

PUBLIC PLAYGROUNDS IN PHILADELPHIA.

Through Mr. Tsanoff's tireless energy, by the spring of 1894 quite a public sentiment was created in favor of the movement, and two playgrounds on a very small scale were opened by some women during that summer. Early in 1895 a permanent playgrounds committee was formed, and in various ways public sentiment was aroused. As a result, the city councils granted \$1,000 for the opening of school yards as children's playgrounds, and four of them were so used during that season. Twelve school yards were opened in 1896; and during 1897 the city councils willingly granted \$3,000 for the purpose, and 23 such playgrounds—several in vacant lots—were in successful operation. Mr. Paul Kavanagh, of the board of education, became thoroughly aroused to the importance of this movement, and as a result of his influence the board of education employed for each school yard playground two teachers, who were helped more or less by volunteer workers; each playground was provided with tents, sand heaps, swings, toys and other good things for the children's enjoyment. The vacant lots were equipped by private subscription. From these playgrounds the children were also taken by young people's societies and other league helpers on frequent trolley outings to Fairmount park and elsewhere, the children usually paying at least part of their own car fare.

The playgrounds did not themselves do the educational work. Mr. Tsanoff says that when one playground in a rough district was opened last spring, its sand piles became, rather, the scene of a desperate grabbing of buckets and shovels. Sand, fists and pails often filled the air, while the cries and complaints of the youngsters added to the confusion. Turning to the swings and see-saws, the caretakers found another crowd of wrangling children, while a shout from the entrance announced the arrival of a "gang" of older boys. The tent collapsed, the swings were monopolized, the sand was scattered over the yard, and the "gang" had more fun than it had enjoyed for many a day. When capture was attempted, the "gang" took to the streets and from a safe distance hurled missiles and epithets at the caretakers and janitor. If a culprit was caught, he hadn't done it, and no one knew who had. When the "cops" were called in, the "gang" was often more than a match for them.

And yet, in a month's time, the sand piles of this playground presented a picturesque scene of quiet enjoyment. Bad boys still came, but they also went, for there was no "gang" to hinder their going. "The boys and girls," says Mr. Tsanoff, "began to look to the caretakers as their friends. Their conduct, language and appearance were really ennobled." "I know that our boy be-

haves differently at home," said one woman, and this was but the expression of the feeling of many. In six hours after the announcement was made last September that this playground must be closed, 180 children had promised to bring two cents each week in order to have it kept open after school hours.

At another playground a tactful teacher won the bad boys by asking their help as heads of departments. "One," says Mr. Tsanoff, "was governor over the swings, another over the hammocks, another over the sand-piles, and another over the ice water. The boys took pride in this," he adds, "and became decent citizens of that young community."

The summer outings witnessed at the beginning experiences similar to those of the playgrounds. This may be sufficiently illustrated by the conduct of one boy who in 1895 jumped into the pail of lemonade "just for fun." The conditions were somewhat improved during 1896, but last year the young people who had entertained the same children for three successive seasons were forced to exclaim: "Are these really the children we had before?" The rowdiness had disappeared, the children had learned to wait their turns at the lunch-tables and to ask the waitresses for what they wanted.

By these playgrounds and outings Mr. Tsanoff and those who have helped him have accomplished two things: (1) They have brought together the rich and the poor, the cultured and the ignorant, for mutual understanding. (2) They have presented ideals to the children without calling them "ideals." The fun of fighting and mischief-making is gradually being replaced, through the influence of the playground, by the fun of a free activity that brings self-respect, regard for law and order, and a desire to be helpful to others.

The success of the playgrounds led Mr. Tsanoff, in the fall of 1895, to undertake the establishment of a model playground, "to serve," he says, "as an object lesson to the city in its endeavors to provide play facilities for its children." After some agitation, John Dickinson square, which is nearly three acres in extent, was procured from the city for this purpose. After a still longer time, through the efforts of Mr. A. S. Eisenhower, commissioner of the city property, who had also secured the square for a playground, \$5,000 was granted by the city councils. The work was, therefore, begun several months ago. This same body has recently granted \$7,000 more, and the \$12,000 from the city has been largely supplemented by private subscriptions secured by Rev. J. L. Jones, of the Culture Extension league, to whom, indeed, belongs the chief credit for carrying through the work. As a result, the Model Playground of Philadelphia is now completed, and we may use Mr.

