

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1904.

Number 341.

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.

What kind of campaign management can that have been which sent Senator Tillman to Chicago to support Parker by appealing to the supposed animosity of the stockyards strikers toward Negroes because some Negroes were imported by the packers to take the strikers' places?

Until he touches upon the race question, Senator Tillman is one of the best democrats, in the fundamental sense of the word, to be found in American public life. But whenever and wherever he faces that question, he loses his democratic balance. It is the worst kind of bad policy, therefore, to assign him to campaign work in any place where the right of Negroes to vote is respected by public sentiment, yet where the relations of the races may become a subject of discussion. He is certain to solidify the Negro vote against his cause, and not unlikely to drive away no inconsiderable number of white voters besides.

But this incident suggests more than bad campaign management. It bears every indication of premeditated deviltry. Owing to the loss of their strike, the stockyards strikers were naturally bitter against the imported "scabs" who had caused their defeat. This feeling would have been the same had all the "scabs" been white men. The hatred was at bottom in no ordinary sense a race hatred. But as many of the imported "scabs" were Negroes, the feeling did take on an appearance of race animosity. The Negroes were hated, not because they were Negroes,

but because they were "scabs;" but their distinguishing color involved their race in that hatred, just as it would have involved whites of distinctive national appearance not represented among the strikers. It was to fan this spark of possible race hatred into flame, that Tillman, whose anti-Negro sentiment is known to be strong and uncontrollable, was sent into the stockyards district of Chicago. The purpose was as cruel as the policy was suicidal.

Parker's managers are not the only unwise ones in this campaign. Watson's chances of polling a vote significantly large are endangered by the recklessness of Populist papers in denouncing Bryan. It would doubtless have been gratifying to Populist leaders had Bryan made the inexcusable mistake last summer of bolting his party, though no more so than it would have been to the plutocrats and wire-pullers who have acquired temporary control of its organization; but their disappointment serves them badly when it excites them to the point of denouncing Bryan as a traitor to the cause of genuine democracy.

Among Bryan's friends are some who, while recognizing the propriety of his course as a leader within the Democratic party, have felt that their confidence in him and their approval of his course would not necessitate their following his advice when they come to vote at the approaching Presidential election. As these men are human, nothing could better serve to divert them from "scratching" for Watson than the unnecessary and unjust attacks which Populist papers are making upon Bryan's good sense and good faith.

It is this kind of irresponsible

run-a-muck leadership, to which the Populist party is sadly subject, that discourages fundamental democrats, disgusted with the plutocracy of their own parties, from trusting the Populist party as an affirmative political force. Governed too much by the sympathetic nerve system and too little by the cerebro-spinal, it has yet to learn that political leadership demands horse sense and patience as well as sincerity and energy. As a negative force in this campaign, this party has unquestionably been welcomed by many Bryanites; but they would be approximately angelic if they did not "cool off" under insinuations against the sincerity of a leader whom they trust, and sneers at a course which he adopts with their approval.

That Bryan is supporting Parker in all good faith, no one who knows the simple straightforwardness of the man can doubt. That he is doing it without enthusiasm is natural. Even the strongest supporters of Judge Parker are without enthusiasm. There is nothing to be enthusiastic about. That Bryan does not deviate from the straight path by supporting Parker is evident. Fidelity to a cause does not always call for a "bolt" when one's party organization falters or its candidate is doubtful. Until a leader's cause within his own party is finally lost, he is under no call to get out of it. Quite the contrary. His followers are free to support him by supporting his party, or to support him by disciplining his party at the polls. They may go out and come back at will. But a leader's place is within his party until he concludes that its regeneration is impossible. Bryan has so construed his obligations of leadership, and Jeffersonian democrats who trust him are not likely to stamp with their approval any

wanton assaults upon his good judgment in so deciding or his good faith in so acting. If Bryan Democrats who wish to discipline their party recoil from voting the Populist ticket, it will be in no small measure because they resent these attacks upon the man whom they regard as preeminently the national leader of Jeffersonian democracy.

With many Bryan Democrats, however, there is a feeling which even the foolishness of Populist papers cannot allay. Though they succeed in turning them away from Watson, it will take more than that to turn those voters toward Judge Parker. They feel that if Parker were to receive a large vote it would be equivalent to a final surrender of the Democratic party to its plutocratic element. And the feeling is well warranted. To quote a humorous paper in support of this assertion may seem incongruous, but Life, while delightfully humorous in method, is really so very serious in purpose that there is no inappropriateness in quoting it on such a point. An ardent supporter of Parker, Life sympathetically explains the motives of a certain class of Democrats in voting against Roosevelt, by saying that their—

foremost interest is not his defeat, but the medication of their own party. They want to see the conservative element in their party confirmed in such a share of control, that when the Democrats win—as they will presently—the party may be fit to administer the government.

The meaning of that is very clear, despite its euphemistic shadings. "Conservative," in the connection in which Life uses it, is Waldorf-Astoria for plutocratic; while the reference to "fitness to administer the government" is, under the circumstances of recent Democratic history and Life's attitude toward it, a very plain intimation that yokels like Bryan are quite unfit for any such patrician service. No more terse and accurate description of the Democratic situation than this by Life is possible; and the fact is realized by others than Life and its "conserva-

tive" Democrats "fit to administer the government." It is realized by many a loyal friend of Mr. Bryan. While these voters approve of Bryan's regularity as a responsible leader in the organization of his party, they look forward without much sorrow to that party's overwhelming defeat at this election as its best "medication." Here is their problem, precisely the one that Life states: Shall the plutocratic element in the Democratic party be confirmed in control of the party, as Life desires; or shall that control be discredited? Parker's election would confirm it, but with some compensations in the way of improved administration. It would be confirmed also by his defeat by only a narrow margin, and in that case without any compensations. But Parker's emphatic defeat would put an end to the control by the plutocratic ring that captured the party at St. Louis. So far as we have been able to discover the sentiments of radical Democrats over the country, they are, with but few exceptions, in entire agreement with Life, as to the significance of a vote for Judge Parker; but unlike Life, these Democrats are inclined to "medicate" their party by casting their votes against "the conservative element" which seeks to control it. They are somewhat confirmed in this inclination, moreover, by recollections of the "medication" to which Life's "conservative" element of the party subjected it in 1896 and 1900.

Walter Wellman has added nothing to a comparatively good reputation as a journalist, by his report on the Colorado situation. He offered in his report to convict the labor leaders of Colorado of moral responsibility for the deplorable conditions there, "before a jury composed of the decent, honorable labor organizations of the country." To this challenge the Chicago Federation of Labor responded with an invitation to Mr. Wellman and his employers "to select a party of 12 prominent men from the labor organizations of the country," and prove Mr.

Wellman's charges before that tribunal. The response fully met the challenge. But Mr. Wellman backed out (p. 355). Because he regarded the response as offensive in some of its language he declined to "take up the Colorado question under the auspices" of the Chicago federation. They had not proposed that he should take it up under their auspices. The auspices under which they had proposed that he take it up, were those of a jury of 12 prominent men from the labor organizations of the country, to be selected by himself. If he made his challenge in good faith, he cannot evade it by complaining of the tone of the response, nor yet by saying, as he does, that his charges have been proved "to the satisfaction of nine-tenths of the people and the press." Mr. Wellman's inference as to what nine-tenths of the people and the press may think, is not equivalent to the verdict of "a jury composed of the leaders of the decent, honorable labor organizations of the country." That was the tribunal to which he appealed; and it was the jury which the Chicago Federation offered him, he himself to select its members.

The Federation's reply to Mr. Wellman's "back out" is worth his consideration whether its rudeness disturbs him or not. In part it reads:

What right have you to assume that "nine-tenths of the people" believed, or have any confidence, in your unproved charges? What right have you to assume that the wealth producers of this nation have sufficient confidence in the public press to accept as true what appears over the signature of a correspondent, when almost every intelligent man knows that this same public press is the purchased oracle of legal brigands, and the secret enemy of American labor, American manhood and American progress? Is it manly to fall back on offended dignity when a question is raised against your integrity by honest men and women who are accustomed to call a spade, a spade? We have not been schooled in refined perfidy nor tutored to hide honest thought behind a mass of dishonest verbiage. We felt that your charges were baseless and made at a time for purposes best known to yourself, and with that thought uppermost in our minds we accepted your challenge.

While we believed we were right, yet we were only too willing to give you every opportunity to prove your case, and would, because we are honest in this matter, accept the verdict of a jury such as you, yourself, proposed; we are now convinced of your real purpose. If you are sensitive to our use of strong language at this time, permit us to suggest that a man of your training and experience should have been at least equally sensitive to the outraged feelings of others, and while our purpose is not to hurt feelings by the use of language, yet if we must, we are but following in the footsteps of that heroic soul, William Lloyd Garrison, who said: "I shall be as harsh as truth." When you use your splendid mental equipment in an attempt to array the different divisions of the labor movement of Colorado against each other, in the interest of their common enemy, as you have attempted in your letter of August 14, you prove recreant to your profession of newspaper correspondent, false to every noble instinct of the true teacher and descend to the level of a mere hireling of the predatory beasts of the industrial jungle. When you, under the mask of impartiality and friendship, draw the journalistic knife of assassination upon the harmony and common cause of plundered workmen within the folds of the organized labor movement of this country, you must expect to be exposed by your intended victims.

The "business" interests of Colorado, which have encouraged the Governor, in his high-handed course, are begging for funds to help reelect the same governor. Why they should need such an enormous fund as their appeal to the country indicates they are trying to raise is not clear. For no legitimate election use can so large a fund be needed. The letter they are sending out is as follows:

The Law and Order Enforcement League, of Colorado. James C. Craig, Pres. Colorado Citizens' Alliance, Chairman. Chamber of Commerce, Denver, Col.

Denver, Col., Sept. 21, 1904.

