

the time would come when the "statutory privilege of bequest and devise" would have to be limited in the interest of the well-being of society "in whose interest" it had been granted, and that the amount which could be left by bequest or devise to any one person or for any one purpose should be demarked.

Intelligence, subtle and far-seeing; character broad and all loving; a moral courage superb; consideration for the foibles and prejudices of others; exquisite courtesies; indifference to personal enrichment; all these marked him a gentleman, and, as such, an embodiment of the highest ideals of the English-speaking race.

I am, with every expression of regard,  
Very truly yours,  
(Signed) JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.  
Mar. 4, 1904.

#### FASHIONABLE ANARCHY.

Some ten days hence  
all the assessors  
in eighty-three counties  
assembling by counties  
will agree among themselves  
to nullify the law,  
to repudiate their oaths,  
to ignore the constitution—  
all the people consenting.

According to their custom  
they will adopt their own standards,  
one class of property 50 per cent,  
another 25 per cent,  
another 20 per cent,  
another 60 per cent,  
another 80 per cent,  
another full 100—  
all in despite of the law.

Other classes they will rate  
at \$40 apiece,  
others at \$1.50 a hundred,  
others at \$5 apiece,  
others at \$5 to \$75,  
without regard to value,  
others they leave entirely  
to the whim of the assessor.

Then they'll go home  
and ignore their agreements  
even as the agreements  
set aside the law,  
all the people consenting.

Here is a shame  
and a veritable scandal,  
the most fundamental  
law of our government  
swept into the dust bin  
by the very officers  
sworn to enforce it—  
all the people consenting.

It strikes at the bottom  
foundations of the government,  
it saps and enfeebles  
the bulwarks of state,  
it undermines decent  
respect for the law,  
it is virtual anarchy  
with its red shirt concealed  
by a mild gray disguise.

It is the same brand of disorder  
that is seen in our great cities

where it spreads into corruption,  
into purchase of special favors  
by otherwise honest citizens,  
where politics is tainted  
by upright business interests,  
where the civic life is rotten  
and honeycombed with grafts  
because law is despised.

This disregard of law  
is the republic's only peril.  
There is one place to cure it  
which is right here at home.  
Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News of Apr. 16.

#### MR. BRYAN ON THE NEW YORK PLATFORM.

Abstract of the speech delivered by William J. Bryan at the Second Regiment armory in Chicago, Saturday evening, April 23, 1904.

As it is somewhat unusual for a political speech to be made as this one is to-night, let me preface my remarks with an explanation. I have hired this hall, and I introduce myself, because I do not care to speak under the auspices of any club or organization which is committed to any particular aspirant for office. My concern is not about the name or the personality of the nominee, but about the principles for which the Democratic party is to stand. While many of the papers seem to assume that the contest for the Democratic nomination is necessarily between Judge Parker and Mr. Hearst, and that every Democrat must either be for one or the other, such a position is illogical and without foundation. Those who are classed as reorganizers—and by that I mean those who would carry the party back to the position that it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration—are not entirely agreed among themselves as to the proper candidate upon whom to concentrate their votes, and so those who are in sympathy with the spirit of our recent platforms may differ as to the relative availability of those who represent the progressive element of the party. My own position is one of neutrality. I regard as available all candidates who are in favor of making the Democratic party an honest, earnest and courageous exponent of the rights and interests of the masses; and I regard as unavailable all who are in sympathy with, or obligated to, the great corporations that to-day dominate the policy of the Republican party, and seek, through the reorganizers, to dominate the policy of the Democratic party. I have no favorites among those on our side, and no special antagonism to those who represent the reorganizers. I believe that the line should be drawn between principles, not between men;

and that men should only be considered as they may be able to advance or retard the progress of Democracy.

