

the outcry is caused by the fact that not the Pendleton bill, but the principle on which that and all true civil service reform rests, is violated, namely, that merit and not politics should be the criterion for appointment. This principle, and not any statute or collection of statutes, is the true foundation of civil service reform. It is morally wrong knowingly to appoint an unworthy or incapable man to office, because the people are robbed of the amount which an efficient and experienced man in the same position might save them.

Whatever may be said of individuals, the course of the National Civil Service Reform League, which best represents that of the "ardent reformer," has not been hypocritical nor pharisaical, but consistent, courageous, and dignified. Its record of eight years' work speaks for itself. During that time it has stood in the forefront of the battle for political honesty, and has exerted an educational effort for which the country will be duly grateful. As the result of its labors we have on our statute books the so-called Pendleton bill and the well-known laws of Massachusetts and New York, all of which have proved the far-seeing sagacity of their framers.

This letter would be incomplete without an expression of appreciation of the value of Mr. Lodge's services in behalf of civil service reform in the National Congress, and the hope that he may make the country his debtor by action along the line pointed out in his article, namely, extension of the civil service law to the unclassified service.

William B. Aiken.

REJOINDER.

DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest Mr. Aiken's open letter which you forward to me before publication. The points which he makes I think can all be answered; and it does not seem to me that we really differ very much in our opinions on the essential principles involved.

First, as to Washington's policy. If Washington had merely appointed friends of the Constitution, Mr. Aiken's comments would be perfectly just, and I should be the first to admit it. But while Washington at the outset appointed friends of the Constitution exclusively, as was wise and proper, after the development of parties, and after he had been himself the subject of party attack, he took the ground that only friends of the Government—that is, Federalists—ought to be appointed to office. In September, 1795, he wrote to Pickering:

I shall not, whilst I have the honor to administer the Government, bring a man into any office of consequence knowingly whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the General Government are pursuing; for this, in my opinion, is a sort of political suicide. That it would embarrass its movements is certain.

Andrew Jackson's change, profound as it was, was a change in degree and not in kind, a change of practice and not of principle, although it undoubtedly had many of the results which Mr. Aiken indicates.

Secondly. When I said that some civil service reformers took what I considered an erroneous historical view, I wrote with two able articles before me by a leading civil service reformer, in which the precise view that I thought mistaken was advanced. I did not criticize the articles by name nor cite the authority, because the writer is laboring just as conscientiously as

myself or any one else in this work, and I dislike nothing so much as to criticize, on a comparatively unimportant point, men who are doing good work in which I believe. I have seen the same view taken elsewhere many times, although I am quite aware that it is not the view of all civil service reformers by any means.

Thirdly. In what I said about the loud cry against each administration, "that the spirit of the reform is not respected" in regard to those offices which are confessedly filled by patronage, I made the statement general because I wished above all things to avoid any party comparisons. The question is not a party question. I do not think that there has been any essential difference in the actual manner in which patronage offices have been dealt with by administrations of either party, and I think we waste our strength by assailing administrations in regard to the use of patronage in patronage offices. The question of good or bad appointments in patronage offices is something wholly distinct from civil service reform. Civil service reform, as I look at it, is simply the attempt to replace a bad system with a better, and my experience leads me to believe that this can be accomplished best by legislation rather than by partizan recrimination. The point I desired especially to press was that the civil service reformers as such should apply the same standard of criticism to both parties, whether the party in power was the one with which they were in general sympathy or not. I do not think that they have done this.

I trust you will permit me to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Aiken, not only for the pleasant way in which he has discussed my article, but also for his extremely kind expressions in regard to myself, which I entirely appreciate.

H. C. Lodge.

The Women who do the Work.

WORKING GIRLS' CLUBS.

AT the convention of Working Girls' Societies held in New York last spring, to which delegates and papers were sent from all parts of this country, there was much that was valuable said and read, much that wise and patient experience gave to new workers in the field; but most of it was in regard to the practical workings of the societies and their influence on the girls themselves, and but little of it went back to the qualifications of the teacher and organizer, or her relations with the girls—and yet this is an important side of the question, and one that has great influence on the results we all hope to attain.

One of the most noticeable things about the work is the great difference among the workers, a difference not only of opinion but of atmosphere, intention, and personality; and it is personality, I think, which is the weightiest factor, and which makes success or failure. Good as the general work may be, intelligent as are the lines upon which it is carried on, faithful as are the workers, it is the personal force which in nine cases out of ten fits the keystone in the arch, binds the girls together, and makes the club a success; and, one may add, it is the giving of that personal force which so often breaks down the worker in the end. It is this, and not the literal amount of time and labor and wisdom given, although they too must play their part—this personal element which in theory is so ignored.

