

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1904.

Number 348.

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.

Several months have now elapsed since Thomas W. Lawson made a widely published and very significant offer to the Democratic national committee. He offered to put \$100,000 into its campaign treasury if Patrick McCarren, the chairman of its executive committee, would publicly and explicitly deny that he is regularly employed, as a trusted political agent, by the Standard Oil or Rockefeller "crowd." No denial of this accusation has yet been published.

More recently, Mr. Lawson has circumstantially charged that Judge Parker's nomination was secured by the Rockefeller "crowd," and that this "crowd" is now devoting its associated energies, etc., to securing Parker's election. That accusation, which should have been explicitly denied if false, has evoked no denial from the managers of Parker's campaign. The Standard Oil company has denied, but indefinitely, and with the inclusion of so much which is generally known to be true as to discredit the rest of its unctious disclaimer. Judge Parker himself may be shrewdly guessed to have intended a denial in a speech he made at Esopus on the 24th. But this speech was not of the kind the public had a right to expect from Judge Parker if he did intend a denial of Lawson's accusation. It did not deny. The best that can be made of it in that respect is that it recognized the kind of corruption Lawson charges and pointed to Roosevelt as the predestined beneficiary. Judge Parker's condemnation of the Republicans for foster-

ing trusts in return for huge campaign funds, is no reply to Lawson's charge that the Standard Oil "crowd" is behind the Democratic party as now organized. Lawson reflects as strongly upon the Republican trust connections as Judge Parker does, and with more definiteness. His charge as to the Democratic-Rockefeller partnership does not imply that Roosevelt has no such partnership. On the contrary, he distinctly associates Roosevelt with the Morgan interests.

So there you have it. According to Lawson's undenied accusations, this quiet Presidential campaign is being slyly managed by Morgan on one side and the Standard Oil "crowd" on the other, Morgan's dummy being Roosevelt and the Standard Oil Company's Parker. "You pays your money and you takes your choice." If you vote for Roosevelt you are voting for J. Pierpont Morgan; if you vote for Parker you are voting for John D. Rockefeller. And that picture of the political situation is not much out of focus. The corrupt and vicious fight to wrest control of the Democratic party from "Bryanism," made under cover of gold standard sentiment, was at bottom a fight not for the gold standard, but for the purpose of making both parties subservient to plutocratic interests. Lawson has really revealed nothing but a detail. He distinguishes the plutocratic brands, and that is all; plutocratic dominance has long been evident.

In these circumstances what is a democratic Democrat to do with his vote? Many there are who are asking themselves that question. The variety of answer is limited only by the variety of

possibilities. Mr. Bryan, with all his great power of persuasion, multiplied in force by his deserved reputation for good sense and sincerity, is a democratic Democrat who urges the support of Parker. This, presumably, is not because he doubts the essential truth which Lawson's accusations embody, nor because he has changed his views of plutocracy. He is neither short-sighted for his cause nor treacherous to his fellows. It must be, as he himself has repeatedly said, because he believes that Parker's election would clear the political air of imperialism and militarism and give democracy an open and unclouded field for its battle with plutocracy. Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, evidently adopts a similar view, as do Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, Judge Maguire, of California, John J. Lentz, of Ohio, and other national leaders among the democratic Democrats. All are endeavoring, for the sake of the future of their cause, to hold the democratic elements of the party together in the confusing currents of this campaign.

We would not have these men do otherwise than they are doing. This is not the time, if such a time there may ever be, for radical leaders in the Democratic party to jump out into independent politics. The approaching election will go either for the Morgan-Roosevelt or the Rockefeller-Parker combination, and no secession of radical leaders from the Democratic party could prevent it. Moreover, what Bryan says of getting rid of imperialism and militarism is true. Judge Parker's election would doubtless tend to exorcise the military spirit. We have no sympathy, therefore, with those who attack Bryan for his present policy. But we see no possibility of Parker's election except through the political po-

tency of the Standard Oil "crowd." Should that succeed, the Democratic party would be the Standard Oil "crowd's" political tool, and par excellence the plutocratic party of the country. Parker couldn't prevent it if he tried, and all hope of making the Democratic party democratic would be gone. The Republican party, thrust from power, might become democratic, or a new party of opposition to plutocracy might arise; but the Democratic party of Jefferson and Jackson would fall as hopelessly under subjection to the plutocracy of our time as in the days of Buchanan it had fallen under the dominion of the chattel-slave oligarchy.

Nor do we look with satisfaction upon the possibility of Parker's being almost elected. That would be worse than his election. His election would exorcise the imperialistic and military spirit at Washington, for whatever this might prove to be worth; but his bare defeat, while failing in that regard, would leave the Democratic party in the hands of the Standard Oil "crowd" as one of its most valuable assets. Well worth owning then, its democratic elements would be as helplessly bound and gagged at the next national convention as they were at St. Louis. From present appearances it seems evident to us that no better fortune could befall the Democratic party nationally this year than to be defeated so badly, to be routed so utterly, as to demonstrate to the plutocracy that they do not secure its votes when they take possession of its machinery. This would be good fortune for the country, too. So long as one party is controlled by Morgan and the other by Rockefeller, the country will suffer. One plutocratic party is natural whenever the issue is between plutocracy and democracy, but only one. Two plutocratic parties are one too many. Yet this is what we shall have unless the national Democratic party, under its present plutocratic control, scores a signal failure at the coming Presidential election.

We are familiar with the plea that only one of two candidates can be elected and that if both are bad a Democratic voter ought to choose the less of the two evils. It must be a good plea, or it could not have survived so much hard usage in so many campaigns. In fact it is a good plea. We yield to it in naming Parker's defeat overwhelmingly as the best thing which at the present crisis and under all the probabilities can happen to the country. If Parker could win, there would be a fair reason for preferring him to Roosevelt. But as Parker's defeat is assured, the choice of evils which presents itself is not Parker or Roosevelt; it is the Democratic party under Standard Oil control almost triumphant, or the Democratic party under Standard Oil control utterly routed. Of these two evils we regard the latter as the lesser one. It would clear the way, better than any other possibility, for a successful battle with plutocracy.

But granting all that, the problem of the democratic Democrat is still unsolved. What shall he do with his vote? For one thing he may refrain from voting for any Presidential candidate. This would be the most effective protest if it were general. Or, he may vote for Roosevelt, as we learn that many will. This would accomplish nothing. Not only would it stultify the voter and add apparently to Roosevelt's popularity, but it could serve very little purpose in making Parker's defeat emphatic. True, it tends best to widen the chasm between Parker's vote and Roosevelt's; but Parker's vote will be compared with Bryan's of 1896 and 1900, rather than with Roosevelt's of 1904, for the purpose of measuring the popular effect of plutocratic control of the Democratic party. Some democratic Democrats tell us they intend to protest by voting for Debs. But this will not be accounted a Democratic protest; it will be regarded as an indication of the growth of socialism. A similar remark applies

to a Democratic vote for Swallow. Votes for Watson are the only ones that will be distinctively estimated as protests. They and they alone, will stand out in the election returns distinctly as the minimum aggregate of the Democratic revolt against plutocratic control of the Democratic party. Of course no thoughtful Democrat, intending to protest, will vote the People's party ticket. Regarding himself as a member of the Democratic party, and the national machinery of that party as having been turned over to the Standard Oil "crowd," he will serve his intent better by "scratching" than by "bolting." This he can do by making his voting cross in the circle at the top of the Democratic column on his ballot, and then marking a cross opposite each name in the list of People's party electors. His vote will then stand as a Democratic vote "scratched" in favor of some of the candidates of another party. Being a "scratcher" and not a "bolter" he will only have exercised a commonly recognized and generally approved right of party men.

On the Chicago charter question (p. 457), which is to come before the voters of Illinois next month, an important consideration, perhaps the most important, is the fact that the charter amendment is a device to avoid the pressing necessity for a constitutional convention. Certain changes in the government of Chicago are necessary. They are so necessary that the pressure of a constitutional convention will be irresistible if the charter amendment is voted down. But other constitutional changes are quite as necessary. They do not happen, however, to be so much desired by the corporation interests of Chicago as some of the municipal changes which the proposed amendment would permit. On the contrary these corporations would strenuously object to many of the useful changes that a constitutional convention would make. For that reason, among others, it is proposed to adopt

merely an amendment under which the changes wanted by the Chicago corporation interests can be secured without the possibility of any realization of those they don't want. Voters who favor a constitutional convention, so that all desirable constitutional changes may be made, will best promote their object in that respect by voting against the proposed charter amendment.

Among the sterling democratic Democrats who are candidates for useful offices of which they would be useful incumbents, is Frank Stephens, of Philadelphia. He is the Democratic candidate for State senator in the seventh senatorial district, his candidacy being under the management of Harold Sudell, 5030 Hazel avenue, Philadelphia. Mr. Stephens is making his campaign, which appears from Philadelphia papers to be a lively one, in the interest of honest taxation—not in the old and hackneyed sense, but in a very real sense. Impressed with the value of the New York system of distinguishing site value from improvement value, in the assessing of each parcel of real estate, and then publishing the tax list in detail, a system but recently adopted in New York (p. 451), Mr. Stephens is urging the adoption of this system in Philadelphia. It is a bad system for tax dodgers but a good one for tax payers. In making his campaign Mr. Stephens is supported by such papers as the Record, the Ledger and the North American, a fact which in itself is an encouraging sign of a developing public sentiment in the right direction on fiscal matters in the good old city of Philadelphia.

Entirely apart from all questions of equal suffrage, the intelligent women of this country are protesting against being classed by act of Congress, in express terms, with illiterates and felons. This classification is made in the bill, now pending in the Senate, for the admission into the Union as a State, of Oklahoma and the

Indian Territory. That bill forbids the proposed State ever to restrict the suffrage "on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude, or on account of any other conditions or qualifications, save and except on account of illiteracy, minority, sex, conviction of felony, mental condition or residence." A committee of protest has been organized by eminent women, who invite immediate correspondence on the subject with Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, of Warren, Ohio. They demand that the word "sex" be struck out of the bill, not only as an open and flagrant insult, but also as making possible such an interpretation of this enabling act as not merely to excuse disfranchisement of women by the State but even to prohibit its enfranchising them.

