

Herbert Welsh, Editor of City and State, 1895-1904

Hence the great practical power of consistent radicals. To all appearances nobody follows them, yet every one believes them. They hold a tuning fork, and sound A, and everybody knows it is really A, though the time-honored pitch is G flat. The community cannot get that A out of its head. Nothing can prevent an upward tendency in the popular tone so long as the real A is kept sounding.¹

HERBERT WELSH, self-styled publicist, set out to keep Philadelphia and the world in tune with what to him was the real A. For Philadelphia his most consistent efforts were from 1895 to 1904, when in *City and State*, his miniscule weekly reform journal, he served up articles, editorials, and letters from the public that shed light on state and local affairs and national issues as well. Yet only two or three thousand readers subscribed, scarcely enough even with local advertisements to cover half his costs; wealthy friends sent him occasional checks for five, ten, or fifty dollars to enable him to keep the faltering journal going as long as it did.

In contrast to his eminent father, John Welsh (who had been a sought-after director of business enterprises and the successful chairman of the Centennial Exhibition of 1876), Herbert Welsh was somewhat of a dilettante. Born in 1851 in Germantown and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania at twenty, he studied art in Philadelphia and Paris. For years he practiced his profession in his native city (water colors were his speciality). A humanitarian who subscribed to the credo of the times—idealism, progress, and Anglo-Saxon culture, he immersed himself in various reform causes as a young man, some of them remaining close to his heart so long as he lived. An organizer in 1882 and thereafter corresponding secretary of the Indian Rights Association, he advocated assimilation of the

¹ John Jay Chapman, "Between Elections," *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXV (January, 1900), 36.

red man into the white man's world. As a patron of Negro education in the South and a friend of Negro leaders North and South, he supported industrial education for the black man. Whether or not these were the best policies, they did reflect his humanitarian concerns at a time when few whites were interested in the problems of minority racial groups. In national politics he was primarily an advocate of civil service reform. Internationally, he was a pacifist who maintained a particular passion for the arbitration of disputes among nations, and in this area of endeavor was a friend and associate of Carl Schurz and Moorfield Story. From 1890 until the early 1900's he was especially interested in municipal reform. Like just about all the leading upper-class good-government advocates in Philadelphia, he was and remained a Republican.²

As a thinker Welsh, judging from his editorials, was generally provocative though not profound. Yet because he was an Old Philadelphian (to use Nathaniel Burt's term denoting eighteenth-century family origins),³ he gained the favor of the Mugwumps who honored him for the family name he bore and appreciated his lending a buoyant personality to the cause of municipal reform. He seemed to bring out the ideas of his associates, and this is strikingly clear in the pages of *City and State* and in the letters he received.⁴

His correspondence reveals how engrossed many of the Philadelphia Mugwumps were in their search for solutions to the problems of their city. Consider, for example, a letter sent to Herbert Welsh in 1893 by a good Quaker businessman which quite well reflected social gospel ideas. Written on March 26th, just as the financial crash was upsetting the normal complacency of the age, the missive pieced together the thoughts of Charles Richardson after he had had an exhilarating conversation with Welsh, ten years his junior. Richardson stated his principal thesis:

That while the gradual extension of wealth and mental activity and political power among the masses seems to have led to a fiercer, more unscrupulous and more general struggle for riches, and to an increase of

² *Who's Who in America*, XX (Chicago, 1938), 2619. For a timely account of his father's role as Centennial head, see George Leighton, "The Spirit of '76 (1876, That Is)," *Philadelphia Magazine* (July, 1969), 68-90. Herbert Welsh died June 28, 1941.

³ Nathaniel Burt, *The Perennial Philadelphians: The Anatomy of an American Aristocracy* (Boston, 1963).

⁴ The Herbert Welsh Papers, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. All letters hereinafter cited are from this source.

luxury and other vices formerly peculiar to the aristocratic minority, it has also been accompanied by a wonderful development of spiritual force or practical Christianity which shows itself in all kinds of religious, charitable, and educational work, but [which] has so far avoided or neglected the political field, although that is where it is most needed and where success would have the grandest and most far reaching results.

