the essential difference between marriage itself and marriage ceremonials, may be pertinent and possibly helpful.

By many persons, perhaps by most of us, the marriage ceremonial and marriage itself are regarded as identical. Seldom is the truth distinctly recognized, that the ceremonials are only formalities declaratory of marriage. Yet marriage formalities are essentially as different from marriage itself as are words and phrases from the thoughts they express.

In very great degree, no doubt, the confusion of these two things, this disposition to regard marriage ceremonials as marriage, is responsible for the tendency to question the sacredness of the marriage relation. It has provoked a controversy which, while seeming to turn on the question of the sanctity of marriage, really turns on the question of the sanctity of the ceremonial. There is in reality much less hostility to marriage itself than might be inferred from the hostility to marriage as a conventionality.

It would be strange if the idolatrous idea that the ceremonial is the marriage were not common. Modern idolatry assumes many guises. The Bible volume, for instance, or its archaic phrasing, rather than the spiritual principles it embodies, excites the reverence of formal pietists. Similarly churchly throngs are more impressed with the externalities of church rituals than with the re-

ligious truths they symbolize. In another relation, the flag of our country rather than the ideals it may represent, makes the blood of perfunctory patriots run faster. The externals in everything rather than the internals in anything, the shadow rather than the substance, the symbol rather than the thing symbolized—it is this that impresses both "the lower mob and the upper." It would be marvelous, therefore, if marriage ceremonials were not popularly mistaken for the intimate and sacred human relationship which these ceremonials only symbolize or shadow forth.

Truly, marriage must be something other than marriage ceremonials—something distinct and different. If the ceremonials have any sanctity at all, their sanctity must be derivative, not original; and it must be derived from marriage itself, which has a sacredness peculiarly and primarily its own.

Although marriage ceremonials may be declaratory of marriage, and may create civil and ecclesiastical obligations, they no more make marriages than the crown makes a king or baptism makes a Christian. The symbols are not the substance. Whether the marriage ceremony be a perfunctory proceeding before a civil magistrate, or an informal public declaration by the parties, or a legal inference from marital conduct, or the most solemn rites of a church—it is neither more nor less than a formality, whereby the fact of marriage itself is certified to society and its obligations proclaimed. The ceremonial is the symbol; marriage itself is the substance.

From this it by no means follows that marriage ceremonials, mere conventionalities though they be, are only empty forms. They may be extremely useful, even indispensable. As military dress does not make a soldier, neither do marriage ceremonials make marriage; yet, as military dress proclaims the wearer's military station, so do marriage ceremonials proclaim the marriage state.

They may do it falsely, even as military dress may be worn falsely. But instances of false participation in marriage ceremonials are not enough to disprove

the genuineness nor to condemn the usefulness of these ceremonials in general.

The point we emphasize here, however, is not the value or legitimacy of marriage ceremonials, but the fact that there is an essential difference between the ceremonial and the marriage itself,—a difference that should always be distinguished.

We are well aware that it may be easier to insist upon this difference strenuously than to distinguish it exactly. But it can be well enough distinguished for all the purposes of practical discussion.

At any rate, we shall come pretty close to a working definition if we specify marriage-love as an element absolutely essential to marriage, but not to marriage ceremonials. Few persons would deny that marriage itself depends, as the marriage ceremonial does not, upon the complete union of one man and one woman through abiding love.

Love is manifestly essential. No union can be a marriage, let the ceremony be never so impressive and authoritative, if love be absent. Is it not equally clear that the love necessary to constitute marriage must be in its nature abiding? Affectionate emotions, stirred by beauty of face or figure, or by strength of body or brain, cannot constitute marriage-love, if marriage itself is more than a momentary passion; and that it is more than this, all who have been truly married know. Marriage is not a passion, tender and fleeting; it is a full-rounded life.

Affectionate emotions inspired by physical attractiveness may attend upon marriage; but they are not necessarily of it. Since physical attractions are transitory, love for them merely is in its nature ephemeral. This is true also of intellectual attractions, such as cleverness, brilliancy and the like. All are ephemeral, and ephemeral love is not marriage-love. The love that characterizes marriage must be of that kind which alone is capable of permanently welding together one man and one woman into a single intellectual and moral being.

Singleness of being in marriage does not mean, of course, that

either of the parties shall be master of the other. Marriage implies cooperation, not despotism.

Neither does it mean that there must be absolute agreement between the parties. As no individual mind can be in agreement even with itself in everything and all the time, identity of intellectual and moral existence in marriage does not necessitate agreement in everything and all the time of two minds.

What is meant by singleness of being in marriage is the almost obvious idea that the parties to a genuine marriage must be in love, each with the higher intellectual qualities and the deeper moral impulses of the other. This is love for the embodied character. It is love for the durable qualities of the marriage partner. It is therefore the type of love that endures, the kind that is abiding in its nature.

Yet marriage-love, abiding though it is in its nature, may often prove to be ephemeral in fact.

The paradox is not unique. Many things besides marriage-love may prove to be ephemeral in fact though they are abiding in their nature. Human life is one. Although human life is in fact often cut off long before three-score-and-ten, it nevertheless comprehends infancy, youth, manhood and age in its nature.

Similarly marriage love, which is abiding in its nature, may prove in particular instances to be ephemeral in fact. One of the parties to a marriage originally genuine, because originally cemented with mutual love of that abiding kind which unifies, love by each for the character-building tendencies of the other, may decide to alter those tendencies. With this diversification in the character-building of the parties, the love that has made their union a true marriage can make it so no longer. Since the indispensable condition of unifying love (complementary functions in character-building) no longer exists in those persons, their unifying love dissolves and their marriage terminates. Obligations resulting from the ceremonial may survive, and rightly so; but the marriage itself is dead.

The man and the woman who

love the same indestructible ideals, in the same general and fundamental way, and discover each in the other—instinctively, it may be, rather than reflectively—a complementary embodiment of those ideals, are mutually under the influence of marriage-love. Intellectually and morally they are thereby made to grow together as one. This would seem to be in harmony with the nature of things.

But if either ceases to love those ideals in that fundamental way, then marriage-love tends to disintegrate and they cease to love each other with the love that unifies. This also seems to be in harmony with the nature of things.

In the one condition they are married essentially, irrespective of ceremonials. In the other they are divorced essentially, irrespective of civil or ecclesiastical sanctions.

Whether this essential marriage should be shadowed forth by ceremonials; whether this essential divorce warrants the formality of civil divorce; whether either civil or ecclesiastical law should tolerate marriages of divorced persons—these questions still remain. So does the question of institutional polygamy. So do all the questions that are colloquially alluded to by the term "free love." So also do the questions that George Meredith has raised by his prediction of marriages for limited periods, whereby the love that makes the marriage would be prejudged to be ephemeral. So may a host of other questions. The marriage problem in all its ramifications is not solved by distinguishing marriage from marriage ceremonials.

But that distinction is the necessary first step in the process of solution. Marriage ceremonials are one thing, marriage itself is another and different thing. Between mere conventional ceremonials proclaiming marriage, and the anterior moral and spiritual fact thereby proclaimed, there must be a complete mental insulation as the primary condition of any rational discussion of the marriage problem.

The worst tyrants are those who know no law but the indulgence of their own benevolence.—Life.

FEDERAL EXTRAVAGANOE.

The Department of Commerce and Labor has recently published statistics of the cost of government in this and other countries from which the statistician of that department has drawn the unwarranted conclusion that the government of the United States is more economically administered than any other government in the world. As might be supposed these statistics are quoted with great satisfaction by the partisan Republican press regardless of their grossly misleading character.