The \_\_\_\_\_ Co., \_\_\_\_\_

Gentlemen: The above named League is conducting an independent and non-partisan campaign to re-elect Gov. James H. Peabody as Governor of Colorado. The question of his re-election is national; it must not and will not be neglected by good citizens, no matter where they reside. Every vital principle of individual liberty and property rights is woven into his re-election. His administration has established precedents which will be as useful to you as they are to us in Colorado. These precedents must be confirmed and ratified at the polls in November.

The most desperate and resourceful campaign ever waged is now being made to defeat him by the socialistic elements throughout the United States. They have made Colorado their battle ground for several years. Our own people have been cruelly taxed in defeating the single tax and other socialistic measures, and in curbing the lawlessness of the criminal Western Federation of Miners.

We need and must have considerable money in order to continue this battle. We will be pleased to receive contributions from you personally and to have you use your influence in every channel where we would be likely to receive contributions, and ask you to suggest how we shall reach them, or to interest yourself enough to do it personally. Send all contributions to the undersigned. Yours very truly, James C. Craig, Chairman.

An examination of the serving grand jurymen of the special and regular grand juries for Cook county, Illinois, called since April, 1904, down to and including the September grand jury, throws light on the present state of social development in Chicago, and is probably not far from typical of conditions elsewhere. This list shows that 135 grand jurors have served in that time. Among these, 15 have been managers; 29 have been proprietors of business establishments; 7 have been insurance agents; 4 have been presidents of corporations; 5 have been superintendents of business enterprises; 18 have been chief clerks and clerks in business enterprises; 3 have been civil and mechanical engineers; 2 have been cashiers; 6 have been freight agents and agents; 6 have been foremen; 3 have been salesmen; 6 have been real estate agents and brokers, every one of whom has a Bradstreet or Dun registry; 4 have been secretaries of corporations; 4 have been journalists; 1 was an architect; 1 was a director of a corporation; 2 were stock brokers; 5 were trades-craftsmen; and the occupations of 14 were not shown. Under the present law regulating the selection of grand jurors, such marked discrimination in the character of employments would seem impossible. The proportion, for instance, of proprietors of businesses in Chicago to trades-craftsmen

is certainly very much less than 29 to 5. This unwarranted preponderance of proprietors on the grand jury is somewhat suggestive.

A very smooth campaign is proceeding in Illinois for a constitutional amendment (vol. v. p. 664; vi, p. 40) allowing the legislature to enact a special charter for Chicago. This amendment, prepared by a local conference (vol. v, p. 600), seems, from the most prominent support it is receiving, to have but one very pronounced purpose—an enlargement of the municipal debt-contracting limit, to the end that large tax-dodgers may more freely cast their own legitimate burdens upon posterity and the banks may have an augmented supply of gilt-edge securities to offer eager customers. The amendment is strenuously advocated by all the big tax-dodgers and their lawyers and by expectant banking interests. If there were no other reason for voting against it, the suspicious unanimity of this kind of support would be enough. Chicago does need a new charter. She does need a special charter. But she needs a better one than this amendment would give her, and can afford to wait until one can be framed by men who love her interests more than they love the luxuriant opportunities she affords for "back-sheesh." A vote against the amendment will not be misplaced.

There are mysterious proceedings before the Inter-State Commerce Commission now in session at Chicago. That body has been informed that railroads are paying excessively for private freight cars, and that the owners of these cars are hiring shippers to patronize them. Wherefore the Commission suspects that this practice is a device for indirectly passing rebates from railroads back to shippers. That suspicion is reasonable enough. But now enters the mystery. The proceedings seem to have been instigated by a railroad man whose relations with large railroad companies has no marked appearance of being unfriendly; and in connection

with the proceedings the railroads are grieving loudly over the slavery in which they find themselves to the owners of private freight cars! How the railroads, with their monopoly power, can be dominated by car owners without their consent, is certainly mysterious. The fact about the growing use of private cars is this, that their owners are coming more and more into the business of doing railroad work, while the owners of railroads are getting more and more to be mere landlords of rights of way. Especially is this true with reference to the owners of great terminals. The minor railroad rights of way not yet absorbed, are engaged in what their directors call "competition;" but in dealing with terminal people, the owners of private freight cars who have no terminal monopolies, are coming under a system of merciless rack-renting.

"No white man is allowed," says a news dispatch, "to take up his residence in the prosperous town of Boley, located on the Fort Smith and Western railroad in the Creek nation." This prosperous town contains, it seems, some "400 law-abiding Negroes," and although only a year old it boasts two churches, a schoolhouse, several large stores and a \$5,000 cotton gin, owned and controlled exclusively by Negroes. Another notable thing about this "inferior race" town is the fact that it is "the only town in the United States without any form of government." There are no regular Territorial laws to bother it, and the town itself has no municipal laws. Yet no serious crime or offense of any kind has been committed in the place. If that dispatch is not a canard, Anglo-Saxon civilization has something to learn of one race which it has outraged and abused and despised.

War is barbarous, horribly barbarous; but there are worse things than war, and one of them would be produced by Andrew Carnegie's proposition for abolishing war. In a letter to the International Peace Congress (p. 425), in ses-

sion last week at Boston, Mr. Carnegie wrote:

Suppose that Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor states as would certainly join them, should unite, prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender (if there ever was one) being rigorously dealt with, war would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth.

That arrangement would reproduce the Roman Empire. Sooner or later all power would centralize, through the arbitration tribunal, first in the hands of the constable nations, then in the hands of a cabal of those nations, and then in the hands of the one that made its policies dominant in the cabal. To preserve international peace by military power is Napoleonic, but not conducive either to liberty or to peace. The centralization of power in the constable states would lead on to enormous injustice, and that in turn would produce revolts of the bloodiest kind. Peace is to be secured by peaceful means. Let arbitration courts decide, let public opinion and that alone enforce their decrees, and there will be little danger of injustice on the part of the tribunal and less of war between the nations.

#### WOMEN AND WAR.

One of the most tantalizing manifestations of that lack of logic which is popularly supposed to be the most charmingly feminine trait of the truly feminine mind, is the ability to be moved to emotion by isolated facts and single pictures, while ignoring utterly their connection one with another—the thread of thought and inter-relation which alone can give them their true significance.

To be absolutely frank, we should confess that this trait is not altogether a stranger to the superior masculine mind either; but it is certainly not so distinctively a sex characteristic as it is, unfortunately, with women. It is the trait that awakens hope within the breast of the ardent reformer who appeals to feminine tenderness and pity, only to receive a cold shower dash in the realization of an utter noncomprehension of his idea, in spite of

ready tears and real sympathy with the sad pictures he paints.

Take this matter of war, for instance, with its present political manifestations of imperialism and militarism. Advocates of peace who really understand not the sentimental significance only, but the actual political and economic meaning of the words "war" and "peace," find ready sympathizers among women when they paint the agony of the battlefield, the misery of the bereaved home. But in midst of their tears, a strain of martial music without will draw these same women to the window with enthusiastic exclamations of, "Oh, the gallant soldier boys! Don't they look fine!" They utterly fail to see the moral and ethical connection between the thing that arouses their enthusiasm and the thing that draws their tears; they utterly fail to realize that just as long as this absurd and unjustified glorification of brute force in the form of militarism continues, just so long will wars be fatally easy to enter into, just so long will imperialistic despotism and commercial tyranny find in the army a ready weapon for their selfish ends.

If women would stop weeping over the "silent, upturned face," and admiring the outer trappings that mark the licensed murderer, long enough to think a little about the connection between the two, the cause of peace would take a seven-league stride onward.

For the woman who thinks comes naturally first of all to think of the good of her sex, and to concern herself about questions pertaining thereto; and for a woman interested in the welfare of woman as a sex, this question of war and militarism is so fundamental that it is incomprehensible how so many can still be blind to its significance.

The mother, wife, sweetheart, and sister, weeping at home for the absent or the dead, are supposed to be the chief sufferers from war's devastations. In reality they are but a few isolated cases, whose sorrows are as nothing compared to what the sex as a whole has suffered from the sway of militarism throughout the ages, and the point of view fostered by it.

It is this spirit of militarism, the glorification of brute force, and this alone, that has kept woman in political, legal and economic bondage throughout the ages, and there is still enough of it remaining in our enlightened twentieth century to make the idea of woman's participation in public office and public life a thing to be scoffed at by the majority, ridiculed and opposed.

It was not any manifestation of superiority of the masculine mind that first threw the chains of political serfhood around one-half of humanity; it was merely the fact that in the dark ages of the world's history brute force, i. e. militarism in one or another form, reigned supreme. Where brute force was lord, woman with her differently constituted muscular development was considered an inferior being simply because she did not bear arms.

It was not that she could not fight, but that instinctively, even in the "dim red dawn of man," prehistoric man felt that giving life was greater than taking it; and woman, as the giver of life, was to be kept back from the possibility of unnecessary physical danger.

From this feeling, become n-thinking and uncomprehended tradition, grew the idea that woman was inferior in bodily strength, and could not bear arms; and therefore was an inferior being.

Nineteenth century man, as far as he began to think at all, began to understand that brute force was not everything, began to find it necessary to discover another reason for woman's political and legal position; and thus was born the legend of woman's inferior mentality.

Medieval man was far more honest in his brutal "Only man, who bears arms, can have a voice in the affairs of his country's politics." Medieval man was consistent, too, and excluded even that part of the male population that did not bear arms from public estimation and from public affairs. Modern man has grown more enlightened with respect to his own sex, but enough of militarism still lingers to make very hard the path of the woman struggling for legal, polit-

ical and economic rights for her sex.

The wonder is that so many, even of these women, do not understand the point of view born of the traditions of centuries of militarism that still opposes them in the solid front of the unthinking conservative mass.