Richardson concluded, after a morally righteous indictment of professional politicians, that friend Welsh and a few others should join him in sending out an address "to leading Divines, thinkers and educators of all denominations or societies, men who are prominent in the pulpit or in the literature or on the platform, asking them how they would regard an effort to form a Moral Government League with branches all over the Country." He concluded—in a tribute to Welsh's genius—"of course, you can imagine details much quicker than I could write them." Whatever came of the idea is not clear, but it may have helped Welsh edge his way toward his publication venture a couple of years later.

Another correspondent, William Sellers of Germantown, was an elderly steel manufacturer with a deep interest in efficiency. He wrote Welsh in 1891 of his concern over municipal corruption and inefficiency. His solution was anything but democratic. Believing that municipal government had to be reformed as a prerequisite for the regeneration of state and nation, Sellers pointed the way for Philadelphia:

Now I have reached the conclusion that it is hopeless to expect any important improvement in this direction, until we have Councils composed of men whose ambition and pecuniary interest will be to have the best interests of the City guarded at all points, and we cannot have such men upon the basis of universal suffrage. This basis I hold to be indispensable for the proper governing of a State, but a Municipality is a very different affair; it in fact is a corporation, and under our present system, the property of the corporation is managed by parties who hold no stock in it. It is the direct interest of a large, perhaps the largest proportion of the voters, to provide work for themselves or their friends, which other people must pay for. . . .⁵

Sellers had a reputation for being a hard driver of men who worked for him. Though hardly a liberal, he nevertheless worried a

⁵ William Sellers to Welsh, July 6, 1891. For a good account of Sellers, who as President of Midvale Steel had had a profound impact on a number of pioneers in the field of scientific management, see Frank B. Copley, *Frederick W. Taylor, Father of Scientific Management* (New York, 1923), I, 107-110.

great deal about his city, beset as it was by corruption and inefficiency. His solution, simply to deny the vote at the municipal level to the common people, was a return to the reality of the city as a closed corporation, as had been true of the colonial era, and it indicated that as a typical conservative Sellers had not accepted in full the Jacksonian revolution that popularized mass democracy. In Philadelphia the fact that the masses voted Republican did not endear them to conservatives like Sellers, who were also Republicans, for they saw their control over the city government taken from them by politicians who, they believed, were pitting masses against classes.

About a month before *City and State* was launched in 1895, John Rodman Paul (or Rodman Paul, as he preferred) warned Welsh against the idea of promoting a Philadelphia edition of the *New York Post*: "It would be too dangerous in this community to make the *Post* a reform organ." Paul, a prominent lawyer, explained to his friend since boyhood that a free trade journal would never do in congenitally high tariff Philadelphia.⁶

Escaping the *Post*, Philadelphia soon had to contend with Welsh's own *City and State*, its first issue appearing on May 9th. From the start the little weekly lashed out at the Republican machine. If Welsh had no particular program for the regeneration of society, he was receptive to any ideas that sparkled with modernity while promising progress all around. Such a latitudinarian policy for a Philadelphia journal was bound to worry some local conservatives. Thomas Robins, surgeon and a close friend of Theodore Roosevelt, was shocked when *City and State* published an account of Eugene V. Debs's release from jail following the Pullman strike. He noted that since Welsh had made no editorial comment "one might infer, not unreasonably, that this dangerous demagogue has the support of *City and State*." His mode of reasoning suggested a kind of reverse credibility gap:

My statement that I could not imagine a more dangerous paper or one less deserving of support by those who believe in a Government by law and not by mob, does not seem too strong when coupled with your statement that

⁶ Rodman Paul to Welsh, Mar. 22, 1894. It is interesting to note that Walter Hines Page, publisher and editor of *The Forum*, considered an expansion of his board of directors to include Welsh, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Carrol D. Wright in order to have intellectuals balance businessmen on the board. Page to Welsh, May 28, 1894.