Tsanoff's description of its plan. "In the middle," he says, "is an open circular area, to be flooded during the skating season and used as a romping ground during the rest of the year. This is surrounded by a bicycle track, fenced for safety. Outside of this are found various provisions for the children's enjoyment, such as tennis courts, swings, parallel bars, swinging rings, and sand piles; also a music stand, sanitary provisions, etc. All is surrounded by a promenade path where mothers may wheel their baby carriages, and where rows of seats invite the visitor to rest under overhanging shade trees. Two sides of this playground have each a pavilion, one for the boys, the other for girls. These are designed to supply the place of the playground in winter and during stormy weather." — The Outlook.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PROPHET.

"The Law of Freedom in a Platform: or True Magistracy Restored," is the quaint title of a little pamphlet published in 1652, which is described and quoted from by L. H. Berens, writing in *The New Age*.

"Of the personal history of the author, one Jerrard Winstanley," Mr. Berens says, "I have as yet been able to learn little or nothing. Quoting from Whitelocke, Thomas Carlyle, in his 'Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches,' mentions him, only to dismiss him with a characteristic sneer. But the most superficial perusal of his pamphlet suffices to show that one is in the presence of a mind of no common order, a mind well stored with the learning of his time, singularly free from superstitions of any kind, logical, penetrating, uncompromising, inspired by noble aspirations, and animated by a love of humanity and a desire for progress."

On the title page the work is:

Humbly presented to Oliver Cromwell, General of the Commonwealth's Army in England, Scotland, and Ireland. And to all Englishmen my brethren whether in Church-fellowship or not in Church-fellowship, both sorts walking as they conceive according to the Order of the Gospel; and from them to all the nations in the world.

To Oliver Cromwell Winstanley says:

That which is wanting on your part to be done is this: To see that the oppressor's power be cast out with his person; and to see that the free possession of the land and liberties be put into the hands of the oppressed commoners of England. . . . For now you have the power of the land in your hand, you must do one of these two things: First, either set the land free to the oppressed com-

moners who assisted you . . . and so take possession of your deserved honor. Or, secondly, you must only remove the conqueror's power out of the king's hand into other men's, maintaining the old laws still; and then your wisdom and honor will be blasted for ever; and you will either lose yourself, or lay the foundation of greater slavery to posterity than ever you knew.

Of "the burthen of landlords," he writes:

And is not this a slavery, say the people, that though there be land enough in England to maintain ten times as many people as are in it, yet some must beg of their brethren, or work in hard drudgery for day wages for them, or starve, or steal, and so be hanged out of the way, as men not fit to live on the earth? Before they are suffered to plant the waste land for a livelihood, they must pay rent to their brethren for it. Well, this is a burthen the creation groans under; and the subjects (so called) have not their birthright freedom granted them from their brethren, who hold it from them by club law, but not by righteousness.

But you will say, Is not the land your brother's? and you cannot take away another man's right by claiming a share therein with him. I answer, It is his either by creation right or by right of conquest; if by creation right he call the earth his and not mine, then it is mine as well as his, for the Spirit of the whole creation, who made us both, is no respecter of persons. And if by conquest he call the earth his and not mine, it must be either by the conquest of the kings over the commoners, or by the conquest of the commoners over the kings. If he claim the earth to be his from the king's conquest, the kings are beaten and cast out, and that title is undone. If he claim title to the earth from the conquest of the commoners over the kings, then I have a right to the land as well as my brother, for my brother without me, nor I without my brother, did not cast out the kings, but both together, assisting with person and purse, we prevailed, so that I have by this victory as equal a share in the earth which is now redeemed as my brother, by the law of righteousness.

On the question of compensation he argues as we do in our day:

When tythes were first enacted and lordly power drawn over the backs of the oppressed, the kings and conquerors made no scruple of conscience to take it, though the people lived in sore bondage of Poverty for want of it; and can there be scruple of conscience to make restitution of this which hath been so long stolen goods? It is no scruple arising from the righteous

law, but from covetousness, who goes away sorrowful to hear he must part with all to follow righteousness and peace.

