

The little preacher eyed him steadily for a moment, and then slowly returned to where he still sat holding his knee.

They had a long talk in very quiet tones. At the end the rector asked :

"Didn't you once meet Dr. Sevier's two nieces — at his house?"

"Yes," said Richling.

"Do you remember the one named Laura? The dark, flashing one?"

"Yes."

"Well,— oh, pshaw! I could tell you something funny, but I don't care to do it."

What he did not care to tell was that she had promised him five years before to be his wife any day when he should say the word. In all that time, and this very night, one letter, one line almost, and he could have ended his waiting.

They smiled together. "Well, good-bye again. Don't think I'm always going to persecute you with my solicitude."

"I'm not worth it," said Richling, slipping slowly down from his high stool and letting the little man out into the street.

A little way down the street some one coming out of a dark alley just in time to confront the clergyman extended a hand in salutation.

"Good-evening, Mr. Blank."

He took the hand. It belonged to a girl of eighteen, bareheaded and barefooted, holding in the other hand a small oil-can. Her eyes looked steadily into his.

"You don't know me," she said, pleasantly.

"Why, yes, now I remember you. You're Maggie."

"Yes," replied the girl. "Don't you recollect — in the mission-school? Don't you recollect you married me and Larry? That's two years ago." She almost laughed out with pleasure.

"And where's Larry?"

"Why, don't you recollect? He's on the sloop-o'-war *Preble*." Then she added more gravely: "I aint seen him in twenty months. But I know he's all right. I aint a-scared about *that* — only if he's alive and well; yes, sir. Well, good-evenin', sir. Yes, sir; I think I'll come to the mission nex' Sunday — and I'll bring the baby, will I? All right, sir. Well, so long, sir. Take care of yourself, sir."

What a word that was! It echoed in his ear all the way home. "Take care of *yourself*." What boast is there for the civilization that refines away the unconscious heroism of the unfriended poor?

He was glad he had not told Richling all his little secret. But Richling found it out later from Dr. Sevier.

(To be continued.)

---

## THE USE AND ABUSE OF PARTIES.

"PARTIES," says Tocqueville, "are a necessary evil in free governments." "We acknowledge with gratitude," says Sir Thomas Erskine May, "that we owe to party most of our rights and liberties." Behind these two sayings lies the political history of two great nations. It is not possible for the Frenchman to discern the uses of party as they appear to the Englishman; the best thing that he can say about it is that it is a "necessary evil"; "to recognize in party the very life-blood of freedom," as the English historian does, appears to him almost a paradox. Yet any one who will carefully read the first chapter of the second volume of May's "Constitutional History," in which he outlines the services of party to liberty in England during the last hundred years, will acknowledge that the Englishman's faith has a solid foundation.

There is not a little indiscriminating denunciation of parties in this country. Tocqueville's dictum expresses a common belief.

Doubtless the parties now existing have much to answer for, and it may be an open question whether both of them might not usefully be superseded by other organizations, with better methods and more definite principles; yet the fact that government in a free country can be carried on only by parties is a fact that the critics must not overlook. "Government without party," as May has vigorously said, "is absolutism. Rulers without opposition may be despots." There is no worse tyranny than that of an absolute democracy. The administration of the government must be conducted by officers who are agreed upon certain lines of public policy, and who work together for certain ends. To these a large number of citizens naturally adhere. The government is stable only when a majority of the citizens support the administration. But history makes nothing in statecraft plainer than that the administration, in any free government, needs to be constantly held in check in the exercise of its power,

to be constantly criticised in its measures and policies, to be constantly watched in the use of its patronage. This opposition ought to be strong enough to be respectable, and even formidable; it ought to be organized, so that it can make its criticisms and its protests effective. A weak opposition breeds tyranny and corruption. No government is likely to remain long in a healthy condition unless the parties are nearly equal numerically, and ready to take advantage of each other's mistakes. It is by the discussions that arise between parties that policies are sifted, public opinion formed, and the people fitted for their public duties.