Owing to the light registration of women in Chicago the usual inane comment upon woman suffrage is going the newspaper rounds—the comment, namely, that this proves indifference to voting rights on the part of the great mass of women. If masculine reasoning powers were to be graded by this test, masculine reputation for intelligence would fare ill. It might better adopt the traditional feminine syllogism—"because." For the Chicago registration of women is utterly without significance. Women are allowed to vote only for trustees of the State University, officers in whom there is no political interest, and for whom but few men would vote if they were not already at the polls to vote for something in which they are interested. Added to this is the fact that every woman who registers and votes is doing something out of the common, and doing it in the face of numerous discouragements—such as offensive polling places, impertinent election officers, and jostling and impudent crowds of men. Furthermore, no attempt is made to "bring out" the woman vote, and only by strict attention to election notices can any woman know that she has the right to vote; for not at all elections does this privilege recur, and

newspapers make no display of the information when the time approaches. Of the women who are now registered voters in Chicago, it would be safe to say that they are a large proportion of those who knew in time that they had a right to vote; of the remainder of those who knew, it would be safe to add that a large proportion were prevented either by a reasonable timidity or by difficulties of time, place and circumstances. No inference can be drawn from a small registration of women under those conditions. Let the politicians nominate for University trustees some persons conspicuously obnoxious to women, and inferences might be drawn from a light registration. But in that case there would be no room for inferences. Women voters would outnumber the men. Voting is not wholly free from the influence of human nature, whether voters are men or women.

The Boston Herald has gone all the way to the Luchu islands to prove that communal land tenure is not productive of good results. In those islands it appears from the Herald to have been customary to re-allot land holdings at intervals of from five to thirty years, and in consequence land was not well improved. But now all this is changed. Individual ownership having been established, the Herald reports great industrial improvement. The sugar crop alone has increased more than 30 per cent. in volume, and other gains equally satisfactory have been made. But satisfactory to whom? Who enjoys the increase? That question is always overlooked by your touter for industrial progress.

Really, it was quite unnecessary to cite the Luchu islands to prove that communal land tenure, with frequent changes of occupiers, does not promote industry. History testifies to it and common sense suggests it. But it is only swapping evils to change from communal tenures to land monopoly. What is needed is security of tenure. This is not afforded by

the communal system, but it is afforded by permanent individual possession. Yet if permanent individual possession be allowed to carry with it ownership of the pecuniary advantages of site monopoly, the end of that community will be worse than its beginning. Its primitive conditions, with freedom and without the evil contrasts of wealth and poverty, will have been exchanged for civilized conditions with freedom and wealth for the few and poverty and some species of slavery for the many. The happy mean is a tenure which secures permanency of possession to the individual, and the differential values of different sites to the community. This can be secured, whether in the Luchu islands or here, by making individual possession continuously dependent upon individual compensation to all for the superior individual holdings of each.

Single taxers everywhere will be glad to learn that Judge Edward Osgood Brown, whose record as one of them dates back into the '80s, and who was elected to the Circuit Court bench in Chicago in June, 1903, has been assigned by the Supreme Court of Illinois to sit in the Appellate Court for the district which includes Chicago. The Appellate Courts of Illinois sit in review of Circuit Court decision in their respective districts, their own decisions in certain cases being reviewable by the Supreme Court of the State and in others being final.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—MARRIAGE CEREMONIALS.

In their civil and social, as distinguished from their religious bearings, marriage problems hinge not upon the fact of marriage itself, but upon the marriage ceremonial. For it is by means of this that the marriage contract is declared, and with reference to it that all the civil obligations of marriage must be determined.

The particular form of ceremonial may be properly disregarded. Whether it be distinguished by lavish display or by severe sim-

licity, by church rituals or customs, by prescribed civil proceedings, or by mere informal announcement, makes no difference, for civil and social purposes. Church authorities may insist upon ecclesiastical formalities, and religious sentiment may reverently acquiesce; but civil society can properly demand nothing more than that there shall be a binding and exclusive contract, and that this contract shall in some form agreeable to the parties be publicly avowed.

That civil society can rightly demand nothing more than this regarding marriages, admits of no dispute without injecting ecclesiasticism into questions of civil government and thereby confusing the functions of church and state. It may be fairly questioned, however, whether civil society has the right to demand even so much. We are therefore confronted with the first three of the five questions (p. 452) heretofore reserved for consideration:

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

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

And in this inquiry the third of those questions is incidentally involved, namely:

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

At the outset of our examination into those questions it may be conceded that the ceremonial contract of marriage is only a conventionality. No marriage is really made by the ceremonial contract. Quite irrespective of that conventionality (p. 405), the marriage either does exist or does not exist. Yet it by no means follows that civil society may properly dispense with or disregard the conventionality.

Doubtless there is plausibility in the argument against conventional marriage. Marriage concerns the parties so vitally, and in its more vital respects seems to affect them so exclusively, that the contention that civil society ought to "keep hands off" appears to have great force. Nor does this

notion lose any of its apparent force when brought to the test of the highest ideals of marriage. Inasmuch as marriage itself is the real substance, and marriage conventionalities only a shadow or shape, the conclusion may seem to follow that civil society ought to ignore conventionality and refer the whole subject of marriage to the unrestrained jurisdiction of the only competent tribunal—the will and understanding of the parties in each case.

But that position is untenable. It rests upon the assumption that only the parties to a marriage are seriously concerned in its civil obligations, which is a manifest mistake; and it proceeds upon the theory that conventionalities are superfluities, which is erroneous, as reflection will show.

Conventionalities are not necessarily superfluous. Probably all persistent conventionalities, even the least important, are rooted in some useful purpose. Were we to take the trouble to understand them, we should probably learn to respect them more highly and to observe them more faithfully.

Occasions arise, of course, when even useful conventionalities are to be cast aside without hesitation or heartache. Such occasions are illustrated in a minor way by the familiar story of the gentleman who, upon observing at a public dinner that other guests were rudely smiling at the mistake of an unsophisticated diner in drinking from his finger bowl, rebuked the cultivated boors and put the stranger in countenance by himself using a finger bowl as a drinking cup. That defiance of a polite conventionality was an act of true politeness, one which probably demanded some degree of moral courage. Yet we should hardly say that it would be either polite or courageous to defy dining conventionalities by habitually drinking from finger bowls.

As a rule, conventionalities are to be respected for their probable usefulness. Little ones may have their little uses, larger ones their larger uses.

The little conventionalities are to brotherly association somewhat as rules to arithmetic. They save the labor of calculation. Abolish them, and we should be under the necessity of calculating

the effect of every social act, with all its possibilities of social disturbance. The conventional rule enables us with ease to avoid awkwardness and to prevent misunderstandings and consequent ill-feeling. Observed with good sense, conventionalities have a function in social intercourse not unlike that of the bark to the tree, the skin to the flesh, the clothing to the skin; they are guards and protectors. Only when they are given greater importance than the uses they serve, do conventionalities become instruments for defeating instead of promoting their legitimate purpose.

To be habitually unconventional, merely for the sake of being so, is to be unsocial. It is not snobishness altogether that excludes unconventional persons from refined social circles. Though this exclusion is often due to idolatrous devotion to conventionalities, yet beneath even that motive there is a substratum of sound reason. One might as well try to enjoy a game with players who know not its rules or insist upon ignoring them, as to expect enjoyment from social intercourse with those who pride themselves upon disregarding social conventionalities.

As with the little conventionalities of social intercourse, so with the bigger ones of our great social life. Their measure is larger and their plane higher, but their function is much the same.

A conventionality is of course to be defied when it is morally wrong. And for this purpose one need but honestly believe it to be morally wrong, for everybody's moral forum is in his own breast. If conventionalities stand in the way of one's duty as he sees duty, his duty has first claim. But unless a conventionality does stand in the way of duty, the presumptions favor its observance. In that larger society of the human brotherhood, as in the little social groups into which it is broken up, conventionalities minimize friction and promote harmony.

In consonance with these views, the respect that ought to be paid to conventional marriage depends upon whether that conventionality conflicts with moral duty. Whoever believes sincerely that the conventionality is immoral,

is in duty bound to disregard it;—bearing the penalty with fortitude, as he would have to bear the penalty for breach of any other generally accepted conventionality. But what good ground is there for regarding conventional marriage as immoral?

Only two plausible reasons are advanced. It may operate, for one thing, to sanction adultery; for in the deeper and truer, as distinguished from the merely conventional sense, cohabitation under the sanctions of a marriage ceremonial which has ceased to be expressive of genuine marriage, is adulterous. For the other, in cases of persons whose conventional marriage does not rest upon genuine marriage, it may operate to prevent genuine marriage. But whatever weight may be given to these reasons as objections to the indissolubility of conventional marriage, neither has any force as an objection to the conventionality itself. Both relate to the perpetuation of the civil tie, not to its exaction. They may come up for consideration later on, but are not pertinent here.

Against the paucity of reasons for doing away with the ceremonial contract of marriage, there are abundant reasons for respecting it as a conventionality and regulating it civilly with reference to its civil obligations.

If marriage—not the conventional form merely, but marriage itself—engenders civil obligations between the parties, or from them to other persons, then society may properly require ceremonial contracts as a consideration of giving to marriages social status and civil recognition. In support of this position it is not necessary to go farther than to the commonest and most obvious principles of organized social life. When any duties are assumed toward individuals whose rights with reference to those duties civil society ought to protect, rights and duties of regulation by civil society arise, and it is thereupon within its province to exact reasonable conventionalities for the purpose of fixing responsibility.

Now, the marriage relation does engender obligations and responsibilities with reference to third persons, of a kind to make it the

duty of civil society, if civil society be conceived of as having any duty at all, to require some kind of marriage contract for the purpose of distinguishing married persons and fixing their marital responsibility.

One of these obligations relates to the civil rights of the parties themselves. The thought is intolerable that either party should be at liberty wantonly to declare their marriage relation at an end without the consent of the other party and regardless of that other's civil rights which the relationship has engendered. The rights and obligations of the parties to such a relationship may require adjustment by civil society, and in cases of separation they are certain to do so if either party objects to a separation which the other insists upon. In order that civil society may have a foundation for such adjustments it is within its proper powers in requiring that the existence of marriages shall be ceremonially declared. Civil society cannot deal with marriage itself. It can deal only with the resulting civil obligations, and to do this it needs the civil basis of a conventional contract. If, then, it may under any circumstances be properly called upon to adjudicate with reference to marriage it may properly require conventional marriage as a condition of recognizing marital rights.