On the question of riches, Mr. Berens declares Winstanley "is as clear and decisive as a Ruskin; some may even think more clear." Hear the old prophet:

But shall not one man be richer than another? There is no need for that; for riches make men vain-glorious, proud, and to oppress their brethren, and are the occasion of wars. No man can be rich but he must be rich either by his own labours or by the labours of other men helping him. If a man have no help from his neighbours, he shall never gather an estate of hundreds and thousands a year. If other men help him to work, then are those riches his neighbours' as well as his; for they be the fruits of other men's labours as well as his own. But all rich men live at ease, feeding and clothing themselves by the labours of other men, which is their shame and not their nobility; for it is a more blessed thing to give than to receive. But rich men receive all they have from the labourer's hand, and what they give, they give away from other men's labours, not their own. Therefore, they are not righteous actors in the earth.

A warning which we Americans may well heed is contained in this practical definition of monarchy:

Monarchy is twofold, either for one king to reign, or for many to rule by kingly principles; for the king's power lies in his laws, not in his name.

To the bar of eternal justice old Jerard Winstanley carried his plea, and his voice still speaks for us:

Hear, O thou Righteous Spirit of the whole creation, and judge who is the thief, he who takes away the freedom of the common earth from me, which is my creation-rights. . . . Or I who take the common earth to plant upon for my free livelihood, endeavoring to live as a free commoner in a free commonwealth, in righteousness and peace.

BUSINESS, POLITICS AND MARRIAGE.

Lyman Abbott is one of the men who are deeply concerned lest woman may go beyond the confines of her natural sphere. So deeply is he concerned that he opposes woman suffrage because he fears it may impose upon woman a duty which she is not prepared to accept. As if any human legislation could impose upon any persons any duty which is not theirs by nature! Legislation may prevent the performance of duties, but it cannot create duties. That matter, however, is only incidental. We are at present interested in some of Dr. Abbott's preaching about the sphere of woman, which fur-

ther illustrates the narrowness of his views upon that subject.

He dwells upon the temptations which confront a woman of the higher education and larger life of our day. While protesting that he would not have her shut out from business, the law, medicine, the pulpit or politics, he insists that it is impossible to open these vocations to her without tempting her to take ambition as her part in place of love; and "over against any notion," he says, "come how or whence it may, that it is a nobler thing to be in business or in politics or in literature than it is to love with fidelity one man, and be his companion, consecrated to him, and joining her life with his, I raise my voice here and everywhere."

Very good. But would Dr. Abbott not raise his voice also against a similar notion with reference to men? Would he have men take ambition as their part rather than love? Is it nobler for men to be in business or politics or literature than to love with fidelity one woman and be her companion, consecrated to her and joining his life to hers? On the contrary, is not marriage a mutual relationship, which is as truly the noblest thing for the husband as for the wife? What significance, then, is there in Dr. Abbott's protest?

He and all objectors like him completely ignore the truth that business, politics and literature, not less than wash tubs and cradles, are among the partnership duties of married life. The wife who intelligently shares her husband's interests in business, politics or literature, is all the more truly his wife, all the more truly his companion; she thereby all the more truly joins her life with his, just as the husband who intelligently shares his wife's interests in the cradle, and if need be in the wash tub, all the more truly joins his life with hers. Wives whose intellectual and affectional horizon is the four walls of their homes, may be likened to husbands whose horizon is their business or political or professional interests. Such husbands are not truly married to such wives. On the one side there may be a good housekeeper, and on the other a good breadwinner; but there is no consecrated companionship, no joining of life to life.

Marriage means union for the whole 24 hours of the day. Just as it takes both husband and wife to make a true domestic home, so it takes both husband and wife to make a true business home. Though they need not work all the time together, part of the day at home and part of the day in business, yet each must have a lively and intelligent interest in the work and interests of the other. This mutuality of interest cannot exist as to any business from which women are excluded, nor as to public affairs in which women have no voice. The very exclusion