We certainly have a right to expect that the cost of government in this country should be less than in most, if not all, other countries, but the figures presented come far from showing this to be the case. They only demonstrate the lack of intelligence or lack of honesty of the official statistician who seeks to establish his assertion of the comparatively low cost of government in the United States by a comparison of incomparable data.

Unlike other countries with which comparison is made as to the cost of government, the United States are a federation of States, in which the national government bears but a part of all the expenses of government for which our people have to pay. Had the statistician of the Department of Commerce and Labor compiled statistics of the total cost of government in every country, there would exist something like a fair basis of comparison.

Whether or not our national government is run extravagantly at the present time can be best determined by a comparison of its present cost with that of former periods.

According to the figures of the Department of Commerce and Labor the present annual cost of the national government amounts to \$604,323,000, the per capita cost being \$7.97. These figures, it should be understood, do not include the amount paid for the Panama canal.

Referring now to the official figures as given in the United States statistical abstract, we find the total expenditures of the United States government in 1890 to

have been \$358,618,514. This shows that in these few years there has been an increase in expenditure of almost 80 per cent., with an increase in population of less than 28 per cent.

Further reference to official figures shows that the per capita cost of the national government 20 years ago was but \$4.44.

Thus, since 1884, there appears to have been an increase in the per capita cost of government of 79.5 per cent. Within the last three years, that is, since 1901, the increase amounts to 30 per cent.

This showing is precisely the opposite of what it should be; for it is a well-known fact that large concerns can be conducted with relatively less cost than small ones. It might be borne cheerfully could it be shown that the affairs of government are better conducted than formerly. But who dares venture the assertion that the administration of Roosevelt is an improvement on that of Benjamin Harrison to the extent of nearly 80 per cent.?

HENRY L. BLISS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTRALIA. (See p. 213).

Corowa, N. S. W., Aug. 26. — The principal amendment to the arbitration bill, carried against the ministry, provided that preference should not be given by the court to trade unionists without the approval of a majority of those affected by the award. The ministry, were not satisfied with this, and, after a long delay, brought up the clause again, and asked the House to go once more into committee to discuss the amendment in order that it might be altered. This the House declined to do, the ministry being defeated by two votes on August 11.

Mr. Watson, the prime minister, then asked the governor-general to dissolve the House. As this was refused, the ministry resigned. Mr. G. H. Reid, the leader of the Free Trade party, being sent for, he has formed a ministry—by a coalition of the Free Traders with most of the Protectionists. In accordance with the agreement made with Deakin some months ago, Reid has composed his ministry of Free Traders and Protectionists in equal numbers. Mr. Deakin would not take office, but Sir George Turner, who was treasurer in the Barton and Deakin ministries, has taken the same post under Reid.

For the first time, there are only two parties in the Federal House, the Labor party, joined by the extreme Protectionist wing, being in opposition. Reid's ministry is the first to command an ab-

solute majority of the House; but with parties so nearly equal, it seems probable that there will be a dissolution before long.

The New South Wales state elections were held on the 6th inst. with the following result:

Opposition (reform party).....	46
Labor	25
Ministerial	15
Independents	4

This will mean the return to office of the old Free Trade Democratic party which was led by Mr. Reid before federation, and will practically reduce the number of parties to two, as in Victoria.

Within the last nine months elections have been held for the Commonwealth and for all the States. The following list shows the growth of the Labor parties:

	Previous	Present
Federal House	17	23
Federal Senate	11	15
West Australia	7	22
Tasmania	0	5
Victoria	12	19
South Australia	7	6
Queensland	22	24
N. S. Wales.....	25	25

In New South Wales the previous House consisted of 125 members; the present has only 90.

In West Australia a Labor party is in office. Probably because mining is the chief industry in West Australia, and there is little agriculture, the Labor party is very strong there. Eight out of its eleven seats in the two Federal houses are held by Labor members. All the labor parties now aim at state socialism, and West Australia will probably lead the way in that direction.

Dalgety, in the southeast corner of New South Wales, was selected on the 9th inst. as the site for the Federal capital, by the Commonwealth parliament. It also recommended that the area should be not less than 900 square miles, but the New South Wales government may not agree to part with so much land. It is very probable that no land will be sold in the Federal area, but that it will be let on lease subject to periodical reappraisements, so that the Commonwealth will gain any increase in value.

ERNEST BRAY.

NEW YORK.

New York, Sept. 26.—The world-famous Broadway "bread line" is receiving more than ordinary notice just now because the founder of it, Louis Fleischmann, is so seriously ill that he is not expected to recover.

One night more than ten years ago Mr. Fleischmann noticed a crowd of men with craving looks, drinking in the odor from the fresh baked bread in his basement. He proffered some bread to the nearest man, who received it so appreciatively and thankfully that he continued to hand it out; and so a line was formed. Every night between 11 and

12 o'clock, summer and winter, raining or snowing, through all this last seven years of "prosperity," a line has been formed, some of the men standing in it for several hours, to receive a piece of bread.

At the beginning, Mr. Fleischmann was on hand every night, giving personal supervision to the work. When organized charity dispensers have protested to him for encouraging unworthy men: he would reply, "A man that will stand in that line gives evidence that he is hungry. I care not what his pedigree may be. He is a brother man."

An instructive story is told of the impressions this "bread line" recently made upon an intelligent and educated young Chinese lady. Miss Ah Mae Wong is a medical student about entering her third year in the Toronto Medical college. She has been visiting New York for the past ten days. Coming down Broadway one night last week her attention was directed at the corner of Tenth street to the "bread line." When told that such a line of men was there regularly every night the year around to receive a dole of dry bread she innocently inquired: "Why don't these men work and earn their bread?" But her friends were unable to make her understand why it was possible for able-bodied men to be out of remunerative employment in a country so full of natural resources as this. Even in China, she told the party, it is possible for the poorest to have plenty of rice, and why men can't find employment remunerative enough to keep them comfortable puzzled her immensely. She confessed that she was too stupid to grasp the explanation.

While a native of China, having been born and reared in Shanghai, Miss Wong has been brought up in the Christian faith. Her father was converted to Christianity when a young man, and for years before his death had charge of an Episcopalian mission in Shanghai. A classmate of Dr. Florence Leigh Jones, now of Brooklyn, went from medical college to this mission in China and Miss Wong became her assistant in the hospital. Having a predilection for medicine, Miss Wong subsequently came to Toronto to attend the medical school there. Dr. Jones, whose guest Miss Wong has been during her stay here, has practiced medicine for more than ten years in Brooklyn and New York city. In the practice of her profession she became aware of social conditions that mystified and appalled her, and being a woman of wide sympathy she was much perplexed and worried over daily experiences. About two years ago a chance circumstance brought "Progress and Poverty" into her hands, and before she had finished the book the mystery had been revealed, the perplexity had passed away. She had no need any longer to ask, "What would'st thou

have me to do?" To her the line of duty was clearly marked out.

Reared in Dixie land, in the Palmetto State, she now saw clearly the solution of the race question as well as the social and labor questions. When she learned that Miss Wong contemplated visiting New York she pressingly invited her to her home as her guest, notwithstanding this Oriental girl belongs to a race so despised by our Christian nation that even she, an intelligent, refined and cultured young woman, embracing the Christian faith, speaking the English language fluently and more grammatically than a majority of our own native born men and women, is prohibited from making her home within the confines of this "land of the free" and "home of the oppressed of all nations."

Not that Miss Wong has a desire to remain here. As soon as she graduates from the medical college she intends to return to Shanghai to work among the people of her own race.