I have come to Chicago because from this point I can reach a large number of voters in the Mississippi valley; and I have expressed a desire to have the ministers attend, because they can and should exert an influence in behalf of honesty and fairness in politics. When some two years ago I became satisfied that ex-Senator David B. Hill was planning to be a candidate, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy. When the Cleveland boom was launched, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy; and now that Mr. Parker seems to be the leading candidate (though not the only candidate) among the reorganizers, I desire to present some reasons why he cannot be considered as an available candidate for a Democratic nomination; and I find these reasons not in his personality, but in his position upon public questions. For a year he has been urged to speak out and declare himself upon the important issues of the coming campaign, but he has remained silent. If this silence meant that nobody knew his views, those who have been loyal to the party in recent years would stand upon an equal footing with those who deserted; but it is evident now that while to the public generally his views are unknown, they are well known to those who are urging his nomination. Whatever doubt may have existed on this subject heretofore, has been dispelled by the platform adopted by the New York State convention; and, taking this platform as a text, I am sanguine enough to believe that I can prove to every unbiased mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated, either by the Democratic party, or by any other party that stands for honesty or fair dealing in politics. I cannot hope to convince those who favor deception and fraud in politics, but I am satisfied that we now have evidence sufficient to convict Judge Parker of absolute unfitness for the nomination. If he did not know of the platform in advance, if he did not himself dictate it, or agree to it, he has allowed it to go out as his utterance, for the convention was dominated by his friends, and adopted a resolution presenting him as the candidate of the party of the State. This platform, then, can fairly be regarded as his declaration upon public questions, and what does the platform say? The first plank reads:

This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no executive en-

encroachment upon the legislative or judicial department.

This is a general plank that says nothing definitely. It is probably intended as a condemnation of the president's pension order, but the idea is so vaguely expressed that those who support the platform can deny that any criticism was intended, if they find that such criticism is unpopular.

The second plank reads:

We must keep inviolate the pledges of our treaties; we must renew and reinvigorate within ourselves that respect for law and that love of liberty and of peace which the spirit of military domination tends inevitably to weaken and destroy.

This is probably intended as a rebuke to the President for his action in the Panama matter; but this, too, is so indefinite that the supporters of the platform can repudiate any such intention if it ever becomes convenient to do so.

The third plank reads:

Unsteady national policies and a restless spirit of adventure engender alarms that check our commercial growth; let us have peace, to the end that business confidence may be restored, and that our people may again in tranquillity enjoy the gains of their toil.

This, possibly, is intended as a criticism of the rashness of the President and of his emotional temperament; and yet it is so impersonal that those who support the platform can very plausibly insist that it has no particular reference to any person, but is intended as a very broad statement of a very general principle.

The fourth plank reads:

Corporations chartered by the State must be subject to just regulation by the State in the interest of the people; taxation for public purposes only; no government partnership with protected monopolies.

This plank might find a welcome place in any platform. It would be difficult to conceive of a party that would object to "just regulations by the state in the interest of the people," nor is there any party that is likely to defend taxation for any other than a public purpose. Even the Republican party has never declared itself in favor of "government partnership with protected monopolies." The plank, therefore, has no meaning at all as it stands, unless there is a secret suggestion that the regulation of corporations must be left entirely to the States. This is the position that is taken by the trust magnates. Whenever congress attempts to interfere with a trust the friends of the trust at once insist that the state must do the regulating—that is the position taken by

the dissenting members of the Supreme Court in the merger case, and if this plank means anything, it is an indorsement of the minority members of the court, rather than an indorsement of the decision of the majority. The fact that the platform is silent about the merger decision lends color to this construction.

The fifth plank reads:

Opposition to trusts and combinations that oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition.

This is the anti-trust plank of the platform! At least it is the only plank in which the trust is mentioned by name. The plank contains 14 words, and it will be noted that the opposition is not to all monopolies, or even to all trusts, but simply to those that "oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition." That is the position taken by Judge Brewer in his separate opinion. He contends that the Sherman law was not intended to prevent all restraint of trade, but only "unreasonable restraint," and so Mr. Hill and the other New York friends of Judge Parker so have worded their trust plank as to make their meaning uncertain. They have so worded the plank as to present the trust view of the question, rather than the view entertained by the people at large. In order to excite the opposition of the friends of Judge Parker the trust must be shown to be "oppressive." It must be shown that it is not only stifling industrial competition, but that it is stifling a "healthy industrial competition." The trust magnates claim that the object of the trust is to stifle unhealthy industrial competition and to promote a "healthy industrial competition." The qualifying words used in this very brief and ambiguous plank destroy whatever vitality it might have had without them. The Kansas City platform declared a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. It not only arraigned private monopoly, as an unmitigated evil, but it pointed out specific remedies for the destruction of this evil. Compare the Kansas City platform with the cowardly and straddling anti-trust—or rather trust—plank of the New York platform, and you will understand why Mr. Hill and Judge Parker are so afraid of the Kansas City platform.

The sixth plank reads:

A check upon extravagance in public expenditures; that the burden of the people's taxes may be lightened.

There is another plank that is as meaningless as those that have preceded it. Who advocates extravagance? Even when the Republican party is

guilty of the largest appropriations, it insists that it is not extravagant, but that it is simply legislating for a large country.