City and State has a growing circulation among the workingmen of Kensington and Frankford. One great element of danger is the knowledge which the workingmen have that the Editors of City and State are men of high character and [are] absolutely disinterested. Even the best of daily papers are not popularly believed to be disinterested, and most of them are well known to be dishonest. I think, therefore, that you are bound to exercise much greater caution than even the conservative Ledger.⁷

Though upper-class fear of workers was doubtless a reality among conservatives like Robins, the more moderate of the reformers usually cloaked any such fears they had with some measure of geniality. George Gluyas Mercer, like Welsh a pacifist as well as a good-government buff, could show his sense of *noblesse oblige* in referring to a labor leader's projected appearance at a reform conference in 1897: "The appearance of the man of whom you write as representing the labor movement is against him. He does not look like a man whom one would wish at a private dinner. I regard him, however, as honest, earnest, and intelligent, and I know of no one who could better represent men of his class."⁸

The reform-minded intelligentsia of Philadelphia sent their best ideas to Welsh, sometimes as copy for the journal, more often than not as a mere sharing of their thoughts. During the early years of *City and State* they forwarded to him a flow of letters in which they discussed topics that ranged from abstract idealistic concepts to random practical proposals. For instance, Francis B. Reeves, banker and board director from Germantown, spoke out against the ward-elected bicameral city councils. One of the most prestigious leaders of reform, Reeves called attention to proposals of the Boston Municipal League that a city's legislature should be one-chambered, its members salaried and chosen on an at-large basis.⁹ The Rev. Charles Roads, writing for the Culture Extension League, outlined a program for "saving the children from growing into idleness, profanity, ignorance, vice, rascality, etc."¹⁰ R. Francis Wood, secretary of the Philadelphia Civil Service Reform Association, asked Welsh, his fellow board member, to select a committee to arrange details so

⁷ Thomas Robins to Welsh, Dec. 4, 1895.

⁸ George Gluyas Mercer to Welsh, Nov. 19, 1897.

⁹ Francis B. Reeves to Welsh, Mar. 22, 1895.

¹⁰ Charles Roads to Welsh, Oct. 16, 1895.

that a few of the lady members of the Association could come to the dinner following the annual meeting. The Association had voted to do this (Charles Richardson had presented the resolution) after some spirited discussion.¹¹ Clinton Rogers Woodruff, one of the few moderate Republicans in the state legislature, was in constant touch with Welsh in respect to *City and State* publicity for bills introduced by Woodruff. James B. Reynolds of the University Settlement Society of New York, after a visit to the Quaker City, wrote Woodruff that someone in Philadelphia should talk to the Presbyterian clergy and upbraid them for the same timidity they showed in the face of Republican corruption at City Hall as typified the Roman Catholics of New York in their lethargic condoning the evils of Tammany Hall. Possibly Welsh was chosen as the "right person" to bring the word to the Philadelphia Presbyterians, for he received a copy of the Reynolds correspondence."¹²

Meanwhile, *City and State* chipped away at the monolithic Republican organization. In late 1897 it chided the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* for sponsoring a gas lease similar to one that the *Ledger* itself had opposed in 1886. It ridiculed P. A. B. Widener's gift of a million dollars to the city for extension of the free library system. Acceptance of the former butcher's "tainted money" might very well enable him to become governor. To underscore the message, *City and State* kept alive a rumor that Widener, the traction magnate, was angling for governor while Dr. William Pepper, who had received the gift for the city, would be its next mayor.¹³

But it was in 1898 when the paper really glowed with excitement. That year, enthusiastic over the example of America fighting "a splendid little war" against Spain, the reformers of Pennsylvania made their most determined bid to dislodge Senator Matthew S. Quay from his seat of power. They sought to win the governorship and elect a liberal state legislature, which would refuse to return Quay to Washington. Herbert Welsh championed Dr. Silas Swallow, a Methodist book publisher from Harrisburg, who ran under the label of the Honest Government Party with support from a number of splinter groups. Welsh thought of the tall, angular

¹¹ R. Francis Wood to Welsh, Feb. 5, 1896.

¹² James B. Reynolds to Clinton Rogers Woodruff (copy), Dec. 13, 1897.

¹³ *City and State*, Nov. 4, Dec. 2, 9, 1897.

churchman as another Lincoln.¹⁴ But Swallow had competition from another reformer in the person of John Wanamaker, the merchant prince. Though many businessmen of Philadelphia were behind Wanamaker, the intrepid little *City and State* took on "pious John," as he was irreverently known to his enemies. In article after article, Welsh hammered at the great department store magnate as a quondam reformer. Welsh reminded voters of the \$400,000 Wanamaker voluntarily had raised for Quay among businessmen when Quay was national chairman of the Republican Party during the Harrison-Cleveland campaign of 1888. Not forgotten was the Post Office Department spoils Wanamaker ladled out while in the Harrison cabinet. And the editor recalled the Edwin A. Van Valkenburg case in 1897 when that Wanamaker lieutenant was alleged to have attempted to bribe a Pennsylvania legislator to vote for his man for a seat in the United States Senate. Rudolph Blankenburg, an honored German-American manufacturer in the Wanamaker camp, Welsh pictured as an innocent dupe of the smooth Van Valkenburg.¹⁵