While the military ideal holds sway in our modern world, woman suffrage and the attainment of full legal and political rights for women will remain a Utopian dream. The military state is the state in which woman has no place; the military mind is the mind that sees in woman only a drudge or a toy, and gives her the one right only to existence—the possibility of bearing sons who will in time become soldiers.

Women may work for the improvement of their minds, they may open schools for their sex, they may make their way in art, in commerce, in the professions, they may prove in a thousand ways their fitness to take part in public life; but it will avail them little so long as one vestige of the tradition and the point of view born of militarism remains in the civilized world. The military point of view is that of contempt for woman, of a denial to her of any other usefulness than that of bearing children.

This is not an exaggeration, for although the military mind, being an anachronism in our modern world, must of itself be illogical, it has certain instinctive forms of thought which are born of strictly logical reasoning.

The most cursory survey of civilized nations to-day will prove the truth of this. The inferior position of women in Germany is not by any means due to a lack in the mentality of the German woman, nor to a lack of educational facilities for either sex in a country justly proud of its magnificent school system. It is simply and solely due to the fact that at present the "nation of poets and thinkers" has for a time sold its birthright of mental pre-eminence for a mess of pottage—military glory and rampant imperialism.

What is it that has made the American woman the admiration of all civilized nations, the envy

of her sisters elsewhere? She was not sent down fresh from Heaven in her present state, nor did she spring full-grown from the head of Jove. She was the daughter of mothers born in the military-ridden states of Europe. But now she is the product of several generations of freedom from the military idea. This, and this alone, has given her a measure of freedom beyond that attained by women anywhere else.

Let American women think seriously on this matter of war and peace, on this question of imperialism and militarism. If our nation should by any unfortunate but highly improbable combination of circumstances take her place amid the army-ridden, land-stealing "world powers" it would mean much more to the American woman than a succession of wars that would bereave her of her loved ones, or send them back to her crippled or afflicted with loathsome disease. It would mean for American woman as a sex the loss of much she has gained by her happier circumstances of the past two centuries, and it would place the goal of perfect political and legal equality she still desires, far, far out of reach in a cloudland which even the most hopeful could scarcely vision.

American woman's being what she is, is our greatest safeguard against the evils that appear to threaten us; but the trouble is, the American woman is what she is only instinctively and unconsciously as yet, and there are far too many of her in the ranks of those who look upon these threatening evils as something good to be desired.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—POLYGYAMY AND "FREE LOVE."

Whether or not we concede the eternity of human life, and therefore the eternity of marriage, there is no reasonable escape from the conclusion that the essential principle which must constitute eternal marriages if they do exist (p. 421), points to the essential principle of temporal marriage. The mystical is here paralleled by the sensuous. Look upon the nature of marriage as we may, whether as continuing upward and inward to the heart

of the great spiritual mystery, or as comprising only the personal and social phenomena that are strictly within the sphere of scientific observation, yet there is no difference in principle. In this world of sense and time, as in the super-sensuous and eternal world, marriage is constituted (p. 405) neither by ephemeral affections nor by contractual ceremonials, but by the reciprocal love, unifying in its tendencies and abiding in its nature, of one man and one woman.

If marriage be so regarded, polygamy is not a variety of marriage. The idea of marriage love between one man and several women is excluded by the expressed condition that marriage love is reciprocal between one man and one woman.

But a question may properly arise. Why the dictum as to one man and one woman? Why not one man and several women?

A little reflection will show, we think, that the definition of marriage in monogamous terms is not an arbitrary dictum. It is a logical conclusion from the premise that marriage love must in its nature be unifying.

In contradistinction to love that does not unify, such as friendship love, the love that does unify may be likened to chemical combinations in contradistinction to mechanical mixtures in physics. Friendship love only aggregates; it does not combine. Consequently it results only in association, not in union, and cannot make marriage. Marriage love must be a love that combines, coalesces, unifies.

Such love is possible only between persons of opposite sex. Between men only, or between women only, the unifying love of marriage is as impossible as electrical attraction between the same poles of a battery. Their love is the aggregative love of friendship; it is not the combining, coalescing and unifying love of marriage. Both the masculine and the feminine elements in marriage love are incomplete in themselves. Each needs its complementary element in order to constitute marriage.

This obvious principle of marriage has its physical analogue in the function of race reproduction.

For the complementary qualities of marriage love, which give to our language such endearing words as "husband" and "wife," may be said, and without mysticism, to be analogous to the physical qualities which give to the language such related words of endearment as "father" and "mother."

It seems superfluous to urge the consideration that marriage love must be sexual, that the complementary and reciprocal qualities indispensable to it do not belong to any kind of love which persons of either sex may have for others of the same sex. Yet the legitimacy of polygamous marriage (and polyandry is of course within the same principle) depends upon ignoring the logic of that most obvious consideration. If it be true that the unifying love of marriage subsists only between persons of opposite sex, does it not follow that marriage is naturally monogamous?

Even if it were conceded that in polygamous relationships each wife might love the common husband with the unifying love of marriage, and that the common husband might love each of his wives with the same kind of love, there would nevertheless be no marriage of all the members of that group; because there could be no unification of the group as a whole. The wives, being of the same sex, could not have the unifying love of marriage for one another.

The love that makes polygamous relationships, produces not a combination but an aggregation. However unifying, even in its heterogeneity, the love of the husband for all his wives and theirs for him may by any stretch of the unbridled imagination be supposed to be, the love of the wives for each other can at best be only the federative love of friendship. Polygamous relationships are no more marriages than a rhyming dictionary is poetry.

Concede that marriage love is the love which in its nature unifies, and you concede the monogamous principle.

Similar considerations are applicable to those marriage (or non-marriage) doctrines that are distinguished as "universal love," "free love," etc.

Strangely enough, the term "free love" has very unpleasant connotations. It has come to imply licentiousness; and the description of anyone as a "free lover" is equivalent to a denunciation of him as bestial. But no one can conceive of love that isn't free. Although tyranny may force men and women to do many things against their will, it cannot force any one to love another. All genuine love is free love.

The bestial connotations of "free love" are largely attributable, no doubt, to the idolatrous mind, which ignores the essence of things and lays all stress on superficialities—forgets the spirit while worshipping the symbol. But advocates of "free love" themselves have contributed no small share to the unpleasant significance of what ought to be one of the cherished terms in the vocabulary of marriage. They also have been led into doing it by concentrating their attention upon symbols instead of substance, upon form instead of essence. In their defiance of certain external forms of the marriage relation, they have neglected to distinguish marriage itself; and in consequence of this confusion they have assumed, in appearance at least, an attitude of hostility to the most sacred thing in human life.

When "free love" philosophies are honestly probed for the truth there may be in them, they will be found to rest upon more or less confused concepts of the idea of brotherly love. While some of them are utilitarian, formally denying the doctrine of brotherly love as a moral law, they nevertheless oppose marriage as strongly upon grounds of the utility of individual freedom as others do on grounds of brotherliness. For the purpose of this discussion they may be grouped with those that accept the doctrine of brotherly love as a moral or spiritual law.

The latter oppose marriage (not the contract alone but marriage itself), as unspiritual because hostile to the spiritual law that we must love all as ourselves—not one man or one woman, but all men and all women. This position depends really upon a verbal double meaning. The spiritual love of each for all, which makes for human brotherhood, is a radically different thing from the spir-

itual love which unites one man and one woman in marriage. Universal love and marital love are similar only in name.

Universal love does, indeed, extend from and to both sexes; but it does so only in the negative sense of ignoring sex distinctions. Being that love of each for all and of all for each, men and women, friend or enemy, which is inculcated by religious precept, it is the love that stimulates the sense and spirit of universal justice. In its nature, therefore, it is the same whether it flows reciprocally between persons of opposite sex, or between persons of the same sex.

Not so with marital love, the accidental similarity of name nevertheless. Marital love is that force which, whether we recognize it as spiritual or class it as sensual, so combines the human masculine and the human feminine parts of the human being as to constitute the human unit.

Latin forms of speech may possibly serve the purpose here of greater definiteness of expression. Universal love, the spiritual love of each for all and all for each, comprises that sense of justice which serves to federate the "homo," thereby forming society; but marriage love is the love that constitutes the "homo" by unifying its complementary parts, the "femina" and the "vir." The "homo," or unit of mankind, is really neither a man nor a woman, these being only the complementary parts. The true human unit is a man and a woman made as one (p. 405) by marriage.

This oneness is produced by the reciprocal sexual love that unifies complementaries — individuals who are complementary not only physically but also in their character-building tendencies. To think of marriage love as identical with brotherly or neighborly love in their spiritual sense, is to confuse different ideas through similarity of names. To infer from the spiritual or brotherly law of universal love that the reciprocal love of husband and wife, if exclusive, is selfish, and therefore unbrotherly and unspiritual, is to fall into one of the traps which lie in wait for minds that refuse or neglect to distinguish essential differences.

This criticism of the spiritual

philosophies that oppose marriage as selfish and unbrotherly, is appropriate also to the utilitarian philosophies which reject it as invasive and inexpedient. They confuse essential differences—differences which in the last analysis are very similar to those just indicated. Observing no essential difference, they make no clear distinction, between the general social federation of men and women and the marriage union of one man and one woman.

It does not follow, necessarily, that the same person may not be more than once genuinely married. Whether death or divorce clears the way for successive marriages remains to be considered. The emphasis at this point is confined to the question of promiscuity. It does not seem to us that promiscuity is natural. Whether in any of the unconventional forms of so-called "free love," which treat the most intimate sexual relation as an incident of ephemeral passion; or in the institutional forms of polygamy or polyandry, which substitute a harem or a hive for the home; or in the numerous prosti-tutional forms, which set up few claims to legitimacy,—promiscuity is not marriage. Though enjoined by the civil power and sanctioned by church authority, these relations would be marriage relations only in form. They could not be marriage itself. Marriage itself, let the outward form or symbolism be what it may, exists only when one man and one woman are united by reciprocal love abiding in its nature.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 13.