The seventh plank reads:

Reasonable revision of the tariff; needless duties upon imported raw material weigh upon the manufacturer, are a menace to the American wage-earner, and by increasing the cost of production shut out our products from foreign markets.

This plank is also evasive. The tariff revision must be "reasonable." What party ever advocated what it believed to be unreasonable on any subject? The duties upon raw material must not be "needless" duties. What party ever admitted that it put needless duties on anything? This plank justifies the criticism of one of the leading Republican papers of the West which says that the platform "does not even dare to recommend the abandonment of the Republican doctrine of protection of home industries, which had been fondly supposed by the old-fashioned Jeffersonian fellows to be about the only thing the party dared to cheep about at St. Louis."

The eighth plank is as follows:

The maintenance of State rights and home rule; no centralization.

Now here is a plank that is a model of obscurity and brevity. Only ten words in the plank. To what issue is it to be applied? How is it to be construed?

The ninth plank reads:

Honesty in public service; vigilance in the prevention of fraud; firmness in the punishment of guilt when detected.

As President Roosevelt prides himself upon his enthusiastic advocacy of honesty in the public service, and as his friends boast of his vigilance in the prevention of fraud and his firmness in the punishment of guilt, that plank might be regarded as an indorsement of him but for the fact that it is contained in a platform that suggests a candidate to oppose him.

The tenth plank reads:

The impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital; no unequal discrimination; no abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression.

Senator Allison has a reputation of being able to walk on eggs without breaking them, and this plank, if it appeared anywhere else than in a Democratic platform, might be attributed to him, for it is about as nice a piece of balancing as has appeared in many a day. The party stands "impartially" between labor and capital. If any discrimination is made, it must not be an "unequal" discrimination. That is, if the party discriminates in favor of one side, it must offset it by an equal discrimination in

favor of the other side. There must be no abuse of the powers of the law, either for favoritism or oppression. Why this prodigality in the use of type? If the convention had said that it was in favor of doing right as between capital and labor, the plank would have been just as clear and just as useful as a guide to the party. In fact the whole platform is so noncommittal, so absolutely colorless, and so capable of being construed in any way, that "we will do right" would have answered as well for the whole platform. A Republican could run on that platform, and after the election construe it as an indorsement of every policy for which the Republican party stands, or at least he could find nothing in that platform that would rebuke him for doing anything that a Republican might want to do.

What are the issues before the country? The trust question is certainly an issue, and yet there is nothing in that platform that gives any encouragement to the opponents of the trusts. There is not a word or syllable that binds a person elected on such a platform to do anything that the trusts are unwilling to have done. The Kansas City platform stated the party's position on the trust question, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the last national platform, but also fails to propose any definite or positive plan of relief.

Imperialism is an issue. Our government is now administering a colonial policy according to the political principles employed by George III, a century and a quarter ago, and yet there is not in this platform a single word relating to the question of imperialism, not a plank that defines the party's position on that subject, not a protest against the surrender of the doctrines of self-government. The Kansas City platform stated the party's opposition to a colonial policy, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the Kansas City platform, but fails to take any position at all on this important question.

The labor question is an issue. The laboring men have been before the committees of congress endeavoring to secure three important measures. One is the arbitration of differences between corporations engaged in interstate commerce and their employes. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms declared in favor of arbitration, but the New York platform not only fails to refer to the arbitration plank of these platforms, but it fails to write a new plank covering this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure an eight-hour day, but the New York platform is silent on this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure the abolition of government by injunction. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms contained planks on this subject, but the New York platform dodges this as it does all other vital questions. As the capitalists now have what they want and are in the position of defendants in a suit, while the laboring men are in the attitude of plaintiffs seeking relief, the failure of the New York platform to advocate what the laboring men desire is really a declaration against them.

On the tariff question no issue is joined. It was reasonable to suppose that on this question, at least, something would be said, but Mr. Hill and Judge Parker seem to be as much afraid of the tariff question as of other issues.

The money question is ignored entirely. No reference is made to bimetallicism at any ratio—not even to international bimetallicism to which Mr. Hill seemed to be so attached in the Chicago convention. No reference is made to the measure now before congress to melt up nearly six hundred million legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin that is only a limited legal tender. Nothing is said about the asset currency which is a part of the scheme of the financiers. Nothing is said about the Aldrich bill which proposes to subsidize the banks into opposition to tax reduction by loaning them the surplus money in the treasury. There is no condemnation of the corruption that such a system would lead to. The platform does not antagonize the proposition now before Congress to give the national banks unlimited control over the volume of paper money. In other words there is not a line in the platform that is written in behalf of the people; not a line that will excite criticism in Wall street.