Another of the obligations in question relates to children. The primary right of every child is a right to legitimate birth. This phrase is used in no mere conventional sense. By legitimacy of birth is meant not legal but natural legitimacy. Every child has a natural right, unless human marriage is indeed no higher in the realm of nature than the level of bestial passion, to be born of a real marriage. This implies a right to legitimate parenthood, natural and complete; not only to a human as distinguished from an animal mother, but also to a human as distinguished from an animal father. True, this right cannot be protected by civil society. It is a right for the protection of which children are dependent upon the marital fidelity of their parents—marital fidelity of a purer kind than fidelity to mere conventional marriage vows. But while civil

society cannot protect the natural right of children to legitimate natural parenthood, it can foster regard for it and protect such social and civil rights of children as naturally spring from parenthood. By exacting ceremonial contracts in testimony of marriage, civil society can at least secure to children, as a rule, the conventional relations and fostering care of complete fatherhood and motherhood and thereby their protection.

This over-guardianship is an obvious duty of organized society if the legitimacy of social organization be granted for any purpose. Without social organization society would unquestionably assume the duty, acting as a mob; and that goes far in itself to prove it a normal social function. And surely if any citizen is entitled to the interference of civil society for the protection of his rights, children come within the category. Although their natural guardians are their parents, and parental love may usually be depended upon best to serve the interests of children, yet children have rights even against their parents. The conservation of those rights must be a proper function of civil society, and this fact alone justifies the requirement of ceremonial contracts. In order that civil society may properly perform its duty with reference to obligations growing out of the relation of parent and child, the status of complete parenthood must have conventional expression through conventional marriage.

Another of the obligations engendered by marriage relates to the rights of third persons other than children. To know that the relationship is in some certain manner accepted by both parties to it as an enduring marriage, may be of serious social importance. Since marriage is a natural social relationship (pp. 405, 421), and can exist only between one man and one woman at the same time (p. 437), every member of society has a right to know, by fixed tests, whether unions apparently marital are so regarded by the parties to them. This is demanded for general good order if for nothing else. Many examples of its necessity might be cited, but a bare allusion to the disorder resulting from marriages not conventionally declared is enough. Not only might

paternal irresponsibility as to children ensue, not only might cruel injustice by one marital companion to the other be possible, but wretched deceit of third persons by either might be invited.

There is nothing in the counter-argument that the nature of a sexual relationship is a private and not a social matter. Even if it were conceded that civil society has no right to regulate individual morals, and therefore may not prohibit concubinage, nevertheless it would have the right to distinguish, for social and civil purposes, between concubinal and marital relations.

The fundamental reason for conventional marriage, however, —metaphysical, perhaps, yet not whimsical nor fanciful— rests upon the fact, heretofore considered (p. 437), that the husband and wife in a genuine marriage, whether conventionally declared or not, constitute in a very important sense the social unit. Although it is true that the individual is the primary unit, yet social life does begin essentially with the coming together of one man and one woman in marital union. In that conjunction, therefore, society is directly and profoundly concerned. If any personal acts may need public avowal in the interest of society this must be one. Secrecy would be totally inconsistent with marriage as we have defined its nature. Although a true marriage might exist in secret, secrecy is not normal to marriage. A relationship which implies the standing forth from the mass of men and women, as a social unit, of one man and one woman, is obviously of a nature, if anything is, to demand public declaration of its existence.

That civil society may properly exact ceremonial marriage contracts, publicly declaratory of the assumed relationship, to which questions regarding civil rights and obligations growing out of marriage may be referred, is a proposition which gains in strength as it secures consideration.

Passing, then, from the propriety of exacting a ceremonial contract, to the subject of its scope, we should suppose that the contract ought to be expressive of the essentials of marriage itself. That

is, the contract should be a mutual agreement between the parties, for mutuality is of the essence of marriage; it should be publicly declared, for that makes one of the necessities for a ceremonial; it should proclaim the parties to be and invoke society to regard them as husband and wife, for that is the thing necessary to be publicly known; and it should be in terms of perpetuity for life, to express the fact without which no sexual union is a marriage, namely, that it is cemented by love abiding in its nature.

The ceremonial contract cannot be in its terms temporary. That would be a concubinal contract, not a contract of marriage. Although temporal marriages may in fact die during the life time of the parties (p. 405), yet, as temporal marriage is abiding for life in its nature, the marriage contract must be couched in corresponding terms. A contract for an hour, a day, a week, a month, a year, or at will, would be repugnant to the abiding nature of marriage, in the sense of being inconsistent with it. Instead of declaring a marriage, it would be declaratory only of concubinage. Whether concubinage is a bad thing or not is immaterial to the point under consideration. All that is necessary here is to recognize that concubinage and marriage are essentially different things. That they are, need only be stated to be acknowledged. This being so, the conclusion is obvious, that a contract declaratory of concubinage is not a contract declaratory of marriage.

Contracts of marriage, to be consistent with the theory of marriage already outlined, must possess the characteristics specified above — mutuality of agreement between one man and one woman, and public avowal thereof in terms of perpetuity for life.

So much conceded, it follows that civil society, in the exercise of its function of exacting ceremonial contracts of marriage, may inhibit the making of later contracts while earlier ones subsist. In other words, upon the theory that marriage is naturally monogamous and that civil society may exact conventional contracts, civil society acts within its proper scope in forbidding bigamy —bigamy being understood to

mean the making of one conventional marriage while a previous conventional marriage of one of the parties remains contractually unrevoked.

The proposition calls for no extended argument. If but one genuine marriage can subsist at one time (pp. 437, 452), if conventional marriage rests upon and is expressive of genuine marriage, and if conventional marriage is a life contract affecting the rights of each of the parties with reference to the other and of third persons with reference to both, then there can be no second conventional marriage during the life time of either party to a former one, without a violation of rights that civil society is bound to protect and obligations which it has undertaken to enforce, unless the former conventional marriage be ceremonially dissolved by divorce.

Whether civil society may by divorce properly dissolve conventional marriages, doing so upon the application of one of the parties and after hearing both and duly considering and conserving all rights and obligations, still remains an open question in this discussion. So also does the question of second marriages after divorce.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK.

New York, Oct. 25.—The mass meeting of the People's party, at the Grand Central Palace, in this city, last night, was a success beyond the most sanguine expectations of the promoters. The great auditorium was packed with an audience surpassing in intelligence and patriotic enthusiasm any gathering of either of the old political parties that I have witnessed during this campaign. The Presidential nominee, Hon. Thomas E. Watson, although giving evidence of the strain on his physical ability, by the arduous campaign he has been making, was in one of his best moods. This was his third speech in this city during this campaign, and while all were good, it seemed to me that he reached a higher plane last night than on former occasions. His enemies will find it difficult to criticize. Judge Samuel Seabury presided, making a brilliant 15 minutes' speech, in which he graphically presented the issues involved in this campaign.

The People's Party, of this State, is practically dominated by single tax men. Judge Seabury is an uncompromising one. M. G. Palliser, chairman of the State executive committee, is vice president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club. H. C. S. Stimpson, the secretary, has been actively identified with the

single tax movement for many years. Louis B. Parsons, chairman of the county committee, is also an old-time single taxer. The nominee for governor, Alfred J. Boulton, has been one of the most devoted single tax propagandists in the East. He has confined his efforts principally to the labor organizations. He is a member of Stereotypers' Union No. 1, of Brooklyn, and has espoused the cause of union labor with so much enthusiasm and persistent effort, that even some of his friends who know what a thorough and comprehensive grasp he has of the single tax philosophy have raised the question of his consistency. This line of action has made him one of the most prominent figures in the labor movement in the State of New York. It was he that took the initiative in organizing the great labor meeting at Cooper Union, July 13, 1894, to protest against the action of President Cleveland in sending the Federal troops to Chicago during the Pullman strike, at which Henry George was the principal speaker. It was under his initiative and direction that the Altgeld meeting of July 4, 1897, in the Brooklyn Academy of Music was conducted. He was one of the most aggressive supporters of Bryan in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, and had direction and charge of several of the largest meetings in both campaigns. He was one of the originators and promoters of the workingmen's famous dollar dinner, at which Bryan was the central figure. He has done more than any other man, since Henry George, to permeate the labor ranks of this State with the single tax philosophy.

The candidate for State engineer and surveyor, on the State ticket, Simon G. Levy, is also one of the most aggressive single taxers in New York. During the summer months he conducted meetings twice a week on Madison Square, and spoke at other meetings almost every other night of the week. He is a forcible outdoor speaker, having an excellent voice, and clear grasp of economics. His first vote was cast for Henry George, in 1887. Both Seabury and Palliser are men of tremendous physique and mentality, in the prime of young manhood, both being but 31 years of age. They are aided by the counsel of such men as John R. Waters and Bolton Hall, men of wealth and commanding influence in this city, whose great ambition in life is to witness a general application of the philosophy of Henry George. Gustave W. Thompson, Peter Hamilton, William Ladd, Raymond V. Ingersoll and Edwin Hammond comprise the executive committee of the People's party in Kings county. They are all active single tax men. The People's party has indorsed Congressman Robert Baker, and his name will appear in their column on the ballot.

George L. Rusby, a successful business man, of this city, who is a persistent single tax propagandist, and has a

single tax motto printed on his bank checks, is the candidate of the People's party for Congress in the Seventh district of New Jersey. He is making an energetic campaign, and will poll a large vote.

The followers of Henry George in past campaigns are not a unit in political action this year by any means. In fact, there is more of a division in their ranks than in any previous Presidential campaign. Some are supporting Debs. Others will vote for Roosevelt; to make their protest as strong as possible. Others are giving an active support to the Democratic ticket. Among the latter are Henry George, Jr., John S. Crosby, Peter Altken and M. J. Flaherty, all of whom have taken the stump for Parker.