Usually, at the present stage of a Presidential campaign, excitement is at its highest; but in the one which is to end in less than four weeks, there has been no excitement, nor are there as yet any indications that there will be. Some meetings are being held and some speeches made, but there is no enthusiasm on either side. The most notable campaigning on the Democratic side is that of William J. Bryan, who has left Nebraska and Missouri to make an eight-day

tour of 52 appointments in Indiana, beginning on the 12th.

Thomas E. Watson's letter of acceptance as the Presidential candidate of the People's party was published on the 10th. Its spirit with reference to the present campaign may be inferred from the following extracts:

When two great political parties have, in turn, governed a country and have between them brought about unsatisfactory conditions, it is but natural that a third party should arise. . . . Much abuse has been heaped upon me because more time was devoted by me to denunciation of Parker than of Roosevelt. The reason is obvious enough. Roosevelt is a straight-out Republican, who declares boldly for Republican principles, defiantly defending existing conditions. To attack him is a short, easy job. He is so conspicuous and stationary a target that no one who wished to take a shot at him could possibly miss the mark. He is not in ambush; he is behind no "blind"; he stands out in the open; and he says to his enemies: "Here I am—a Republican who stands pat on all existing conditions; if you want a fight come on!" . . . Mr. Roosevelt will get Republican votes and no others. He is not seeking the support of Bryan Democrats upon false pretenses. He is not playing a confidence game on the Negro question. He is not attempting to win Jeffersonians by a sham adherence to Jeffersonian principles. In short, there is no danger that Jeffersonian democrats will vote for Roosevelt upon the assumption that he is a Jeffersonian democrat. There is no danger that Roosevelt will get a single vote to which I, as a Jeffersonian in principle, am entitled. With Mr. Parker it is different. He is not a Jeffersonian democrat, yet he seeks to secure the support of Jeffersonians. If he would speak out plainly and tell the people that he is in principle the same thing, practically, that Roosevelt is, the Bryan Democrats would fall away from him by the million. . . . The chosen advisers of Mr. Parker are the men who led for the trusts and corporations when the taxpayers were looted during Cleveland's second administration. From Gorman, who reeks with the foulest trust legislation of the last 20 years, to Carlisle, who wrote the sugar schedule at the dictation of the sugar trust, down to Olney, who in effect advised the too-willing Cleveland to send the United States army to the Pullman Palace Car company in Chicago, the notorious old band of boodlers are there. What may be expected of them if Parker is elected can be guessed by those who remember the carnival of class legislation which rendered forever infamous the second administration of Grover Cleveland. . . . To the extent that the opponents of Republican principles sup-

port me in 1904, the hands of those will be strengthened who shall make war upon the Republicans in 1908. The present attitude of the national Democracy is an impossible one. They will be driven from it beyond all doubt. Four years from now the Belmonts, Gormans and Hills should be put into the Republican camp, where they belong. The real Democrats will return to their Kansas City and Chicago platforms. In some honorable way the Bryan Democrats must act with us; the cause demands it; duty requires it; patriotism exacts it; to the success of true Democracy it is indispensable. To preserve an organization of resistance to the plutocracy, to show them that they cannot play their selfish games quite so easily as they had imagined, to make them feel that there is life in the people yet to form a nucleus around which the betrayed people may rally, we make this struggle.

The Republican situation in politics is the most disturbing in Wisconsin. Since the decision of the highest court of that State in favor of the La Follette, or "half-breed" faction of the party (p. 425), the "stalwarts" have been under pressure from the Republican national committee to abandon their opposition to La Follette. In consequence the "stalwart" candidate for governor, Samuel A. Cook, promptly resigned. But the "stalwart" State committee, unwilling to withdraw their ticket, have named ex-Gov. Edward Scofield to take Mr. Cook's place and Scofield has accepted. They name their faction the "National Republican Party." The Republican national committee has now ignored the "stalwart" State committee and formally recognized the La Follette faction. But the "stalwarts" have decided to continue the fight.

At the county primaries for Milwaukee on the 7th, the La Follette faction was completely victorious. It will control the county convention by a safe majority and take over the county organization which has heretofore been controlled by the now defeated "stalwarts."

In Massachusetts on the 7th the Republicans nominated Gov. John L. Bates for governor, against whom, on the same day, the Democrats nominated William L. Douglas. The tariff issue is uppermost in this State, with

reference especially to reciprocity with Canada, both parties advocating reciprocity. The Republicans ask for "reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, and especially with Canada and Newfoundland, upon such terms and conditions as will secure an enlargement of our foreign trade, for the common benefit of our principle, wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistently with the principles of protection." The Democrats demand reciprocity in hostility to the system of protection, which they hold responsible for trusts and the unwholesome prosperity of "the huge industrial giant, otherwise known as 'infant industries.'"

The Republicans of Rhode Island nominated Charles P. Utter for governor on the 12th; and on the same day the two Republican factions of Delaware agreed upon a fusion ticket with Preston Lea (anti-Addicks) for governor, and Isaac T. Parker (pro-Addicks) for lieutenant governor.

One of the straws in the currents of organized labor, disclosing a tendency toward political action, was the report of Mr. Barney Cohen, as president of the Illinois Federation of Labor, at its opening session at Aurora on the 11th. In this report Mr. Cohen urged a political programme by saying:

The question of the unemployed man is the question to be solved. It is the question that must be solved. . . . Now there is only one place a man can live and obtain food, clothing and shelter and be a free man, and this place is the land. He is a land animal, and land is necessary to his existence. But land is monopolized and the institution of land monopoly has become so firmly entrenched in common thought by 300 years of habit, that it can be better attacked through reform in taxation than by direct assault. If the values of this monopoly were absorbed by direct taxes upon it its evils would soon be destroyed.

Fortunately the way is open to organized labor in this State of Illinois to make that kind of attack, and to make it effectively and at once. At the election this fall, three questions are to be voted upon under the public policy referendum law. The third of these relates directly to the subject under consideration. It is as follows: "Shall the State legislature submit to the voters of the State of Illinois at the next following State election an amendment to the State constitution which will enable the voters of every county, city, vil-

lage or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine?" This is right in itself. The people of every locality should have power to levy their own taxes in their own way. The proposition should command the support of every one who believes in home rule and government by the people. Organized labor, therefore, ought to do all in its power to secure votes at the coming election for this non-partisan home rule measure.

After it has been recommended by referendum, more pressure will be needed. The legislature must then adopt and submit to the people the necessary constitutional amendment. So I hope to see you instruct your legislative committee in the event of a majority this Fall in favor of this proposition, to secure from the legislature the proposed constitutional amendment. I would further suggest that the labor organizations of the State be urged to devote their energies to securing the adoption of the amendment by the voters of the State. When that shall have been accomplished every locality will be at liberty to select its own method of taxation, and organized labor can then secure taxes destructive of land monopoly in every community in which it can influence local sentiment.

With active work this can be accomplished within a short time, and the New Zealand system of exempting labor and taxing land monopoly for local purposes can be in full operation in a number of our localities. This is a line of work that can be prosecuted at once and with reasonable expectation of early benefits. . . . I can well understand the difficulty of securing the desired legislation, or in fact much of any real labor legislation from legislators so largely influenced by the employing and privileged classes, and a thorough consideration of this matter convinces me that labor must play a dual role in the future in its own interest. In the first platform of the American Federation of Labor, adopted at Pittsburg, Pa., in 1881, it was declared to be one of the objects of the organization "to secure legislation favorable to the interests of the industrial classes," and the same thought has been expressed in countless trades union platforms ever since, as well as being a part of our own constitution.

But we are a little too slow in living up to our own declarations. It seems to me that a little more activity in this direction can do no harm and may be productive of a great deal of good, and I would therefore recommend that you consider the advisability of taking immediate steps, after January next, to organize politically as well as economically throughout the State, so as to force legislation favorable to us at the earliest possible time. The political feature can be separated from the trades



union business just as well as we today separate our lodge business from our trades union affairs. It can be a distinct organization, meeting at different halls and on different nights if desired, but should be confined to trades union membership. It is the height of folly to expect radical, honest labor legislation from legislators selected by the political rings of to-day, when the manipulators of those machines are as a rule the hirelings of the great corporations and trusts.

The tendency of Chicago officials to proceed at once to establish a municipally owned traction system with expired grants for a nucleus (p. 424), took shape on the 7th in a demand by Mayor Harrison upon the receivers of the Union Traction company to vacate certain streets held by it under a franchise to the Passenger Railway Co. granted in 1884 for twenty years and which expired last spring. This franchise is not within the 99-years claim. When it had expired, and on the 11th of July last, the city council passed a resolution (p. 236) regarding it. One part of the resolution directed the Mayor to order the company to vacate within 90 days; the other directed him to invite proposals for the installation of a new system in the streets so to be vacated. It is pursuant to the first clause of these resolutions that Mayor Harrison has now ordered the streets in question to be vacated, the 90 days having expired on the 9th. Proposals for bids under the second clause have not yet been invited.

Immediately upon receiving the Mayor's notice to vacate, the receivers applied to the Federal Judge, Grosscup, for an injunction against the city, on the ground that the franchise of 1884 was invalid and that the 20 years did not begin to run until 1887, when a curative ordinance was passed. They contend, therefore, that the vacation of the streets in question cannot be legally enforced until March 28, 1907. Judge Grosscup ordered a hearing for October 13, granting a restraining order in the meantime.

The International Peace Congress (p. 425) adjourned on the 8th. Its action on the report of the committee on the universal reduction of armaments, made on the 6th, was the most important

of the congress. As reported the recommendation was as follows:

The congress thanks the President of the United States for his promise to take the first steps toward the convocation of a new international peace congress, to resume the deliberations commenced at The Hague in 1899. It expresses the opinion that the first task of such conference should be to elaborate and apply a definite plan of simultaneous arrest and subsequent reduction of armaments.