Tocqueville distinguishes between great and small parties, the great parties being "those which cling to principles more than to consequences; to general, and not to especial, cases; to ideas, and not to men." He seems to think that such parties are not likely to exist except in times of revolution. But it cannot be denied that the two historical parties of England are both great parties; and they have maintained their organization, and, in the main, have adhered to their distinctive ideas in peace and in war, now for more than two hundred years. It is true that when great structural changes are rapidly taking place in governments, the more vital questions come into greater prominence, and matters of secondary moment are kept in the background. Nevertheless, in a progressive state of society there must be constant changes of form; upon the desirability of these changes there will be differences of opinion; and there is, therefore, a good basis for great parties even in times of peace.

Perhaps the most natural political division is that which distinguishes the great parties in England. Lord Macaulay urges, with some justice, that this distinction is one grounded in human nature; that it "had its origin in diversities of temper, of understanding, and of interest, which are found in all societies, and which will be found till the human mind ceases to be drawn in opposite directions by the charm of habit and by the charm of novelty."

The well-known passage in which this master of antithesis contrasts these two great tendencies of human nature indicates the historical basis of the two English parties: "Everywhere there is a class of men who cling with fondness to whatever is ancient, and who, even when convinced by overpowering reasons that innovation would be beneficial, consent to it with many misgivings and forebodings. We find, also, everywhere another class of men sanguine in hope, bold in speculation, always pressing forward, quick to discern the imperfections of whatever exists, disposed to think lightly of the risks which attend

improvements, and disposed to give every change credit for being an improvement."

These two classes of men are found everywhere, and there is no free government in which both of them are not needed. Changes must be made from time to time; yet there is danger that these changes will be rashly made. The liberals are wanted to push forward the car of progress, and the conservatives to steady its movements. It is in the just balancing of these two opposite tendencies that the order and healthful growth of society are secured.

When parties are formed around these two principles of human nature, a wise man may join the one to which his traditions guide him or his temperament inclines him, and be sure that he will find in either of them a good field for patriotic service. There is something to be said and done for the state on both sides. The tendency of the one party is toward absolutism, and of the other toward lawless individualism; but it is only a small section of either party that pushes toward these logical extremes. Macaulay says of the two English parties that, through all their history, "the great majority of those who fought for the crown were averse to despotism, and the great majority of the champions of popular rights were averse to anarchy." The man of moderation who unites with the conservatives will stand with them against innovations for which the time is not ripe; and will resist, also, the reactionary tendencies of extreme men in his own party. The man of just judgment who joins the liberals will unite with them in promoting the changes that ought to be made, while he helps to restrain the radicals whose zeal is untempered by experience.

In the evolution of free society this distinction of parties appears to be the most natural one; and if, as history seems to show, this distinction of the two great national parties, under various names, has been substantially preserved for more than two centuries in England, this fact will help to explain the peaceful progress of constitutional reform in that country.

In our own country the party lines originally followed distinctions less profoundly philosophical, and more obviously political, though it would not be difficult to show the presence in the two historical parties of our early history of organizing forces quite akin to those which gathered the English parties. With us, however, the opposing tendencies were the centralization and the diffusion of political power. The one party sought to strengthen the national government, the other to maintain the rights of the States. The stability of our political system depends on the proper balancing of these two forces. Certain powers

are reserved to the States, other powers are vested in the Federal Government; the coördination of these powers may well be the task of two great political parties. Here, too, there is something to be said on both sides. So long as the parties divide on this line, the patriotic citizen may safely attach himself to either of them. National authority needs to be strengthened; municipal liberties need to be preserved; there is room for good work in both directions. While these questions formed the staple of political discussion there was still fierce party spirit, and much unseemly and bitter controversy, in our political life; but there was also dignity in its debates, and meaning in its movements.

Other issues on which the parties have divided have been legitimate and fruitful. The tariff question is a question with two sides. That revenue is to be raised from imports everybody allows; the method of raising it, and the principles on which duties should be imposed, are matters worth discussion. I suppose that the ethical basis of free trade is the Christian law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; and on this a good argument may be rested, forbidding all restrictions upon commerce, and all discriminations against the industries of other nations. But the protectionist may well reply that the Christian law enjoins a rational self-love as the measure of our love to our neighbor; that it applies to nations not less than to individuals; and that the nation which neglects the development of its own resources can be of small service to the world. There are self-regarding virtues for peoples, as well as for persons; and it is as true of a nation as of a man, that by making the most of itself it can do the most for its neighbors. This line of thinking can easily be pushed to the extreme of international pharisaism, just as the doctrine of free trade may degenerate into an unpractical sentimentality; my contention is for neither of these doctrines, but only for the proposition that the issue which they make is one on which there may be honest difference and profitable discussion.

