

morality or spirituality or that all are on the same social plane. Not at all—only that as human beings all have a right to live and a right to protection, in person and property, from the government to which they render allegiance, and a right to share by their votes in the government which they help to support. Social life, its amenities, its hospitalities, its limitations, its requirements, must depend upon the culture, the taste and spirit of the people.

Each home must be a law unto itself; it is sacred ground to be guarded and watched over by father and mother: they alone must determine what guests shall be invited there and what spirit of peace and good will shall pervade it.

A genial and kindly hospitality will often welcome to share the social pleasures of the home those who are not eligible as lifelong companions or as desirable suitors for the hand of a daughter. Narrow, indeed, would be one's social life and lonely one's home if none could enter there except acceptable matches for one's daughter.

Dr. Ligon says [in Good Housekeeping]:

The greatest wrong ever done civilization was when thousands of beings only two degrees removed from naked barbarism were declared by law to be and taught that they were the social equals of a race which represents the refinement, the chivalry, the bravery of thousands of years of civilization.

What law is that?

There is no such law, there can be no such law; it is the inalienable right of everyone to choose his own associates. If the Welsh or the German people choose to associate only with those of their own nationality that is their privilege; if the Jew wishes to keep himself distinct from other people that is his right. On the other hand if Mr. Roosevelt wishes to invite a Negro or an Indian or a Hottentot or an orang-outang to dine with him he has a perfect right to do so, but he cannot require others to do the same. If Dr. Ligon desires to associate only with white people she can make her own choice, if others wish to confine their acquaintance to college professors or to artists or to musicians there is no law either to prevent or to compel them. There is only the divine law of peace and good will to men applicable alike to Jew or Gentile, bond or free.

Equally irrelevant are all discussions of the causes of slavery in this country, of the purposes for which the war was waged, of the influence of carpet-bag politicians or the doctrines maintained by the abolitionists; these things are "ancient history." Nor need we at this

time define the exact limitations of the capabilities of the Negro or speculate as to his future. The present only is ours. The Negro is here; he was born here and he is at home here; he is endowed with the attributes of our common humanity; he is therefore entitled to a fair field, to an opportunity to earn his living, to acquire knowledge and to gain, if he can, the wealth of the world and its prizes. He is a citizen of the United States and therefore entitled to his vote; if he violates the law or is guilty of gross offenses, he must be punished according to law; if white men are guilty, let them be likewise punished.

Justice, and yet more justice, is what we need. As Americans and Christians, north as well as south, we need to rise above narrow prejudices and be willing to allow to others the same rights, opportunities and privileges that we ask for ourselves. Let us have justice for all, special privilege for none. More righteousness among all classes is the need of this hour.

BY FEAR AND FAVOR.

Laws are to be enforced without fear or favor and without respect of persons. That is mere commonplacé, baldest of truisms—no room for difference on that proposition. To set up the opposite, that laws should not touch the rich, or should not restrain the good from doing forbidden things, or should not apply alike to all, small and great—to hold such a view of law would make a law no law at all, but mere vehicle of whim. The thing states itself.

Yet in this merger case, this maze of hysteria, the law and its majesty seems hardly involved.

What's Jim Hill's attitude? Why, that they're heaving bricks at the kind gentleman who built the northwest as a personal favor, when they ought to be grateful. The bare question of law does not enter into his head.

What does Van Sant think? Why, that he's vindicated, that he has won a fight by employment of the law as the most handy tool; not that he enforced the law just as he found it there, but that he made it serve some end beyond itself, as though without that end he had not invoked it.

As for the president, silent himself, except as he congratulates Knox on his victory—so etiquette demands—friends speaking for him

tell his intentions to press the law where he thinks good, and let it lapse where he thinks good to carry out good policies; no word of principle. As though law were nothing else than vehicle of whim.

And the supreme court itself which laid down this law as the law of the case, though by an half and half, half and a little more contrary to the law, half and a little less perfectly legal—what does Judge Harlan say with the majority? Why, that this thing was wrong, hurtful and dangerous, therefore against the law, whether 'twas or not illegal. As though they were to decide what's good and what is not, and fit the law to it; as though they had power to make laws as they went along.

