

Editorials By Commoner Readers

Mrs. L. A. Davis, Ballard, Wash.—
In one issue of The Commoner there is an article entitled "A Merry Christmas at the Bide-A-Wee Home," which is an account taken from the New York World of a Christmas dinner given to homeless cats and dogs, and you comment on it as follows: "The philanthropy that would give feasts to cats and dogs and neglect the children of the streets is wonderfully misdirected. And there must be something wrong with the minds and hearts of women who can call feasting dogs and cats 'the merriest Christmas,' while there are thousands of God's children starving within sight and sound of the Bide-A-Wee Home." In an issue of The Commoner a few years ago there was a news item saying that some ladies in Chicago had started a home for homeless cats, and the comment at that time was that they ought to have started a home for children instead. May I ask why The Commoner should put this criticism in the light of a comparison? Does The Commoner mean to imply by a comparison that philanthropy which considers the welfare of cats and dogs is at all times "misdirected?" Why put the criticism in the light of a comparison at all? Is it actually true that there are "thousands of God's children actually starving within sight and sound" of the Bide-a-Wee Home? Are not cats and dogs "God's children," but of a different species than the human family? At least they ought to have the title of "God's creatures" if not "God's children." Any criticism which would call the attention of this country to deserving children in need of charity is a well-taken criticism and is so in this case, but I submit that such criticism should not be so worded as to imply that since there isn't enough "unskimmed milk" to go around that the children should have it, and the cats and dogs left to starve. There ought to be enough "unskimmed milk" to feed the children first and the dogs and cats second, and if there is not enough milk to be had, then the cats and dogs should be humanely killed and thus put where they will not come into competition with children for the necessities of life. I have worked in humane work for two years, and find that consideration for animals is a charity for which there is a crying need in every corner of the United States, and fortunately in most localities there are not many children who are in a suffering state for food or the necessities of life. The charity for animals is a much greater question than the mere suffering of the animal. It is the moral degradation of the person who causes the animal to suffer or allows it to suffer, which causes the greater evil. This question has the support of some (if not all) of our prominent educators. The great French teacher, DeSailly, says that "I am convinced that kindness to animals is not only a powerful cause of material prosperity, but also of moral prosperity." The teaching to children of kindness to animals is the surest way of teaching a child to be unselfish. It is almost the only means of appealing to certain qualities in a little child, because a little child is in the position before the world of being a recipient of kindness rather than a giver, but by teaching the child kindness to cats and dogs he learns self-restraint and unselfishness at an earlier age than the same qualities could be inculcated in any other way, and the fact that there are homes where homeless animals can be taken is not only a relief to the animal, but the little child is taught as it grows up that whenever it finds a homeless animal for which it has no immediate asylum that the animal has a place of refuge whither it can be taken, and thus the child (which may be of

wealthy parentage) gets the idea that compassion for all creatures should be exercised. If this kindness to animals had been taught for the past fifty years in our schools from the kindergarten up, do you think there would be as many cases of graft in politics as we find today? Does not a habit of selfishness and cruelty toward animals in early childhood breed selfishness, greed and graft, which shows in the man after he is grown? It most certainly does. "The child is father to the man." (The Commoner gives all possible encouragement to the effort to educate the children and grown folks to be kind to birds and beasts. The editorial to which this correspondent with respect to the what was reported by a New York newspaper as a "tea party for cats and dogs." There is little difference between The Commoner and its fair correspondent refers related to subject she discusses in such an interesting way. It is true that "the habit of selfishness and cruelty towards animals in early childhood, breeds selfishness, greed and graft, which shows in the man after he is grown."—The Commoner.)

Rhodes I. Gregory, Canton, Ohio.—
I have been a subscriber for The Commoner since its introduction to the public, and as thoroughly satisfied that it is subserving the purpose for which it was intended—viz: to impart facts to an outraged public. I cannot speak in too high praise of The Commoner and the work it is doing. I am very much interested in it and its editor, who is now abroad. As a delegate to the St. Louis convention, I opposed the nomination of Mr. Parker, and stated that Ohio would go republican by 200,000 if Parker should be nominated. For this they called me radical. When they fastened the unit rule on the Ohio delegation, I asked if they could adopt any rule compelling me and my constituents of the Eighteen Ohio district to vote for a candidate nominated by such methods. Then they took occasion to brand me as a bolter. But I did not bolt. I voted for Parker, thinking by so doing that I was privileged to support a few of the democratic principles. If demanding honesty in politics is radical, I am a radical. If being faithful to democratic principles constitutes a bolter, I am a bolter. I have expressed my doctrine many times, in public and private, and was applauded. I have stuck to the faith through thick and thin, in season and out of season. Now, in these later days, I am told by my friends, in the language of my enemies, that I am a radical. This may be true, but I am not ready to plead guilty. If to give your neighbor a "square deal" and to tell him the truth in politics as well as out of politics, is radicalism, then I am a radical. If to believe a thing, work for it, spend brain and muscle and substance for it, give accomplishment for it, sacrifice all hope, much of life: if to shut your eyes to the chase for gain; if these attributes constitute radicalism, then I am a radical. I believe that a man's politics should be an open book. I believe that we should turn from "what is in it" to "what is right." I believe that all men are created equal. I believe that the poor devil should have an equal chance with the rich. I believe in the commandment "thou shalt not steal" seven days of the week. I believe that no man should sacrifice his own honor to preserve a nation's honor. I believe that no insurance company has a right to collect premiums, from all the people, and donate, without their consent, the money collected to a political campaign fund for the election of certain candidates for president of the United States. I believe democrats should

