

A BROADER LIFE FOR WOMEN.

Extracts from an article in the Independent of July 9, 1903, by Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman.

But just as the man, howsoever well pleased with his family and home, needs something more, so does the woman, equally well pleased, also need something more. Both are citizens of the world as well as members of the family, both need the largest general relations of life as well as the smaller personal ones.

It is not true that love "is of man's life a thing apart—'tis woman's whole existence." It is nobody's whole existence. It is a vital part of everybody's existence, beautiful, natural, sweet, indispensable—but not all. Here we have a large common ground of explanation for much of the unhappiness in marriage so general in our life to-day; under which women suffer most, and for which men are most blamed. The woman suffers most in an unhappy marriage, because she has no other life from which to draw strength and practical consolation. She may try to drown her trouble in religion—and religious monomania among home-bound women is painfully common—or she may seek consolation in "society," in excitement, and amusement.

But a man has his work to take pleasure in, to take pride in, to gratify ambition, to obtain profit, to fill out the varied wants and impulses of his nature. He has the world as well as the woman, and with them both gets on more comfortably. She has only the man. He is the world to her—or she thinks he is; and she makes him miserable as well as herself, by trying to drag out of one never so worthy man the satisfaction which a human creature can only find in full human life. We shall have far happier marriages, happier homes, happier women and happier men when both sexes realize that they are human, and that humanity has far wider duties and desires than those of the domestic relations.

A wise fulfillment of these broader social relations will make a far more healthy and reasonable woman, and a healthy, reasonable woman will not expect of any man alive that he be to her lover, husband, friend and world.

It appears somewhat strange that two sentences so unlike as "Nigger in the wood pile," and "Sugar in a Congressman's vote," should contain the same number of words.

G. T. E.

THE LIFE OF RELIGION THE DEATH OF THE CHURCH.

Portions of a sermon delivered at the Vine street Congregational church, Cincinnati, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

There will be no policemen in Heaven, and no churches. Both institutions are born of the imperfections of society, and must disappear together.

There was a man, a prophetic soul, named John, who dreamed a dream; saw a vision of the heavenly city. In the twenty-first chapter of Revelation we read that, at least in two respects, this was a most remarkable vision.

First as to the location of this city. It was not in the clouds. It was on the earth. He did not see people ascending to Heaven. He saw Heaven descending to the people.

"And I, John, saw the holy city coming down from God out of Heaven."

He did not see the people going to dwell with God. He saw God coming down to dwell with them.

A remarkable thing about this heavenly city, as seen by John, was the absence of any church. "And I saw no temple therein." Society is to be redeemed and earth made heavenly, not by the building of costly churches and the nursing of religious institutions, but by the diffusion of the spirit of true religion through the mass. This is a bold thought. We think of the multiplication of churches and the growth of organized religious activity as signs of progress. In a measure, this is true. Yet there is also truth in the paradox which was suggested by John's churchless Heaven. A progressing society means a vanishing church.

In the beginning the church was everything. In the end, it will be nothing. The church is to die that the world may be saved.

In a recent election in Ohio the church was successfully appealed to to defeat an amendment which had for its object the removal of a constitutional obstruction to reform in taxation. The argument was that some future legislature might put church property on the tax duplicate. The financial interests of the institution were placed above society's liberty to make progress. The church lost that opportunity to die for the world.

It is often said that if the church would take a bold stand on the right side of the great struggle that is now being waged between popular liberty and the power of monopoly, it would fill its pews and make itself strong with the multitude. This is not true.

The most successful churches, from the institutional point of view, are the churches where monopoly worships, or those where superstition runs high. The more rational and concrete and courageous the preaching, the weaker the church.

It is an opinion of mine, from which many noble-minded men will dissent, that we have in the pulpits of to-day, many gifted preachers, but few prophets. The church does not strike the deepest chords of modern life. The mighty hopes which are beginning to stir in the hearts of men are not inspired by pulpit eloquence. It is not to the hosts that burn incense in the temple, but to a few humble men in the street, that the evangel of our day has come, proclaiming to the weary and heavy-laden glad tidings of great joy.

To those who sit in the darkness a light is breaking; the light is the dawn of a wonderful faith; a faith that humanity is gathering strength for a mighty forward impulse; and that after the impending storm is past, the rose of equality will bloom and blossom on the deserts and plague-spots of earth; and the harvest-songs of brave men, and the lullabys of free women and the laughter of welcome children will mingle in a new wondrous anthem of praise to the God of Liberty and Truth. Is this Gospel proclaimed from our pulpits? How much more glorious it is to preach the truth than to build a church!

A STORY OF HOTHOUSE BANANAS.

The Hon. John Sharp Williams, the new minority leader in Congress, is making his Republican opponents uncomfortable whenever he rises to speak, which is quite often. In his rattling speech on Cuban reciprocity he said in part:

Protection, Mr. Chairman, is a system of taxation whereby many are robbed in order that a few may be hothoused by legislation into artificial prosperity. As a supplementary definition, protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from naturally profitable pursuits and enterprises into channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises. And, as a corollary, the method whereby they are deflected is by the enactment of laws forcing the consumer to pay to the artificial hothoused enterprises a higher price than with a free commerce the consumer would have to pay. . . .

That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to my favorite banana theory. There is in the United States, I suppose, one hundred acres of land where bananas can be grown in the open air, and yet I could, were I the legislating body of this coun-

try, or were I the Czar with absolute power and disposed to make the people pay the price for it, create a "Great American Banana Industry." I could put a tax of one dollar apiece on bananas which are now selling in the streets three for a nickel, and inside of five years I could, with a good custom house service, have created and exploited a vast banana industry. It is true that a great many people who formerly ate bananas could not buy any bananas at all, and some people would have to buy fewer bananas; but it is also true that a great many people, who are plutocrats and aristocrats, would eat them because the common people—Dagoes, Jersey-men and Mississippians—could not.