Had Miss Wong and party transferred from Broadway to the eastbound car on Twenty-third street the same night she witnessed the "bread line," she could have beheld another sight that would have puzzled her even more. One of the finest office buildings in the world covers three-fourths of the block bounded by Madison square and Fourth avenue, and Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth streets. Ultimately the building will occupy the entire block, as Dr. Parkhurst's church property, which embraces the other quarter, has been sold to the company. The exterior of the building is of granite, so white as to have the appearance of Italian marble. It is massive in structure and ornamental in design. As has become the custom in all great cities where land values are high, the space underneath the sidewalk is utilized. The ground floor of the west half of the building facing on Twenty-third street is occupied by the Madison Square station of the New York postoffice. On the third and fourth floors of this building are the offices of the Republican national committee. Between 12 and 1 o'clock on the night the "bread line" was observed by Miss Wong and party, the writer mailed a letter at Madison Square station. Before he could enter, human beings sleeping on the sidewalk, blocking the entrance, had to get up to make way for him, so closely were they huddled together. Along the entire western half of the building, wherever the sidewalk was heated from the steam in the basement below, men were packed as tightly as sardines, with no shelter but the clouded canopy of heaven, and above them the sign, "Republican National Committee."

Here, at the base of one of the most magnificent structures in the world, representing luxuriant wealth, underneath the headquarters of the political party that is proclaiming from the ros-

trum, the pulpit and the press that we are enjoying transcendent prosperity, is the most remarkable juxtaposition of wealth and poverty possible to behold. A picture of it, could it be so portrayed as to be brought to the view of all the voters of the land, would forever relegate from power a party so brazenly audacious as to shout "prosperity" when such conditions are so apparent in all great centers of population.

D. S. LUTHER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 29.

Judge Parker's letter of acceptance as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency appeared just two weeks after Mr. Roosevelt's (p. 376), having been released for publication on the 26th. It contains about 7,000 words and is in substance as follows:

Beginning with the statement of a desire that so much of his notification speech (p. 295) as refers to matters not mentioned in his letter shall be regarded as part of it, he again declares his "unqualified belief" in the gold standard, and proceeds to a specific discussion of "tariff reform, imperialism, economical administration and honesty in the public service," issues which "stand forth preeminent in the public mind." He describes tariff reform as "one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith," insisting that "the necessity for it was never greater than at the present time," and that "it should be undertaken at once in the interest of all our people." Proceeding then to a discussion of the Dingley tariff and its operation he concludes: "The two leading parties have always differed as to the principle of customs taxation. Our party has always advanced the theory that the object is the raising of revenue for support of the government whatever other results may incidentally flow therefrom. The Republican party, on the other hand, contends that customs duties should be levied primarily for protection, so called, with revenue as the subordinate purpose, thus using the power of taxation to build up the business and property of the few at the expense of the many. The difference of principle still obtains, but our party appreciates that the long continued policy of the country, as manifested in its statutes, makes it necessary that tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken on scientific principles, to the end that there should not be an immediate revolution in existing conditions. In the words of our platform we demand 'a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses, and for the common weal,

and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and discriminations.

It is true that the Republicans, who do not admit in their platform that the Dingley tariff needs the slightest alteration, are likely to retain a majority of the Federal Senate throughout the next Presidential term, and could, therefore, if they chose, block every attempt at legislative relief. But it should be remembered that the Republican party includes many revisionists, and I believe it will shrink from defying the popular will expressed unmistakably and peremptorily at the ballot box." Turning next to the question of Imperialism the letter explains Judge Parker's use in his speech of the term "self government" with reference to the Philippines, saying that it "was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it does mean, less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, cannot be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights, for a free people cannot withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self government and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights." Following this declaration as to Philippine independence the letter declares with reference to equality of citizenship that "the pledge of the platform to secure to our citizens, without distinction of race or creed, whether native born or naturalized, at home and abroad, the equal protection of the laws and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties, as their just due, should be made good to them." The remainder of the letter is devoted to questions of administration. It commits Judge Parker to civil service reform; to faithful administration of the act for the irrigation of the arid lands; to diligence in the construction of the Panama canal, while criticizing the Executive methods whereby that particular route was acquired; to oppose ship subsidies; to purify the Executive departments; and to abolish favoritism in army and navy appointments. Much space is given to the subject of pensions. Declaring that the Democratic party favors liberal pensions, the letter "denies the right of the Executive to usurp the power of Congress to legis-

late on that subject." This condemnation refers to pension order No. 78, which provides for an age pension to surviving soldiers and sailors over 62 years old, although Congress has never authorized age pensions. Repeating the challenge of the Republicans that the Democrats may take the responsibility of revoking this order if they wish to, Judge Parker says: "This suggests the suspicion, at least, that the order was made to create an issue—that it was supposed to present a strong strategic position in the battle of the ballots. On the assumption that the order, as stated by the Administration, is revocable at the pleasure of the Executive, it having been attempted, though perhaps unwitting encroachment upon the legislative power, and therefore unwarranted by the Constitution, I accept the challenge and declare that if elected I will revoke the order. But I go further and say that that being done, I will contribute my effort toward the enactment of a law, to be passed by the Executive, that will give an age pension without reference to disability, to the surviving heroes of the civil war, and under the provisions of which a pension may be accepted with dignity because of the consciousness that it comes as a just due from the people through their chosen representatives, and not as a largess distributed by the Chief Executive." Referring to foreign relations Judge Parker urges that new conditions have made it more than ever essential "to adhere strictly to the traditional policy of the country as formulated by its first President and never, in my judgment, wisely departed from—to invite friendly relations with all nations while avoiding entangling alliances with any. Such a policy means the cultivation of peace instead of the glorification of war, and the minding of our own business in lieu of spectacular intermeddling with the affairs of other nations. It means strict observance of the principles of international law, and condemns the doctrine that a great state, by reason of its strength, may rightfully appropriate the sovereignty or territory of a small one on account of its weakness. It means for other American states that we claim no rights and will assume no functions save those of a friend and of an ally and defender as against European aggressions. It means that we repudiate the role of the American continental policeman; that we refuse to act as debt collector for foreign states or their citizens; that we respect the independent sovereignty of each American state and its right to preserve order and otherwise regulate its own internal affairs in its own way; and that any intervention in its affairs by us is limited to the single office of enabling its people to work out their own political and national destiny for themselves free from the coercion of any European state." The remainder of the letter relates to extravagant expenditures, and

promises economy. The peroration is in full as follows:

I have put aside a congenial work, to which I had expected to devote my life, in order to assume, as best I can, the responsibilities your convention put upon me.

I solicit the cordial cooperation and generous assistance of every man who believes that a change of measures and of men at this time would be wise, and urge harmony of endeavor as well as vigorous action on the part of all so minded.

The issues are joined and the people must render the verdict.

Shall economy of administration be demanded or shall extravagance be encouraged?

Shall the wrongdoer be brought to bay by the people, or must justice wait upon political oligarchy?

Shall our government stand for equal opportunity or for special privilege?

Shall it remain a government of law or become one of individual caprice?

Shall we cling to the rule of the people, or shall we embrace benevolent despotism?

With calmness and confidence we await the people's verdict.

If called to the office of President, I shall consider myself the Chief Magistrate of all the people and not of any faction, and shall ever be mindful of the fact that on many questions of national policy there are honest differences of opinion. I believe in the patriotism, good sense, and absolute sincerity of all the people. I shall strive to remember that he may serve his party best who serves his country best.

If it be the wish of the people that I undertake the duties of the Presidency, I pledge myself, with God's help, to devote all my powers and energy to the duties of this exalted office.