The one great question of our later history was, however, an illegitimate political issue; and the division of the people into two great parties about such a question could only result in disaster. Slavery in a democratic republic is an abnormity; the question whether slavery shall be extended or suppressed is like the question whether a malignant tumor on the human body shall be cultivated or reduced. Doubtless most political questions are more or less involved with ethical principles; but a question like this, which raises an enormous wrong into a political issue, and ranges half the people of the land among its

supporters and apologists, must work vast demoralization. To those who believe in the supremacy of the Power that makes for righteousness, by whatever name that Power may be called, it must be evident that a nation so divided is in a state of very unstable equilibrium. But, neglecting the ethical aspects of the case, the question about slavery struck at the organic ideas of the national life. Slavery may be a beneficent institution; but if so, this nation has no right to exist. To this complexion it came at last, and was sure to come from the first. The slavery question was not, therefore, a legitimate political issue, because it had not two sides, unless the question of the national existence has two sides. The thrusting of such an issue into political discussion works mischief in many ways; it damages those who support the anomaly; it renders many of those who oppose it fierce and pharisaical; the worst passions are aroused, and when the smouldering strife breaks out, as it surely will, in the horrible conflagration of civil war, a condition has been reached from which it is not easy to lead political discussion back to sober ways.

This is the difficulty in which our politics has been floundering now for fifteen years. The slavery question was settled by the war and the constitutional amendments. For a few years the obligation of the nation to care for the freedmen furnished the Republican party with a cry; slavery was dead, but the sequences of slavery prolonged the conflict. Of late, however, it has been evident enough to all sagacious Republicans that the negro at the South is better off without their championship; that his social condition is improving quite as fast as could be expected; that the only remedies now needed at the South are the development of its industries and the promotion of intelligence and morality. The Southern question, which in one form or another has been the burning question ever since the Republican party was organized, has now dropped out of politics. A leader of that faction which struggled to perpetuate this contest — a Stalwart of the Stalwarts — comes to the Presidency, and in his first message there is absolutely not one word about the Southern question! If there were a Southern question, could President Arthur have failed to discuss it before now? It is not only dead, it is so completely forgotten that he has even omitted to drop a tear upon its grave.

And now where are we? What political issue has survived the burial of the Southern question? On what lines of policy, on what doctrines of statecraft, are the two great parties divided. Precisely what does the Republican party now stand for, and what the Democratic

party? A thorough study of the platforms of the two parties and of the utterances of the party organs and of the party leaders for the last ten years would fail to afford any clear answer to these questions. On finance, while finance was an issue, neither party maintained any consistent policy; the Democrats, turning their backs on all their traditions, flirted most with the Greenback faction; but there were hard-money Democrats and soft-money Republicans, all in good standing in their respective parties. The same thing may be said of the tariff question. What intellectual change a man would be required to make in passing from one of these parties to the other it would be hard to tell. Who are the men most prominent as political leaders during the last twelve years, and what are their opinions on questions of legislation?

The lack of significance in the opinions of the men who have been of late the accredited leaders of the two parties, together with the studied ambiguities of their platforms, show that there is now no intelligible doctrinal difference between them. There is a difference, however, and it is easy to formulate: the Republican party exists for the purpose of retaining and distributing the offices; the Democratic party exists for the purpose of regaining and distributing the offices.

The mental change required of the voter who passes from one party to another involves, therefore, simply the substitution of one letter of the alphabet for another. Perhaps the moral change is not much greater.

It is no exaggeration, it is the simple truth, to say that the *raison d'être* of each of the two great political parties to-day is the government patronage — the possession of it in the one case, the hope of it in the other. Principles on which the two parties differ there are none to speak of; policies about which they disagree they rarely mention; the strife is simply for the spoils of office. Each party is ready to read its own record backward for the sake of carrying an election.