And the people, whose servant is Van Sant, likewise the president, who set the court in place who made the law itself—hardly more clear are they than their creations. Halling this syllabus as though laws were but decrees given by their masters, as though courts had right to make laws just to suit themselves and this one time had bent to please the people. Scarcely a thought all through of the law's majesty made by the people's will to carry out their purpose. —Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News.

"Why, see here, you've raised the price of your bananas again!"

"Yes, yes. Me raisa price. Too mucha war."

"What's the war got to do with it?"

"War raisa price. Raisa price of bread. Raisa price of meat. Raisa price of banan'."

"Nonsense! Why should war raise the price of bananas?"

"War raisa price. Russia man, Japa man, buy aplenty banan'. Eata banan', throw skin down so! Long come greata general, step on banan' skin, whoof! He fall and breaka his head. All ze generals fall. Take much banan'. War raisa price."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

BOOKS

CHESTERTON'S VARIED TYPES.

Some time ago a little volume on Robert Browning was reviewed in The Public. The originality and freshness of the book struck with surprise all readers who had not happened to become acquainted with the author's brief newspaper essays and reviews. Nineteen of these essays and reviews have now been gathered into a volume ("Varied Types," by G. K. Chesterton, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, \$1.20). It is a clear-type, wide-

margin, attractive book of 269 pages, with a portrait of the author. There is one puzzling mistake; the top line of p. 233 should be at the top of p. 234, and vice versa.

The contents carry very truly a variety of types, such, for example, as William Morris, Francis of Assisi, Charles II., Tolstol, Savonarola, Bret Harte, the German Emperor, and Tennyson. About each of these and the others some new thought is suggested, some new light thrown on their work or their careers.

The first thing one feels like saying about Mr. Chesterton is that nobody is his master. He gives himself the privilege of thinking for himself, and takes the further privilege of saying his thoughts in his own delightfully fresh way. His style abounds in paradoxes, and in a less bold and candid writer would seem affected, but in him it is all right. Nothing could be less affected than his affectation — or perhaps he would say that there is no such thing as affectation, just as he says that "Nothing in the world has ever been artificial." Of course in a style like this we must not expect a verbal consistency. After denying artificiality, Mr. Chesterton will say: "Byronism was a revolt against artificiality." He might deny affectation, and still say: "The Byronite young man had an affectation of sincerity; the decadent has positively an affectation of affectation." But if you follow him closely he will clear himself of any real inconsistency.

He makes many upsetting statements, but the beauty of it is that he proves them. For example, to whom but Mr. Chesterton has it occurred to say that now-a-days "we are not generous enough to write great satire?" People do not readily associate generosity with satire. And yet he shows that effective satire presupposes a knowledge of the good points in the victim. We cannot satirize what we totally despise. "It is impossible to vanquish an army without having a full account of its strength. It is impossible to satirize a man without having a full account of his virtues." He aptly cites Pope's attack on Addison. "Pope," he says, "was not such a fool as to try to make out that Addison was a fool. He knew that Addison was not a fool, and he knew that Addison knew it. But hatred, in Pope's case, had become so great, and I was almost going to say, so pure, that it illuminated all things, as love illuminate all things." At any rate, Pope knew where Addison was weak, and where he was not, else he could not have hit him so effectively.

Thus and more fully Mr. Chesterton proves his points. We are convinced and grateful. So many paradoxical writers leave the reader dangling in the air, wondering whether he is a fool or not, because he cannot catch the author's drift.

Apropos of satire, and Mr. Chester-

ton's dictum of modern failure in that line, it would be interesting to know what he thinks of Howells. It seems to me that Mr. Howells is far the best of all modern satirists, for the very reason that he sees the good points in his characters. In fact, pretty near all he says of them is on the good side. The real satire comes when his victims themselves talk. They satirize themselves.