To the very end of the campaign of 1898, Wanamaker was *persona non grata* to the men running Swallow. One would think that moralistic reformers like the Methodist Swallow, who had the endorsement of the Prohibition Party, and the Presbyterian Wanamaker, with his YMCA and Sunday School background, would have agreed on fusion after Wanamaker failed to get the Republican nomination. But no—the Swallow faction could never forget the merchant prince's remarks in Lancaster in February when he was reported to have called them "cacklers of the spacklers" (Welsh was not at all sure of the meaning, but he sensed that it was uncomplimentary) and referred to himself as "a Republican of Republicans."¹⁶ That Wanamaker in delivering over seventy exciting anti-Quay speeches around the state made enormous gains for reform sentiment Welsh readily conceded. Slyly, however, the editor pointed out that since Wanamaker had all his facts concerning past corruption in Pennsylvania right it was due, of course, to David Martin, the ex-Quayite Philadelphia Republican ward leader who, no true friend

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Feb. 24, 1898. Charles Richardson was Swallow's campaign manager.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Feb. 10, 1898.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

of reform, was an aspirant for the role of city boss, hoping to unseat "Iz" Durham.¹⁷ And it was not overlooked that Wanamaker legislators in Harrisburg often ignored Rep. Clinton Rogers Woodruff's scientific government proposals. Woodruff, who was spokesman for the Philadelphia Municipal League, could cite chapter and verse. Angrily, Wanamaker dismissed Woodruff as a machine tool. But no matter what Wanamaker himself could accomplish for reform, there was a feeling among the aristocratic echelon that John Wanamaker, the commercial drummer, was probably insincere. *City and State* raked over old charges to show how he had supposedly double-crossed his antimachine colleagues more than once in the past. As for the merchant prince, he wrote to a Mrs. Elmore in Meadville that he could not support Dr. Swallow because *City and State*, Swallow's principal organ in Philadelphia, had opposed his—Wanamaker's—good work in the city for years.¹⁸

The various reform hopefuls in the gubernatorial race of 1898, including the Democratic nominee, were defeated by Quay's candidate, William A. Stone. The *City and State* analysis of the November debacle was that because George A. Jenks (the Democrat) once had been for free silver, conservative Republicans responded to a baseless rumor he could win and consequently endanger their sound money system. As much as they disapproved of Quay for his corruption, they preferred him to Bryanism.¹⁹ Whatever the truth, the election showed how divided were the reformers. Personality factors, struggle for leadership, anti-Democratic bias and local considerations in the end were evidently more determinative than common goals—if indeed they had sufficient goals in common to justify a viable second party.

Aside from the Wanamaker-Van Valkenburg strain of practical reformers, who were probably more interested in state and national politics than in municipal affairs per se, there was still another group, and this one was identified with the concept of reform at the local level for the most part (at the national level its members were staunch Republicans). Welsh had some painful exchanges with the second group, of which Clinton Rogers Woodruff, general counsel

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Mar. 24, 1898.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1898.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Nov. 17, 1898.

for the Philadelphia Municipal League and secretary and guiding light of the National Municipal League, was spokesman. The Philadelphia Municipal League's preamble endorsed the following goals:

The practical separation of municipal affairs from state and national politics; the extension of the principles of civil-service reform to all city departments; the conduct of the city's affairs by enlightened methods and upon business principles, so that Philadelphia should have the most improved system of taxes, of street paving, of lighting, of water, of drainage, of schools, of transit, and other public necessities and conveniences.²⁰

Herbert Welsh could agree to all of this except the statement that there should be separation of municipal affairs from state and national politics. Herein was the rub.

