

can be studied—through comradeship on the level. His position as a professor in the department of sociology and anthropology at the University of Chicago lends additional importance to a course in ethnology which he has projected for September at the St. Louis Exposition. Although this course is to be for the immediate benefit of an organized class, meeting three hours a day six days in the week for three weeks, attendants at single lectures only are also to be welcomed and arrangements made for their comfort. The groups of savage and barbarous types in the out-door ethnological exhibit are to be put at the service of Prof. Starr for the purposes of this course of instruction, among them being the Philippine groups, including the Igorrotes. The opportunity will be a good one for studying these people under the guidance of an expert who "takes no stock" in "inferior-race" fads.

Persons afflicted with fears of "the yellow peril" will find a needed tonic in Geo. F. Seward's pamphlet on the Russian-Japanese war, which may probably be obtained of the Newark (N. J.) Evening News, in which it originally appeared March 1, 1904, as an interview with Mr. Seward. Mr. Seward is exceptionally well qualified to discuss this subject. A nephew of the great Secretary, he served the United States officially in China for 20 years—1861 to 1880. He was consul and consul general at Shanghai from 1861 to 1876, and minister to China from 1876 to 1880. During this service he proved to be a faithful and efficient representative not only of American commercial interests but also of the most wholesome and hopeful American thought; and he might have remained in the service but for his truly American conscience, his recall in 1880 having resulted from his courageous refusal to undertake the negotiation of a treaty for restricting Chinese immigration into the United States. The opinions of such a man regarding

"the yellow peril" should be welcome to all his thoughtful fellow countrymen whose sentiments are comprehensively democratic. We therefore reproduce in our Miscellany department liberal extracts from his pamphlet.

#### THE WIFE OF HENRY GEORGE.

Wife and husband are too commonly thought of as distinct persons, with independent functions and duties. To some imaginations the husband is habitually pictured as a sturdy oak and the wife as a clinging vine; to others they appear simply as associates, no closer related at best than as Pythian friends. Few of us picture them as the two halves of one person. Yet this is the true figure. In all their relations they are complementaries. The functions and duties and rights of each are necessary to completeness in the functions, duties and rights of the other.

There are no natural monopolies, no natural masterships, no natural privileges in marriage. Its equality and mutuality and interdependence on every plane is symbolized by its function of parenthood on the physical plane. As truly products of intimate marriage union as children of the body, and as dependent upon this union for vitality, are those little children of the brain and heart which go out into the world as wise thoughts and good deeds. Nature abhors a bachelor as she does a vacuum. Wherever on the lower planes of her activities man has made himself familiar with her laws, he has learned that she works eternally through unions of masculine with feminine. He has only to become familiar with her laws on higher planes, to learn that there also masculine and feminine unions are indispensable.

A notable example of this idea of the reciprocity of marriage relations may be found in the marital life of the late Henry George and his wife, which is recalled by the death of Mrs. George.

She died at Merriewood Park, in the mountains of Sullivan county, New York, on Thursday the twenty-first day of July, 1904. Her burial took place on the 23d

at Greenwood Cemetery, New York, where her body was laid by the side of her husband's.

In the trend of their affections, in the complementary cast of their minds, in identity of general purpose, in mutuality of service, in all else that goes to make marriage unity, these two were distinctly one. Between them there was no mastership in anything; in everything there was interdependence on the basis of equality. Without him, her intellect might have stagnated; without her, his genius might have shriveled or soured.

This woman was born in Australia, October 12, 1843. Her mother, of Irish birth, was in religion a Roman Catholic; her father, an Englishman, was a major in the British army and in religion a Protestant; her name was Annie Corsina Fox.

Having lost both her parents, Miss Fox came to San Francisco with a branch of her mother's family in 1851. Nine years later she met Henry George, then an impecunious printer of San Francisco. An affection sprang up between them, but her foster family interfered, and the disheartened girl, now in her eighteenth year, was upon the point of leaving her romance behind her and becoming a teacher in the school of the Sisters of Charity at Los Angeles. This despondent plan was abandoned, however, for her wedding with George. It occurred under circumstances somewhat prophetic of the completeness of their marriage.

As narrated by his son and biographer, when George had learned of his sweetheart's intention to go to Los Angeles—

The young man said: "If you go I'll not see you," to which the girl replied that since she could not stay with her relatives in San Francisco she saw nothing else to do. The young man drew from his pocket a single coin. "Annie," said he, solemnly, "that is all the money I have in the world. Will you marry me?" She gravely answered: "If you are willing to undertake the responsibilities of marriage, I will marry you."

So they were married, he at 22 and she at 18.

