

tions thrown in the way have not defeated us. The people were behind us if the Republican leaders were not. And now we are going on in our work of getting a municipal lighting system along with our water system, of establishing a 3-cent fare street car system, and of establishing equality of taxation.

As the monopolists have resisted us so far by means of Republican legislatures, we have had to carry our local fight into the State at large. We have learned that cities cannot be governed by the principles of the Declaration of Independence so long as beneficiaries of local special privileges can frustrate local movements through legislatures and political bosses. We are trying to secure the right of local self-government.

I have no unkind feelings toward Republicans. I could not have. Without the votes of Republicans in Cleveland and in Ohio we could win no elections. They say that in Cleveland some Republicans have got the bad habit of voting our way. It is not because we call them hard names. I have every feeling of affection for men of all parties who love liberty and fair play. But I say this to you, that the Republican managers today have allied themselves with privileged monopolies in return for campaign funds. From the party of Lincoln down to the party of Mark Hanna has been an awful descent. (Applause.)

I have no ill will for Senator Hanna. Personally he is a nice man. In business he lives up to his agreements. But his public record must be condemned. In our campaign last fall Senator Hanna put it out as his key-note that Republicans should "stand pat." Now, think of that! Think of that as the political key note for an intelligent community. "Stand pat"! Do you know what that means? Why, to "stand pat" is the highest and biggest play of the professional gambler in our great American game of draw poker. He holds five cards. They may make the best or they may make the poorest hand in the deck. Holding them up close to him he says: "I stand pat," which means he doesn't need any better cards, or wants you to think he doesn't. Let the other players guess what he has. It is a game of bluff. That was Senator Hanna's game in Ohio politics. That was his key-note in a great campaign where men and women were interested in vital questions—"stand pat"! Think of the fall from the days of Abraham Lincoln. When he played the game of life they call politics, he did not "stand pat." He didn't hold five cards and bluff you to guess. He played his hand open on the

table before him where everybody could see it. Lincoln, probably, never knew what a pat hand was. Oh, my Republican friends of Nebraska, isn't it a fall from the Republicanism of Lincoln to the Republicanism of Hanna? Think of Abraham Lincoln, humanity-loving Lincoln, with his open hands, and then of Mark Hanna with his "pat hands." (Laughter and applause.)

One word in closing. This is my first visit to your beautiful country. This is the first time I have stopped in your State, though I have passed through it before. I hope it will not be my last visit. And I hope above all that our friend, Mr. Bryan, who has traveled and spoken so much all over the United States, will long be spared to continue his good work. I hope that the people of this country will continue to love and honor him as I love and honor him and you here this afternoon. My friends, I thank you for your attention. Good-by.

TO A PAIR OF LOVERS.

If you only love each other,
Never will your love be blessed.
Those who love the world together
Love each other best.
—The Whim.

Advertisement Manager of Great Newspaper (to clerk)—Jones, take down an advertisement as I dictate it, and then send it up. Ready? All right—

"Wanted—A man for a pleasant indoor position; short hours, light work, no experience necessary; place permanent; salary, £1,000 a year.—Apply, in own handwriting, to Millionaire, 'Great Daily' office."

Jones—I have it down, sir, and will send it to the printers at once.

Advertisement Manager (a week later)—Jones, how many answers were received from that advertisement?

Clerk—Eighteen thousand.

Advertisement Manager (an hour later)—Good morning, sir. What can we do for you?

Seedy Individual—What do you charge for an advertisement for a situation wanted?

Advertisement Manager—Our charges are high—half a crown a line; but you must remember the vast number of people we reach. Why, sir, from one single advertisement inserted last week there were received 18,000 answers.—Star.

Speaking of Rockefeller's gift to the University of Nebraska, there are some cranks, and possibly a few others, who are not thoroughly well assured of the propriety of a State university accepting gifts.

The old universities are mostly down on their knees at the feet of Mammon begging his favor. If they are not grinding Mammon's ax, it is simply because Mammon happens not to have an ax to grind at the moment.

The State universities, in theory at least, are free. It might be worth while to keep them free, for the Lord only knows what is coming to pass.—Life.

The dodging of the plain truth about human brotherhood furnishes the reason why it has always been so difficult to draw the line, in churches and societies and colonies and nations and races, between our precious clique and the rest of the wicked world. There is no such line. "Class-consciousness" is the nightmare of a cramped intellect and an overfed prejudice. The truth shall make you free from all such uncomfortable sensations.—The Straight Edge, of New York.