Actually, Woodruff and Welsh got along very well at first. Welsh was a charter member of the Municipal League and Woodruff in Harrisburg kept him informed about the alleged sabotage of League bills by the Wanamaker faction working with machine Republicans. Welsh publicized Woodruff's role in Harrisburg and sent him bundles of copies of the paper, which Woodruff passed out among his fellow Solons. But after the excitement of the Swallow campaign in 1898 Welsh became impatient with the Philadelphia Municipal League's luke-warm endorsements of first a Republican and now and then a Democrat or a splinter party candidate. He felt that the League should offer itself as the minority party of Philadelphia because the Democratic leaders had sold out to the Quay-Penrose machine for their share of place and pelf. Also, Welsh was more willing to support those whom he considered were good Democrats than was Woodruff. In the city elections of March, 1899, he endorsed Dr. Horace Hoskins, Democrat, for mayor, feeling that a respected old reformer was preferable to Samuel Howell Ashbridge, nominee of the Republican machine. Ashbridge was anathema to Welsh for tolerating drink and making hedonistic speeches to revelers. (Welsh for some time had been deeply involved with the work of the moralistic Law and Order Society of Philadelphia.) Also, the editor would not overlook the fact that Ashbridge had such tangled personal

²⁰ The national organization was an outgrowth of the Philadelphia group, which after it was formed in 1893 called a conference for January, 1894, that was co-sponsored by the City Club of New York. At this meeting the N.M.L. was formed. See Clinton Rogers Woodruff, "The Municipal League of Philadelphia," *American Journal of Sociology*, VII (1905), 336-337.

finances as to render him—in Welsh’s opinion—unsafe for high office.²¹ But when Ashbridge swept every ward in the city in a crushing defeat of Hoskins by nearly a three to one margin, Welsh could only deplore the lack of leadership exhibited by the Municipal League in city elections. Woodruff in a letter to the editor reminded him that since only the efforts of local citizens in the wards could win elections it was not at all fair to blame the League for the debacle of 1899.²²

Just as Welsh had predicted from the start, the new mayor was soon to become the *bête noire* of just about all the reformers. During the Ashbridge administration, the editor’s sad duty was to comment on a long series of disastrous setbacks for Philadelphia. The mayor scorned civil service ideals, going so far as to dismiss “the upright” Charles Richardson from the board of examiners of the Civil Service Commission. In the 7th Ward, a notorious group of ballot-box stuffers, though apprehended, was acquitted in a jury trial (the Samuel Salter case) and nearly all of the accused and the city officials who lent them aid were rewarded with cushy jobs at City Hall. Senator Matthew Quay, indicted for misusing state monies, was let off by a hung jury in the celebrated Peoples’ Bank affair. After all that and more, too, Welsh could only applaud Lincoln Steffens’ famous quip “Philadelphia, corrupt and contented,” and he enthusiastically reviewed on the front page of *City and State* the celebrated muckraker’s exposé after it appeared in *McClure’s*.²³

When in 1903 another city mayoralty election rolled around, Woodruff and the Philadelphia Municipal League endorsed District Attorney John Weaver, the Republican candidate. Welsh contrarily (it would almost seem) endorsed Francis Fisher Kane, a youthful Democratic attorney from an Old Philadelphia family. Bitter comments, public and private, marked a final rift between Welsh and Woodruff. Other reformers were involved in similar re-creminations. Woodruff could say the Municipal League had the right to support good Republicans when it had a chance, which was not too often; Welsh could retort that Woodruff leaned too much toward the Quay-Penrose leadership of the Republican Party.

²¹ *City and State*, Jan. 26, 1899.

²² *Ibid.*, Apr. 13, 1899.

²³ *Ibid.*, July 2, 1903.

Actually, Woodruff and the Municipal League were in an untenable position in that they had endorsed Weaver even before the Democratic Party had selected Kane, whose credentials as an able reform candidate were especially noteworthy.²⁴ But no matter, Weaver demolished the hapless Kane in the 1903 election by a four to one margin. Acting on the defensive, Woodruff also felt constrained to explain why he had supported Judge Samuel Pennypacker for governor in 1903, and in doing so he predicted, rather far from the mark, that Pennypacker would be to Boss Quay of Pennsylvania what Theodore Roosevelt had been to Boss Tom Platt of New York.²⁵