The only other political news of the week of special interest relates to the contest in the Republican party of Wisconsin. The "stalwarts," with Samuel A. Cole as their candidate for governor; and the "half-breeds," with Robert M. La Follette for their candidate, were hopelessly split at the State convention (p. 119), whereupon they carried their contest to the national convention, which decided against the "half-breeds" (p. 182), who refused, however, to submit, contending that this decision had been forced upon the party by corporation interests represented by Senator Spooner and Postmaster General Payne, both of whom are leaders in the "stalwart" faction of their State. The matter then came into the Supreme Court of Wisconsin (p. 293), which issued an order in August requiring the Secretary of State to show cause why he should not be restrained from placing the names of the "half breed" candidates, and be compelled to place those of the "stalwart" candidates, on the official ballot in the Republican column. The arguments in this case, lasting two days and a half, were concluded on the 16th, and a decision was expected on the 27th; but on the latter day no decision came, and

there are no trustworthy explanations of the delay nor intimations of when the case may be decided. The situation is fairly described from Madison, Wis., by a staff correspondent of the Chicago Tribune (regular Republican) in its issue of the 28th, as follows:

This delay has complicated politics in Wisconsin greatly—State politics at least, and perhaps national. General Apathy may rule in other commonwealths, but he has no commission here. Every man and woman, and most of the children, are talking politics, but it is all State politics. They know in a general way that Theodore Roosevelt and Alton B. Parker are running for President of the United States, but that does not seem to concern them. What they are talking about is La Follette's chances of re-election, and will George W. Peck be able to beat him? Nobody seems to take Cook's chances seriously. Out of this has come a danger to the national ticket which some thoughtful men think they see. They are arguing that if the people pay more attention to State issues than to national ones the larger issue is apt to be forgotten in the smaller, and if Wisconsin should elect a Democratic governor it might easily elect a Democratic set of Presidential electors, as Wisconsin and Illinois both did in 1892, when the question at issue in each State was purely a local one—the school law. The danger men who are more concerned in national than in State politics see in any more delay in the judicial determination of the status of the rival claimants for the name of "Republican" on the official ballot, is that the longer the matter is delayed the more bitter will become the factional feeling. Already it is bitter enough. It has gone way past the argumentative stage and reached the denunciatory one—personal denunciations.

No change has occurred in the Chicago traction situation (p. 392), and the only news of special importance regarding it is the announcement on the 29th by the Chicago Examiner that the emergent petition for a referendum vote had the received 51,556 signatures. In the prior issue of the Examiner Mr. Victor F. Lawson, proprietor of the Daily News, which is strenuously opposing this referendum, was editorially invited to inspect the petition for the purpose of assisting in determining the genuineness, etc., of the signatures.

From across the water there is an unusual dearth of news of permanent interest. The Russian protest against the British-Thi-

etan treaty (p. 394) was presented to the Chinese government at Peking on the 22d. At the seat of the Russian-Japanese war in Manchuria (p. 392) advance movements by the Japanese are reported daily, but nothing decisive has occurred and no trustworthy reports of the preliminary movements are available.

The Land Reform league, which is the association of single taxers in Germany, will hold its fourteenth annual convention in Darmstadt on October 15th and 16th. This is the first attempt of the association to hold a convention elsewhere than in Berlin, where the association had its birth. The result is looked forward to as an interesting test of the spread of single tax theories throughout conservative south Germany. One hundred delegates from Germany have already been announced. Switzerland will be represented by Professor Schaer, the leader of the movement there, and delegates from France and Sweden are expected. All the German governments which are at the present time engaged in a reform of existing tax conditions have been invited to send delegates. This includes the governments of the Free Cities as well. Bremen and Hamburg have promised to send members of the senate, the president of the senate in the former city being himself a member of the League. The government of Hesse-Darmstadt is very favorably inclined towards the work of the League, and it is expected that the grand duke himself may receive the leading delegates. German single taxers are very conservative, as may be seen from these announcements, and put their faith in assistance from "above." The programme of the convention includes a resume of the work of the past year by the president of the League, Adolf Damaschke. Speeches will be made on legislative attempts at a taxation of increase in land values by Prof. Baumeister of Karlsruhe; on the housing problem and tuberculosis, by Dr. Gruber of Munich and Dr. Ebeling of Berlin; on governmental ownership of the water power, by Prof. Schaer of Basel; and on land reform and colonial administration, by Admiral Boet-

ers. Grace Isabel Colbron of the Women's Henry George league and the Manhattan Single Tax club of New York will speak on single tax work in America.

NEWS NOTES.

—Franklin Edson, at one time mayor of New York, died in that city on the 24th at the age of 72.

—Chief Joseph, the famous Nez Perce warrior, died on the Colville reservation, Washington, on the 21st, of heart disease.

—Judge George Gray, of Delaware, has been appointed to the chairmanship of the National Civic Federation as the successor of the late Senator Hanna.

—Rear Admiral Fernando P. Gilmores died at New York on the 25th at the age of 57. During the Spanish-American war he commanded the monitor Monadnock.

—Prof. Niels R. Flinsen, discoverer of the method of curing lupus, or tuberculosis of the face, with light rays, and director of the Flinsen Ray Institute at Copenhagen, died in that city on the 24th, at the age of 43.

—The twenty-seventh annual convention of the American Bar association met at St. Louis on the 27th. Under the auspices of this association a universal congress of lawyers and judges assembled in the same place on the 28th.

—President Roosevelt announced on the 24th to the delegates of the International Union (p. 392) that at an early date he would invite the nations of the world to send delegates to a second peace conference whose work should be supplemental to that of the first conference at The Hague.

—Prof. Howard Moore, of the Hyde Park high school, Chicago, is to speak on "Evidences of Evolution" at Masonic Temple, October 2 at three o'clock, on the occasion of the opening of the tenth course of weekly lectures and discussions under the auspices of the Chicago Society of Anthropology.

The military court which met at Huntsville to investigate the conduct of Company F, Alabama national guard, of that city, in not protecting the Negro prisoner, Horace Maples, from the hands of a mob on the night of September 7 (p. 393), reported to the governor on the 26th that the company was inefficient and should be cashiered.

—A Massachusetts justice of the peace having fined the third secretary of the British embassy for "scorching" with an automobile, the British embassy complained on the 26th to the State department at Washington, which addressed the Governor of Massachusetts on the subject, who has taken measures to repay the fine and to authorize an apology to the British government at the same time suggesting the propriety

of asking the recall of the offender by his government.

—A conference of the Institute of International Law, comprising the leading jurists of the world, opened at Edinburgh, Scotland, on the 22d under the presidency of Lord Reay. The principal subjects discussed were arbitration treaties, their proper interpretation, international conventions, the position of foreigners in the military service of belligerents, and declarations of war and neutrality.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (p. 310) for the two months ending August 31, 1904, as given by the statistical sheet of the Department of Commerce and Labor for August, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance
M	\$177,571,512	\$158,635,166	\$18,936,346 exp.
G	11,846,067	16,686,789	4,840,722 imp.
S	91,383,446	3,894,567	5,488,879 exp.
	\$198,801,025	\$179,216,522	\$19,584,503 exp.

—The Paris "Matin" makes the announcement that Great Britain, the United States, France, and Italy have refused to sign the treaty which was drafted by the late Mr. Plehve, Russian minister of the interior, with a view to insuring the extradition of anarchists to their country of origin, and that the diplomatic negotiations have been closed. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Denmark, Sweden, Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia and Switzerland signed the treaty.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PARKER'S LETTER.

Chicago Daily News (Ind.), Sept. 26.—There is a sort of pastoral air about the letter from first to last, indicating good intentions rather than ambition.