Newport was once a fairly respectable city. Look at it now! Breathitt county was settled by decent folks, and its eccentricities of conduct are due to nothing but isolation. When too much society can result in a modern Newport, and too little in a Breathitt, how easy seems the road to the bow-wows!—Life.

"Well," said the New Yorker, tauntingly, "you don't see any grass growing in our streets."

"That's so," replied the Philadelphian; "clever scheme of yours."

"What's that?"

"To keep tearing your streets up so the grass can't grow."—Philadelphia Press.

BOOKS

THE WONDERFUL RECORD OF A SINGLE SESSION.

"You nominated me for a seat in Congress notwithstanding I besought you not to do so." Thus begins the letter of confession and thanks which Gerrit Smith addressed to his constituents in the counties of Oswego and Madison, New York, on the 5th of November, 1852. He goes on to speak of his age, of his habits formed for private life, of his shrinking from public life. Then he tells them with evident sincerity that he would be glad to resign before taking his seat, but that he feels bound by their generosity, because knowing his political creed they had yet elected him by a large majority.

As if to offer the voters a final opportunity to pass judgment upon him, he proceeds in this remarkable letter

to state the leading features of his political creed. It is safe to say that in all the recorded history of politics during the nineteenth century, there is to be found nothing more remarkable than this declaration of principles. For the sake of brevity some parts may be omitted here, but the reader will confess that enough is given to enlist his homage to the courage and genius of this seer of half a century ago.

1st. In opposition to slavery.

2nd. The right to the soil is as natural, absolute, and equal, as the right to the light and the air.

3d. Political rights are not conventional, but natural—inhering in all persons, the black as well as the white, the female as well as the male.

4th. The doctrine of free trade is the necessary outgrowth of the doctrine of human brotherhood, and to impose restrictions on commerce is to build up unnatural and sinful barriers across that brotherhood.

5th. National wars are as brutal, barbarous, and unnecessary, as are the violence and bloodshed to which misguided and frenzied individuals are prompted; our country should, by her own Heaven-trusting and beautiful example, hasten the day, when the nations of the earth 'shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.'

6th. Aimed against the extension of governmental functions, in conformity with the notion that the less government the better.

7th. As far as practicable, every officer, from the highest to the lowest, should be elected directly by the people.

Such was the clear, bold declaration of principles set forth by the member elect. He served but a single session, and resigned on the very day that the session ended. The principles upon which he stood appear again and again in the speeches which he made during that session. These speeches are contained in the old volume that lies before me—Speeches of Gerrit Smith in Congress, Mason Brothers, New York, 1855. How many readers of to-day have ever heard of Mason Brothers as publishers? They have passed—and how much else—since they issued this volume of speeches, copied, as they say, "without change from their original publication." Surely the house of Mason Brothers did a good turn, and proved its right to existence by publishing this handy volume; for these speeches are made of the stuff that the world will need some generations yet to come. Will not some successor to Mason Brothers publish at least selections, in order

that they may be made more accessible to a new generation? Of course some of the speeches are out of date, but there are others which in all essential principles will be modern for many a day.

I presume this volume is now rare, and that its contents are not otherwise readily accessible to many readers: I shall therefore venture to make a number of quotations. On Jan. 16, 1854, Mr. Smith introduced a series of resolutions on the Public Lands. The 4th section reads as follows:

"That it is not because land monopoly is the most efficient cause of inordinate and tyrannical riches on the one hand, and of dependent and abject poverty on the other; and that it is not because it is, therefore, the most efficient cause of that inequality of condition so well-nigh fatal to the spread of democracy and Christianity, that Government is called upon to abolish it; but it is because the right, which this mighty agent of evil violates and tramples under foot, is among those clear, certain, essential, natural rights which it is the province of Government to protect at all hazards and irrespective of all consequences." It is needless to say that the resolutions were promptly laid on the table; but their author again and again found opportunity to proclaim his doctrine.

In a speech on the Homestead Bill, Jan. 21, 1854, he said:

"The right of a man to the soil, the light, and the air, is to so much of each of them as he needs and no more, and for so long as he lives and no longer. In other words, this dear mother earth, with her never-failing nutritious bosom; and this life-preserving air, which floats around it; and this sweet light, which visits, are all owned by each present generation, and are equally owned by all the members of such generation."

Again: "Were the monopoly of the light and air practicable . . . there would be no higher duty on Government than to put an end to such wicked and death-dealing monopolies. . . . Why land monopoly has not swept the earth of all good, is not because it is unadapted and inadequate to that end, but because it has been only partially carried out."