But the Woodruff-Welsh fall out over the issue of Republicanism was eclipsed by the issue of the separation of municipal affairs from national politics. It all began when Welsh became an anti-imperialist after the Spanish-American War. It was the very issue that led Theodore Roosevelt to say that Welsh was "suffering from prolonged and excessive indulgence in the [New York] Evening Post—which is fatal to any man's usefulness."²⁶ On a number of occasions Woodruff complained about the direction *City and State* was taking. His most poignant plea came in 1903: "Although I have been pained beyond expression by your utterances on the Philippines on more than one occasion I never felt justified in uttering similarly sharp words about your attitude. I can see no reason why strong feelings on public matters should be allowed to prejudice friendship and cause unnecessary acrimonious discussion."²⁷

Not only did Woodruff bemoan the fact that the *City and State* stance in favor of pacifism was jeopardizing reform solidarity in Philadelphia but other influential men and women were unhappy about this, too. Some canceled their subscriptions and quit supporting the paper with occasional checks. And yet there were a few influential pacifist reformers in Philadelphia, who, like Welsh, were active in the American League, an anti-imperialist organization that

²⁴ Rogers to Welsh, Jan. 9-10, 23, 1903.

²⁵ Rogers to Welsh, Jan. 9-10, 1903.

²⁶ Theodore Roosevelt to William Dudley Foulke, Nov. 3, 1898; the letter is reproduced in William Dudley Foulke, *A Hoosier Autobiography* (New York, 1922), 112-113. Roosevelt was not too harsh, referring as he did to Welsh's "honesty and sincerity."

²⁷ Rogers to Welsh, Jan. 30, 1903. Years after their break, Welsh met Woodruff and his wife by chance at the Academy of Music, which prompted Woodruff to write Welsh a very cordial note. Woodruff to Welsh, Jan. 30, 1915.

included George Gluyas Mercer, Henry Budd, George Burnham, Jr., Charles Richardson, Joseph Fels, and Isaac Sharpless.²⁸

Eventually Welsh turned more to other interests. He obtained the services of John McKenna, formerly of the *Public Ledger*, as his associate editor,²⁹ and this experienced news man acted in his stead while Welsh toured Europe for nine months. Returning, he sought the lordly sum of \$100,000 from his top-hatted reform friends; he needed such a purse to convert *City and State* into a daily. But ruefully he had to admit that past displays of independent journalism, like the exposure of United States army torture in the Philippines and his tendency to support "good Democrats," as readily as most Old Philadelphians tended to support "good Republicans," was fatal for any chances he might have to expand the paper. Reluctantly, after more than nine years as the editor and proprietor of the saucy little reform journal, he put out the last issue on May 26, 1904.

Now it would be the turn of Van Valkenburg, editor of the powerful *North American*, to fight on for the cause of good government. Thereafter, in the *North American* the Philadelphia public would get a mixture of exciting local exposure along with uncritical publicity for Theodore Roosevelt's Square Deal and Big Stick policies. Gone was *City and State* with its somewhat more detached devotion to all aspects of reform. Perhaps Welsh's retirement was premature—he missed the great upheaval of 1905 when the new City Party consolidated reform splinter parties and took over from the defunct Philadelphia Municipal League as the fountainhead for progressive goals and strategy. Though pretty much out of the local reform picture, Welsh continued his interest in increasing measure in national and international issues. But he still had hopes for Philadelphia. His diary for November 7, 1911, reads: "Cool-fair. Rose at 6:30. Voted for Rudolph Blankenburg and the whole Keystone ticket at 7:15." Although he saw reform coming at last to Philadelphia, he had no role to play in the Blankenburg administration.

John B. Roberts, prominent Philadelphia surgeon, wrote Welsh on May 31, 1904: "It is not odd that your paper and Senator Quay, representing as they did the two extremes of political conduct,

²⁸ *City and State*, Dec. 21, 1899.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 1, 1903. McKenna joined Matthew K. Sniffen and William J. Skillman on the staff.

should die the same week! Your absolute truthfulness and honesty, and the courage of the editorial columns of City and State will long be remembered. You have helped us all." Others felt that way, too.

But Herbert Welsh was not to be well remembered, perhaps because the thundering editorials of Van Valkenburg in the daily *North American* stirred up such great controversy that by contrast Welsh's little sixteen-page weekly had been too scholarly, too broad in scope for the public to remember it long after its time. But Welsh no doubt had helped the *fin de siècle* reformers, and he deserves some attention as a molder of liberal thought in Philadelphia just as the Progressive Era was getting into full swing.

Eastern Michigan University

DONALD W. DISBROW