In the contest that arose respecting the Louisiana election returns in 1876, the Republicans in Congress insisted that the certificate of the State officers was final; that Congress had no right to go behind the returns. The Democrats, on the other hand, maintained the obligation of Congress to reopen the whole subject, and investigate the election. Thus the Republicans exalted State rights and the Democrats national supremacy, each party renouncing its own traditional principles, and espousing those of its antagonist, for the sake of counting in its candidates! A little more than a year after this hot debate, a Democrat came to Congress from Florida,

bearing the certificate of the State officers, but followed by a Republican contestant. And now the Republicans, to a man, insisted that Congress ought to go behind the returns; and the Democrats, to a man, contended that the certificate of the Governor must always be final! It would have been amusing, if it had not been painful, to sit in the gallery and hear these honorable gentlemen read extracts from one another's speeches of the year before, in which each one had flatly contradicted all that he then was saying. What was consistency when an office was at stake?

Here are two noteworthy facts in our recent political history: the dearth of principles, the strife for patronage. Which of these is cause, and which is effect? Perhaps the relation is reciprocal. In the disappearance of the old issues the mind of the manager has lightly turned to thoughts of spoil; while the enormous growth of government patronage has offered to ambition a prize so large as to withdraw the attention of all but the soberest men from the business of statesmanship. Certain it is that the presence of this element has greatly retarded the finding of new questions for discussion and new measures for advocacy. Questions there must be of grave importance to this nation at the present juncture; questions that admit of honest difference of opinion; measures that affect the enlightenment, the peace, the order, the prosperity of the whole country. Now that a fair beginning has been made in the reform of the civil service, we may hope that such questions will receive a little more attention. But in order that our future political discussions may have dignity and meaning, the good work thus begun must be completed. There will never again be any assignable difference of principle or policy between the two political parties, until the belittling and warping influence of the spoils shall cease to be paramount in political life. If we would have parties that stand for something, and campaigns that enlighten instead of mislead and corrupt the voters, let us make haste to establish an unpartisan civil service in all branches of the government.

It may be added in passing — though this wisdom will seem foolishness to the machinist — that the intellectual bond of a common belief in certain clearly expressed political principles will hold a party together much more firmly than the possession of political spoil. "The cohesive power of public plunder" is a misnomer; the principle is one of repulsion rather than of attraction; by this force parties are oftener rent than compacted. The English parties never stood together so solidly as they have done since there has been no patronage to divide among the victors.

Our discussion has taken us over familiar fields; but it may have helped us to a clearer understanding of the uses and abuses of political parties. That they may be the instruments of justice is evident; and it is not less clear that they may be the weapons of selfishness.

"Party," says Burke, "is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle upon which they are agreed." "National interests," says Bolingbroke, speaking of certain supposed combinations of men, "would sometimes be sacrificed and always made subordinate to personal interests; and that, I think, is the true character of faction."

Just so long as a party answers Burke's definition, just so long as it is bound together by a common attachment to principles and a supreme regard for the national welfare, its existence is justified; the moment it becomes a machine for the dispensation of patronage, it is a menace to the state. The question whether the two great political organizations of this country are best described by Burke's or by Bolingbroke's definition is a question which good Americans would do well to ponder.

They will not smell any too sweet, no matter by what name we call them. In the rank and file there is patriotism enough, but the management is often selfish and venal. What, then, is the duty of intelligent and patriotic men respecting them? To this question various answers are given.

1. Keep out of political life. It is hopelessly corrupt. You can do nothing to purify it. Let it alone.

This is the argument of despair, lightly urged by many frivolous and faithless souls, but not to be entertained by any patriot.

2. Vote always, but belong to no party. Join the unorganized mob of Independents; take your place on what Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., calls "the center of the tilting-board," and put your votes in every election where they will do the most good — voting always for the best men, or, at any rate, against the worse rascals.

This is a comfortable way of doing political duty; the practical difficulty is in determining which rascal is the worse. Both are sometimes so bad that it is hard to choose.

3. Maintain a loose relation to one party or the other, but take no part in the primary meetings, and bolt when they offer you bad candidates or bad measures. The theory is that in this semi-attached condition you will influence somewhat the nominations; that the party managers will be thinking of you when they make up the ticket.

This, too, is apt to leave the voter simply a choice of two evils. The gentlemen left by

you in charge of the primary meetings are not sure to think of you, and if they do, they console themselves with the reflection that the other fellows will probably nominate a worse man than theirs.