Again: "Land monopoly has reduced no small share of the human family to abject and wretched dependence, for it has shut them out from the great source of subsistence, and frightfully increased the precariousness of life. Unhappy Ireland illustrates the great power of land monopoly for evil. The right to so much as a standing place on the earth is denied to the great mass of her people."

Again: "What a man produces

from the soil, he has an absolute right to. He may abuse the right. It nevertheless remains. But no such right can he have in the soil itself. . . . But it may be said that a man might monopolize the fruits of the soil, and thus become as injurious to his fellow-men as by monopolizing the soil itself. It is true that he might, in this wise, produce a scarcity of food. But the calamity would be for a few months only. Having the soil still in their hands the sufferers would have the remedy still in their hands."

Toward the close of this remarkable address, the speaker describes in vivid ways the increased happiness that would come to the human race by the abolition of the land monopoly. Let me quote a few sentences here and there:

"Land monopoly is the chief cause of beggary—comparatively little beggary will remain after land monopoly is abolished."

"The world will be happier, when land monopoly is abolished, because it will more abound in marriage. Marriage, when invited by a free soil, will be much more common and early, than when, as now, it must be delayed until the parties to it are able to purchase a home."

"And still another benefit to flow from the abolition of land monopoly is its happy influence upon the cause of temperance. . . . The ranks of intemperance, like those of war, are, to a great extent, recruited from the homeless and vagrant."

"I will glance at but one more of the good effects that will result from the abolition of land monopoly. Religion will rejoice, when the masses, now robbed of homes by land monopoly, shall have homes to thank God for—homes in which to cultivate the home-bred virtues and to grow in Christian vigor and beauty."

No matter what the subject of his speech, this early apostle of "the land for the people" managed to get in some word for the cause in which he had come to believe so strongly. In a speech on the Territory of Minnesota I find these words: "The bare fact that a man is without land is title enough to his needed share of the vacant land. No clearer, stronger title to it can he possibly have. Is there a spare home in the great common inheritance of the human family? Who should have it if not the homeless?"

In a speech on the Pacific Railroad, delivered May 30, 1854, he confessed:

"I am so full of it that I could well-nigh consent to say, in all my speeches, as did Cato his 'Carthago delenda est' in all his—that the vacant land belongs to the landless. The simple fact that the one is vacant and the other landless, is of itself the highest proof that they

should be allowed to come together. Alas, what a crime against nature that they should be kept apart."

The coupling of the words Pacific Railroad and land monopoly brings up another memory. One can not but wonder whether a certain boy, then but sixteen years of age, living in Philadelphia—if he had happened on this 30th of May to be taken to Washington, and could have sat in the gallery and heard these words—whether he would have felt some special thrill, and would have had some clairvoyant premonition of some twenty years ahead, when he too would be talking about a Pacific Railroad and about land monopoly. Can we imagine that he might have dreamt then that to him it would be given to see the evils with the clear vision of the speaker, and with clearer vision to point the way of relief?

Nothing could better convince one of the greatness of the work and service of Henry George than the reading of these speeches of Gerrit Smith. Great as was the mind of this preacher of freedom, keen as was his insight into the evils of monopoly, he had no other remedy to propose than the crude limitation of the quantity of land a man might hold. One can easily imagine with what enthusiasm he would have welcomed the system which George set forth a quarter of a century later. It would have fallen in precisely with Gerrit Smith's political principles; for he believed most heartily in free trade and in direct taxation. In a speech on War, from which I wish I might quote at length, he said: "No government ever was, or ever will be, either honest or frugal, whose expenses are defrayed by indirect taxation."

I find it difficult to cease quoting from this book, which seems to come to us like a fresh voice from a dead past. I have said nothing of the literary qualities of the author, with his fine, calm temper, and yet with a facility and pithiness of style that are constantly apparent. And more than style is the large, noble compass of his thought. Would that we in our day might listen again to his sincerity, his high ideals, his belief in human rights, and his devotion to principle and religion. "I trust," he said, in the very first speech which he delivered in Congress. "I trust that a better day will come, when all men shall be convinced that human rights are not to be secured by human cunning and human juggles, but solely by the unfaltering acknowledgment of the Divine Power. This crazy world is intent on saving itself by dethroning God. But, in that better day, to which I have referred, the conviction shall be universal, that the only safety of man consists in leaving God upon His throne."

