

Turn, turn, turn, O Wheel,  
By rut and path progress;  
Turn to the land of light and love  
From the land of wickedness.  
CHARLES HOWARD FITCH.  
124 South Grove avenue, Oak Park, Ill.

#### NOT BY BREAD ALONE.

On April 23, at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, spoke of the deeper needs of man's nature which make religion a necessity.

It was not said: "Man does not live by bread." He lives by bread and something more.

It is a tragic thing when a man must choose between the satisfaction of his body and the integrity of his soul. When this choice must be made, mankind are a unit in praising those who starved in their garret or died on a scaffold rather than save the body at the cost of the soul. If the soul is the immortal part and the body but the tenement of a day, then, if both cannot live, it is better for the body to die.

In a well-ordered society, however, there could be no such discord. Both soul and body would be nourished. There can be no health of one without the nourishment of the other, as Browning would say: "Nor soul helps flesh more, now, than flesh helps soul."

Those who insist upon social justice that all may have their daily bread—they are the friends of the soul. Moreover, when we insist upon the needs of the soul, we do not deny the needs of the body.

First among the needs of the soul is a clean conscience. It is man's glory that he knows the meaning of that word, "ought." Guilt is a yoke that enslaves him. Remorse rises like a tide within him. He alone is free who can look his fellow-man full in the face; who hides no ugly secret in his heart; who respects himself and has none to fear in all the universe.

A man may have bread enough and to spare, but he will starve without that inward peace. He may have linen and fine raiment, but he will be a naked, shivering soul, if the sense of wrong is rankling in his heart.

The salvation of the soul, what can it mean but the normal life and growth of the soul? Conversion, what is that but the discovery that a man has a soul which must be fed with its own food? There is no true life until the soul comes to a realization of its sovereignty. Redemption is a waking of the desire and determination to be a man, not a wolf nor a swine, but a man, conscious of his divine heritage and his lofty purpose on this earth. Such a man cannot live by bread alone.

Another need of the soul which bread cannot supply is love. Love, also, is meat and drink, and without it the gifts of the world are dry husks.

The wife has put the house in order. She has removed the dust from a hundred places which might have been passed over. She has created an atmosphere of welcome by countless little obscure services. Does the husband take it all as a matter of course? Has he no loving sign of recognition of that thoughtful, heartfelt ministry? A sign of appreciation may crown the labor of a day, and a grateful word feed the hungry heart with happiness.

Another need of the soul is religion. Men may live without creeds and without churches, but there come times when they ask themselves sad questions, and they would give much to know that life has a rational meaning and that man is not mocked by his immortal hopes.

The atom trembles at the thought of the Infinite. The mind craves a reason for things. The heart cannot become reconciled to a loveless universe. The philosopher who traces the course of the stars, the martyr who bears witness to his truth on the up-lifted cross, these mighty thinkers and lovers of mankind, these august souls—are they all the prey of maggots in the end? That thought would kill humanity. Bread alone will not do. We cannot cease to ask questions. We cannot live without hope.

#### THE ELECTORAL WISDOM OF JAPAN.

It has occurred to me that the old wars of Spain and England, about the time of Queen Elizabeth, furnish an interesting historical parallel with the present war between Russia and Japan. In each case we have a huge despotism unsuccessfully fighting a small maritime power with its face set steadfastly towards constitutional freedom. Since Elizabeth's time England has attained by slow and painful steps the measure of representative government which modern Japan has had the good sense and good fortune to secure almost at a bound. But Japan has done more than this. She has adopted an electoral method which gives her a Parliament more truly representative of the people than the Parliament of England or the Congress of the United States.

Japan's Parliament or "Diet" consists of an upper and a lower house, called respectively the House of Peers and the House of Commons. The Japanese House of Peers corresponds to the House of Lords in England, or the Senate in America—more closely with the former than the latter, because it represents an aristocracy rather than a plutocracy. This article will deal with the House of Commons and the wise principle upon which the election of its members is based. That principle is proportional representation.