4. Join one party or the other. Go into the caucuses, if you can get in. Take your pluck and your independence along with you. Tell the gentlemen in charge that you are interested in the success of the party, and that you want to help keep it in a shape in which it will deserve to succeed. Give them distinctly to understand that while you ask nothing for yourself, you intend to take a hand in shaping the party policy and in making the nominations; and that you will be guided in all this by a supreme regard for national interests rather than personal interests. If, in spite of your protests, they make bad nominations, bolt the nominations, and return to the charge the next time, taking with you as many as you can of your well-intentioned neighbors. If you preserve your temper, and use reason, and keep standing up for men and things that are honest and of good report, peradventure they will listen to you at length, and you may succeed in lifting up the standards and in purifying party management.

This last method appears to me by far the wisest one. Of course there are communities where men of independent judgment are not tolerated in caucuses. In New York City, for example, until recently no man could vote in a Republican caucus unless he were a member of a Republican "Association," and no man could join a Republican "Association" unless he pledged himself beforehand to vote for every regular Republican candidate. Certainly no man is fit to be intrusted with the franchise who will thus sell his vote beforehand to a political club for the price of admission to its membership. But the party organizations throughout the country are not all of this character; and there is generally a chance for respectable men, who are determined to maintain their independence, to gain a hearing in the caucuses. Of course many of the gentlemen in charge would much prefer to have them stay away; but these gentlemen will commonly contrive to conceal their displeasure, and will endure the irruption as gracefully as they can.

It is by this active and personal interest in political affairs that men of intelligence and virtue can best serve their country. The government will continue to be administered by parties, and it is in the caucuses that party character is formed and party action shaped. Not to attend the caucus is to neglect the supreme duty of citizenship. By reforming the

civil service, one chief cause of party corruption will be removed. But the warfare will not then be accomplished; it will only just be well begun. The need of beginning at the sources of political activity and cleansing the stream that issues therefrom should be obvious to every public-spirited citizen. When every voter recognizes the truth that the obligation to attend the caucus can no more be shirked than the obligation to vote, the character of the parties will speedily show signs of improvement. The man who always votes, but never attends the primary meeting, is much like the man who always eats, but takes no pains to secure wholesome food, or like the man who always shoots, but lets somebody else direct his aim.

Since government in a free country is and must be by parties, the purity of the government depends on the purity of the party organizations. And the party organizations will

not be kept pure if the business of managing them is left to a few professional politicians. Mr. Stickney urges that this business is now become so vast that it cannot be done by ordinary citizens, who have their ordinary daily callings to follow; and that it must be attended to by professionals, who give to it their whole time and thought. I do not think that this is true; I believe that the intelligent and prosperous citizens can afford to give the necessary time to practical politics. They must do it, or lose their liberties.

The simple question is whether the intelligent and prosperous citizens will make up their minds to use the political parties as the instruments of patriotism, or whether the political managers shall continue to use the intelligent and prosperous citizens as the instruments of knavery. The abuses of party will cease when good men use the parties instead of being used by them.

*Washington Gladden.*



## THE RED SILK HANDKERCHIEF.

THE yellow afternoon sun came in through the long blank windows of the room wherein the Superior Court of the State of New York, Part II., Gillespie, Judge, was in session. The hour of adjournment was near at hand; a dozen court loungers slouched on the hard benches in the attitudes of cramped carelessness which mark the familiar of the halls of justice. Beyond the rail sat a dozen lawyers and lawyers' clerks, and a dozen weary jurymen. Above the drowsy silence rose the nasal voice of the junior counsel for the defense, who, in a high monotone, with his faint eyes fixed on the paper in his hand, was making something like a half-a-score of "requests to charge."

Nobody paid attention to him. Two lawyer's clerks whispered like mischievous school-

boys, hiding behind a pile of books that towered upon a table. Junior counsel for the plaintiff chewed his pencil and took advantage of his opportunity to familiarize himself with certain neglected passages of the New Code. The crier, like a half-dormant old spider, sat in his place and watched a boy who was fidgeting at the far end of the room, and who looked as though he wanted to whistle.

The jurymen might have been dream-men, vague creations of an autumn afternoon's doze. It was hard to connect them with a world of life and business. Yet, gazing closer, you might have seen that one looked as if he were thinking of his dinner, and another as if he were thinking of the lost love of his youth; and that the expression on the faces of the