John Moody, publisher of Moody's Manual" and "The Truth About the Trusts," who is also a single taxer, is chairman of the Democratic county committee, of Union county, N. J. Through his efforts, James E. Martine, a democratic Democrat, was nominated for Congress in the Fifth district of New Jersey. Martine was opposed by De Witt Clinton Flanagan, a plutocratic millionaire, who aspires to be a political boss in this district, and the State. Martine was one of Bryan's most enthusiastic supporters in both of the last Presidential campaigns, and is an ardent advocate of public ownership of public utilities. While not a pronounced single tax man, he is sympathetic. He is opposed by Congressman Fowler, who has represented the district for the last ten years, who ranks as a millionaire and special representative of the Rockefellers, and who has no difficulty in raising all the funds necessary to make an aggressive campaign. Martine will have to rely on his own resources, as he will be unable to get any outside financial aid. His political antagonists recognize that he is a strong candidate. The Plainfield Courier-News, a Republican journal supporting Fowler, sounded a warning note in the editorial columns of its last issue as follows: "Compared with the other Democratic Congressional candidates who have opposed Mr. Fowler, Mr. Martine is a giant among pygmies. He is well known throughout the Fifth district, has an engaging manner, is a man of pronounced views, with a faculty of presenting them in a trenchant manner—though fundamentally wrong in some of them, notably the money question—and is a campaigner of more than 30 years' experience. These are facts not to be lightly regarded by the Republicans in dealing with the "Farmers' Orator's" candidacy. . . . The earnest nature of his Democracy, his loyalty and self-sacrifice to his party in its ups and downs, coupled with the knowledge of his aspiration, are things which are stirring the Democrats to supreme efforts to elect him."

It is now reported from the inside

that the plutocratic Democratic leaders of the South have been buncoed. The agents of the trusts had assured them that they would furnish the funds to elect "a safe and sane" man. But it is said in spite of Lawson's story that they have concluded Mr. Roosevelt is "safe" enough for them. I am informed that the campaign lags because of lack of funds in the Democratic exchequer. That this is due to the failure of the trusts to respond is supposed to be corroborated by the editorial columns of the pluto-Democratic press, and the change that has come over Mr. Parker himself.

In my letter of last week I said that there was no enthusiasm among the Socialists. But Debs addressed two immense meetings here last Sunday. The first was held in the Academy of Music, on Fourteenth street, adjoining Tammany Hall. The capacity of this auditorium is about 2,500. The price of admission tickets ranged from 10 to 50 cents. After the three galleries, the orchestra and orchestra circle were packed and stage crowded to the limit, hundreds clamored at the box office, or as near as they could get to it, with money in hand to buy tickets, and were refused. The second meeting was held in the Majestic theater, in Brooklyn, at night, the price of admission being the same, and the house was packed to the limit, while hundreds were turned away. I was able to get on the stage at both meetings, through the courtesy of the managers, and was in a position to look into the faces of both audiences. Here were gathered thousands of earnest, well-dressed men and women, who gave evidence of a high degree of intelligence as they applauded the strong points of the speaker. It was an encouraging sign, at least, to look into these earnest and intelligent faces, and know that here were thousands that had passed from the thralldom of the political boss, men who you knew by their honest, earnest faces could never again be coerced or corrupted into voting against their convictions. It is my judgment, after witnessing these meetings, that the Socialist vote will be a surprise to the bosses of both the old political parties.

Debs made inspiring speeches, but was quite weak in his economic reasoning, absolutely ignoring the land as one of the factors in the production of wealth. He probably included it in the "machinery and tools of production," or may have inadvertently overlooked it. His audience gave evidence of being in accord with him on every proposition.

Results of the greatest interest to students of taxation methods are following the application of the new law in New York city. This law, besides compelling from the assessors the separate valuation of land distinct from

the value of buildings or other improvements, also commands the detailed official publication of the result of the assessments. Following the example first set by the tax commission two years ago in assessing all real estate at its full value, the assessors under the new conditions are realizing a nearer approach to equality before the law than has ever before, perhaps, been attained in urban taxation in the United States. Such inequalities and seeming discrimination as still exist, evidenced in some instances by a higher assessment upon land that is built upon than upon neighboring vacant land of similar area, must yield to the inevitable demand for equality that will follow the publication of the detailed assessment by districts. The placing of this beneficent law on the statute books of the Empire State is due to the intelligent and persistent efforts of one of the most brilliant young members of the New York bar, whose office is located in the very center of the great financial district of the city. That the law is beneficent is pretty generally conceded.

Mr. Charles O'Connor, Messeny, vice president and manager of the Franklin Society, of this city, a society that deals heavily in real estate, told me this morning that New York's new taxation methods have borne hard and heavy upon the vacant land speculator, as is seen in the almost feverish anxiety of holders of large tracts in the outskirts of the city to get their holdings on the market either in bulk or sub-divided for homeseekers. Take for instance the section of Jamaica, in Queen's Borough, where scores of new houses have been built during the last 18 months upon land that for years was held out of the market by thrifty farmers banking upon the increasing needs of a steadily increasing population.

"It's an outrageous law," said one of these speculators, after he had sold his 30 acres of land at \$2,500 an acre. "Them fellows would have ruined me if I hadn't sold out," he added, referring to the tax assessors, who had raised the valuation of his property from \$400 to \$2,000. This land was quickly sub-divided by speculators of another and better kind, who, after making street improvements, offered it in parcels to home seekers for immediate use. Under the new dispensation the speculator in vacant land must unload quickly, for fear that taxes and interest will eat up his speculative profit. And this leads to more houses built, more labor employed and larger public revenues."

D. S. LUTHER.

I have always thought that all men should be free, but if any should be slaves, it should be, first those who desire it for themselves, and secondly those who desire it for others.—Abraham Lincoln.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 27.

The sensational political event of the week is Thomas W. Lawson's charge that Judge Parker's candidacy originated in and is corruptly promoted by what is known as "the Standard Oil crowd."

Replying in the November issue of Everybody's Magazine to a correspondent who had addressed him with reference to his series of articles in that magazine on Frenzied Finance (p. 177), Mr. Lawson condemned President Roosevelt for countenancing "so bad a man as Addicks," saying that "if this were an ordinary national election," one "where both the leading parties stood as they usually do, for honest Americanisms, but of different brand, Theodore Roosevelt should be defeated for this one act alone." In a subsequent newspaper interview, he also said of Roosevelt's candidacy that it is supported by the Pierpont Morgan interests. It was in continuance, however, of his letter in the November Everybody's at page 71, that he made his accusation regarding Judge Parker and the Standard Oil "crowd."

On that point Mr. Lawson said:

Theodore Roosevelt, while President of the United States, refused to allow "Standard Oil" to run him, and "Standard Oil" got hotter and hotter; but, not daring to rage openly, how they did spit fire "on the quiet!" If I have listened once, I have twenty times while Mr. Rogers raved at "that—" well, I won't use his exact language, it wouldn't be respectful to our President. At last, as in all such cases, there came an absolutely-not-to-be-borne trampling on "Standard Oil" dignity, and Theodore Roosevelt was on the "System's" blacklist until eternity. Mr. Rogers called me to New York in connection with some other business. I found him in a terribly excited mood. "What do you think that fellow Roosevelt has done now? Young John Rockefeller telegraphed him to give an audience to Archibald on the trust matter. Roosevelt saw he had us and played some of his dirty politics. He sent for the manager of the Western Associated Press and had him agree to publish the telegram in the West, keeping it out of the East, and to publish it as having been sent by Mr. Rockefeller instead of that unthinking boy, and, of course, you have seen it in the papers;

it's everywhere how he kicked 'Standard Oil' out of the White House. That is his last insult to us, and we will defeat him at any cost." From that time on Mr. Rogers's able brain was working day and night, first to get John Hay to run against Roosevelt, next Root, then Uncle Mark Hanna; but owing to one of those complicated entanglements that old Dame Fate now and then reels out of her crochet basket to the bewilderment of slick mortals, his efforts went for naught, and he was compelled to fall back on a more dangerous and expensive plan. He laid out on his campaign table the "most available" (what worlds of eel-skin political plety those two words cover!) Democrats, and it didn't take him long to make his selection of a man who would, if President of the United States, allow those who put him there to "run the shop." When his selection was made he called in his faithful hired man, Senator "Pat" McCarren, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and gave his orders, the same kind of orders as he gives for the purchase of an oil well, or the knocking in the head of a business rival, or the setting up of an Amalgamated knock-down-and-drag-out—"Go here!" "Go there!" "Buy this!" "Sell that!" "Billy Sheehan to captain that company, and Dave Hill to dig that mine!" In short order the venture was all covered to its finality, and there has never been a slip of a cog or the unengearing of a wheel that was not foreseen and provided for. To try to balk a part of his game I posted Bryan in advance of the St. Louis convention, and we all know how he upset their plans in the committee, but we also know it took the pressure of one finger on the button at 26 Broadway and the gold telegram episode to put things back into the smooth-running groove. We all know of the kick-up in New York city between McCarren and the Tammany leader, but a pressure of a thumb on another button at 26 Broadway, and the hated antagonists found it possible to live in the same world without flying at each other's throats. Everybody marvelled at the ease with which the various rivalries in Democratic politics in New York State were subdued to make unanimous Judge Herrick's nomination for Governor. I could give you, had I the space, a thousand and one of the marvels which this "System" is performing in the present campaign, and which will have for their finish the sudden purchase of a few doubtful States a few days before election, and—the annihilation of Theodore Roosevelt and his ambitions, and—hell for the American people.

Four days after the publication of these statements in New York, at Esopus on the 24th, Judge Parker made a speech in which he criticized the trusts and their activities in politics. Explaining

that many years had passed since his active participation in politics, he said that a startling change for the worse had taken place—

a change that has introduced debasing and corrupt methods, which threaten the integrity of our government, leaving it perhaps a republic in form, but not a republic in substance; no longer a government of the people, by the people, for the people, but a government whose officers are practically chosen by a handful of corporate managers, who levy upon the assets of the stockholders whom they represent such sums of money as they deem requisite to place the conduct of the government in such hands as they consider best for their private interests.