An amendment, offered by Charles F. Dole, deploring the policy of increased armament for the United States and expressing the hope "that the party in America which had got the country into a declining plan will not be able to carry it further," was tabled by a large majority. An amendment calling for "eventual abolition of armament" was also tabled. The resolution as originally recommended by the committee and quoted above was adopted.

On the 7th the congress recommended as a model arbitration treaty for adoption by the nations, the following outline substitute for the inefficient plan establishing The Hague tribunal:

That the congress recommend that a new convention be concluded between the parties which are parties to The Hague convention, or so many of them as may be willing to join in such a convention, establishing a Pacifergent union between them on the following basis:

1. Whilst the high contracting powers mutually recognize each other's absolute sovereignty and independence, they bind themselves, each for itself, to work together for the furtherance of universal peace.

2. The high contracting Powers pledge themselves to refer to the permanent arbitral tribunal (established by the convention for the peaceful solution of international disputes, signed at The Hague, July 29, 1899), every dispute or contention which may arise between them that cannot be solved by diplomacy, or any other amicable adjustment agreed upon, whatever the cause, nature or object of disagreement may be, and further pledge themselves not to engage in any warlike action, directly or indirectly, with respect to each other.

3. Each of the high contracting Powers shall in turn take the presidency of the Pacifergent Union, and with its accession, the task of securing the united method of procedure decided upon in article IV, below, which has for its object the fulfillment of the duty imposed by article 27 of the above named convention.

4. On the 1st of January, each year, the presidency passes to that one of the

signatory powers whose name follows alphabetically, in French, that of the State or Power whose presidency has expired. When the list of the states has been gone through the presidency will be transferred back to that state or Power in the alliance which stands first alphabetically. Which state shall have the presidency the first year shall be determined by lot. If a Power whose turn it is to preside finds itself at war, the turn passes over to the next state alphabetically.

5. In case an acute contention shall threaten to break out between two or more Powers the signatory Powers shall immediately, by a collective note, remind them that the permanent tribunal is open to them. The state which holds the presidency shall, for this purpose, be provided with the full authority needed. Its adherence to the alliance carries with it a binding duty to fulfill this task. Also it shall be the duty of the president state to offer to states in mutual contention, if it should seem advisable to do so, the "good offices" of the Pacifergent alliance, or their mediation. This duty shall in no wise lessen the right of any of the allied states to offer its own good offices or mediation to the states at strife, nor shall the action of the alliance relieve any of the allied states from the duty of using all means within reach to secure a peaceful or judicial solution of the conflict.

6. If any of the high contracting parties should desire to withdraw from the present treaty, such withdrawal would not come into force until one year after it had notified the remaining states, and only then with respect to the Powers which it had notified.

7. This convention is open to all Powers on sending their adhesion to the president state for the time being.

One of the notable events of the congress was the speech by Gen. Miles, the eminent soldier who stands conspicuously as an advocate of peace. The keynote of his speech was his declaration that

The settlement of international controversies by the dread arbitrament of war involves the destruction of tens of thousands and sometimes hundreds of thousands of young men of both countries. Could any rule, code or method be more void of reason and justice? The great majority of wars in the world's history have been occasioned by the selfish ambition of some usurper or cruel tyrant, the intrigue of unscrupulous men, or the avarice and greed of a people.

Another incident of special importance related to the Congo Independent State in Africa. This colonial organization grew out of the Congo International Associa-

tion, founded in 1883 by Leopold II, King of the Belgians, under whose sovereignty it has since been placed by international arrangement. Its central government is at Brussels, Belgium, and consists of the king and a secretary of state acting under his orders. The secretary of state is chief of the departments of foreign affairs, finance, and the interior, of the Congo Independent State. A governor general represents the king at Boma, the capital, on the Congo river and near the Atlantic coast. At the peace congress on the 7th, the rule of King Leopold in the Congo was bitterly assailed by E. T. Morel, of England, who represents the Congo Reform Association. He charged that King Leopold is personally responsible in a large measure for cruelties practiced on the natives of the Congo in the terrific endeavors of monopolistic commercial organizations to obtain from the country all the ivory and rubber possible. The king was defended by George H. Head, of Cambridge, England.

Before adjourning sine die the congress voted that the next meeting shall be held at Luzerne, Switzerland, in 1905; and as the last act of the Boston meeting it put forth, by unanimous vote, an appeal to the nations, in which it said:

The congress, at the conclusion of its deliberation, appeals to the peoples of all nations and of all classes to arouse themselves to a finer and more adequate conception of their rights in the determination of the foreign policies pursued by their governments, that they may no longer be involved without their consent in foolish and ruinous wars with other Powers or in the unjust exploitation of those whom they are bound by every consideration of righteousness and honor to assist and elevate rather than to plunder and degrade. It respectfully invites all the national sovereigns and presidents, all ministers of religion, all instructors of youth in schools of every grade, and all others who wield influence in the molding and directing of public opinion, to throw the entire weight, not only of their powerful influence, but of their positions, toward eradicating the causes of misunderstanding and conflict and the creation of such a complete system of international adjudication and such a wide-reaching pacific public sentiment as will in time render the barbarous method of war impossible.

A change in the military situation at the seat of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 425) is reported. As long ago as the 2d, Gen. Kuropatkin issued at Mukden a long "order of the day," in which he directed a general advance southward. "Heretofore," it explained, "the enemy, in operating, has relied on his great forces, and disposing his armies so as to surround us has chosen as he deemed fit his time for attack; but now the moment to go to meet the enemy, for which the whole army has been longing, has come, and the time has arrived for us to compel the Japanese to do our will, for the forces of the Manchurian army are strong enough to begin a forward movement." Eight days elapsed, and then, by way of St. Petersburg on the 10th, came the statement that Kuropatkin had actually taken the offensive, advancing southward from Mukden with the whole Manchurian army upon Liaoyang. Bentziaputez, about a third of the distance to Liaoyang, was then reported to have been taken by the Russians; and on the 11th, by way of London, the Japanese were reported to be retreating. From both St. Petersburg and Tokio came dispatches on the 12th telling of a tremendous battle which had been raging south of Mukden uninterruptedly since the 10th. This was confirmed by dispatches on the 13th, which reported the battle as still on.

NEWS NOTES.

—Robert J. Wynne, first assistant postmaster general, was appointed by the President on the 10th to be postmaster general. In place of the late Henry C. Payne. Mr. Wynne was inducted into his new office later in the day.

—Lord Milner resigned the high commissionership of South Africa on the 11th. The reason reported is "ill health brought about by the prolonged strain in grappling with the situation, which is daily becoming more difficult, owing to the financial and racial troubles of the country."

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 359) for September shows on hand September 1, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash .....	151,414,162.82
Total .....	\$301,414,162.82
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1904.....	319,027,242.39
Decrease .....	\$17,613,079.57

—A 284.4-mile automobile race was

run over the highways of Long Island on the 8th, for a cup offered by W. K. Vanderbilt, Jr. The highway had for the purpose been closed to the general public by the county supervisors, against whose act the courts refused to issue an injunction. The race was won in 5 hours, 26 minutes and 45 seconds by George Heath with a Panhard 90-horse-power automobile. One man was killed and two wounded, one of them probably fatally.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 359) for the month ending September 30, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff .....	\$65,131,784.46
Internal revenue.....	58,951,813.63
Miscellaneous .....	13,950,864.28
	\$138,034,462.37
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$36,647,806.06
War .....	41,715,459.16
Navy .....	31,619,750.10
Indians .....	3,090,720.57
Pensions .....	36,875,359.79
Interest .....	6,081,988.67
	\$155,991,073.35
Deficit .....	\$17,556,610.98

—Judge Thomas G. Jones, the Federal judge sitting at Huntville, Ala., on the 11th charged the Federal grand jury relative to the lynching of the Negro prisoner Maples (p. 410), that if they were "fairly satisfied that the mob would not have murdered Maples if he had been a white man," but were actuated by the purpose of depriving a Negro prisoner, because of his race, of his right to a lawful trial, then the act constituted a Federal crime under the Thirteenth and Fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, and the acts of Congress pursuant thereto, and it was their duty to return indictments.

FREE OPINIONS.

THE BASIS OF DEMOCRACY.

The World To-Day (Ind.), Oct.—You can educate the individual away from the masses, or you can educate the masses themselves. The former is the easier and, to most men's minds, the safer programme. But it is not the best. A schoolhouse should be the place where social equality and fraternity, and not mere fighting power, are bred. It must create a democracy and not an oligarchy.

MORALITY BY LAW.

The Voice (Pro.), Oct. 6.—It is time to send that cheap platitude, "You cannot make men moral by law," to the dead limbo of dead sophisms. Its whole power is in using the word "moral" in one sense, in order to have it understood in another sense. It says in effect, "You cannot make a man moral (in deepest heart) by law; therefore it is useless to try to restrain him from immorality (of conduct) by law." Yet this latter thing is just what all our laws are made for, and what they are continually doing. . . . It is just this that Prohibition aims to do, and in doing this it is simply taking one step further in the well-worn path of the protective legislation of the ages.

LAW-BOOK MORALITY.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News (Dem.), Sept. 17.—It may be doubted if the statutes altogether accomplish anything substantial for morality. The most that can be

said is that laws of this sort are formal recognition of standards of morality adopted by the community. Where they lack the sanction of public opinion they are futile and where they have public sentiment strong enough to be effective they are very near superfluous. . . . Social sanction is stronger than law itself. Did you ever try to go to an evening party with yellow shoes? Did you ever try to pass the plate in church with a rip in your trousers? A man who could break half the laws on the book without batting an eye, would shrink through a crack in the floor before he would perform one of those solecisms.