The clubs need workers, need ladies to help carry on and extend the work; there is room now for any number of women: ten, twenty, or a hundred can have their hands filled with work if they will come forward and stretch them out to us and help us try to make life happier and more full of meaning and freer from temptation for the girls and women who have to work for their living in our great stores and factories. Not to raise up those who fall,—that task is for others,—but to help the weak-hearted and the strong-hearted to bear more joyfully the burden of life amid difficulties and temptations which would daunt the bravest and the strongest.

We want the best you can give us; we want women who come to the work *con amore*, not merely to do the orthodox modicum demanded now by society from all unmarried or childless women—and we don't want *only* the women who have nothing else to do. For centuries these women have been a standing protest against that truly masculine proverb that "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do,"—unless their struggle against the results of other people's sins can be so interpreted,—and philanthropy has almost come to be considered their exclusive possession. Now this is neither just nor expedient, for there is much work that can be done only by women who are more in touch with the affairs of life. It was well said of Sister Dora by a distinguished man of letters that she possessed three of the most important qualifications for her work—"great personal beauty, fine health, and a keen sense of humor." You will say at once that these are qualities which would fit a woman for success in any sphere of life; and that is just the point I wish to make—that we need the best you can give us, and that it is not only to the women who can devote their energies exclusively to the work, but also to the society belle, the clever writer, the crack lawn-tennis player, and the happy daughter, that we turn. And to the friends and relatives who throw so many obstacles in the way of the worker, and who lay on the shoulders of the club every pale face they see, let us say, What protest did you make when your child laid her young health on the altar of fashionable late hours and wore out her beauty in the incessant pursuit of pleasure? Did you not rather smile with pride to think how sought after she was? Surely you need not grudge the one night a week she gives to her work down town. The clubs keep no late hours.

The working girls want more than classes and club-rooms—they want inspiration and sympathy; often an individual inspiration and sympathy to fit their individual needs. The best that we can give them is our best morally and mentally, the results of our most earnest prayer and practice, of our clearest and hardest thinking. The influence on the worker is perhaps one of the best results of the work,—although it may not be an sensible end in view,—for one cannot with honesty, nor indeed with any comfort to one's self, lead a life outside the club willfully inconsistent with the light in which one appears to the girls; for never mind how little we desire to be looked upon as examples, we are looked upon as such even by the girls with whom we have least personal contact, and we are apt to find that their belief in us and constant reference to us is a pretty sharp reminder of our own shortcomings, even in such minor matters as untidy bureau drawers and buttonless boots, not to speak of the graver questions of living

which are continually raised and whose solution is complicated by the real differences of position and education.

There are two kindred questions about which there has been and still is much controversy, and, I think, many serious mistakes made—first, in underestimating the intelligence of the girls, particularly in practical matters, in which it is apt to be far greater than our own; and secondly, in belittling our advantages in order to conciliate their prejudices. In many cases these prejudices do not exist, and even when they do the differences in our position and education are sure to come to the front sooner or later, and by frankly recognizing them in the beginning as an advantage we prevent their being regarded later on as a barrier. The girls are sure to end by knowing that we keep servants, wear evening dresses, and go to the opera; and by plainly speaking of these things when necessary (the necessity will be rare), as comforts won for us by our husbands' or our fathers' intelligence and labor, we make the distinction in our ways of living more one of degree than one of kind. When once recognized the truth will make our relations with the girls of more value than when it existed on an ignorant or mistaken foundation.

The very leisure and knowledge we are able to put at their disposal comes from this difference of conditions, and it is shirking our responsibility as women of a leisure class when we attempt to pretend that our conditions of life are the same as theirs. The newspapers in this country are successful in giving the working classes a false idea of the occupations and pleasures of the "upper classes." They represent them in all their most sensational and regrettable moments, and but little record is made of the majority of well-to-do and educated people with whom plain living and high thinking has not come to be a dead letter. In our most natural and laudable efforts not to patronize the girls we are apt to forget that we are foregoing the natural advantages of our birthrights in attempting to appear to them as anomalous women from nowhere, instead of ladies whose life and education in perhaps wealthy homes has inspired us with the desire to share what we consider our real advantages with our less fortunate sisters.

It is a great pleasure, this club work—work which any woman with a warm heart will find repaying. Much has been said, but it would be difficult to say enough of the gratitude and responsiveness of the girls to any effort made in their behalf. No one who has not had the experience can realize the pleasure and stimulus of being looked up to and followed, however undeservedly, by a clubful of hard-working girls. The labor is great but the rewards are infinitely greater, and there are not many of us, I fancy, who would not tell you that they had gained vastly more than they had given.

Florence Lockwood.

Two Monuments.

ON the western coast of North America, upon one of the hills of San Francisco, overlooking the great Pacific Ocean and within one mile of its shore, in Laurel Hill Cemetery, there is a beautiful marble monument, some fifteen feet in height, with a round pillar of graceful proportions encircled with a garland of convolvuli and other flowers, the whole surmounted by a draped vase with a wreath of drooping roses and chrysanthemums.