Protesting then that he meant no criticism of individual contributions to legitimate campaign expenses, nor of the accumulation of property and its just protection, Judge Parker indicated as the objects of his criticism that class of enterprises, some of which, having unduly thrived through favoritism and been permitted by statute to indirectly levy tribute on the people, have in the course of time—

become so rich and strong that they can and do contribute vast sums when it is made clear that it will advantage them; and they contribute upon the promise, direct or implied, that they shall be permitted to continue to tax the people for their own benefit. Upon such promises contributions have been not infrequently made in such large measure as to induce and procure colonization, repeating and bribery in doubtful States. This has built up a class of voters known to local leaders as 'floaters,' a class so numerous that party canvassers allot to them in their canvass books a separate column headed with that name. This condition is recognized by party workers, local, State and national. They are no longer shocked by it. It has become so prevalent that they are becoming hardened to it. They sometimes wonder where it is to end, but under the stress of a campaign they postpone consideration until the next election. I am persuaded the time to begin the fight against those who would control the results of election contests for their private corporate interests as distinguished from the public interest should begin now, and whatever the result of the election may be it should be continued until the evil is checked. The excessively protected interests, which formerly poured out their treasure in order to continue existing and procure the passage of new laws permitting its further accumulation, have been joined by the combinations popularly called trusts. Their plan is to perpetuate the present Administration. Such of the combinations or trusts as do

not profit by the aid of the tariff secure their profits by the exercise of monopolies. Hence their officers are opposed to the enforcement of law as against them. When such forces unite to furnish the money which they are promised will control the election their purpose is as clear as noonday; it is to buy the election, to purchase four years more of profit by tariff or four years more of extortion from the public by means of monopoly. Political contributions by corporations and trusts mean corruption. They cannot be honest. Merely business interests are moved by merely business considerations. A corporation will subscribe to a political party only because the corporation expects that party, through its control of public officers, executive or legislative, to do something for the benefit of the corporation or to refrain from doing something to its injury. No other motive can be imagined. In the nature of things no other motive can exist. The relations established mean the expectation, if not agreement, actual or implied, that government action is to be influenced by and for corporation interests. No sophistry can give any other aspect to the transaction in the minds of reasonable men.

The scheme of our government opposes favoritism, but in its administration there has been much of it. Indeed, it has been growing with such rapidity in recent years that those few who have enjoyed favors contributed either directly by statute or indirectly by the nonprosecution of violations of law, represent, control and are possessed of many hundreds of millions of dollars. These interests have decided to attempt to continue the present administration in power. Their representatives scolded about the President for some months and thus contributed their part toward the effort which was assiduously made to satisfy the country that the trusts were opposed to their present administration. Whether there were real difficulties between these great powers and the administration, difficulties which have since been settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, or whether there were no difficulties to be compromised and adjusted, their action being but a play to deceive the voters, the fact remains that the trusts are not now opposed to the continuance of the present administration. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that they have determined to furnish such a sum of money to the Republican national committee as it is hoped will secure the 'floaters' in the doubtful States for the Republican ticket. Such an attempt constitutes both a menace and a challenge to every patriotic and law-abiding person in this country; a challenge which ought to be accepted. The question ought to be settled now whether the 'floaters' and illegal combinations can together control an election in this country. Such a contest means on one side vast sums of money and every man with an itch

ing palm. It ought to array every honest, independent and patriotic citizen on the other side."

Following immediately upon Judge Parker's speech, which is supposed to have been intended as an indirect denial of Lawson's accusation, there appeared the subjoined official denial by the board of directors of the Standard Oil company:

In view of the many false and misleading statements from various sources, the directors of the Standard Oil company deem it advisable to state to the company's shareholders and the public that neither now nor at any time has the Standard Oil company, or any of its constituent companies, been interested in any business not directly related with and necessary to the petroleum trade. It would be almost impossible to designate in this denial the different classes of business with which irresponsible parties have coupled the Standard Oil company's name, but it may not be amiss to specify copper, steel, banks, railroads and gas (other than natural gas) as being most prominently mentioned. With none of these affairs has the Standard Oil company been at any time connected. Individual members of the Standard Oil company have been and are interested as individuals in various enterprises, but this is entirely outside of the business of the Standard Oil company, which is oil alone, unaffected by other interests in which its stockholders may invest. Neither is it true that Standard Oil company, Mr. John D. Rockefeller or any officer of the Standard Oil company has taken part in securing the nomination of any candidate for office, as is so positively stated. Furthermore, it is entirely untrue that there is any "Standard Oil party" banded together for speculation in stocks, as is so commonly charged. The name of Standard Oil company is frequently used by designing persons in the manipulation of the stock market, but its use is unwarranted. The Standard Oil company departs from its usual custom in making this denial for the reason that the statements being made at this time by newspapers, magazines and sensational public speakers appear to be unusually mendacious, and may, to a great extent, mislead the public.

Mr. Lawson responded on the 26th to the Standard Oil company's statement, reiterating his original accusation. He declares the nomination of Parker was secured by Senator McCarren, and that McCarren for years has been in the employ of Standard Oil, assertions for which he names H. H. Rogers as his authority. Describ-

ing the directors' meeting at which the Standard Oil statement was adopted, Mr. Lawson says:

Yesterday "Standard Oil" had a meeting. There probably never was one held before to which the other "Standard Oil" men went with such uncertain dread as yesterday. I keep closely in touch with 26 Broadway. I used to for gain, but I do now for safety. The word was passed before yesterday's meeting 'John D.' is furious, and something is going to drop. A few of the active men were so scared they slipped into the market and out of their stocks. John D. Rockefeller did all the talking that broke 40 years of silence. Bolled down, it would read: "The people are aroused as never before. Bank deposits are being withdrawn throughout the country, and insurance policy-holders are panic stricken. Some one in this building is responsible for it. It is not I. I have been deceived, whether intentionally or unintentionally is of no choice, but I see and hear enough to convince me there has been done in the name of "Standard Oil" that which I am in ignorance of, and I propose to tell the people it is not this company or John D. Rockefeller who has done it," and he dictated the statement that this morning startled the business world.

Mr. Lawson adds:

Notwithstanding the resolution passed by the Standard Oil company yesterday, I now repeat all that I have stated in regard to those people's operations in business and in connection with the present campaign.

Prior to his speech on that episode of the campaign, Judge Parker had made a speech, on the 22d, in opposition to the protective policy and in favor of gradual tariff reduction. On the 23d a dispatch from Gov. Wright, of the Philippines, in answer to Judge Parker's speech of the 15th (p. 456), was given out at Washington. On the 21st ex-President Cleveland re-entered the Democratic party with a speech for Parker at Carnegie Hall, New York. His reception was enthusiastic, the initial applause lasting for 13 minutes. Wm. J. Bryan returned to the stump in Indiana (p. 456) on the 25th, after a speaking tour of Ohio in which he spoke for Parker at 21 different places.

A unique political situation is presented in the 21st Congressional district of Ohio, the district formerly represented by Mayor Johnson of Cleveland. Mr. Johnson's successor was Theodore E.

Burton, who has been reelected since 1894. Although a Republican, Mr. Burton has opposed the ship subsidy measures and otherwise made himself acceptable to Democrats. The Democratic convention nominated Edmund G. Vail, a radical Democrat, as Mr. Burton's adversary; but Mr. Vail declined and intimated his intention of voting for Burton. Several delegates to the Democratic convention thereupon proposed to nominate Burton himself in Vail's place. Mayor Johnson advised against this course, but suggested that no nomination be made, a suggestion which was adopted. Mr. Burton's is therefore the only important Congressional candidacy in the district and Mayor Johnson among other leading Democrats has announced his intention of voting for him.

Pursuant to instructions (p. 458), the legislative committee of the Chicago Federation appeared before the school management committee of the school board on the 24th with their request that literature in behalf of the "public policy" propositions to be voted on at the coming election be distributed through the public schools in the same manner in which the board has decided to distribute Civic Federation literature in support of the proposed charter amendment also to be voted on at that time. The president of the board advocated a secret session for consideration of the subject, but this was voted down. After a long discussion the committee decided to reject the petition, the voting standing three to five. The minority, composed of the Rev. R. A. White, Mr. O'Ryan and Mrs. Keogh, took the ground that inasmuch as the board had set the precedent of using the schools for electioneering on the charter it could not refuse to use them similarly in electioneering on other questions of public local concern. This has had the effect of influencing the board to rescind its action regarding the charter, which it did on the 26th. The influence to that end is reported to have been strengthened by threats of the Federation of Labor, the Referendum League and other civil bodies not only to apply to the courts but to urge parents to keep their children out of school on the day designated as "Charter Day."

The triennial general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which assembled at Boston on the 5th, dissolved on the 26th. Strenuous efforts were made during the convention to secure the adoption of a new marriage-and-divorce canon. The old canon allows Episcopal clergymen to marry the innocent party to a divorce granted for adultery. A stricter rule was aimed at. But the house of bishops and the house of clerical and lay deputies, of which the general convention is composed, were unable to agree upon any radical change. Following is the canon adopted on the 24th:

No minister, knowingly after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has been or is the husband or wife of any other person then living, from whom he or she has been divorced, for any cause arising after marriage. But this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, provided, that before the application for such remarriage a period of not less than one year shall have elapsed after the granting of such divorce, and that satisfactory evidence, touching the facts in the case, including a copy of the court's decree and record, if practicable, with such proof that the defendant was personally served or appeared in the action, be laid before the ecclesiastical authority, and such ecclesiastical authority, having taken legal advice thereon, shall have declared in writing that in his judgment the case of the applicant conforms to the requirements of this canon, and, provided further, that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to solemnize any marriage.

Another event of general interest at the Episcopal convention was the presentation on the 18th of a report on labor unions by a committee of which Bishop Potter was chairman. In the course of their report the committee declared that—

the laborer has learned from the capitalist to despise order and break law. He has learned from the churchman to pursue the dissenter with menace and violence. The recent tragedies in Colorado do not follow at a great distance the massacres which in the sixteenth century ensued upon the withdrawal of Holland from the ecclesiastical union. While, then, we condemn the tyranny and turbulence of the labor union and call upon the law to preserve the liberty of every citizen to employ whom he will and to work for whom he will, we deprecate the hasty temper, which, in con-

demning the errors of the unions, condemns at the same time the whole movement with which they are connected.

The labor union movement scored a notable victory at the Illinois convention of Women's clubs at Danville on the 20th. The question turned on a motion to amend the clause in the constitution fixing terms of membership in the State organization, which was in these words:

Clubs applying for membership shall show that their chief purpose is literary, artistic, educational or philanthropic. For the word "philanthropic" the word "sociological" was substituted by a vote of 270 to 35. The opposition was strenuous on the ground that the change would open the way to admitting delegates from labor unions. To this objection such impressive replies as these were made: "These working women are our sisters." "It is for us to extend the hand of fellowship to them. They need us; we need them." "What have we to fear from labor unions? They are made up of earnest, hard-working women, with hearts like our hearts and ideals as high as ours. They are our sisters." "They give us our leisure. They are doing our work for us that we may be down here. They are making in factories the clothes we used to make at home, the preserves we used to put up at home. We are indebted to them for our leisure." "We are human, and nothing human should be foreign to us."