The platform ignores the income tax; it fails to indorse the election of Senators by direct vote; and it also omits the plank of the Kansas City platform denouncing corporate domination in politics.

The New York platform is a dishonest platform, fit only for a dishonest party. No one but an artful dodger would stand upon it. The submission of such a platform to the voters of a state is an insult to their intelligence, for it is intended to deceive them, and a deliberate attempt to deceive—especially so clumsy an attempt as this platform is—is a reflection upon the brains of those to whom it is submitted.

This platform proves that the opposition to the Kansas City platform is

not opposition to silver, but opposition to every needed reform and opposition to all that the masses desire.

I had expected that a platform prepared by Mr. Hill for Judge Parker would be evasive and lacking in frankness, but I did not conceive that any body of men calling themselves Democrats would present such a platform as a recommendation of a candidate. If we are to take the New York platform as an indication of what the next Democratic platform is to be, in case the reorganizers control the convention, then who will be able to deny the secret purpose of the reorganizers to turn the party over to predatory wealth? It is to this danger that I desire to call your attention to-night. With such a platform and a candidate who would be willing to run upon it, the party could secure as large a campaign fund as the Republican party has ever secured, but in securing it it would, like the Republican party, secretly pledge the administration to a construction of the platform satisfactory to the corporations and the combinations. If you would know why the corporations contribute to campaign funds, read the testimony given by Mr. H. O. Havemeyer before the Senate committee in the spring of 1894. The answers made by Mr. Havemeyer to Senator Allen's questions are conclusive as to the purpose of the campaign contributions made by the great corporations:

Senator Allen—Therefore, you feel at liberty to contribute to both parties?

Mr. Havemeyer—It depends. In the State of New York, where the Democratic majority is between 40,000 and 50,000, we throw it their way. In the State of Massachusetts, where the Republican party is doubtful, they probably have the call.

Senator Allen—In the State of Massachusetts do you contribute anything?

Mr. Havemeyer—Very likely.

Senator Allen—What is your best recollection as to contributions made by your company in the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. Havemeyer—I could not name the amount.

Senator Allen—However, in the State of New York you contribute to the Democratic party, and in the commonwealth of Massachusetts you contribute to the Republican party?

Mr. Havemeyer—It is my impression that wherever there is a dominant party, wherever the majority is very large, that is the party that gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters.

Senator Allen—Then, the sugar trust is a Democrat in a Democratic State, and a Republican in a Republican State?

Mr. Havemeyer—As far as local matters are concerned, I think that is about it.

Senator Allen—In the State of your nativity, or the nativity of your corporation, New Jersey, where do your contributions go?

Mr. Havemeyer—I will have to look that up.

Senator Allen—I understand New Jersey is invariably a Democratic State. It would naturally go to the Democratic party?

Mr. Havemeyer—Under the theory I have suggested, if they were there it would naturally go to them.

Here we have the head of the sugar trust admitting that his corporation contributes to campaign funds, and that its contribution is determined, not by political convictions, but by its desire to stand in with the winning party. Senator Allen tried to ascertain the amounts contributed to the various campaign funds, but Mr. Havemeyer refused to answer.

The two Republican members of the committee, Senator Davis and Senator Lodge, joined Senator Allen in calling the matter to the attention of the attorney general for the District of Columbia. Senator Allen individually reported a resolution in favor of calling the witness before the Senate for contempt, but Senator Gray and Senator Lindsey, both Gold Democrats, presented a minority report in which they opposed taking any action in regard to the witness.

If you desire further testimony in regard to the purpose of corporations in contributing, you will find it in a letter sent by Mr. A. B. Hepburn, of the National City bank, of New York, to Lyman J. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury. The letter bears date of June 5, 1897, and is published in House document 264 of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress. In closing the letter, after asking for deposits, Mr. Hepburn says:

Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have great political claims in view of what was done in the campaign last year.

Here is the president of the most influential bank in the country calling attention to political service rendered by the directors of the bank, as a reason why the bank should be remembered in the distribution of government money. Now, with the testimony of the head of one of the great trusts, and the testimony of an official of one of the great banks, can any one doubt that contributions are made by the corporations for the purpose of controlling the policy of the party after the election? Can any one doubt that with such a platform as was adopted in New York, and with a candidate whose conscience would permit him to run upon such a platform—does any one doubt that with such a platform and candidate the party

would be mortgaged beforehand to the corporations that are now using the government as a private asset, and plundering the people at will?