Buffalo Enquirer (Dem.), Sept. 26.—The term masterly is one which may be applied without exaggeration and in entire sincerity to the acceptance letter considered as a whole and in every specific detail.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Sept. 26.—Every issue which confronts this country is met squarely and vigorously, and the Democrat who does not find this utterance satisfactory has no place in the party of Jefferson.

Columbus (O.) Press-Post (Dem.), Sept. 26.—If it is true, as claimed, that many Democrats are waiting to see whether the candidate measures up to the platform, the most rabid opponent must admit that he is "getting there."

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Sept. 27.—The essence of the Parker letter is a declaration the Executive must rule by law and that he has no authority to overstep the limits of the Constitution or to construe it as he sees fit.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 26.—Judge Parker states the issues as he views them in a clear and succinct way. His letter will be more widely read because of the fact that his views on all public questions have not been well known to the people generally.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Sept. 26.—The Judge goes on to say that the four leading issues are tariff reform, imperialism, economical administration and honesty in public service. . . . Does not Judge

Parker think the trust question is entitled to a place among the "leading issues?"

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 26.—It sets forth what may be hoped for from Mr. Parker and supplies an infallible index to his character, revealing, as it does, high dignity, honesty that partakes largely of candor, sincerity, devotion to fundamental democracy and an instinctive love for the orderly, warranted course.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Sept. 26.—Like his speech of acceptance, this letter of Judge Parker lacks definiteness on almost ever vital point. It leaves the reader puzzled and perplexed. In not one sentence does it appeal to the heart, and not often does it touch the head, of the thoroughly alive American citizen.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Sept. 26.—As regards the Democratic past, he enters a plea of guilty, with some extenuating circumstances. . . . As regards the Philippines, he would give them a promise of independence as soon as the natives "are reasonably prepared for it." How gloriously indefinite this sounds, when coming from a man to whom the Democratic hosts have looked for constructive leadership!

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Sept. 26.—If he was stung by the President's references to some of the views he has expressed and to the history of his party he does not retort in the sentences of an eager, fiery debater—such sentences, for example, as Mr. Bryan might have used. . . . There is hardly any response to the partisan demand for a more intensely aggressive leadership, and the antithesis that is thus presented to the President's letter is remarkable.

New Haven Union (Dem.), Sept. 26.—In the main an admirable presentation of his position on the issues proclaimed in the platform of the Democratic party, and contrasts most favorably with President Roosevelt's intemperate and undignified message to the country. . . . Not a word about impending legislation in Congress in which hundreds of thousands of the followers of William J. Bryan are vitally interested! He leaves them and the public entirely in the dark.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Sept. 26.—Calm in tone, frank enough in expression and perhaps as courageous as we could expect under all the circumstances. It may not please all Democrats and it may fall short of firing the country's heart as a more vigorous and aggressive deliverance might have done, but sober minds will find assurance in it of that safety and sanity which has come to be regarded as a desirable if not a necessary escape from the hot-headed strenuousness of the belligerent flourisher of the big stick.

INDECENCY IN JOURNALISM.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Sept. 27.—With that reverence for the proprieties which only a Republican machine journal can properly enjoy, the Commercial yesterday [the Chicago Chronicle (Rep.) of September 28, was guilty of the same inexcusable offense] said: "Parker was absolutely undecided what his letter should be even to the eleventh hour. . . . Late on Saturday came from Esopus a long string of corrections, emendations and excisions and turns to this paragraph and to that paragraph." That any newspaper in the United States would violate the trust reposed in it, in calling public attention to a matter which it received in confidence and which it was bound in honor not to divulge is to be regretted. It would have been just as honorable for the Commercial to publish Mr. Parker's letter before its release as it is for it to refer to alterations made in it while it was in the Commercial's possession as a confidential communication.

CHICAGO TRACTION.

Chicago Daily News (Ind. and pro. ord.), Sept. 26.—The petition which has been sent

out for signatures asking that the board of election commissioners place upon the ballots at the spring election a question testing the views of the voters on the Chicago City railway ordinance now before the council asks also that there be printed on the ballots the following questions: "Shall the city council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway company? Shall the city council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to any street railroad company?" Any voter opposed to the impracticable schemes of immediate municipal ownership advocates, should he express himself on these questions would either have to support their schemes by casting a negative vote or he would say in effect by an affirmative vote: "Yes, the city council shall pass any ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway company or any other company." What a monstrously unfair position to place the voter in! . . . An affirmative vote by the people of Chicago upon the propositions quoted above might be held to authorize the passage by the city council of the worst franchise ordinance that could be framed.

Chicago Examiner (Dem. and anti-ord.), Sept. 27.—Who are the people that the Chicago Daily News has branded as "dishonest" because they are opposing a fraudulent franchise for a piratical street railroad company? Judge Tuley, for instance. . . . Judge Dunne and Judge Barnum . . . all the members of the Turners' societies . . . the members of the Referendum and the Municipal Ownership leagues . . . the 120,863 citizens that at the last election voted against this grab and set upon it the stamp of their disapproval. All these, according to the Chicago Daily News, are extremely "dishonest" persons, unworthy of the respect of their fellowmen, and engaged in a low, disreputable enterprise. What enterprise is that? Trying to prevent a rich corporation that has for years swindled, robbed and maltreated the public, from getting from the city an almost priceless privilege to which it has no shadow of right, and for which it is to pay practically nothing. Honest men, according to the News, are those that are, for various reasons of interest and profit, engaged in helping in this plundering scheme. The newspapers that hold stock in the street car company and will share in the loot if this franchise goes through, they are the "honest" newspapers. The franchise is a fraud and a lie, and is being pushed along by methods that will not bear examination, but the newspapers that lie about it and misrepresent it, and are trying to bunco the people into accepting it, they are "honest." And what is the authority that decides in this way between "honest" and "dishonest" men?

MISCELLANY

ROME AND AN . . . ER.

She asked for all things, . . . dominion such
As never man had . . .
The gods first gave . . . lightly, touch by
touch,
O'erthrew he, seven-hilled throne.
Imperial Power, that hungerest for the
globe,
Restrain thy conquering feet,
Lest the same Fates that spun thy purple
robe
Should weave thy winding sheet.
—William Watson.

GENTLE "SAVAGES."

The history of Chief Joseph and his tribe is a typical Indian romance. What is now the state of Idaho and part of

Oregon was the original home of the Nez Percés. The tribe welcomed and succored Lewis and Clark on their wonderful expedition to the Pacific in 1804. It was the Nez Percés who sent a delegation east and asked that the "book" might be sent them, that they might learn the white man's religion. Within a period of almost 70 years there is but one case on record where a Nez Percé shed the blood of a white man.

Then the white settlers began to take the lands of the Nez Percés, and then there followed an Indian war, in which the methods of the Indian were pitted against the skill and discipline of the United States troops. Chief Joseph and his band of a few hundred followers gave Gen. Miles one of the hardest campaigns he ever undertook. The end was the usual one, and finally the chief and all that was left of his tribe became wards of the nation.—Chicago Record-Herald of September 23.

THE FIRST CASE OF "RECALL."

HOW IT HAPPENED.

News dispatch from Los Angeles, Cal., to the Chicago Examiner of Sept. 17, under date of the 17th.

For the first time in the history of republican government the impeachment of an unfaithful public servant has been sustained at the polls.

Growing out of the action of a cabal in the city council of this city, known as the "Big Six," in awarding the contract for the city's printing to the Los Angeles Times at \$15,000 a year in excess of the highest bid of its competitors, and the ratification of this action over the veto of Mayor M. P. Snyder, has been invoked that provision of the city charter which provides for the Recall and retirement to private life of officials guilty of unfaithful service.