The day following that on which this convention enlarged the limitations of its membership so as to include sociological organizations, it endorsed, by a vote of 74 to 35, a bill to be introduced in the next legislature of Illinois giving to women the full measure of suffrage.

At a meeting of the International Arbitration Society at Chicago on the 23d, at which Edmund J. James, president of the University of Illinois, presided, a resolution was adopted recommending to the government of the United States that it make efforts to secure a treaty with Great Britain agreeing to submit to arbitration by the permanent court at The Hague, or, in default of such submission, by some tribunal espe-

cially constituted for the case, all differences which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiations. The resolution also urged that these two governments agree not to resort in any case to hostile measures of any description till an effort has been made to settle any matter in dispute by submitting the same either to the permanent court at The Hague or to a commission composed of an equal number of persons from each country of recognized competence in questions of international law. It was decided to call later in the year a conference at Chicago of representatives of municipalities, commercial, industrial, legal and philanthropic societies and other organizations to adopt means to promote this movement for a permanent Anglo-American peace treaty.

In fulfillment of his promise to the members of the Interparliamentary Union (p. 425), President Roosevelt has made advances to the European powers with a view to reconvening The Hague conference. This action was announced from Washington on the 25th. It takes the form of an invitation from President Roosevelt to the signatory Powers of the original Hague treaty to come together again for the purpose of broadening and strengthening that treaty, and especially to consider means to ameliorate further the horrors of modern warfare, and to conserve and extend the rights of neutral commerce on the high seas. In addition to the signatory Powers the invitation goes to four of the South and Central American republics, which have signified an earnest desire to adhere to The Hague treaty, but so far have been prevented from doing so by the treaties allowing Powers to adhere to the articles of the treaty upon their own application. The President's note of invitation is directed to the American ambassadors and ministers abroad, with instructions to sound the governments to which they are accredited, and to extend the invitation in such terms as they see fit.

In the French chamber of deputies on the 22d Mr. Combes, the premier, formally announced that the concordat between France and the Roman Catholic Church (p. 279) could not continue. The

announcement caused a great uproar and a heated debate in the chamber, but the premier's declared policy was approved by a vote of 325 to 237.

No important changes in the military situation are reliably reported, either from the field of operations near Mukden or from the siege of Port Arthur. Gen. Kourapatkin was promoted by the Czar on the 23d as commander-in-chief of the Russian army.

General attention has been drawn away from the fighting in Manchuria by the astonishing operations of the Russian Baltic fleet in the North Sea. This fleet sailed from Cronstadt on the 11th of September (p. 374), but was detained on the 14th of that month at Revel, near the mouth of the Gulf of Finland, for further orders. After the lapse of more than a month there were reports from Scandinavian ports of the movement of the fleet into the North Sea; and on the 24th came the astonishing report from London that on the 22d it had fired into a British fishing fleet. It appears that the Gamecock fishing fleet of 50 trawlers from Hull, lying 220 miles from Spurnhead in the North Sea, was sighted by the Russian fleet about half past one in the morning of the 22d and scrutinized with search-lights. After this scrutiny the fleet fired upon the fishing vessels killing several fishermen and sinking one of the trawlers. It then sailed away on its course. There was great indignation in England when the facts were reported. The Czar sent a message to King Edward on the 25th expressing profound regret and stating that while no report had yet been received on the subject, the fullest reparation would be made to the families of the sufferers. The Russian fleet has arrived at Vigo, Spain, and on the 26th, from that port, Vice-Admiral Rojestvensky is reported to have said in an interview that he acted for the purpose of preventing the destruction of his fleet. This is explained by the statement that he had made known his intention to attack any vessel approaching his fleet, and that torpedo boats, supposed to be Japanese, had suddenly appeared between the two divisions of the

fleet in the North Sea and seemed to discharge torpedoes, whereupon the fleet had opened fire.

The British government was reported from London on the 27th as having made the following demands upon Russia:

- (1) An apology for the attack.
- (2) Pecuniary indemnity for the victims.
- (3) The punishment of the Russian officers concerned.
- (4) A guarantee of the future security of British shipping from similar attacks.

According to the same report a squadron of British battleships has been ordered to cross the pathway of the Russian fleet off Gibraltar.

NEWS NOTES.

—John Morley, the English author and statesman, arrived in New York on the 24th.

—Cornelius Van Cott, postmaster of New York, died in that city on the 25th, at the age of 66.

—Victor Yarros has begun a series of eight lectures on "Herbert Spencer and Evolution" before the philosophy and science department of the Woman's Club of Chicago.

—The Federal grand jury of Alabama returned indictments on the 24th against members of the mob that lynched Horace Maples (p. 442) the Negro prisoner at Huntsville.

—The Chicago Examiner is still soliciting signatures for the petition against the pending compromise traction ordinance (p. 424), with the object of securing 200,000 names.

—Vassar college students are reported as trying the novel experiment of holding a mock Presidential election, with all the machinery in operation according to the election laws. They have campaign committees, political headquarters, a quota of spellbinders, and workers to solicit votes. The voting is to be done on the legal election day.

—In charging the grand jury of Bullock county, Ga., on the 24th regarding the lynching and burning of two Negro prisoners by a mob (p. 377) Judge A. F. Daly said: "If you have a majority in favor of mob law you are in a bad way and need correction in your county. The court-martial had evidence that some of your citizens were leaders of the mob. If you find this to be true, you must indict them."

—An airship was sailed successfully on the 26th from the world's fair grounds in St. Louis to Cahokia, Ill., across the Mississippi river. The flight consumed an hour's time and during 15 minutes the

ship responded to its propellers and flew in any direction desired by the operator. After the first 15 minutes it was steerable, but the motors had stopped owing to a mishap to the engines. This dirigible balloon is the invention of Thomas S. Baldwin, of California, and during its flight was operated by A. Ray Knabenshue, of Toledo, O.

—Prof. Oscar L. Triggs, who left the University of Chicago last spring (p. 158), has announced a new educational institution, the "People's Industrial School," to be established near Chicago. The office is at Twentieth street and Indiana avenue. The curriculum embraces no studies but farming, wood-working, iron-working and other industrial arts. Higher mathematics will be omitted as of little value and history and geography will have no place. The school is to be made self-supporting so as to be independent of rich men's favors.

PRESS OPINIONS.

JUDGE PARKER AND HIS PLATFORM.
Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Oct. 19.—Judge Parker insists that the Filipinos shall be given their independence as soon as they are prepared for it. The platform says they shall have it as soon as they shall give suitable guaranties that the lives and property of foreigners will be respected. There is a vital difference between Judge Parker's position and that of the party as declared in its platform. His promise has an exceedingly long string to it. For evidently he contemplates that we and not the Filipinos shall be the judge of their fitness for independence. And even the Saintly Taft says the Philippines shall be given their independence when they are prepared to exercise it according to our standards.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.
The Commoner (Dem.), Oct. 21.—Every man is responsible for his influence, be it small or great. Every Democrat who votes for Parker votes to defeat Roosevelt. Every Democrat who does not vote for Parker contributes toward the election of Roosevelt. On every question upon which Judge Parker's position is open to criticism, President Roosevelt's position is worse; where they differ, as they do upon many important questions, Parker is right and Roosevelt is wrong. Roosevelt favors a high tariff; Parker favors tariff reform. Roosevelt favors a standing army of 80,000 at the minimum; Parker favors a reduction of the army. Roosevelt has brought the race issue into national politics; Parker would remove the race issue from politics. Roosevelt stands for a colonial policy; Parker favors independence for the Filipinos and would make the promise now. Roosevelt took into the White House a spirit of war; Judge Parker would substitute for it a spirit of peace. Four years more of Roosevelt would make economic and industrial reform more difficult; Judge Parker's election would clear the way for economic issues. Let no Democrat, by voting against Parker or by refusing to vote, take upon himself the responsibility for four years more of Rooseveltism.

THE UNANIMOUS CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE.
Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Oct. 21.—The withdrawal of Mr. Vall from the Democratic Congressional ticket leaves Hon. Theodore E. Burton practically without opposition. Mr. Vall was nominated without his consent and had no intention

of remaining a candidate. He had, in fact, announced his intention of voting for Mr. Burton, and it was well understood that a number of influential Democrats had the same intention. This action is a justification of the Plain Dealer's course in supporting Mr. Burton two years ago for the same reasons that Democratic opposition to him has now been withdrawn. It is true that Mr. Burton is a Republican and remains true to the party organization. But it is also true that he represents the good in that party and has firmly resisted endeavors to induce him to favor what he believes to be evil tendencies in it. More than once the party lash has been applied, but without effect. . . . His election for the seventh time, and without opposition except by the minor parties, will give him a unique position in the next Congress and one of great influence, whatever may be the political complexion of the majority.

PARTY REGULARITY.

Cleveland Waechter und Anzeiger (Ger. Dem.), Oct. 24.—Whenever you hear the cry: "Vote the ticket straight!" you may depend upon it there are crooked designs back of it.

THE CHICAGO CHARTER QUESTION.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep. and pro-charter), Oct. 26.—The Lincoln News-Herald announces that after having for some time past advocated the proposed constitutional amendment it will hereafter oppose it. . . . It objects to the proposed amendment because, it says, it will defeat the adoption of an entirely new constitution. It says the whole State is as much hampered by the present constitution as Chicago is and wants a new one, but that Chicago opposes it and proposes to obtain relief from its own troubles and leave the rest of the State in a hole. . . . The truth is, as the News-Herald ought to know, that the whole State dreads a constitutional convention, and dreads it for the same reason that Hamlet dreaded death. That is, because it is better to bear the ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of. This State is honeycombed with socialism, populism and every other sort of political heresy and vagary, and it is the fear that some of these poisonous errors may creep into a new constitution that makes the State willing to put up as long as possible with the imperfections of the present one. . . . Many other reasons might be given why this State never will and never ought to see another constitutional convention, but we will promise the News-Herald that if the outside counties will scratch Chicago's back this time Chicago will return the favor whenever they choose to ask for relief through a reasonable constitutional amendment.

MISCELLANY

THE LONE TRAVELER.

For The Public.

