

Turn, turn, turn, O Wheel,
By rut and path progress;
Turn to the land of light and love
From the land of wickedness.
CHARLES HOWARD FITCH.
124 South Grove avenue, Oak Park, Ill.

NOT BY BREAD ALONE.

On April 23, at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, spoke of the deeper needs of man's nature which make religion a necessity.

It was not said: "Man does not live by bread." He lives by bread and something more.

It is a tragic thing when a man must choose between the satisfaction of his body and the integrity of his soul. When this choice must be made, mankind are a unit in praising those who starved in their garret or died on a scaffold rather than save the body at the cost of the soul. If the soul is the immortal part and the body but the tenement of a day, then, if both cannot live, it is better for the body to die.

In a well-ordered society, however, there could be no such discord. Both soul and body would be nourished. There can be no health of one without the nourishment of the other, as Browning would say: "Nor soul helps flesh more, now, than flesh helps soul."

Those who insist upon social justice that all may have their daily bread—they are the friends of the soul. Moreover, when we insist upon the needs of the soul, we do not deny the needs of the body.

First among the needs of the soul is a clean conscience. It is man's glory that he knows the meaning of that word, "ought." Guilt is a yoke that enslaves him. Remorse rises like a tide within him. He alone is free who can look his fellow-man full in the face; who hides no ugly secret in his heart; who respects himself and has none to fear in all the universe.

A man may have bread enough and to spare, but he will starve without that inward peace. He may have linen and fine raiment, but he will be a naked, shivering soul, if the sense of wrong is rankling in his heart.

The salvation of the soul, what can it mean but the normal life and growth of the soul? Conversion, what is that but the discovery that a man has a soul which must be fed with its own food? There is no true life until the soul comes to a realization of its sovereignty. Redemption is a waking of the desire and determination to be a man, not a wolf nor a swine, but a man, conscious of his divine heritage and his lofty purpose on this earth. Such a man cannot live by bread alone.

Another need of the soul which bread cannot supply is love. Love, also, is meat and drink, and without it the gifts of the world are dry husks.

The wife has put the house in order. She has removed the dust from a hundred places which might have been passed over. She has created an atmosphere of welcome by countless little obscure services. Does the husband take it all as a matter of course? Has he no loving sign of recognition of that thoughtful, heartfelt ministry? A sign of appreciation may crown the labor of a day, and a grateful word feed the hungry heart with happiness.

Another need of the soul is religion. Men may live without creeds and without churches, but there come times when they ask themselves sad questions, and they would give much to know that life has a rational meaning and that man is not mocked by his immortal hopes.

The atom trembles at the thought of the Infinite. The mind craves a reason for things. The heart cannot become reconciled to a loveless universe. The philosopher who traces the course of the stars, the martyr who bears witness to his truth on the up-lifted cross, these mighty thinkers and lovers of mankind, these august souls—are they all the prey of maggots in the end? That thought would kill humanity. Bread alone will not do. We cannot cease to ask questions. We cannot live without hope.

THE ELECTORAL WISDOM OF JAPAN.

It has occurred to me that the old wars of Spain and England, about the time of Queen Elizabeth, furnish an interesting historical parallel with the present war between Russia and Japan. In each case we have a huge despotism unsuccessfully fighting a small maritime power with its face set steadfastly towards constitutional freedom. Since Elizabeth's time England has attained by slow and painful steps the measure of representative government which modern Japan has had the good sense and good fortune to secure almost at a bound. But Japan has done more than this. She has adopted an electoral method which gives her a Parliament more truly representative of the people than the Parliament of England or the Congress of the United States.

Japan's Parliament or "Diet" consists of an upper and a lower house, called respectively the House of Peers and the House of Commons. The Japanese House of Peers corresponds to the House of Lords in England, or the Senate in America—more closely with the former than the latter, because it represents an aristocracy rather than a plutocracy. This article will deal with the House of Commons and the wise principle upon which the election of its members is based. That principle is proportional representation.

The essential facts may be stated in a few words. Japan's House of Commons consists of 379 members, elected by ballot for four years on a very liberal

franchise. There are 47 "prefectures," or electoral districts, giving an average of eight members to a district. These electoral districts vary in population, and the number of members elected from each varies accordingly; the smallest number being five and the largest 13, except in the case of the city of Tokio, which has 15 members to represent its 1,500,000 of souls. Like the others, it is one electoral district.

In every district each elector has one vote only. That is the proportional feature. The very simplicity of the plan stands in the way of a full apprehension of the great political reform which it involves. I shall therefore devote some space to an elucidation of the principle of proportional representation, with brief sketches of the more important systems by which that principle is put into operation. There are several such systems, and that used in Japan is the simplest of them all.

The keynote of proportional representation is the single vote in large electoral districts. By that I mean that each elector casts only one vote, although in his voting district several members or representatives are elected. Unproportional representation is for each elector to cast as many votes as there are members to be elected in such a district, or to vote in a single-member district if he has but a single vote. This is a broad statement, and does not quite cover the ground; but it is a sufficient generalization for my present purpose.

Much puzzlement has resulted from multiplicity of systems and complexity of detail. One purpose of this article is to reduce proportional representation to its simplest terms, both in principle and methods. Before going further, I will summarize briefly the defects of the systems of voting generally used; because the reader new to the subject will ask why any change is needed. With these defects I present also the expected remedies. My statements here are merely dogmatic, but can be amply verified by argument and experience:

1. Nominations, under the present system, are in the hands of the managers of the party machine.

Proportional representation would place nominations in the hands of the people at large.

2. Gerrymandering pays and is practiced under the present system.

Proportional representation would make gerrymandering useless.

3. Bribery pays and is practiced under the present system, because a few purchasable voters can turn the scale. Drinking and treating come under the same category.

Proportional representation would make bribery and treating unpractical.

4. Disfranchisement of nearly half the electors takes place at every general election. An unrepresented minority is created in every district.