Immediately on the passage of the bill awarding the printing contract to the Times, the Good Government League began agitation for the Recall of the six aldermen who constituted a majority of the council, and whose acts in the matter of granting franchises, etc., had been unsatisfactory for months. Councilman J. P. Davenport, of the Sixth ward—the workingman's ward and the worst sufferer at the hands of the "Big Six"—was selected as the first to be Recalled.

Following the provisions of the charter, a petition was started, the minimum number of signatures of which must be 25 per cent. of the voters of the ward. Within two weeks it bore 1,300 signatures out of 2,864 votes cast at the previous election.

This petition was presented to the

city clerk for the certification of the names it bore. It was checked against the city directory by that official, and was thrown out for the reason that many of the addresses placed opposite the names did not tally with the directory.

Another petition was started. Other charges were added and the second document received more signatures than the first.

The fight thereafter was a hot one, Councilman Davenport invoking the aid of the saloon element to secure his reelection. The election was held yesterday, and resulted in the ratification of the Recall, Davenport being defeated by a vote of two to one.

A NEW WRINKLE IN CITY GOVERNMENT.

From the Denver (Colo.) News.

The charter of the city of Los Angeles provides for the "recall" of officials believed to have proven themselves unworthy of the trust bestowed upon them.

Six of the city aldermen have been carrying matters with a high hand, granting franchises that were unwarranted, and awarding the printing contract to a paper whose bid was \$13,000 higher than the next lowest office.

The Good Government League selected a member—one of the six—from one ward by the machinery of the new recall. The petition for a recall and a new election had to contain 25 per cent. of the voters of the ward.

Half the number which voted at the preceding election was soon obtained, but the city clerk refused to accept the names of such as had moved since the directory was issued. A second petition the unwilling official was obliged to accept. The election was ordered. An effort to secure an injunction failed, and the matter came to a vote.

The alderman attacked was defeated by a vote of two to one, in spite of the active efforts of the elements in whose interests his malfeasance had been carried on.

Doubtless the remaining five aldermen will now be proceeded against, and, if equally successful, Los Angeles will begin to believe that there is, after all, such a thing as popular rule.

The first charter drafted for greater Denver, which was defeated by the corporation interests which are undertaking now to run both city and state, contained a provision for the "recall" or removal of officials deemed unworthy by the people. On petition of 30 per cent. of the vote cast at the last election the holder of any office was required to go before the people for approval or disapproval of his course. The charter, of course, was defeated, because if

there is any one thing that corporation bosses don't want it is that the people shall be able to remove unfaithful public officers. The people of Los Angeles are fortunate in possessing the power.

THE CHICAGO CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE.

For The Public.

Many of Chicago's good citizens, who really and truly believe that they are Civil Service supporters, know so little of the actual conditions of employment by the municipality that they are actually a hindrance and detriment to the proper enforcement of the Civil Service Law. They say with loud voices that a Civil Service law is a good thing when properly enforced, and they believe in it, and would like to see it enforced, but that City employes are grafters and crooked, and what can they do?

If they happen to want favors in the way of a little patronage for friends or relatives, they don't hesitate to look for it, always crying out for an exception in their particular case, and the strict enforcement of the Law against all others. But this is human nature and must be expected in all reforms, so it must be met by the real friends and supporters of the Law, and provision made to educate and lead those would-be friends of the Law into paths of righteousness, where they may be of some actual use. As a means to this end a short history of the Chicago Civil Service League may be of some value at this time.

Along about the end of 1900 two distinct and separate groups of Civil Service employes became actuated with the belief that something must be done by the employes themselves to combat the political influences that were continually working against them. By a very fortunate and singular coincidence they both came in contact with Mr. Western Starr, the well known attorney, who even then had begun to be known as a political fighter for the Law. Through the good offices of Mr. Starr the two groups met, and as their aims and ideas were the same, it did not take long to perfect an organization, which was done with an initial membership of about 15 or 18, in January, 1901.

All persons believing in the Civil Service Law were made eligible to membership, and the object to be attained was "The strict enforcement of the Civil Service Law," as applied to Chicago. The subject was looked at this way: The theoretical reformers had obtained the passage of the Law;

the people had voted on the subject, and by a 50,000 majority had elected to put the Law into effect. Reluctantly and with many evasions, and even downright violations, the Mayor and his Cabinet were making a mere pretense of enforcing the Law, while the "practical" politicians, the "ward heelers," "handy men," "bosses," et al., were cursing it with bitter, burning words, and scheming with devilish ingenuity to put it out of business. The Law was in dire danger of becoming worse than a failure; it was up to somebody to come to its support. If the actual bona fide Civil Service employes, those who were being benefited under the Law, did not support it, who would?

Under such circumstances the League was born. It was regarded over in the City Hall as an Ishmaelite, a renegade, a thing to be avoided and denounced. But there were a few brave souls among those few pioneers who thrived on war. The breath of battle was sweet to their nostrils, and knowing that they were in the right, they sought the enemy in his own camp, and carried the fighting to him. What an ally they had in Mr. Starr! He haunted the Civil Service Commissioners' office, he hauled them over the coals and roasted them to a turn one day; then helped them out of some difficulty the next. So it went on from day to day; cases were taken to the Grand Jury; indictments were obtained; after awhile trials came off, and, wonderful to relate, convictions were obtained and punishments meted out for the violation of the Civil Service Law. Members of the League began to have more confidence in themselves and the Law. Little by little they began to talk about the League to their friends and fellow workmen. The Law began to be enforced more strictly; examinations were actually "on the square." Members of the League managed to take about all the examinations that were held. They wanted to be on the ground and see for themselves how things were done. It might be handy for evidence sometime.

As time went on the League began to grow. Employes of one department talked about it to those of another. By and by people began to ask for application blanks. They did not have to be urged to come in; they no longer regarded the Chicago Civil Service League as a joke. It was a grim reality, and they made haste to seek admittance. Some of them did not get in. The leaders in the League, right from the start, took a strong position in regard to new members. The only requirement of appli-

cants is that "they believe in the Civil Service Law." But as actions sometimes speak louder than words, a man's history and his previous attitude toward the Law is taken into account, and while there may be conversions from the heathen state of a politician to the more Christian condition of a Civil Service man, still an applicant to the League who is known to have been at some previous time a spoilsman, is scrutinized very carefully, and, as a considerable number know by experience, a pretense of belief in the Law is not sufficient to open the doors to them.

And so the League has grown and expanded till at the present time more than 300 earnest, active supporters of Civil Service principles are enrolled as its members. Nearly every department of the City Service is represented, and now applicants are continually seeking admittance. Probably, in all the history of organizations in any way connected with City affairs, this is the first one which has never looked or asked for favors of any kind. Its members know that having complied with the requirements of the Law they have rights under the Law, and those rights are all they ask. But they do ask for them with a mighty loud and insistent voice, and they are going to keep right on asking, and woe be to the politician who thinks he is big enough to say them nay. He will wish he hadn't. That's all.

In conclusion: The Chicago Civil Service League knows no creed, no party, no nationality, no sex, no color. It has one object—"the enforcement of the Civil Service Law in Chicago." It is no reform organization. It is a practical business proposition, designed to prevent lawlessness and discourage law-breakers. It asks no favors, but it would be pleased to have the respect and confidence of all good citizens; and having gained these, it promises to so safeguard and protect the Civil Service Law of Chicago, that in time to come this City may be pointed to as the best governed City of this great Country of ours.