Whence comest thou, lone traveler,
And whither is thy flight?
And why thy journey thus alone?
Day fadeth into night;
Day fadeth into night;
And still with outstretched, tireless wing,
Danger unheeding,
Onward thou'rt speeding,
Whither, ah, whither?

Art thou intrepid pioneer,
That leads the pathless way
To some bright, sunlit home, afar
From darksome winter day?
Or, laggard-like, hast lingered near
Some fav'rite marsh or fen,
Beyond the sight or ken
Of mortal eye?

Until, with shrill cry of alarm,
Thou'st found thyself alone

With dark'ning skies and winter's chill,
Mates and companions flown.
With swifter pinions art thou blest?
And canst thou overtake
Thy mates, and hope to make
With them thy home?

Ah, tireless wanderer! who guides
Thy lonely, weary way?
Dost follow unknown star that leads
Thee on to cloudless day?
Dost feel some wise, unerring sight,
That watches o'er thy pathless flight,
That thou 'mid storm and darkest night,
Undaunted, strong, without affright,
Thy way pursuest?

Hush! eager questioner; nor seek
Life's mysteries to unfold!
Enough that One doth hold
In wisdom and in love,
The universe above,
Beneath, around us all,
And naught is great, and naught is small
To Love Omnipotent!
SARAH MARTYN WRIGHT.

PROTECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Portions of the address of W. L. Douglas, accepting the Democratic nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, October 13, 1904.

Our forefathers builded wisely when they tore down the tariff walls that surrounded each State previous to 1787 and made it unconstitutional to build new walls around the States. And yet, is there any stronger reason for an insurmountable tariff wall between New York and Canada than between New York and Pennsylvania? What would happen in this country if the tariff wall between us and Canada were extended around each State? Prosperity would vanish and we would sink to the low industrial level of the small European countries, each surrounded by a tariff wall, not nearly so high as our Dingley inclosure. What would happen to this grand old Commonwealth if cut off from the rest of the United States by a Dingley wall? Would not the New England States soon be depopulated if thus deprived of the foodstuffs and raw materials of the middle and western States? Only a truly great country can prosper under the blighting Dingley tariff.

It is because Massachusetts is partly cut off from the rest of this country, and is, by protected trusts, deprived of the cheap raw materials to which she is fairly entitled, as one of the States composing our Union, that her more intelligent and enterprising citizens are now agitating for reciprocity with Canada and other countries. She is unwilling to further sacrifice her industries upon the altar of protection, and is asking her representatives in Congress not to forget her interests.
But few, perhaps, realize the heavy tariff burden now carried by Massachusetts. Based upon the census figures for

1900 and upon the Statistics of Manufactures of Massachusetts for 1903, the value of the materials or stock used in our manufactures in 1903 was \$660,000,000. Rough estimates indicate that the tariff tax upon such of these materials as are dutiable is about \$71,000,000. That is, materials which would cost our manufacturers but \$589,000,000 were they free, now cost \$660,000,000. With free raw materials, goods which last year cost us \$1,243,000,000 to produce, would have cost us only \$1,172,000,000. That is, taxed raw materials add more than six per cent. to the cost of manufacturing goods in this Commonwealth. Only those who know the small margins on which most manufactured goods are sold can appreciate the handicap thus placed upon our industries and the effect that its removal would have upon our manufactures, especially in obtaining foreign trade. Give our manufacturers as cheap materials as have manufacturers in England, and we will soon be masters of the world's markets in the several great industries in which we are by nature and by acquired abilities preeminent.

To our workmen free raw materials would mean more work and steadier employment at higher wages. If not higher money wages, at least higher purchasing power, for prices would be lower and the cost of living less.

In 1903, about \$250,000,000 was paid in wages to about 535,000 workers in Massachusetts. The average earnings, then, was about \$471.23 a year, or \$9.06 per week. If the manufacturers could save \$71,000,000 on materials, they could pay \$71,000,000 more in wages, and manufacture goods at the same cost as at present. That is, they could afford to raise wages about 30 per cent., and not make the goods cost more than now.

Had our cotton manufacturers untaxed yarns, chemicals and dyestuffs, coal, and other materials and supplies, it is probable that the 30,000 workers now on strike in Fall River against a 12½ per cent. reduction in wages, on top of a ten per cent. reduction last fall, would now be at work at higher wages.

As nearly all of the materials and supplies used in our manufactures comes from outside Massachusetts, it is probable that our Commonwealth loses five times as much as she gains by protection—to somebody, somewhere. That is, we put six dollars into the protection pool for every one that we get out. Our protectionist statesmen at Washington insist that we shall go on doing this and keep quiet.

The greatest of our manufacturing industries is that of boots and shoes.

The value of the factory product of the 645 establishments reported in the Massachusetts Statistics of Manufactures for 1903 was \$159,247,529; and the value of stock used, \$100,300,514.

Considering the product of these 645 establishments, for which we can make approximate estimates of the values of the various kinds of materials used, we estimate the amount of the tariff tax on these materials and supplies at \$9,900,000. The tax on sole leather alone is estimated at \$2,250,000, or ten per cent. of the value of the leather used. There can be but little doubt about this tax, for both sole and upper leather, made in the United States from imported hides, is sold to foreign manufacturers at prices much less than we can buy it.

As about 25 per cent. of all leather manufactured in this country is made from foreign hides and skins, it is clear not only that the duty of 15 per cent. on hides not only enhances the price of leather made from imported hides, but the price of all sole leather to American manufacturers by 11 or 12 per cent.

Very little sole leather is made in Massachusetts. Nearly all of this tariff tax is supposed to go to the beef and sole leather trusts. To the beef trust by virtue of the 15 per cent. duty on hides, and to the leather trust by virtue of the 20 per cent. duty on leather. Some of the members of the beef trust have become large tanners of hides in order that they may get the full benefit of these duties. It is doubtful if the prices of cattle are affected in the least by the duty on hides.

As there were about 110,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes made in Massachusetts in 1903, the average manufacturing cost per pair was about \$1.44 and the average tax about nine cents per pair. The saving of this tariff tax by reciprocal trade treaties or otherwise would enable us to greatly increase our output and to give steadier employment to labor. The saving to the 3,000,000 people of Massachusetts in the cost of shoes would be nearly \$1,000,000.

Speaking for myself, I would gladly give up the duty of 25 per cent. on shoes to obtain free raw materials. Yes, even to obtain free hides and free sole leather. If the handicap of taxed leather were removed I could produce shoes at as low cost as could any manufacturer in any foreign country and meet the competition of the world. Cheap labor is not cheap. It is clear

when effectiveness is considered. Our Massachusetts methods of manufacturing and the economical division of labor enables us to produce shoes at as low labor cost, quality considered, as anywhere in the world. It is the high cost of materials that bars us from the fullest possible participation in foreign markets. In spite of this handicap our last year's exports of boots and shoes from the United States were valued at \$7,238,940.

But I am not alone in these views. Early in 1903, 311 out of 375 important manufacturers of boots and shoes in New England declared in favor of giving up the duty on shoes if hides were made free. Many of our very largest manufacturers have frequently and publicly denounced the duty on hides and proclaimed their willingness to part with the duty on shoes.

Besides the effect of the tariff tax on raw materials, which affects the manufacturers primarily, we must not forget or neglect, as the Republicans do, the interests of the consumers, of whom there are about 3,000,000 in Massachusetts. The motto of the Democratic party is, as I understand it: "The greatest good to the greatest number."

Careful estimates show that the average tariff tax per family paid in 1903 was about \$111 for the United States. Of this tax only \$16.52 per family went to the Government. Over \$94 went to the trusts and other protected interests. It is probable that this tax for the benefit of trusts averaged \$100 per family for the 650,000 families in Massachusetts, or \$65,000,000 for the Commonwealth.

While it is impossible as long as we obtain our revenue largely from tariff taxes, to prevent considerable salvage for the protected trusts, yet our aim should be to minimize this loss and to get into our treasury at Washington nearly every dollar collected from the people. There should be no tariff "graft" for the trusts. This \$100 tariff tax paid by each family should go for more and better food and clothing for our women and children, and not to increase the dividends on the watered stocks of the protected corporations. Our constant aim should be to reduce the cost of living and to increase the comforts and health of the people.

A NEW ENGLAND ESTIMATE OF WATSON.

From the Boston Evening Transcript of October 15, 1904.

Thomas E. Watson, the Georgian populist leader, now candidate for the presidency on the People's Party ticket, is not a man who will have to

be seriously reckoned with in national politics; but he is nevertheless a serious force in the South. What he said and did and the way in which he bore himself during his recent campaigning visit to New York and New Jersey attracted much attention from men who look beneath the surface in politics. Watson is worth study.

His platform, made very plain in his sincere, impassioned and somewhat bitter letter of acceptance, to which all the New York newspapers gave much space on Sunday and Monday, is of course the old Bryan platform with additions. It stands for "bimetallism," the public ownership of railroads, etc., the popular election of judges (including the justices of the United States supreme court), the referendum, etc. But none of these specific "planks" or demands explains the man or gives a very clear idea of what he stands for; for they are more or less ineffective efforts to translate into current political phraseology what is really a social idea. Watson is more interesting than his platform, and more significant.

Respectably born and reared, of good Southern stock, with no pretensions to "aristocracy," but with a good and secure claim on dignity, decency and sincerity, he took seriously the Southern talk about Jeffersonian democracy which to most men is a mere formula—a dogma that is useful and sonorous in public addresses, but has no relation to public or private life. For the whole tendency of Southern thought is away from a real democracy. Every step it has taken in Watson's lifetime has been towards an oligarchy—directly away from a real democracy. But here is a man who really read Jefferson (he has written a "life" of him), who sincerely accepted the Declaration of Independence, who believes that the people ought to decide all public questions and that they will decide wisely—a real democratic man.

He has practiced the law with a fair measure of success; he has served in Congress; he has already had a long experience in politics, as a candidate once for the vice presidency and now for the presidency; he has done as much public speaking, perhaps, as any man in public life, Bryan only excepted, but none of these activities gives the central clew to the man's character and temperament. His real life has been spent in his library. His "Life of Jefferson" and his "History of the French Revolution" tell the true story of his ambition and dis-

position. Not having had the training of a scholar, his literary and historical work is faulty. It is work done by a man who has lived alone in a little Georgian town, who does not know what the great scholars and historians of this era of scholarship have done. His books are books of the sort—second-hand books, of course—that men wrote on such subjects 50 years ago. But they show sincerity of conviction, an intellectual zeal, and a clear style. All his life he has hammered on the one idea of the people, the people, the people. They are the source of power; and they must regain power; and they must use it directly. The nation must, as nearly as possible, be a town-meeting.