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

The Red Book for July (Chicago), edited by Crumbull White, offers an inviting bill of fare to the Summer story reader.

While there is nothing particularly new in Mr. Carl Snyder's article in the June Harper on "The World Beyond Our Senses," he calls our attention in an interesting way to the fact that if we could only see a little better, the revelation would "seem as strange to us as would our visible world could Helen Keller's sightless eyes be touched to the light of day." Beyond all that the eye may see, that ear may hear, that hands may feel, outside of taste or smell, there lies an unseen, unheard, unfeeling universe whose fringe," he says, "we are just beginning to explore. A flash, so to speak, from this suprasensual world came with the discovery of the Roentgen rays.

But they are still called X-rays, for we still do not know what they are nor where they belong." J. H. D.

The July Arena tells of the reign of terror in Finland, in a contribution by John Jackson; and in a paper by Mr. Flower the corruption of government by corporations is circumstantially and graphically told. Government by injunction is treated by Ernest Crosby, who emphasizes some important points. Premising that injunctions must enjoin acts which are either lawful or unlawful, he contends that "if they are unlawful they are already forbidden by law, and the penal code is a standing injunction against them. Why, then, issue another injunction? If, on the other hand, the acts are lawful, why should they be forbidden? It is a dangerous legislative power to put into the hands of a single judge, and we have seen numerous examples of its abuse." Mr. Crosby adds a timely word on the proposal to allow men charged with violations of injunctions to have a jury trial. "Such a remedy," he says, "would be most inadequate. The jury could only consider the question of fact, whether or not the accused has disobeyed the in-

junction, while the main issue, namely, whether the judge had any right to enjoin the act, would be altogether beyond the scope of their functions."

In McClure's for July Mr. Henry Harland continues "My Friend Prospero," and there are good short stories; but of course the notable papers of the number are the continuation, and conclusion of the first part, of Miss Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company," and Mr. Steffens's "Philadelphia: Corrupt and Contented." Of the latter the editor remarks that it is "the most depressing of our city articles and we regard it as peculiarly appropriate reading for the glorious Fourth of July, the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, which was adopted one hundred and twenty-seven years ago in Philadelphia." Mr. Steffens tells, among other ras-calities, of the refusal of Wanamaker's offer of \$2,500,000 for the street-car franchises that were given away. I happened to be in Philadelphia at the time, and while driving next day with a Republican friend I asked him why the people, or somebody, did not try to do something about so open a steal. "Oh," he replied, "we have got so that we can stand anything." J. H. D.

The Century for July is a noteworthy number. It opens with a little poem of high quality by Edwin Markham entitled "At Friends with Life." Wm. Hayes Ward has a most instructive article on "Who Was Hammurabi?" taking us back to 2250 B.C. There is the first installment of some "Unpublished Letters by Sir Walter Scott," and Richard Whiteing continues "The Yellow Van." But to many the most interesting feature will be "John Wesley," by Prof. C. T. Winchester of Wesleyan University, an admirable sketch of the great reformer, bringing his life down to about 1750. It is interesting to note, apropos of recent discussion, that Wesley's mother was her father's twenty-fifth child, and that she bore to her husband nineteen children in twenty-one years. The husband was meantime rector of an obscure parish on \$750 a year. Yet they did great things, these two

Fabian Essays in Socialism

Essays by G. Bernard Shaw, Sydney Olivier, Sidney Webb, Wm. Clarke, Hubert Bland, Graham Wallas

American Edition, with Introduction and Notes by H. G. Wilshire

PRESS NOTICES

The whole book deserves reading as a thoughtful and interesting contribution to current discussions.—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

We attach great importance to this collection of essays as a fair and competent representation of the Socialist case.—*Co-operative News*.

We think every minister of religion, and every intelligent, earnest Christian ought to read and ponder this most important and fascinating volume.—*The Methodist Times*.

The writers of the "Fabian Essays in Socialism" have produced a volume which ought to be read by all who wish to understand the movements of the time.—*Daily News*.

By far the best account of the basis of Socialism yet published in England, and by their temperate and "evolutionary" spirit cannot fail to be of great service in dispelling much misunderstanding of current Socialism.—*The Academy*.

After a careful and conscientious perusal one is compelled to admit that they are written with conspicuous ability and sagacity from the Socialistic point of view, and that they must mark a departure as notable in social politics as the famous *Essays and Reviews* were in theology.—*The Scots Observer*.

Paper, 25 cents ; Cloth, 75 cents

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS
17 East 16th Street, NEW YORK