PHILIP STEELE,
Of the Board of Directors.

THE MEASURE OF SUCCESS.

Portions of an address delivered in Cincinnati, Ohio, Sept. 25, 1904, by Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the Vine St. Congregational Church.

What is our philosophy of life? What do we strive for? What is our measure of success? What star guides us? What goal urges us on? This question of aims and motives is pre-eminently the theme of religion. If the church has any message to the world, it relates to this question: What

aims and ambitions are worthy of a man, and what should be his measure of success?

In the woods this summer I noticed an oak sapling that had sprung up beneath a group of trees, the shade of which was so dense that the sapling sought to escape from it. Instead of growing erect, it had stooped and passed under the darksome branches and made a break for light and liberty. So eager was it to get to the sunshine that it had inclined to an angle of 45 degrees, and in that attitude of supplication it seemed to pray for its share of life and light.

As saplings thirst for the light, so man craves happiness; and the course of each is swayed by what his nature demands. Man, like the tree, strains and struggles to arrive somewhere; but, unlike the tree, he can stop and inquire if that for which he strives is worth while, and if he chooses, he can change his course and go in search of some other and higher good. His desires are capable of education, and this is because he is gifted, as trees are not, with the faculty of taking himself in hand, of thinking about the question of his destiny, and to some extent shaping it to his taste.

A man may be unlearned. The word "philosophy" or "ethics" may not be in his vocabulary. Yet he lives, and the manner of his life shows his philosophy. What he thinks, that is what he is. The man who uses the spade as well as he who wields the pen has each his scheme of life and his course is molded by it. What is our scheme of life? Is it the best? Is it developing, or deforming us? Are we growing erect, with our face to the stars, or are we bent and crippled with gazing on the ground?

A man's philosophy will always be influenced by his environment. But there is still a margin of responsibility left to his soul. That margin is the dynamic of human progress.

In the same environment and with the same chances, so far as we can see, one man will be sodden with beer and beastliness, while his brother, with ashen cheeks and hungry soul, will pore over a book in his miserable attic, while the desire for liberty rages like a fever within him, and the angels sing him songs of a world made free.

Take the world with a brave heart. Let the years of our life throb with high thought and true endeavor. Drink the full cup. Taste the whole of it. The toil and the play, the joy and the sorrow—these are but the materials with which we build for eter-

nity. Fear nothing. Welcome whatever comes. Even death—let us approach it with the interest of the schoolboy for whom the teacher unravels the mysteries of a difficult problem. The spirit is free. On earth there is no bondage for it. In heaven there is no terror. The days are opportunities. Action is glorious. The higher the aims, the broader the sympathies, the more abundant the life, the greater the joy of it.

You can't expect to lynch the Negro in the winter and have him pick your cotton in the summer.—Booker T. Washington.

"Up to this time th' issue has been measures not men. Th' rayublicans ar-re ashamed iv all their measures an' th' dimmycrats have no measures that fit."—F. P. Dunne's "Mr. Dooley."

I find three classes of men who are not willing that women should have political equality. First, the fossilized and crystallized class, who cry out against any change in church or state; the man who is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." Second, the man of colossal conceit, who thinks a woman's brain was cut on the bias, and his own on the straight. Third, the very young man, who is learning to smoke his first cigar.—Kate F. O'Connor.

BOOKS

LETTERS FROM A CHINESE OFFICIAL.

A Philadelphia clergyman has given voice to the humble utterance that "the people of America are preeminently the children of Providence." By his side stands an imposing band who, presumably in like humility, aver that no race can compare in all virtuous qualities with the Anglo-Saxon, no business methods can equal those of America, no culture is so subtle as ours and no religion so civilizing as the one we profess and are willing to share, by means of powder and shell if need be.

There is another band of Americans—as large and as influential, it is earnestly hoped—who, while recognizing the grand achievements of the Anglo-Saxon race, while admitting the American faculty for business, the existence of true culture and the beauty of Christianity, can yet have the honesty, the judgment, and the altruism to see that neither our achievements, our commercial methods and ethics, our religious tendencies nor our culture are what they should be, or can always stand comparison with those of certain other peoples whom we despise and reject.

One of this class, therefore, will receive with openmindedness and lay aside with mingled shame and admiration a book recently published. This is "The Letters from a Chinese Official" (published by McClure, Phillips & Co., New York, 75c.).

The author's name is withheld, and much discussion has arisen concerning the authenticity of the book—the genuineness of its Chinese origin. But since no less a person than the Chinese minister at Washington has vouched for the Orientality of its authorship, averring that he knows the writer, we need not further question. Even without such assurance, it is hard to see in it anything spurious or affected, and we are ready to believe that the author is a Chinaman of the Chinese—one who for many years has lived in England, holding some important post. "A long residence in England gives me some right to speak of your institutions; while absence from my own country has not disqualified me to speak of ours."

And so, although the book was written primarily for the people of England, yet having received many of her distinctive characteristics, and the same blood flowing in our veins, we may rightfully be included in the analysis and may not escape the arraignment of this Eastern critic. For the object of these letters is to analyze the English nation—to study its qualities, its tendencies, its political, social and religious conditions.

It is not an easy matter to select representative passages for quotation, since quotable sentences follow one after the other on every page. There is a vigor and finality about them that cause one to pause and ponder. "With you the individual is the unit, and all the units are free. No one is tied, but also no one is rooted." To this lack of fixity, due primarily to the looseness and indifference of our family ties and relations, he attributes our unrest, our confusion, our lack of morality. He calls our civilization "an economic chaos," and adds: "The salient characteristic of your civilization is its irresponsibility."

These and many more are his judgments—shrewd, clear-sighted and deep-probing, but uttered always with the utmost courtesy and without manifest bitterness or prejudice.

And then having drawn his picture of Occidental life in general, and that of England in particular, he hangs another beside it—that of his own land and people, the life and aims, faith and earnestness of those whom we are pleased to call "heathen." It is undoubtedly a fair scene he puts before us, the colors all aglow and the shadows very faint. It might be urged that his deep love for his country has led him to overestimate the good and

hindered him from seeing the evil. But remembering that his discernment of our defects has not blinded him to the good that is in us, we may trust him to see and to present his country in its entirety. "We measure the degree of civilization not by accumulation of the means of living, but by the character and value of the life lived. Where there are no humane and stable relations, no reverence for the past, no respect even for the present, but only a cupidinous ravishment of the future, there, we think, there is no true society. And we would not if we could rival you in your wealth, your sciences, and your arts, if we must do so at the cost of imitating your institutions." And again: "None is master, none servant; but equality, concrete and real, regulates and sustains their intercourse. Healthy toil, sufficient leisure, frank hospitality, a content born of habit and undisturbed by chimerical ambitions"—these are some of the more pronounced characteristics of his fellow countrymen.

As to their life, their religion, their government, their devotion to the soil, their love of home and attachment to each other, their preference for "the simple life" over "the strenuous life"—all these are noted and justified. And then putting the one picture beside the other, he points out wherein these two great peoples differ—with a difference almost inconceivable—and shows that there is in China no desire to adopt Western civilization; that there is, in fact, and will continue to be most vigorous efforts to keep out of China the aggressive European. For aggressive he is, coming under the pretext of civilizing and Christianizing "the barbarian"—he in reality is demoralizing and defrauding.

And so, as I said, having read this book one will lay it down with mingled shame and admiration: Shame that such things be (for we must admit the truth of the presentation), and admiration for the scholarly Oriental who can thus grasp and express the very essence of a life and condition so vastly different from his own.

As a piece of literature the book is masterly; as a work in ethics, it is salutary.

MARY HEATH LEE.