The essential facts may be stated in a few words. Japan's House of Commons consists of 379 members, elected by ballot for four years on a very liberal

franchise. There are 47 "prefectures," or electoral districts, giving an average of eight members to a district. These electoral districts vary in population, and the number of members elected from each varies accordingly; the smallest number being five and the largest 13, except in the case of the city of Tokio, which has 15 members to represent its 1,500,000 of souls. Like the others, it is one electoral district.

In every district each elector has one vote only. That is the proportional feature. The very simplicity of the plan stands in the way of a full apprehension of the great political reform which it involves. I shall therefore devote some space to an elucidation of the principle of proportional representation, with brief sketches of the more important systems by which that principle is put into operation. There are several such systems, and that used in Japan is the simplest of them all.

The keynote of proportional representation is the single vote in large electoral districts. By that I mean that each elector casts only one vote, although in his voting district several members or representatives are elected. Unproportional representation is for each elector to cast as many votes as there are members to be elected in such a district, or to vote in a single-member district if he has but a single vote. This is a broad statement, and does not quite cover the ground; but it is a sufficient generalization for my present purpose.

Much puzzlement has resulted from multiplicity of systems and complexity of detail. One purpose of this article is to reduce proportional representation to its simplest terms, both in principle and methods. Before going further, I will summarize briefly the defects of the systems of voting generally used; because the reader new to the subject will ask why any change is needed. With these defects I present also the expected remedies. My statements here are merely dogmatic, but can be amply verified by argument and experience:

1. Nominations, under the present system, are in the hands of the managers of the party machine.

Proportional representation would place nominations in the hands of the people at large.

2. Gerrymandering pays and is practiced under the present system.

Proportional representation would make gerrymandering useless.

3. Bribery pays and is practiced under the present system, because a few purchasable voters can turn the scale. Drinking and treating come under the same category.

Proportional representation would make bribery and treating unpractical.

4. Disfranchisement of nearly half the electors takes place at every general election. An unrepresented minority is created in every district.

Proportional representation would represent all the voters, a very small percentage of lost votes excepted.

5. The two main parties unjustly monopolize representation. They squeeze out minor parties, and all independent candidates.

Proportional representation would give minor parties the number of members that their voting strength entitled them to.

6. Reform movements are now blocked and hindered, because their advocates cannot get a voice in parliament, legislature or municipal council.

Under proportional representation any reform which was supported by a quota of electors in a few districts would be heard, would be treated with consideration, and would become a political force, if inherently strong and worthy.

7. Party splits are caused by the nomination of independent candidates under the present system.

Proportional representation, on the full plan, would enable two Democrats to run without the risk of giving a Republican a seat, even although only one Democrat could be elected. Similarly in the converse case.

8. Intense party bitterness is caused by the present system, because elections are fights in which the beaten party is disfranchised and humiliated.

Proportional representation disfranchises nobody. No vote can kill any other vote.

9. Dodging, shuffling and evasion are prompted by the present system, because every candidate has to appeal to electors holding opinions diverse from his own on various public questions.

Proportional representation promotes straightforward politics because each candidate appeals only to that group of electors who are in general accord with his views, and he need not truckle to the others.

10. Many good men are excluded under the present system, because the first requisite is to get the candidate who has the best fighting chance of carrying the constituency, and often that does not mean the best representative.

Proportional representation does away with this necessity, and promotes the election of the best men.

11. The evils of civic and municipal misgovernment have their main cause in a faulty method of election.

Proportional representation is just as applicable to the township, the village, the town, as to the great city. In each it is the foundation of good government.

The formidable indictment contained in these paragraphs will, I hope, induce readers unfamiliar with the subject to give it some study.

The above is a rough generalization of the proportional method. We need now a generalization of the proportional

principle, which can best be made by basing it on specific cases. The intelligence of the reader will easily make further application of the principle. It is this:

In a seven-member district, any one-seventh of the electors must be able to elect one representative.