Their life in the world was cast for many years among stones and brambles, but their life together was an unbroken story of marital unity. The place in which

they lived was invariably their home, their children were their cherished responsibilities, fidelity to conscience was their solemn obligation, development of their intellectual powers in the service of truth as they saw the truth was their inspiration and pleasure. In all this they were one in affections and one in mind; each supplemented the work of the other in the promotion of their common purposes.

It was no unusual thing for Henry George to tell his friends that his wife was his best adviser and critic. Nor was this an empty compliment. Into all his books her best thought entered along with his, and in the weeding process her judgment was often his court of final appeal. It was not alone as child-bearer and home-keeper that she was his help-mate. Without neglecting any of the functions that are distinctly those of wife and mother, neither did she attend to these exclusively and at the expense of ignoring those which while less distinctive are assuredly among the functions of wifehood. She was his wife and he her husband in all the relations of their common life, from dining-room to library, from kitchen to lecture platform, from home-making to citizenship.

Yet each respected the individuality of the other. Neither admitted coercion into their marital scheme. In no circumstances did either rank as inferior or superior. If they had lived in a State where all citizens may vote, one might have expected them to go arm-in-arm to the polls, and to come arm-in-arm away after having cast independent ballots, expressive of individual convictions, without dictation, and subject to no influence of either upon the other except that beneficent influence which flows from reciprocal confidence in a condition of actual and mutually conscious equality.

Their personal affection, though intense, was not alone in giving this character to their married life. They were influenced also by convictions with reference to masculine and feminine functions of the mind.

Not merely because she was his own wife did he exalt her judgment. While he realized that this gave it peculiar value to him-

self, his dominant thought sprang from a recognition of the superiority of feminine perceptions, and a belief that these perceptions are at their best when cooperating with masculine deliberation under the impulses of a happy marriage. Responding to the same thought, she received from him as he from her. Their marriage consequently grew into a type of those full-rounded marital unions of which the great world seldom hears but of which it is always full—those myriad unions of "sweet and patient souls who in narrow circles live radiant lives."

After thirty-six years, this union ended with the death of Henry George. It was on the eve of the mayoralty election of 1897 in Greater New York, at which he was one of the three principal candidates. Mrs. George's life since then has seemed like a crowning of the work in which she and her distinguished husband were so long jointly concerned. The principles for which he stood, the affections by which he was drawn, the work he left unfinished, have all come within the influence of her quiet life. Her own death marks the end of an old and the beginning of a new era, in the cause with which both their names are inseparably linked.

#### THE SPENCER-GEORGE CONTROVERSY.

When we discussed the posthumously published letters of Mr. Herbert Spencer relative to this controversy (p. 146), we supposed that all his letters on that subject had then been published. The manner of their publication seemed to warrant this supposition. But after an interval of five weeks, another installment appeared in the *Independent* of June 30. There is nothing in these later letters, however, to call for revision of our article, nor for extended supplementary comment. Without in any important respect controverting George's "Perplexed Philosopher," they only reveal an intolerable uneasiness on the part of Spencer to attack George in the American press behind somebody else's signature.

The merits of this controversy are admirably summed up and

fairly judged in the same issue of the *Independent* in which the Spencer letters appear—June 30—in a very brief review by Mr. T. Scanlon. Three searching questions which go to the heart of the dispute are asked and answered by Mr. Scanlon:

(1) What was Spencer's position on the land question in 1850? (2) What was it in 1891? (3) Was the process a valid one, whereby the change from the earlier to the later position was effected?

Mr. Scanlon considers that what Mr. Spencer meant by "compensation" in 1850 in "Social Statics" was compensation both for land value itself and for the value of those improvements which merge into the land in the process of reducing wildernesses to fertile fields—"but in a mild form and as a matter of expediency, not as a matter of right."

That is a totally different thing, as he proceeds to show, from Mr. Spencer's meaning in 1891, when, in "Justice," he lengthened out the idea of "improvements" so as to "include practically all that human labor has done to the land since the days of Adam."

Concluding that Mr. Spencer's position on the land question did change between 1850 and 1891, and that it changed so radically as to involve "a virtual surrender of the fundamental position" he originally assumed "respecting the people's rights in the soil," Mr. Scanlon implies that the process whereby Mr. Spencer changed from his earlier to his later position was not a valid one. Vigorous as is his condemnation, few of his fellow Spencerians will venture to dispute its justice. We quote him:

In the field of philosophy at large Spencer was great, and his methods were unassailable; he weighed every fact and shrank from no conclusion to which it logically led; but there is no longer the disinterested inquirer after truth; he has the manner of the special pleader, whose function is to make facts accord with ready-shaped conclusions. Hence the bungling and pettifogging nature of his new doctrines; doctrines which need only to be placed alongside his former noble utterances in order to show how worthless they are. "The rod of civilization is bent," says the earlier Spencer, in effect, "and we must bend it back so as to get it straight." But the later Spencer says: "No; if the rod is bent, let it stay bent." "At