But there is another reason why the Democratic party cannot afford to go before the country with an ambiguous platform and an uncertain candidate. No matter how people may differ as to the relative importance of issues, all must recognize that the trust question to-day presents an important phase of the great conflict between plutocracy and democracy. We have recently had a Supreme Court decision on the merger case. This decision was rendered by a bare majority of one, and that one (Judge Brewer) in a separate opinion has stated his position in such a way as to leave no doubt that in the first case involving a trust he may join the minority and defeat the Sherman law. Judge Brewer construes the anti-trust law to apply only to reasonable restraint of trade. He would have the Court decide whether the restraint is reasonable or unreasonable. His decision, taken in connection with the dissenting opinions of Justices Fuller, Peckham, White and Holmes, shows that the appointment of a new judge might throw the decision to the one side or to the other. The judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, and the President to be elected this fall will doubtless have the appointment of one or two, and possibly three, Supreme Court judges. If his sympathies are with the corporations he will doubtless appoint judges satisfactory to the corporations—especially if obligated to the corporations by large campaign contributions—and these judges can make it impossible to secure any remedial legislation for years to come. If, four years hence, the people should secure a President, a Senate, and a House opposed to private monopolies, they may find themselves unable to get any remedial legislation past the Supreme Court for several years.

The opinion filed by Judge White and concurred in by the others, denies the power of Congress over monopolies organized in a State. These dissenting judges insist that Congress has no power to regulate or restrain the creation of a monopoly within a State. It will be remembered that the decision in the Knight case, known as the sugar trust case, turned upon that very question. It was admitted in that case that the sugar trust controlled the production of sugar; but the Court held that the Sherman law

did not prevent the buying up of the individual refineries, even though the product of the refineries might ultimately enter into interstate commerce.

The division of the Supreme Court in the merger case shows the cleavage on the trust question. The dissenting judges would deny the power of Congress to prevent a private monopoly; and when the power of Congress to destroy monopolies is denied, the people are left helpless, because some of the States, such as Delaware and New Jersey, find it profitable to permit the creation of these monopolies, and so long as they are created and can evade federal laws, no separate State can fully protect itself against them.

The dissenting judges in the merger case refused to draw a distinction between an individual and a corporation. Justice White says:

The principle that the ownership of property is embraced within the power of congress to regulate commerce, whenever that body deems that a particular character of ownership, if allowed to continue, may restrain commerce between the states or create a monopoly thereof, is in my opinion in conflict with the most elementary conceptions of rights of property.

And Justices Fuller, Peckham and Holmes concur.

"Rights of property," are, according to the dissenting judges, supreme, and when Congress tries to prevent a monopoly, it is interfering with "the most elementary conception of the rights of property." The issue presented to-day in the trust question, and in all the other questions with which we have to deal, is the question between human rights and so-called "property rights"—or, more properly speaking, between ordinary people and the great corporations. Those who believe that property rights are supreme, take the side of the trusts. If we have a President who is in sympathy with this theory, it means that the Dollar will be given consideration before the Man; it means that organized wealth can continue to trample upon the rights of the people; it means that the instrumentalities of government can be used for the protection of every scheme of exploitation that the capitalists can conceive.

I, for one, am not willing that the Democratic party shall become the tool of the corporations; I am not willing that it shall be the champion of organized wealth. And it is because I believe that the party has a higher mission than to be the exponent of plutocracy, that I am protesting against the schemes of those who would put it into competition with the Republic-

an party for the support of Wall street financiers. It is for this reason that I protest against mortgaging the party to the capitalists to secure an enormous corruption fund.

If any who are present to-night, or who read what I say, think that I am trying to interfere with Democratic success, let me answer that no Democrat is more anxious for the party to succeed than I am. No one has suffered more from dissensions and divisions in the party, and no one, I believe, is more eager for the country to enjoy the great benefits which a triumph of real Democracy would bring. But I do not desire that the party shall win offices only. If that is the only purpose of the party, let its principles be abandoned, and let its platform simply declare the party hungry for the patronage. The lesson of 1894 shows the folly of hoping to win by a surrender to the corporations, but even if success could be bought in such a way, it would not be worth the price.