He has lived in a simple community where the people are poor. Their poverty, then, like all other misfortunes, is due to the loss of direct power by the people. The Jeffersonian doctrine would cure poverty as well as boss-ship.

The practically socialistic doctrine that he has developed is not the result of Karl Marx's books. It is not European socialism of any of the well-known types. It is not the doctrine that you hear expounded by either of the organized groups of Socialists that we have in all our industrial centers. The interesting thing about it is that it is a native Georgia product. Watson differs from Bryan in several ways; and in these differences appears the really Southern quality of his thought.

What he stands for is rebellion against the insincerity that he has found all about him. The Southern Democracy is not democratic. To him, then, it is a lie, and this is the one truth that he is trying to express in terms of tariffs, currency plans, municipal ownership, and the like. He represents a revolt, as clearly as Tillman represented a revolt, and, in its essence, it is a social revolt. "You mumble the Declaration," he says in effect, "but your conduct gives the lie to it every day of your life."

Now what are the instruments of revolt in the South? In politics the Republican party seems a natural instrument. But to a man of Watson's rearing and bent of mind, it was impossible to use it. His dogma includes free trade and "bimetallism," and other doctrines that the Republican party does not stand for. Watson does not see—perhaps can never see—that as regards the large, simple question of human rights he is in close sympathy with all the great Republicans. His doctrinal way leads elsewhere. Since he must express himself politically, he had no course

open to him (from his point of view) but a third party.

His third party is a hopeless undertaking. He is little better than a political outcast in the South; and he will never make his revolt an effective political movement. It is academic and antiquated. He is, therefore, only a sort of voice crying in the wilderness; and the miscellaneous group of doctrines that he carries will not win him a large compact following—certainly not in prosperous times.

But this is by no means the end of the matter or of its significance. The one fact that has forced Watson to revolt from the Democratic party is that speech and opinion are not free in the South. There is a central falsehood in a Democracy that is not democratic. He is not a charlatan, not a poseur. He is both sincere and brave. His doctrines are mistaken—his remedies false remedies. But that is an intellectual, not a moral mistake. And the necessity of revolt is not an intellectual mistake.

This is the interesting spectacle that he presents, then—a man of the South, a man of the common people, a man, too, of honesty and sincerity, comes and says: "We are mocked by this so-called Democracy. We call on Jefferson, and we do not know what Jefferson stood for. We talk about equal rights, and we have no equal rights. If a man differs with you, you yell 'Negro rule,' thus using the poor Negro as a cloak to your lie. Let us be honest. We shall have freedom at least of discussion." It were better that a man who raises such a cry of revolt were not encumbered with a lot of doctrinal baggage, which impedes his journey. But it is better to have this revolt than none at all.

And the Southern masses recognize the fundamental truth that moves him out of the beaten paths. He is having an influence far beyond the number of votes that he will poll. He is an important step in the growth of revolt. First there was Tillman, who overthrew in South Carolina the aristocratic oligarchy. But he did it in the manner of a bully, and he set up an oligarchy of his own vulgar sort, outdoing the old oligarchies. They were at least gentlemen. That social revolt did not get far. Now as the next revolt (among the people themselves) comes Watson's. A gentler, higher, finer man, he has nothing in common with Tillman. He is a democrat, not a bully. He has a sort of apostolic fervor. Eloquent in his way, he wins your sympathy. He hurts his cause, no doubt, by his easy use of sarcasm; but he is not coarse. He has the gift of speech, too, to an uncommon degree of clearness as well as

of fluency. There are few Southern men in public life who speak as well. He has humor, too; and you find when you talk with him that he has companionable qualities. You like the man. As you come closer to him, you discover a reason for his declaration of independence. You respect him. His remedies may be wrong. But he is no demagogue. He means every word that he says. He has not analyzed the great forces of political life clearly, but he has made a good moral analysis of the Southern repressive attitude. He sees that the political use of the Negro is a piece of humbug. He revolts at the fraud of it. He sees and feels the neglect of the masses of the whites. The pretended political concern for them also is a humbug. In him the honest, uninformed, common Southern man finds a voice—a voice crying against a real wrong.

In physique and in manner he is very Southern. Thin, wiry, somewhat ungainly, yet perfectly self-possessed; good-natured—there is no bitterness in the man, but a serene, philosophical temper—apt in illustration; a man with a dreamy, unpractical mind, like most Southerners he can ride a theory from one end of life to the other, and never discover that he has not moved forward a foot; he mistakes prancing for progress. His homely face lights up wonderfully in conversation, and it can become set, too, when he becomes earnest, to a mood of the utmost seriousness.

This earnest son of the soil says to you when you come to know him that the Southern masses must throw off the essential falsehood of Southern political life. Although he seeks a national audience and proclaims his economic formulae in New York and in New Jersey with the same confidence as in Georgia and Mississippi, he is really speaking all the while for and to the Southern masses, the men who are led by their race feeling to smother independence of thought on most important public subjects. Men everywhere discern this. His thoughtful hearers understand it even better, perhaps, than Mr. Watson understands it himself.

When, for instance, a cry was raised in one Southern community against a white man that he had once voted for a colored man, and thereby showed himself a "traitor" to his race, and the whole dominant crowd raised the cry of "traitor," Watson said in a speech there that the white Democrats' use of the Negro was simply to stifle thought and discussion. He knew nothing of the local incident; but his hearers applied his philosophy to it, and knew that he spoke truly.

Again, no man has spoken more fear-

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER, COUNSELLOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 50 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, Tel. Call, 604 Cortlandt, Rooms 211-212, NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON, CONTRACTOR. Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley and Municipal Work. 35 Liberty Street, New York. Trolley Roads built complete and snappy.

A BANQUET will be given in honor of the Rev. H. S. Bigelow on November 21st, at Kinsley's. For further information, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1202 Ashland Block, Tel.—Central 927—or Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1014 Masonic Temple, Tel. Central 2691, Automatic 7391. Speakers and programme will be announced later.

Mr. John Z. White's Dates FOR THE SEASON.

Monday, October 17th, to Monday, October 24th—Kansas City, Mo. Tuesday, October 25th, to Wednesday, October 26th—St. Joseph, Mo. Thursday, October 27th, to Sunday, November 6th—St. Louis, Mo. Thursday, November 10th—First Address 9:00 a. m.—Creston, Ia. Friday, November 11th, to November 13th—Omaha, Neb. Monday, November 14th—Lincoln, Neb. Wednesday 18th to Saturday 18th inclusive—Bloomington, Ill. Monday Evening, November 21st—Bigelow dinner, Chicago. Thursday, November 24th, to Wednesday, November 30th inclusive—Butler County, Penn. Thursday, December 1st, to Wednesday, December 14th—Pittsburg, Penn. Thursday, December 15th—Greensburg, Penn. Friday, December 16th, to Thursday, December 22—Johnstown, Penn. Friday, December 23—Allentown, Penn. Saturday, December 25th, to December 28th—Reading, Penn. December 30th—Pottstown, Penn. January 2d to January 15th—Philadelphia, Penn. January 16th to 19th—Wilmington, Del. January 20th to January 24th—Baltimore, Md. January 25th to January 28th—Washington, D. C. January 29th—Lancaster, Penn. January 30th—York, Penn. February 1st to February 7th—Cleveland, O. February 8th to February 12th—Akron, O. February 11th to 15th—Columbus, O. February 16th—Newark, O. February 17th—Zanesville, O. February 18th to 21st—Hamilton, O. February 22d to March 7th—Cincinnati, O. March 8th to March 17th—Indianapolis, Ind. March 18th to March 19th—St. Wayne, Ind. March 20th to 25th—Chicago, Ill. March 27th to April 30th—Tour including Toledo, Ohio, Albany and Birmingham, N. Y., and intermediate points. Address F. H. MONROE, Pres. Henry George Lecture Association, PALOS PARK (Suburb of Chicago), ILL.

FROM THE NEW YORK...

...APATHY

lessly and plainly about child-labor in the Southern cotton mills. In fact he made this a part of his letter of acceptance.

When the political solidity of the South is broken—if it ever is—it will not be broken by pressure from without. The soldiers invite pressure from without, and use it to their advantage. "Northern interference" is one of their best cards. But the solidity will be broken by a revolt from within. It is because of the general tendency of the Watson campaign to break up this stolid solidity of mind that it has a deeper meaning than will appear in the election returns. His particular political programme will be forgotten long before his influence dies away.

SONG OF A CAMPAIGN MANAGER.

For The Public.

At St. Louis we triumphed over Bryan in the fight. By tricks we'd cogitated on through many a sleepless night; We have given every guarantee the case could well admit That if we are successful nothing much will come of it. On no radical proposals have we sympathy to waste, We teach the earth is round or flat according to your taste; Democracy historic we have thus reorganized Only by General Apathy to see it paralyzed.

CHORUS.

We are the genuinely safe and sane, We have cleansed away the Bryanistic stain; But what are we to do—is the question we ask you, To put a little life in our campaign?

In the abstract we believe the Filipinos should be free; But we've got them, and we'd scorn to shirk responsibility; The tariff robbery we fain would reasonably reduce, But the senate stands to render all our efforts of no use. So our giant infant industries have naught to fear from us, We repudiate with emphasis this Bryan railroad muss. Monopolies triumphant find us prompt to pay them court, And why, oh why, do they delay to rush to our support?

CHORUS.

They surely know that we are safe and sane, That politically Bryan's dead again; But they don't come out and say what would be the proper way To put some signs of life in our campaign.

Our candidate—Heaven help the man!—is harassed night and day, So many strings pull on him, pulling each a different way; With safety and with sanity he's hampered, head and hands, Till he almost wishes that he knew himself just where he stands. And the mighty city dailies, which have told and told again How the country would be with us when we ended Bryan's reign, Now that we've planned and schemed and sacrificed and paid the cost, Unkindly nag and scold us shivering out here in the frost.

CHORUS.

Though undeniably we're safe and sane, And have put an end to Bryan's fatal reign. There's a pressing question now that confronts us, namely: How Can we galvanize to life this dead campaign?

JAY HAWKINS.