If I continued that system of taxation in existence for twenty years, at the end of that time there would have come to the front a new generation that "knew not Joseph" nor cheap bananas; and the moment sensible people came into power with the idea of revising the banana schedule these gentlemen who "knew not Joseph" and had gone into the American banana business and perhaps formed a banana trust would come to the committee room of the national legislature, knocking upon the doors all the time, and giving utterance to cries of unutterable woe: "Are you going to strike down the Great American Banana Industry; are you going to reduce the duty from a dollar apiece on bananas to 80 cents? We can't stand it. It will ruin us. Are you going to make the people engaged in banana raising go to the soup houses? Are you going to discriminate in favor of pauper tropical sunshine against self-respecting American hothouse laborers?"

Let us stop a moment and follow the banana theory a little further, because I am fond of bananas. What would have been the result of establishing that industry? Merely this, that you would have deflected a certain amount of American capital and a certain amount of American labor engaged in the general hothouse industry into a different channel of hothouse proceedings, and instead of having their hothouses for the purpose they have them now they would have converted them into banana nurseries, and the consumers would be paying a dollar apiece, or perhaps 90 cents apiece, for bananas, because the protected interest would have to undersell somewhat the foreign markets.

After fifteen or twenty years "home competition" would have reduced the price of bananas in the American market to, let us say, 40 cents apiece, and then Republican orators and politicians would say privately, in newspapers, and

on the stump and within these walls, with due solemnity and without a mutual smile: "Lo, and behold! See how a protective tariff has reduced the price of bananas from 90 cents apiece in 1950 to 40 cents apiece in 1965—nearly 50 per cent. decrease in price to the consumer! Protection did it!"

Yes! A reduction from superlative extortion to comparative extortion!

But in all this picture keep in mind one thing: While protectionism lasted bananas would never reach three for a nickel, because if they did, that public enemy—tropical sunshine—would be master.

What would you have accomplished? Would you have increased the wages of labor? Not a particle. You would merely have deflected capital from one channel to another, from one sort of hothouse production to another, or from a production which was not hothoused at all into a hothouse production. Would you have increased the demand for labor? Not at all, because this capital and this labor would have gone out of something else—something that with freer commerce or with free commerce would have been naturally profitable—into this business, which, otherwise unprofitable, you have by law made profitable.

CHAMBERLAIN HIT HARD.

Dr. Henry S. Lunn, who with Lord Lyveden is now in this country arranging for a visit next year to the St. Louis exposition of a large party of members of the British parliament, is president of the new Reform club in England and is one of the ablest and most vigorous of the opponents of the protectionist scheme of Joseph Chamberlain. The kind of blows he is giving Chamberlain is evident from the following extracts from an interview printed at Washington November 24:

"There is an infinite difference between the fiscal position of Great Britain and of America. Geographically, Great Britain could be added to one of the American states like Texas without perceptibly increasing the size of that state. Politically, Great Britain is part of an empire consisting of widely separated territories divided by oceans and hostile territories, while the United States are self-contained. Economically, if England alone, like Noah's ark, survived a universal flood, the majority of the population would be starved to death within three months. On the other hand, if the United States alone survived a great cosmic cataclysm, the population would be, practically speaking, unaffected, so far as the means of subsistence was concerned. Why is

this? Because in America the country produces everything from an iceberg to a banana. . . .

"At the present time England is prosperous beyond the wildest dreams of our ancestors. The income tax, which is the real test of national prosperity, was levied on gross incomes, in 1861 amounting to \$1,500,000,000; in 1881, \$2,330,000,000; in 1901, \$4,330,000,000. . . .

"During the last 40 years the number of paupers in Great Britain has declined from 47 per 1,000 to 25 per 1,000, while the wages of the average workman have increased 13.71 per cent. and the purchasing power of food has diminished from 143 to 100, so that a laborer who to-day has 100 shillings can buy produce worth 143 shillings 25 years ago, while at that date the laborer would only have 86.29 shillings to purchase at these higher values. Therefore, the real worth of the workman has nearly doubled during this period.

"Mr. Chamberlain has dwelt greatly upon the excess of our imports over our exports, and has argued that we are either selling our securities or running into debt. When we turn, however, to the figures, we discover that the income derived from British investments abroad increased between the year 1881 and 1891 from \$30,000,000 to \$54,000,000, and from 1891 to 1902 from \$54,000,000 to \$62,000,000. Moreover our gigantic shipping industry is estimated to earn \$90,000,000 per year, and, in addition to this, we have the great profits of our international banking, insurance, brokerage, etc.

"If the theory were right that we paid in golden sovereigns, as some embryonic economists have argued, we should have paid away during the last ten years \$8,000,000,000, which, as Euclid would say, 'is absurd.' This impossible sum is really the tribute of the nation to England, as the great creditor nation, and the payment of the nations for our great services rendered in shipping, banking, etc.

"The United Kingdom is in a particularly weak condition for retaliation. Our shipping is vulnerable, our imports consist of few and raw materials, and the greater portion of our exports are manufactured goods.

"Now, Mr. Chamberlain's remedy: Mr. Chamberlain comes forward with his remedy of preferential tariffs. What would be the result of giving preference when immediately elements of great discord would be introduced into the councils of the empire? Canada will complain unless she gets a great preference in wheat; Australia will then insist on a protection on wool, which Mr. Cham-