No one can defend the Democratic party without defending its principles, and its principles ought to be so clearly set forth as to be easily understood. We ought to appeal to the conscience of the public, and arraign Republican policies as hostile both to the principles of free government and to the principles of morality. We have an opportunity to make the Democratic party a power in this country—not only a power, but a power for good. Let us array the party against every abuse of government and against every policy that is hurtful to the people. Let us drive out of the party every Democrat who betrays his trust, every official who would administer the office for his private advantage. Let us make Democracy stand not only for good government—for honest government—but for a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” And the first step in this direction is the adoption of a platform that recognizes the right of the people to decide public questions, as well as their capacity for understanding public questions. To present a platform which is evasive and ambiguous, shows that those who write the platform either distrust the people who are to act upon it, or have purposes that they desire to conceal.

The New York platform is ambiguous, uncertain, evasive and dishonest. It would disgrace the Democrats of the nation to adopt such a platform, and it ought to defeat as an aspirant for a Democratic nomination any man who

would be willing to have it go forth as a declaration of his views on public questions. In Illinois, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in Minnesota, in Indiana, in Ohio, and in every other State that has not acted, it behooves the Democrats to avenge themselves and organize, to the end that they may prevent the consummation of the schemes of the reorganizers. Their scheme begins with the deception of the rank and file of the party. It is to be followed up by the debauching of the public with a campaign fund secured from the corporations, and it is to be consummated by the betrayal of the party organization and of the country into the hands of those who are to-day menacing the liberties of the country by their exploitation of the producers of wealth.

#### “WHEN WAS A DUMB MAN SENT TO THE WHITE HOUSE?”

At the April dinner of the Gridiron club at the Arlington hotel in Washington, April 22, four members sang to the tune of “The Little Black Bull” a song, the title of which was given as “Peeping Through the Knot Hole in Papa’s Wooden Leg, or Why Was the Ocean Bull so Near to the Shore?” We reprint from the report in the Chicago Tribune.

David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Long time ago.

He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Long time ago.

He says: “Don’t talk, and we’ll beat T. Roosevelt.”

Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

He says: “Don’t talk, and we’ll beat T. Roosevelt.”  
Long time ago.

And he didn’t say a word all spring or summer,

Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

And he didn’t say a word all spring or summer,  
Long time ago.

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?

Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Long time ago.

#### CHORUS.

Long time ago, long time ago,

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?

Long time ago.

Just as in a neglected house there may be conditions that attract vermin and breed a pestilence, so in the mind, long closed to light, there may be a stock of old ideas in different stages of decay in which are nurtured the germs of disease and death. To go down into the cellar of the mind and up into the garret, to drag out the moldy and infected thoughts

and scour the hidden corners and flood the darkness with the sunshine—what if we were to do this every spring?—Herbert S. Bigelow.

Miss Susan B. Anthony at 84, as chipper as a blackbird and merry as a cricket, says: “I may not be here when the campaign opens but if anywhere, I shall be somewhere.” This is lucid, diplomatic, a little mysterious and delightfully non-committal. She would make an excellent secretary of state if anything should happen to John Hay.—Lawrence (Mass.) Sentinel.

The man with narrow mind and low ambitions who is irritated at the mere mention of the wrongs of others and whose absorbing interest is in personal gain and pleasure—he is a vulture spirit, bent on carrion, and has not the moral perception to realize his own ugliness.—Herbert S. Bigelow.

## BOOKS

### A CHALLENGE TO SOCIALISM.

The anti-socialism crusade of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, seems upon the surface to be an ecclesiastical attack upon an economic and political movement. There are many things about the crusade and in the spirit and method of its active participants to account for this; but it must eventually be conceded that there is much in socialism that would justify such a crusade from purely religious motives and upon strictly religious grounds. For socialism, in so far as it is represented by what are called “scientific” socialists—and they are now dominant in the movement, not only in Europe but here—stands not alone for economic and political change, but also for the destruction of existing religious institutions and beliefs and the denial of absolute moral ideals and standards.

This is the keynote of the book before us: “Socialism; the Nation of Fatherless Children,” (Boston: The Union News League), by David Goldstein. Mr. Goldstein’s work is edited by Martha Moore Avery. His subtitle is an allusion to the subject matter of his chapter on “Homeless Children,” which explains that under socialism children would be reared no longer in family homes, but in collective nurseries.

It appears that Mr. Goldstein was for eight years an active and studious propagandist of socialism. Being a theist, though not a church-goer or advocate of any religious creed, he was always repelled by the assertions of the German socialists, who “controlled the organization, that ‘you cannot be a socialist without being an atheist.’” but for a long time he took this for their