In a five-member district, any one-fifth of the electors must be able to elect one representative.

In other words, the electors, by the act of balloting, must be able to divide themselves into as many groups as there are members to be elected; each group being represented by the one man of its choice, without interference or dictation from the other groups. The individual units of each group may come from any part of the electoral district. The electors are not divided on territorial lines, but on lines of principle and preference. In speaking of a "group," I mean the voters who have in a sense grouped themselves together by voting for the same man.

A member of the South Australian Parliament put the idea very happily when he said: "In proportional representation, the voters divide themselves into equal, voluntary and unanimous electorates."

Let us now see how the proportional method carries out the proportional principles. What enlargement of our rough generalization of method is necessary?

In the first place, the single vote may be either transferable or untransferable. It may either stay where it is put or be subject to transfer from one candidate to another.

The untransferable single vote in a large electoral district is the simplest form of proportional representation. This is what Japan uses. In four cases out of five—perhaps in nine cases out of ten—it gives a true proportional result. Here is the reason.

Let 14 candidates contest the seven seats in a seven-member electoral district on the single-vote plan, without ballot transfer; and suppose that 35,000 votes are cast. These votes are divided amongst the 14 candidates, in numbers varying from, say, 600, the lowest, up to 6,000, the highest. The voters have divided themselves into 14 unequal groups, the smallest of which contains 600 and the largest 6,000. Then the seven highest candidates are declared elected. That is, the seven largest groups are represented; they put their men in; but the seven smaller groups are apparently unrepresented. How can this ever be true proportional representation?

For this reason: Experience shows that in most cases the transfers are from the seven smaller groups to the seven larger ones, so that the transfers make no difference. "To him that hath shall be given." If this were always so, we could go on our way rejoicing and advocating nothing but the single untrans-

ferable vote in large districts. But it is not always so; hence the need for some system of transfer. Here is where our troubles commence; for, roughly speaking, the different "plans" and "systems" of proportional representation are but different ways of transferring votes; whilst the fearful and wonderful complexities that mathematicians have introduced are but endeavors to obtain an absolute mathematical accuracy of transfer, which, if obtained, is not worth the trouble that it entails and the mystery with which, to ordinary minds, it is enwrapped.—Robert Tyson, in the Arena.

### THOSE FLATS.

For The Public.

Some are too low and some are too high;  
Some are too wet and some are too dry;  
Some are too hot and some are too cold;  
Some are too new and some are too old;  
Some are too large and some are too small;  
Some are too nice and some not nice at all;  
Some are too dark but none are too light;  
Some are too noisy and some are too quiet;  
Some are too far from the murderous class;  
Some are too near to the scintillant stars;  
Some must be plastered and some must be tinted.

But the flat that you want is unfinished or "rented."

WILEY WRIGHT MILLS.

"They stood at the foot of the Alps.  
"They are no higher than many buildings in New York," said the woman.  
"It must be the amount of ground they cover that makes them remarkable," said the man, who was more discerning.—Puck.

"Children don't seem to have as much respect for their parents as formerly."

"No," answered the cynic; "and I have never quite been able to make up my mind whether this is because modern children are less dutiful or more discerning."—Washington Star.

### BOOKS

#### THE LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AFTER DEATH.

There are evidences that we are coming into a time of increasingly active curiosity in regard to the problem of the future life. In the Atlantic Monthly for April the publishers devote a page of advertisement to books on immortality, and in the same number there is an article entitled the Eternal Life. Among other indications of the revival of interest and discussion is the republication of Fechner's Little Book of Life After Death (Little, Brown and Co., Boston).

This little book, by the German philosopher, Gustav Theodor Fechner, was first published in 1836. The present edition is a translation by Mary C. Wadsworth, with an introduction by William James. It is in fact a little book, containing about a hundred short pages, and can be read in a couple of hours—if the reader is satisfied with failing to com-