**BUTRESSING MONOPOLY BY TAXATION.**

Why (s.t.), Aug.-Sept.—One of the pet political ideas of Henry G. Davis, Democratic candidate for vice president, is that corporations should be taxed on their output instead of on the real estate they own, and he has had his way so far as the platform of West Virginia Democrats is concerned. That is to say, Mr. Davis would tax the tons of coal mined, the barrels of oil or tons of beef produced, and nothing else in the business. His purpose, it is declared, is to lighten or exempt the taxes on real estate. No better system could be devised to make secure the monopoly privileges of existing corporations or to encourage the growth and dangerous power of the so-called trusts. Take the anthracite coal business for an example. The essence of that monopoly is the ownership of the mines; and under the Davis plan, if the trust were to stop mining coal, which it does often to limit the output, it would pay no taxes. Such a system, it is plain, would place a premium on keeping down the production of coal to the lowest possible notch. It would bring it to a point where the monopolists could get the most profit on the least coal.

**HENRY GEORGE'S IDEAS.**

Manchester (Eng.) Guardian (Lib.), Sept. 23.—Two ideas of George's remain as strong as ever—the first that since the economic rent of land is not created by individuals but by the community it can fairly and should rightly be netted by the community; the second that since everyone needs land to sleep on, live on, work on, and often to work at, the degree in which land is readily accessible for the use of the individuals in a community will be one of the principal gauges of their freedom and well-being, and the community ought to promote its accessibility in every possible way. English land law, the handiwork of lawyers working for a small landed class, opposed both these ideas; the evolution out of feudalism and patriarchalism had made landed tenure amount to private property, and centuries of ingenuity had been spent in learning how to tie up this property in the hands of a few hereditary landlords. The agitation against these evils which led up to the current-damning reforms of Lord Cairns started at a time earlier than George's work, but "Progress and Poverty" gave it an undoubted impetus, as it did also to the very different agitation against landlordism in Ireland. The most considerable legislation which is directly to be traced to George's influence is that of New Zealand and the Australian colonies, whose experiments in land taxation and land reform, based on his ideas but not at all slavishly copying his proposals, seem likely to teach Europe lessons in the near future, for which she in her turn must give part of the credit to the courageous California journalist.

**POLITICAL APATHY.**

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Oct. 8.—Three months have passed since the St. Louis convention met, adopted its platform and nominated its candidates, and yet the Democratic masses have not been adequately

aroused. There is apathy North, South, East and West. Why? The answer should now be sufficiently plain. The right issues, the real issues, have been subordinated. . . . The Democratic party is the party of the people or it is nothing and worse than nothing. The people, therefore, have a right to look to it to make war in their behalf upon these trusts through which a buccaneering plutocracy pillage them. . . . Appeal to the American people on the national Democratic platform. To win, the Democratic party must be democratic.

**THE NEGRO QUESTION IN POLITICS.**

Detroit Informer (Negro-Ind.), Oct. 8.—Believing as we do, that a division of the Negro vote between the parties would have a salutary effect and greatly modify the present opposition to the Negro, we keenly regret that the situation in this campaign prevents such a disposition, and leaves but one course open to Negro voters, and that course is to solidly support Mr. Roosevelt at the polls next month. . . . In thus advising our constituency we yield none of our own democratic principles or independent character. We still think the Negro should be, politically independent and diffuse his vote among the parties, but for the present campaign we are satisfied that the higher Roosevelt's majority mounts the deeper the Tillman-Gorman un-democratic policy in regard to the Negro will be buried and be removed from discussion in future campaigns. This result ought to be as pleasing to Mr. Wm. J. Bryan . . . as it will prove satisfactory to all lovers of fair play and exact justice.

**THIBET.**

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), Sept. 20.—An English officer recently described his visit to a Thibetan temple and "the diabolical rites of the monks." Now it is for the Thibetan monks to say what they think of the diabolical deeds of the English soldiers who have invaded their sacred precincts.

**MISCELLANY**

**SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.**

For The Public.

The robber is after your purse;  
And you righteously curse  
Whoever would take without giving,  
The man who would steal for a living.  
Getting something for nothing is crime:  
Whether robbing direct,  
Or with arts none detect,  
Let's call it, and make it, a crime.

You call for a gun—or a rope—  
And a jailer, to cope  
With the horsethief, highwayman and sneak  
Who spoil the unarmed and the weak.  
It's right; drag them all off to jail—  
Every last mother's son  
Who robs with a gun,  
Every thief, should be helped off to jail.

But wait. Are there wardens enough  
To lock up the tough?  
Are the prisons sufficiently spacious  
To hold all whose greed is rapacious?  
How many are there who obtain  
More wealth than they give?  
How many, who live  
On what they from others can gain?

Wherever men meet in the mart  
Each thinks it is smart  
To drive a hard trade with his neighbor,  
To gobble his goods and his labor;

The more he can get than the worth  
Of that which he sells,  
The prouder he swells,—  
While he fences the poor from the earth.

If "something for nothing" is crime,  
There's a reckoning time—  
A day when the just shall have risen  
To put all who plunder in prison.  
Oh, woe to the rich and the strong  
When Truth shall surprise  
Their refuge of lies,  
And land them where robbers belong!  
GEORGE HOWARD GIBSON.

**SENATOR HOAR'S ADVICE TO YOUNG MEN.**

At the Vine Street Congregational church, in Cincinnati, October 9, 1904, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, made reference to the life of Senator Hoar.

There would be some compensation in the death of the great man if the youth of the land would do him the reverence to reflect upon his advice:

Remember that there is something more to live for than money. Turn from the race after the world's goods, the mad fight for greed, to the love of higher things.

What shall a young man read? Senator Hoar said:

Read the lives of Thomas Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, Wendell Phillips, John Bright, Henry George and other men that have stood for something and meant something.

One could think of pleasanter tasks than preaching liberty and humanity in the United States senate. We are not surprised that Senator Hoar's appeals there should have fallen on deaf ears. He had that passion for liberty which seems to us one of our departing glories. But to the Quays and the Clarks and the Forakers, he was a man with an "over-heated conscience."

Yet the voice of the senate is not the voice of God. When these creatures are gone and forgotten, those glowing words of Senator Hoar will remain a living inspiration:

I appeal from the spirit of trade to the spirit of liberty. I appeal from the empire to the republic. I appeal from the millionaire, and the boss, and the wirepuller and the manager, to the statesman of the older time, in whose eyes a guinea never glistened, who lived and died poor, and who left to his children and his countrymen a good name far better than riches. I appeal from the Present, bloated with material prosperity, drunk with the lust of empire, to another and a better age. I appeal from the Present to the Future and the Past.

No man is good enough to govern another without that other's consent. This is the leading principle—the sheet anchor of American republicanism.—Abraham Lincoln in debate with Douglas.

### THE PRESIDENT AND FREE PASSES.

Portions of a speech by Roger Foster, Esq., before the Commercial Travelers' Democratic Club of New York, at a noon meeting on September 24, as reported in the New York Evening Post of that date.

President Roosevelt has refused to prevent the corrupt favoritism shown to many railroads by the post office department and by Congress in bills which he might veto, but which he has allowed to become laws.

After a careful examination of the facts it has been ascertained by Mr. Baker, a Democratic member of Congress from Brooklyn, that President Roosevelt has accepted free passes and free railroad transportation for himself, his family and his retinue which cost the railroad companies more than \$50,000. When Mr. Baker tried to bring this matter before the House of Representatives, and to include in the appropriations a return of this money to the railroad companies from the national treasury, he was choked off and silenced by the presiding officer and the Republican majority. The Inter-State Commerce Commission and the courts have held that the giving of such a free passage and transportation is a violation of the inter-State commerce law, which makes the same a crime punishable by a fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment for two years.

Do you not think that we should elect as President of the United States, a man who will pay his railroad fare out of his own pocket? Should not a public officer who receives a salary of \$50,000 a year be able to afford to do this? I do not accuse President Roosevelt of taking these free passes worth more than \$50,000 in cash as a bribe not to do his duty. I presume that he would not have accepted that amount of money or any amount of money in greenbacks or gold from any corporation. It displays, however, a singular obtuseness in intellect or in the moral perception to see any distinction between one case and the other.

Is there not need of another chapter in American ideals?

I do not make this charge, which I consider serious, of my own knowledge. I make it from statements made in Congress by a representative of the Republican party, which are supported by editorials in newspapers. If President Roosevelt will make the statement that he has always paid his fare when he has traveled on a railroad since he has been President, it will give me great pleasure to withdraw all that I have said upon this subject; for I would much prefer to believe that no President of the United States could be guilty of such an offense.

If it is true, it is a sufficient ground for his impeachment.

Railway men have said that this \$50,000 was paid by them as blackmail. Judges who have accepted free passes to the amount of less than \$1,000, when they had cases affecting railroad companies before them, have been accused of receiving bribes. Men have been impeached for accepting presents, although there was no promise that they would decide in favor of the giver. That was the case with Lord Chancellor Bacon. I do not, however, accuse the President of the United States of asking and receiving bribes when he requested railroad passes of the value of over \$50,000. Nor do I accuse him of thus levying blackmail to the amount of \$50,000 upon men whom he might at any time have imprisoned for other violations of the inter-State commerce law; and with whom he is continually making contracts and for their benefit signing bills for payment to them of large sums of money by the United States. I prefer to believe that this is only one of the many examples of his utter lawlessness and disrespect for statutes and for constitutions which he has displayed by his practice and his preaching in many cases.

### MR. ASTOR AND THE FAIRIES.

Arthur McEwen, in the Chicago Examiner of Sept. 20, 1904.

"Why?" demanded Col. Abe Edgarton, the Arizona mining man, "shouldn't William Waldorf Astor be attracted by Christian Science and show up at the churches of the sect while he's in America? It's easy for Astor to see nothing incredible in miracles of healing, or in miracles of any kind. Stranger things happen to him right along than the cure of disease by faith. The knitting of a broken leg without the aid of surgery wouldn't be a marker compared to his own experience here since he landed a week ago.