PAMPHLETS.

Fairhope Colony, which has become famous through widely published reports about it as a successful single tax colony, has published a description of itself (Fairhope, Ala.; price, 10 cents) illustrated with local pictures. The title to the land of this colony is vested in the corporation as trustee for residents, who hold under 99-year leases subject to a ground rent to be annually assessed in accordance with annual appraisements based upon the value of each occupant's holding regardless of the

improvements in or upon it. This plan is under the avowed principle of utilizing ground rent for the common benefit and equalizing the varying financial advantages of the different sites. The pamphlet is designed to show that the justice and wisdom of the principle has been demonstrated in practice by the colony, and this it seems clearly to do.

PERIODICALS.

—Eltweed Pomeroy and Robert Tyson have merged the Direct Legislation Record in Wetmore's Weekly, of St. Louis,

to the first issue of which each month they will contribute four pages on direct legislation and proportional representation.

—Thomas W. Lawson appears now to have really begun his story of "Frenzied Finance" in Everybody's. The October number is devoted to "Gas" Adicks, out of whose operations in connection with "Bay State Gas" grew the great copper "bunco" of the Standard Oil crowd.

—Readers of Out West and friends of its editor, Charles F. Lummis, will be in-

terested in reading in the "Booklovers" for October a description, by Henrietta P. Keith, of Mr. Lummis's country house at Los Angeles, built by his own hands and as unique as the most picturesque sentence that ever followed the scratch of his pen.

—Trumbull White's Red Book for October looks more prosperous than ever and is no less interesting. Distinctly a short-story magazine, it has won a place with lovers of light stories which makes the reader who is not satisfied with fiction alone wish that it might

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY—THE NEW LIBRARY EDITION OF THE COMPLETE

WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE

AND LIFE OF HENRY GEORGE, BY HENRY GEORGE, JR.

Just published in ten volumes, handsomely bound in buckram, gilt tops, untrimmed edges, etc. It contains a full set of portraits, and is in all respects equal to the well-known MEMORIAL EDITION, issued in 1896, which is now out of print, and which sold for \$25.00 per set.

What Tom L. Johnson Says of This New Enterprise.

Gentlemen:—

I wish to congratulate you on bringing out a new library edition of the works of Henry George. The day is not far distant when the professional or business man who does not understand the philosophy of Henry George will stand discredited in any intelligent community.

A knowledge of this philosophy will broaden and strengthen any man; morally and intellectually; will make him a more public spirited citizen, and better equip him for the activities of business and professional life. It will give him a clearer comprehension of his duties to his fellow man, to the State and to the Great Ruler of the Universe; lifting him immeasurably above the plane of vanity, sordidness and selfishness which now seems to be the chief end of man.

I hope and believe that your enterprise will be a success beyond your most sanguine expectations.

Very truly yours,

TOM L. JOHNSON.

Volume I. Progress and Poverty.

Volume II. Social Problems.

Volume III. The Land Question.

This volume contains three short works: (1) A brochure of seventeen short chapters and entitled, "The Land Question"; (2) "Property in Land," a passage-at-arms with the Duke of Argyle; (3) "The Condition of Labor," an open letter to Pope Leo XIII. in reply to the Pope's encyclical letter on "the condition of labor."

Volume IV. Protection or Free Trade.

Volume V. A Perplexed Philosopher.

Volumes VI and VII. The Science of Political Economy.

As an addition to Vol. VII appears the celebrated lecture entitled "Moses," which was written and delivered in San Francisco in 1878, while the author was writing "Progress and Poverty."

Volume VIII. Our Land and Land Policy.

Volumes IX and X. The Life of Henry George.

This handsome set of books, of uniform size and boxed, will be sent to any address, in the United States for \$17.50 in installment payments of \$2.00. Deliveries in Canada or Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for custom duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for custom duties and expressage.

The Prophet of San Francisco

An interesting sketch of Henry George's life with a lucid explanation of the Single Tax philosophy by Louis F. Post.

CLOTH, 40 CENTS; FOUR COPIES, \$1.00 POSTPAID
PAPER, 20 CENTS; TEN COPIES, \$1.00 POSTPAID

L. S. DICKEY & CO., 79 Dearborn Street, CHICAGO, ILL.



BUT HE COULDN'T DO IT.

U. S.—“Now, my little man, let's see if you can read. Say those words out loud, and clear, and distinct, with moral earnestness, and I'll give you this sugar-stick!”

try its hand at the kind of work for which another short story magazine, McClure's, has blazed the way.

—The best review of the life of Stanley that has appeared since his death is the article in the Cornhill magazine by Sidney Low. He shows Stanley to have been more of a man than many have thought. It is quite likely that Stanley's lack of suavity prejudiced many contemporaries against him. “But,” says Mr. Low, “men who feel intensely, who have suffered deeply under unmerited injuries, and who have Stanley's defiant sense of justice, are not always so tactful and polite as the social amenities require.” J. H. D.

—Under the apt heading, “The Philosophy of Freedom,” the Nebraska Independent continues to publish valuable contributions on the single tax. In the issue of September 15 it gives a column of Brief Paragraphs for Busy Men, by J. B. Vining, secretary of the Ohio Single Tax League. Almost every recent issue of the Independent has contained the full text of some speech by Watson. These speeches, in their literary quality as well as in intense earnestness, surpass any that are being delivered in any party during the present campaign. There are passages in them worthy of becoming classic as expressions of genuine democracy. J. H. D.

—The similarities between the present campaign and that of 1852 are ably set forth in an editorial in the Springfield Republican of September 21. There

are, indeed, many parallels in the political field between the present decade and that of the 50's. Both parties 50 years ago dabbled with the great absorbing question of that day, just as both parties are now dallying with the still greater absorbing question of to-day. Then, as now, as the Republican says, both parties had adopted platforms which sought to secure the favor of established interests against any disturbance of the existing order. Incidentally the editorial pays Mr. Bryan the compliment of showing that what he has said in the campaign points the only way for the Democrats to follow if they would arouse popular interest, that is, the way that leads away from “European conceptions of where glory must be sought.” J. H. D.

—In the Ladies' Home Journal for September Mr. Hamilton W. Mable gives valuable lists of books, having especially in view the literature for young people which is to replace the old-time Sunday school books. They are all good; books of entertainment, books of instruction, books of incentive, and so on. Yet in going over the list one is reminded of the fact how entirely conservative is the reading that is prepared and recommended for young people. The biographies, for example, are never those of men who were ahead of their times and fought without personal triumph the social evils about them, but of men who simply successfully represented the level of opinion in their day. We give children biographies of the

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 wholly 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 filling.

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BUNNEX BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 4094 Corlandt, Rooms 1011-1012,
NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON,
CONTRACTOR.
Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley Roads built complete and financed.
58 Liberty Street, New York.

Campaign Subscriptions

THE PUBLIC will be sent during the campaign to persons not now on its subscription list, for

TEN CENTS

This will include the issue of November 19, 1904. Address: BOX 687, CHICAGO.

SINGLE TAXERS. Please send me your name and address on postal card. I have something important to mail you. BILLY RADCLIFFE, S. T., Youngstown, O.

NOTICE. All persons interested in political, social and economic questions should carefully and thoroughly investigate the theory of Single Tax. Send for free literature to BUREAU OF SINGLE TAX INFORMATION, Springfield, Illinois.

Cavours, but not of the Mazzinis; of the Lincolns, but not of the Garrisons; of the Roosevelts, but not of the Henry Georges. No wonder, when we consider the one-sided reading set before us in childhood, that nine-tenths of us grow up to be conventional and conservative. J. H. D.