But to return to the essays; as I have said, each of them will be found to contain some fresh view-point of the subject. Take the essay on St. Francis, and we shall be told "that all true joy expresses itself in asceticism." We shall learn that religious asceticism is only "the repudiation of the great mass of human joys because of the supreme joyfulness of the one joy." We shall see, furthermore, that religious asceticism is by no means the only species. Or take the essay on Charles II., and we shall learn that man is too great to be satisfied with any cut-and-dried scheme, however rational it may be, or, to speak a la Chesterton, however satisfactory. "The puritans fell," he says, "not because they were fanatics, but because they were rationalists." They fell "through the damning fact that they had a complete theory of life." Or take the essay on Queen Victoria, who, he says, "for 70 years followed through every possible tangle and distraction the fairy thread of common sense." She was a great monarch by doing nothing in the traditional monarch line of business. Her strength was her "brilliant inaction." Her self-control and sense of proportion teach a good lesson, Mr. Chesterton thinks, at the present day. "In psychology," he says, "in sociology, above all, in education, we are learning to do a great many clever things. Unless we are much mistaken, the next great task will be to learn not to do them."

So we might go on from essay to essay; but enough has perhaps been said to give some idea of this little volume, which is both charming and thoughtful. Not that all the essays are equally satisfactory; those on William Morris and Tolstol seem to me least so, because he hardly touches upon what many consider the supreme service of these two, namely, their enthusiasm for better conditions of life among the masses of mankind. It is a pity that Mr. Chesterton skips this side of them, as he would surely say something worth thinking about.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Christ. By S. D. McConnell, D. D., LL. D., rector of All Souls' church, New York. New York: The Macmillan Company. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS.

"Lawson Purdy's "Taxation of Personal Property" (New York: Tax Reform Association, 52 William St.) is a reproduction, typographically very inviting, of Mr. Purdy's impressive argument against personal property taxation, which appeared

in Municipal Affairs. The text has been revised and the statistics brought down to date.

The printed argument of Clarence S. Darrow and Edgar L. Masters, of Chicago, in the Turner case (vol. vi., p. 810), before the Supreme Court of the United States, is a powerful Constitutional argument both in its purely legal aspects and in the broader and more important political considerations which it presents. One can hardly read this lawyers' argument without feeling very strongly with the able authors of it that the real danger which now confronts the people of the United States is not opinions in opposition to all organized government, but "the aggressiveness of government"—the disregard by the government itself of its own fundamental law.

PERIODICALS.

The paper on Thomas Nast, in Pearson's for April, stirs sleeping memories of life and cartoonist's art in New York nearly half a century ago.

If "Labor and Capital," a New York magazine of which the first copy is before us, keeps good its promise of maintaining the policy of establishing as far as possible "a forum in which the vital issues of social economics, as they exist today, can be discussed without one iota of bias," it will perform something like a miracle. Yet the experiment is well worth trying.

Chicago's aspiring magazine, the World To-Day, modeled upon the Review of Reviews, improves apace. Three articles of special interest in the April number deal with the Negro problem from the Negro point of view. One is by Booker T. Washington; another is by Prof. Kelly Miller, of Washington; the third is by Jesse Lawson, president of the National Sociological Society; the fourth is by Ida B. Wells-Barnett, chairman of the Anti-Lynching League; and the fifth is by Prof. W. E. Burghardt DuBois, author of the "Souls of Black Folk." These articles cannot be

IN PRESS.

"THE PROPHET of SAN FRANCISCO."

A MONOGRAPH

By LOUIS F. POST.

Originally prepared for and read at the Chicago Literary Club in its regular members' programme for 1902-03, Monday, November 17, 1902.

A resume of the work, and a character sketch of the life, of Henry George.

Price, 20 Cents.

SPECIAL PRICES IF ORDERED IN QUANTITY

Printed from good type, on high grade stock, and daintily bound in paper.

MOODY PUBLISHING COMPANY.

35 Nassau St., 1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago. New York.

Special Course of Lectures

FOR

The Henry George Association

Of Chicago, to be held in Hall 607, Handel Hall Building, Thursday Evenings, During March and April. Admission Free.

PROGRAM:

- April 14—Charles Zuehlke, "Aesthetic Poverty of Chicago." Illustrated with Stereoscopic.
- April 21—William D. Mac Clintock, "Readings from Whitman the Poet of Democracy."
- April 28—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Ibsen's "Enemy of the People."