"Now, I ask you, gentlemen," continued the Colonel, appealing to the cafe, "what would be the state of mind of any of you, if, on returning from Europe, you were met on the wharf by a mob of strangers, every one of whom held out handfuls of money, real money, to you, what would you think?"

"That there'd been an outbreak at an insane asylum, followed by a general looting of the banks," answered a broker.

"Exactly; you'd take the money-offering crowd to be lunatics, of course. But that's the kind of reception Astor gets whenever he lands, or, if he doesn't come, the money's sent over to him in London. Is it any wonder that mir-

acles seem commonplace to him, and that he believes in fairies?"

"Fairies, Edgarton, fairies?" expostulated Prof. Jenks, of Pennsylvania. "Oh, come, now."

"Well," explained the Colonel, "if he doesn't believe in fairies, he ought to. Suppose you, on going home to Philadelphia, should find a pile of gold coin in your back yard waiting for you, and no claimants appeared, what would be your conclusion?"

"That hard-pressed counterfeiters had dropped it in their flight, of course."

"Wise Jenks. But Astor makes no such stupid rationalistic mistakes. He thinks of the fairies and gives thanks. You've all read that in the five years he's been gone the value of William Waldorf's New York estate has increased from \$100,000,000 to \$125,000,000. Now, what has he, over in London, done to make his fortune here grow like that?"

"Built dwellings to house our people and paid his taxes," said Prof. Jenks.

"We'll let the houses go, and take a vacant lot for the fairies to work on. Five years ago it was worth \$100,000, say; now it is worth \$125,000. Meantime he's paid about \$5,000 in taxes on the land. When he goes out with his bodyguard to have a look at the lot it's just the same to the view as when he saw it last, yet it represents \$20,000 clear gain to him. Isn't that just as if during his absence \$20,000 in coin had been stacked up on that lot for him to pocket? Could the fairies do better for a fellow than that?"

"Now," inquired Col. Edgarton, gazing hard at Prof. Jenks, "who put that money there for Astor's special benefit while he's far away in London singing 'God Save the King'?"

"I didn't, anyway," replied the educator, humorously.

"Oh, you run over from Philadelphia pretty often and spend a few dollars, which helps the town along, so you've contributed your mite, Jenks. You're among the crowd that meets Astor at the gangplank bearing gifts of gold and bills. All the people of the community, regulars and transients, aid in the growth of the town and make the demand for the use of land, which is what raises its value, and that's where the \$20,000 stacked on the vacant lot for Astor has come from. It warms your sense of self-respect as a reasonable human being and puffs out your chest as a free, intelligent American citizen, to reflect on how kind you've been to Mr. Astor of England, doesn't it, Jenks?"

"What would you do about it?" rasped the professor.

"Turn that \$20,000 into the city treasury on the principle that values created by the community should belong to the community, sir."

"That," cried Prof. Jenks, horrified, "is simply single-tax insanity, and as a sane, safe and conservative Democrat, as well as an instructor of youth, I cannot sit here and listen to such mad revolutionary nonsense."

"All right, my boy," called the Colonel after the retreating form of the shocked educator. "All right, but just the same Astor has got that \$20,000, earned by the people of New York, tucked away in his seams, and by the same process his estate, which was worth \$100,000,000 five years ago, is worth over \$125,000,000 now."

"Yes, gentlemen," said Col. Edgerton, speaking to the unsympathetic and suspicious café, "there are no flies on William Waldorf, even if the rest of us are pretty well covered with them. He was quite right when he said to the reporters the other day that greater fortunes are to be made in New York real estate than in Wall street."

#### PRUSSIAN OWNERSHIP OF COAL MINES.

Editorial in the New York Evening Post of September 14, 1904.

The attempt of the Prussian government to add another to its numerous coal mines has met with a severe check, if not with a final defeat. At a meeting of the stockholders of the great Hibernia mine, held at Dusseldorf, the government's bid for the property was rejected by an overwhelming vote. With more than two-thirds of the stock represented, the government and its ally, the Bank of Dresden, polled only two and a half millions, while their opponents voted shares valued at more than 29 millions of marks. Then, as if to make the government reverse the more hopeless, a six and one-half million increase of the stock was decreed, very little of which will be allowed to find its way into the hands of those who favor government ownership. Naturally, the opponents of the sale are jubilant. In their opinion the real desire of the Prussian Minister of Commerce and Industry, Herr Moeller, is to acquire all the large coal mines in Rhenish Westphalia, the most important group in the entire kingdom.

Those newspapers and individuals which favor nationalization, like the Deutsche Tageszeitung, will not, however, accept the defeat as final. That organ of the Agrarians declares that the government will not be balked, and intimates that there are other and

surer ways of accomplishing its end than by the purchase of a majority of the shares. By this it can only mean legislation against the coal trust or a condemnation of the mines, on the ground of the general welfare. It unhesitatingly avers that nationalization must come some day, and its opinion is of considerable importance, because of the friendly relations of the Agrarians to the government, as evidenced by the latter's readiness to sell coal to the farmers' associations at a lower rate than the trust will give them. Even so liberal a newspaper as the Frankfurter Zeitung, perhaps the most weighty in Germany, which is certainly beyond all governmental influences, declines to believe that the stockholders' vote is final. A financial crisis or hard times might, it thinks, induce the owners of the Hibernia to part with their property, and on less favorable terms. It has heartily approved Herr Moeller's plan.

From the American point of view, the most interesting phase of this situation lies in the announcement that the government's action was based on fear of a dangerous private monopoly. This the semi-official Politische Nachrichten, of Berlin, very clearly intimates. The government's original aim, as set forth in the inspired press, was to assure itself a sufficient supply of coal for its railroads and for military purposes, and also to become a member of the Rhenish-Westphalian Coal syndicate. As it investigated the situation, it found that the trust's influence had grown very rapidly; that it had absorbed all the small mines which had hitherto acted as a check upon its operations; that it was supreme in its field, and meditated incursions into other and related industries. The government then decided that the general welfare was a further and more cogent reason for its entering into competition with the syndicate. The decision is noteworthy, since this is the first time that it has admitted the danger of a monopoly of any industry.

It is not, of course, the first time that Prussia has taken a step toward State ownership. The control of railroads and telegraphs was assumed long ago, and it has owned coal mines in the Saar district and in upper Silesia for many years. Hitherto other considerations than a fear of the trusts have guided such investments. As in this country, the great industrial combinations seem to be doing the work of State socialism far better and far more rapidly than its avowed advocates ever dreamed. The coal strike of two years ago re-

vealed to our public the practical monopoly of the Pennsylvania coal fields. As in monarchical Germany, the thought which then presented itself to many minds in this republic was government ownership and control; even though we had no such excuse as the national ownership of railroads. In his letter of acceptance, President Roosevelt says that it was his interference which alone prevented the movement from becoming too "irresistible" for even his unchanging "principles."

Fortunately, in this country, the working of statutory and economic laws has shown, and will continue to show, the needlessness of a plunge into socialism. In Germany the possibility of a resort to legal control seems for the moment all but forgotten. Her editors see the State fighting the great combination of capital in Westphalia and coming out second best. They see ministers and chancellors taking orders from manufacturers or Agrarians in Landtag or Reichstag, and they ask, in despair, what is to be the fate of the consumer and the individual? They remember that the government itself has helped into being the Coal and Steel Trusts, which now terrify the very ministers who were the fairy godmothers when these infants were born, and praised them so highly but the other day, when they were growing to their full strength. Only the Frankfurter Zeitung and one or two others call for a revision of the laws bearing on coal mining. The rest of the press affects, like the Berlin Tageblatt, to believe that the decisive conflict between the State and the capitalistic forces has not yet begun, or urges the government on to further attempts to obtain control, not only of the Hibernia, but of all private mines, in order to avenge its defeat and to prove that the final arbitrament rests with itself, and not with the capitalists that defy it.

#### WHATSOEVER YE WOULD THAT MEN SHOULD DO TO YOU, DO YE EVEN SO TO THEM.

An address delivered by Edward Howell Putnam, of Moline, Ill., before the Congregational convention in session at Genseo, Ill., September 14, 1904.

That command of the Master asserts the equality of human rights, and enjoins the Christian to defend every individual against any encroachment upon his rights.

The inequity of material condition that prevails in the world to-day exists because Christians have not understood this command and therefore have not obeyed its spirit.

Every human being is both object and subject of this command. That is, if every one must do unto others as he would be done by, every one is also entitled to be done by as others would wish him to do to them. Could equality of rights be described in more precise terms?

Christ's object was to set up in this world the conditions that obtain in Heaven. This world is as truly a part of God's Kingdom as is any other world. "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." Wherever a human being is, there, potentially, is the Kingdom of Heaven.

In modern industry, the individual does not produce the things that he needs. One man preaches, another practices law, another merchandizes, another manufactures furniture, another raises wheat, another makes nails, etc. Each individual seeks to confine his work to a specialty—to as limited a field as possible, while drawing from as wide a field as possible to satisfy his wants.

No matter how well a man may do his part, his reward is determined by society as a whole. When the individual enters into the industrial mechanism, his duty is to do a man's part; and the duty of society is to maintain a system that will insure him a reward commensurate with his service. That is simple equity.

A preacher may bargain directly with his church as to salary, a workman with his employer as to the number of dollars and cents that he shall receive in exchange for his work—but if society permits a limited number of men to monopolize the sources of the raw materials of industry, those monopolists will overreach both the preacher and the workman in the hocus pocus of exchange.

The workman may do an honest day's work, and his employer may pay him the full wage agreed upon, but so surely as monopoly exists, it will extort a tribute from both employer and workman.

Why do men seek to establish monopolies? What is the object? It is for the purpose of enabling them to get more of value than they impart.