nominate for congress men who kept the faith in 1896 and 1900, as well as in 1904. Men, whose names alone would be certificates of good character. It would be in bad taste to select, as a candidate for congress, one who belongs to the crowd that classed all who voted for Bryan in 1896 and 1900, as anarchists, disturbers, destroyers of national honor, etc., and then ask them to vote for him. I believe unremitting warfare should be declared against corruptionists and those who countenance bribery, or they who, having knowledge of the same, conceal such knowledge from the officers of the law. I believe we should announce the decree that there is no room in the democratic party for the hoodler or a corruptionist of any sort. I believe we should repudiate their support, invite them to leave the party, and offer them shelter only in the penitentiary, if they attempt to remain. These are some of the things for which I stand. If they are radical, then I am radical. I play my cards on the table face up, so that all may see. I believed in the Kansas City platform. I believed in the Chicago platform. I believe in them now. I believe in holding truth to the front. I would to win, but not at the sacrifice of truth. I believe that those who would resort to expediency, in any of her enticements or allurements, to carry a political point as against truth, should be classed among rogues and cutthroats, and driven out of the democratic party. Give us men of strength, who can withstand a storm; men who cannot be carried away by expediency; men who are willing to lose their all in support of right; men who work their way to the front through deeds of honor. Away from him, who through strategy, deception, misrepresentation, or by downright purchase, gains his shoulder straps. No such generals should be allowed to lead an honest democracy. I like success that is woven from a warp of consistency and persistency. I believe in saying things and then sticking to what has been said. I herewith enclose twenty-three signed primary pledges, including my

own. Also seven new subscribers to The Commoner; my renewal for The Commoner and Commoner Condensed, for which you will find New York draft for \$5.70. Every democrat should sign the primary pledge and do everything in his power to increase The Commoner's circulation. I regret that I cannot give it more time myself. Best wishes for The Commoner and the principles it advocates.

TROWMART HAS ELEVATOR GIRL

Three representatives of the male sex—the electrician, the porter and the night watchman—are the sole defenses against burglars, mice or other ills at Trowmart Inn, the new hotel for young woman on Abingdon square that opened last Wednesday. A woman clerk pulls forward the register. Even the elevator boy is a girl, and the young woman guest carries her bag to her own room unless it is heavy enough to require a special visit from the porter.

One feature that emphasizes the "business" atmosphere of the Inn's clientele is the absence of that classic adjunct popularly known as "Front." Unlike the Martha Washington, the Inn has no waiting row of shirtwaisted and pigtailed bell girls to waft the card of the caller to regions above. This is explained by the fact that as all the young women are employed during the day there is an absence of any such necessity till evening. Then the parlor maid supplies the lack with the assistance of one of the waitresses—one of the dining room staff serving each evening of the week. Later when the hotel is full two will be in attendance.

Many are already registered, but only about thirty guests are actually living at the Inn. Most are department store clerks, between the ages of 15 and 35, as required by the regulations. The rest are stenographers and typewriters and one a newspaper woman. All have sworn to the fact that they earn no more than \$15 and no less than \$10 a week.—New York World.

The Omaha World-Herald

ABLY EDITED. NEWSY. DEMOCRATIC.

—OUR SPECIAL OFFER—

The Commoner and World Herald (Semi-weekly) BOTH \$1.25

Send Subscriptions NOW to THE COMMONER

LINCOLN,



NEBRASKA

THE
NEW YORK
WORLDThrice-a-Week
EditionTHIS is a Time of Great
Events.....

Changes of a stirring kind are occurring both at home and abroad. The Thrice-a-week World comes to you every other day, except Sunday, with all the news, fully and promptly told.

The Thrice-a-week World always has a serial story running. Special attention is also given to markets, and there are many other valuable features.

The Thrice-a-week World's regular subscription price is only \$1.00 per year, and this pays for 156 papers. We offer this unequalled newspaper and The Commoner together one year for \$1.35. The regular subscription price of the two papers is \$2.00.

Address all orders to

THE COMMONER
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.