Monopoly controls the greater part of the raw materials of our industries; and its motto is: "Charge all that the traffic will bear." Years ago, when the product of industry per capita of the population was comparatively small, the traffic would bear but a correspondingly small tribute to monopoly. But with the rapid advance in the social productivity monopolies have multiplied and grown rich beyond the dreams of avarice!

Monopoly seeks to control as large a part of the industrial field as possible. Its method is to expand the field, and contract the number of the beneficiaries. Monopoly is valuable only in proportion to the number of individuals excluded from its benefits. The very definition of the word "monopoly" indicates that—and it is amazing that men who wish to be regarded as intelligent should hold their peace in the presence of this gigantic iniquity! to say nothing of those who profess to be followers of Christ, and yet who lift not a finger to crush these juggernauts of commerce, that roll their merciless wheels over the writhing bodies of the struggling masses of humanity!

Monopoly has so far extended its field as to control the major part of the raw materials of industry, without which we cannot work. Its power is so great that it can appropriate to itself the greater part of the rapid increase of the social productivity. No matter how much more productive we become from year to year, monopoly can, by charging all that the traffic will bear, extort the larger part of it from us.

It is a demonstrable fact that increasingly strenuous industry on the part of the people as a whole does not and cannot result in proportionately increased reward to themselves. For, the harder they work, the more monopoly can extort from them. The greater the volume of traffic, the more the traffic will bear—and monopoly charges all the traffic will bear!

Monopoly is to-day charging more than the traffic will bear, with the result that a check is put upon industry, and two hundred thousands of men and millions of capital are thrown out of employment. This whole country is now being plunged into the throes of business depression, solely because monopoly is charging more for the raw materials of industry than the people can pay, and at the same time consume as much as they can produce; therefore, we must produce less—men must be discharged from employment, capital in large volumes must lie idle, entailing a period of hard times.

Do not fall into the inexcusable blunder of antagonizing capital; of fighting employers of labor. It takes a man of heroic mold to venture his capital anywhere in the competitive field to-day. Capitalists, as such, are not oppressors of the laborer. Capitalists are the world's greatest benefactors, in a material way. So long as a capitalist must compete with the whole world, is it not puerile for us to denounce

him for his success? For the capitalist, in the competitive field, succeeds by means of outdoing his unsuccessful competitors in service to the public. He maintains his position just as you and I maintain ours. There are lots of men who would like to get your place, and it is only by successful competition that you hold your own. I have been amused to hear preachers decry competition! The preacher is a competitor as surely as the merchant or laborer. I hope I shall not be asked to prove this. I could do it by citing examples that it would not be pleasant for you to hear.

Competition is the true law of human industry. It is "civil service" in practical application, wherein each finds the place that fits him as nearly as can be so long as the element of monopoly exists in the social mechanism. Abolish all monopoly, and universal competition would determine each individual to the place wherein his service to himself and all society would be greatest, and each would be able to take from the market the equivalent of his contribution to the market; demand would equal the utmost possible supply, and never ending prosperity would enrich and gladden the world.

Universal competition would be the exemplification in industry of the command: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Monopoly is the infraction of that command.

The individual may do his part never so well, yet unless society maintain social equity—equality of opportunity—the equal right of all and each, he will inevitably be defrauded by those whom society permits to deprive him of his equal rights.

Monopoly is the great generator of social inequity. The attitude of the church should be one of unremitting aggressive hostility to all private monopoly, and the time is near at hand when the preacher who is not equipped by special education to fight monopoly intelligently, will be retired in favor of competitors who are able not only to apply the command, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," to the simple, obvious things of life, but also to the complex intricacies of the social system.

Society owes it to the individual that his rights shall be safeguarded. Every individual shares in the social responsibility. The church, being the repository of the sacred law, is under two-

fold obligation to lead the fight against monopoly—that concrete defiance of Christ's command—two-fold, because it is bound to antagonize immorality as a human matter of course, and, beyond that, it is bound to denounce whatsoever is opposed to the teachings of the Master.

### O LAWD! OH—LAN'LAWD!

A "COON" DITTY.

For The Public.

The lan'lawd's settin' on top his fence—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
He's livin' high an' at my expense—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
He's got mo' nalls, an' he's got mo' boa'ds,  
An' he's got mo' gall 'n a hog affoa'ds;  
Gwine t' bull' mo' fence, an' collec' mo'  
rent,  
Till he gits this niggah man's las' red cent!  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!

The moon's tu'n red an' the sky's tu'n  
black—

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
Oie Nick's gwine home an' he won't be  
back—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
His wuk's done finish' on top this earth,  
An' he laugh' t' hissef fo' all he's worth;  
An' he say t' the man on the fence up  
there:  
"You mus' run things now while I go some-  
where."

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The sistahs weep an' the eldahs pray—  
But Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The preacha's got a whole lot to say—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
But, you that's talkin', jus' tu'n me loose,  
Fo' yo' can't, fo' true, give a good excuse  
Fo' the pa'dnin' grace that the lan'lawd  
gits

When he comes to meetin' an' draps two  
bits.

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The soul an' stomach—they fus' rate  
friends—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The things life borries, why earth it len's—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
But this the thing that the lan'lawd say:  
"It's the earth that len's, but it's me you  
pay."

An' he'll skinn yo' clothes neahly offen yo'  
backs  
Less you bus' his game with the single  
tax—

O Lawd! No—lan'lawd!  
E. J. SALISBURY.

Rev. Charles Wagner, the author of a book entitled: "The Simple Life," is now visiting this country for the purpose of giving our people further light on his theories in the lectures which he proposes to deliver. The new gospel—that of the simple life—is in truth very old. The Roman satirists pleaded for the simple life and hashed the luxury of the day. As far back as we can go in history we find the same doctrine eloquently preached. And it could hardly have been otherwise. For the very moment that man became conscious that

he possessed a soul, or a spiritual nature, he realized that his true life was not dependent on the multitude of his possessions—rather that it was cramped and fettered by them.—Indianapolis News.

"Yes," said the proprietor of the "A—," as he came out from Mr. Max Hirsch's lecture, "what Mr. Hirsch says is all right, but . . . it recalls to my mind the story of little Bobbie, who told his mamma that he quite enjoyed the doctor's advice, but it was his horrid medicine he hated to take."—Progress, of Melbourne, Australia.

Race hatred never settled any problem on this earth. The way for one race to show a greater degree of superiority over any other is by a greater degree of kindness, of thoughtfulness and of brotherly love. No race is free, indeed, so long as it is ruled by passion and brute force.—Booker T. Washington, before the Peace Congress in Boston.

Uncle Hiram—They say that the sun never sets on the British empire.

Aunt Hannah—Doesn't it, now? And we have such lovely sunsets over here!  
—Puck.

## BOOKS

### A PROBLEM IN DEMOCRACY.

It is always refreshing to read an author who meets the common cry that "democracy is a failure," with the response that it is not democracy, but lack of democracy, that has caused the conditions which to superficial or hostile observers look like failures of democracy. "What we need is not less democracy, but more," writes Delos F. Wilcox in *The American City, a Problem in Democracy* (New York: The Macmillan Co., price \$1.25 net); and in that friendly spirit he studies his problem.

Any discussion of the many details of city affairs would fail to escape just criticism at some points, and Dr. Wilcox's work is no exception. But on the vital points of his subject he leaves little room for controversy from the democratic point of view. His chapters on the control of public utilities, municipal home rule, municipal revenues, and municipal debt are especially valuable. On the subject of municipal debt he reaches the important conclusion that "we must call a halt in the piling up of debts for our children to pay."

The book is extremely conservative in method and tone; but advances in the direction of what has been commonly regarded as "radical" are for that reason all the more valuable. Dr. Wilcox's advances in that direction are particularly noticeable in his discussion of

the subject of municipal revenues, where the single tax on land values is considered. After an intelligent explanation of that reform, something quite unusual in books of this conservative class, the author concludes that "clearly, as regards cities at least, the single taxer is right; the only really legitimate source of municipal revenue is the tax on land value."

Dr. Wilcox includes in that category "a franchise tax and a vehicle tax." The classification is hardly correct, but the author practically minimizes the error by this qualification: "If the city desires to treat the streets like other land and make them self-supporting."

Problems of municipal government are forging so fast to the front as the favorite problems of modern democracy, that books of this character are becoming indispensable to all public-spirited men, and this one is among the best that have as yet appeared. It is published in Macmillan's Citizens' Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology, of which Prof. Richard T. Ely is the editor.

Note.—In reply to inquiries with regard to "Democracy," the early production of Richard Whiteing, author of "No. 5 John St." and "The Yellow Van," our information is that the firm (Chatto and Windus, London) which published the book is no longer in existence. We are not aware of an American edition.

## PAMPHLETS.

In Plain Facts and Figures Mr. D. M. Hall (Washington, D. C.) makes a statistical but reasonable comparison of the rate of increase in prosperity under Democratic administrations down to 1860 with that under Republican administrations subsequent to 1860.

Those ill-informed persons who suppose that anarchism and assassination are synonymous terms may improve their knowledge, whether they find edification therein or not, by reading Joseph A. Labadie's leaflet (Detroit) on Anarchism, What It Is and What It Is Not.

## PERIODICALS.

Joaquin Miller opposes the Chinese exclusion Act, in the *Arena* for October, but for reasons that appeal more strongly to the class feeling of employers than to democratic sentiment. Three articles on popular government are especially useful: Flower's account of the referendum in Brookline, Tyson's Single Vote in Plural Elections, and Doty's Chicago referendum. A symposium on the Presidential election is one of the features of this number.

R. F. Powell's Vacant Lot Gardens vs. Vagrancy, in *Charities* for October 1, is a suggestive story of one of the Pingree "potato patch" experiments,—that at Philadelphia, of which Mr. Powell is the superintendent. This is the scheme proposed by Gov. Pingree for ridding society of the tramp evil. "If," said Gov. Pingree, "we will give the members